

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The OREGON DAILY EMERALD published Monday through Friday during the college year except Oct. 30; Dec. 5 through Jan. 3; Mar. 6 through 28; May 7; Nov. 22 through 27; and after May 24, with issues on Nov. 4 and May 12, by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year; \$2 per term.

Every Block Is a Builder

Why did you bring all this up in the first place?

That's a question which has come more than once to the Emerald in the last week. "This" refers to the case of the sorority member who moved from her house rather than stop dating a Negro student.

We firmly believe racial discrimination should not exist. We believe the United States has steadily progressed in the direction of non-discrimination because of race, religion, and color. And we believe our country will continue to move in this direction.

But it will be slowed immeasurably if every incident such as this one is buried. One incident on one college campus will not change the whole of society, but when enough of these blocks are stacked, the great barriers of prejudice will groan and give way to legislation or change in attitude without legislation.

And to the second point of our "Code of Prejudice" editorial, we believe there's more to education than texts and tests. Here is where we must learn to make decisions. Here is where we must become individuals, doing our own thinking.

The active sorority members were given no voice or vote in this case. Decisions were made by alumnae of the house.

The ultimate goal of our telling this story was the accomplishment of some good. And if a similar case of social wrong comes tomorrow from any segment of the campus, the story must be told.

The Year of the Union

1950-51—the year the "Brick Lady" came to be.

She's new—spanking new, in fact—an addition to the University family not even a year old. She's still feeling her way—and she hasn't quite adjusted to the students who make her their home "port" for a coke or a good breeze session or a club meeting. And the students haven't quite adjusted to her—but time cures a lot of things.

Ah, to build, to build!

That is the noblest of all the arts.

Longfellow.

And so they built her—the "Brick Lady". And then the students came . . . they came to her bowling alleys and her snack-bar and they crowded around her pool tables and into her plush meeting rooms.

A few noticed the semi-circular driveway in the back—but most of her people came up the walk and passed the muddy lawn that became so green and pretty by spring. And they came into the place that was quickly christened the "fish bowl" and pretty soon the "Brick Lady" was buzzing and bulging and everyone realized that a 23-year-old dream was a dream no more.

"The University Here Makes Grateful Recognition of All who Gave Their Devotion and Their Substance that This Student Union Might Be."

Everybody enjoyed the Union—from the activity people who worked in glassed-in cubicles that looked like bird cages to the kinds whose only interest was a warm game of ping-pong. But there were complaints, too.

They said that the architectural design was poor and that someone forgot to put in windows on the back sides. They said the service at the bar was slow and clumsy and they talked about it all year and the service is still slow and clumsy and they'll talk about it all next year. They complained about "foreigners" taking over "our building" and crowding us out of our meeting rooms and off our bowling alleys.

We still hear patented gripes about the "cold" atmosphere of the big place—but the years will pass and the "U" will become a little friendlier and the students will become a little friendlier.

"Do not be tolerant of misrepresentation of superficiality, or the parading of false issues as though they were real. Tolerance does not extend to intellectual dishonesty or ineptitude."

—Donald M. Erb

But we can look back now—and mix our toleration and our intoleration—our praises and complaints. We'll wonder about the abstracts on the walls that we'll never understand—and we'll wonder what band they'll get for the next Junior prom and chuckle about the time LaFollette's formal address in the ballroom was interrupted by rasping announcements from the lobby desk.

The first chapter on the big "U" closes now—and in the time ahead, we know we'll always remember that last year at Oregon as the year that the Union came to be.

THE DAILY 'E' . . .

to the 199 University students and high school seniors who received scholarships for next year,

Letters

The Campus Answers

Bluffed Out Emerald Editor:

A front page spread in the Oregonian appears to throw a little more light on the situation of the girl who was bluffed out of living in her sorority because of dating a colored student.

It is suggested that her sorority sisters were sympathetic toward her, but were given no opportunity to vote on the matter. It is intimated that the alumnae advisor is the main "trouble-maker."

If that is true, it seems to me a

tragic instance of the older generation teaching prejudice very forcefully to the younger, who seemed instinctively without it.

I don't believe this is the kind of education we want at the University of Oregon. Attitudes formed at college are likely to stay with us all our lives, and it is pretty important that they be democratic, right now.

In my opinion the sorority sisters should inform their advisor that she is unacceptable to them.

Troy F. Caldwell

Behavior Disgusting

Emerald Editor:

You make a mistake in referring to opposition to dating of white girl and Negro as "prejudice." Opposition to shocking and disgusting human behavior is not prejudice. The white Negro-dating girl and her Negro man should resign or be forced out of the University.

H. Henry

(letter from Portland)

Spotlight on a Former Fraternity President

Emerald Editor:

May we answer the letter from the former fraternity president that appeared in yesterday's "The Campus Answers" column?

(1) If membership in a Greek social fraternity or sorority means one must give up his principles and values in terms of what constitutes democratic and Christian living, or fair play, then the organization is not worthy of membership.

(2) By the very nature of the college fraternal system at the University of Oregon, it is obvious that "for the good of the chapter" one must practice discrimination. However, on the campus of many American colleges where chapters of the same fraternities and sororities exist, minority group members are being admitted to membership. Because an individual is big in heart and spirit, has a definite moral code in regard to her fellowmen, and has the courage to stick to her principles and values does it mean that that individual is acting "in a manner that would bring unfavorable attention to the group?"

