

Oregon Daily EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published five days a week during the school year, except during examinations and vacation periods, by the Student Publications Board of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the post office, Eugene, Ore. Subscription: \$5 per school year, \$2 per term.

BILL MAINWARING, Editor

MARCIA MAUNEY, Editorial Page Editor CHUCK MITCHELMORE, Managing Editor DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of The Emerald and do not pretend to represent the opinion of the ASUO or the University. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

KEN NIEHANS, Business Manager

Now We Know

Several weeks ago The Emerald questioned editorially many aspects of women's dormitory rules.

We wondered first of all who made the rules which presently govern our freshman women's dormitory living. We were able to find nothing whatsoever down in black and white to answer this question. We were amazed that the "Handbook for Dormitory Women" which includes the official list of rules gives no indication as to where any one of them originated.

We wondered, too, just what the philosophy and attitude supporting these rules might be... what type of person the freshman woman is assumed to be in order to justify these rules and in what ways she is expected to develop through her dormitory experience.

Because it is our conviction that the freshman women merit a great deal more freedom than they are now experiencing, we were concerned, too, about what procedure exists, if any, for revising these rules.

Do the women living under them have anything to say? If they appear obviously unhappy with their restrictions (as many have during the past months), do their counselors and housemothers explain to them the method for expressing their feelings to a group which does have some power in this area? If a freshman approaches the Student Affairs office, is she told the procedure for doing this?

Reports to us indicated that these women

had not been informed of any recourse available to them.

But a statement from Student Affairs on page one of today's Emerald explains where the rules originated and many other interesting things about them — things which may very possibly come as a surprise to the women who have been living under them.

These women who have been frustrated for months in trying to get someone with authority to lend them a sympathetic ear will be happy to know that there is "an established procedure — from individual students through hall presidents and counselors — for making recommendations for change."

In fact, any concerned students are "invited to make their recommendations, in writing and with reasons, to the Dean of Women for consideration by Heads of Houses during spring term."

From this statement we must assume that Heads of Houses possesses some authority to revise these rules. We're extremely pleased to know this. And we imagine many freshmen are too.

Student Affairs also stated that the rules "are designed to develop maturity and responsibility in academic performance, personal behavior, and citizenship." We hope the rule changes recommended will be thoughtful, serious and