It seems to us that that person alone knows the meaning of the words fraternity and sorority. Is the person wrong in being broader in perspective than others who can only see as far as the end of their noses?

(3) On what basis in terms of democracy and Christianity don't some people approve of White-Negro dating? Students attend institutions of higher learning to learn the way of the "good life". What is the point of philosophy, sociology, history, and all of the various subject-matter areas if an individual doesn't learn to live with his fellowmen? Should we leave the campus as narrow in our outlook as we entered for the first time?

(4) It is a sad state of affairs and speaks poorly for the administration of the University of Oregon if the mores of the society of this campus are based on segregation and discrimination. The Negro concerned, we are sure, felt that he was a student at the University with all of the rights and privileges accorded any student and could date any girl as any other male student as long as the two individuals concerned were mutually agreed. It is all right for Negroes to play football, basketball, and the other sports on this campus, but he must not date any girls or be accorded membership in the Greek letter organizations.

Our plea to the administration and the student body of the University of Oregon is to wake up and really become educated and intelligent people. Be big, not little, let democracy and Christianity be meaningful not mere words.

Let's change the Code of Prejudice on this campus.

In conclusion, please be advised that a recent decision handed down by the Supreme Court of the United States (McLaurin vs University of Oklahoma) ruled that Negroes were to be admitted to state universities of higher

learning on a non-segregated basis. If the Greek letter organizations on this campus are a part of the university (and we believe they are), then they are operating in violation of this decision as well as the non-discriminatory clauses of some of their national bodies.

Beta Psi Chapter

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity
(Inter-racial fraternity organized this year at Oregon)

Emerald Editor:

The following comments are the result of some serious thinking, over a period of time, by one who is making sociology his life work.

1. It is interesting to note that a letter, such as appeared in the letterbox May 22, should be unsigned. Formerly, the "unsigned" were on the other side of the fence. The fact that so many have written in, and signed names, indicates a change. If an individual has something to say, which follows deep thought, and of which he is firmly convinced, it would not seem that he would be unwilling to stand up and be counted.

2. It is enlightening to know that the "good social reputation" of a chapter depends upon "subordination of personal desires for the general good of the chapter." The important point involves whether or not the "good social reputation" of a chapter depends upon a restriction of individual choice regarding friends, or of discrimination against certain other individuals or groups.

3. I am also happy to know that it is "for the good of the group" not to bring unfavorable attention from "ANY" other group. This probably includes such groups as responded in the letter box, alumni groups, the Communist Party, N. A. A. C. P.,—it begins to get a bit ridiculous to make such a statement, for the disapproval of SOME is taken to be a good thing in itself.

4. I question the statement concerning "mores of the society in which we live" Witness Negroes admitted to southern universities, allowed to eat in the diners of southern trains, and even F.E.P. laws in Oregon. Obviously, the mores he talks about are only the mores of those who "just don't completely approve of white-Negro dating."

5. The writer, as indeed do most such individuals, leaps to the hysterical conclusion that "dating means mating."

6. As far as a "deliberate and poorly-considered breach of the mores"—since when has friendship—not forced, or artificial, or class-bound, or Greek bound—since when is that kind of friendship deliberately plotted? In the "case" discussed at length by so many, we have an example of friendship, something, I believe, which goes much deeper than most superficial attachments which take place through high school and most of college. Here, it would seem, is the basis of Christianity, which so many pro-

less, but which so few do anything about.

7. And finally, (and this will hurt), it is my opinion that certain individuals, who have, in the past history of the university, been suspended or expelled for questionable activities, would be far more damaging to "the good social reputation" of a chapter if they were to associate with its members, whereas, I have yet to meet a Negro student on campus who would bring down such "unfavorable attention."

R. L. James

Dear "Mr. Name Withheld",

Tch, tch. Such a cowardly act. Apparently you don't believe in the things you say, or you would have no fear of censure. Anyhow the question is not one of group taste, but one of fundamental human rights. The act committed by the sorority, while in keeping with the policies of some white Greek organizations is a violation of the true principles and gallant spirit upon which this nation was founded and built.

Consequently that which you term as being "for the general good of the chapter," is only the ranting of a bigoted minority, serving to undermine the integrity of the nation.

Today the nation is in the feverish grip of a battle. The battle of ideologies which so far, we have not been able to counteract with maximum success; not because of the total strength of the opposing ideology, but more so the artificially created weaknesses within our own ideology.

Those weaknesses created by you and a reactionary traditionalist-herd who insist on the maintenance of a decadent and corrupt status quo, and like the Norwegian mice on their periodic suicide marches, leaves destruction in the wake of their path while forging ahead to a certain and eventual destruction.

In reference to point four of your letter, that I would regard as a feeble apology for the subtle maneuvers of a bigoted minority. Moreover it seems that you have failed to realize that Negroes here at the University of Oregon or any where in the United States are not prepared nor do they intend to help you and your kind maintain a harmful status quo.

G. E. Jean-Jacques

Emerald Editor:

. . . May I remind him (the former fraternity president) that social fraternities and sororities are merely a small part of a larger society and that their "good social reputation" depends upon how they conduct themselves with respect to this larger society.

Our correspondent intimates that a member (of a fraternity or sorority) should "not act in a manner that would bring unfavorable attention to the group from ANY other group, or substantial portion thereof." In this age of conflicting ideals and restructuring of institutions such a

(Please turn to page three)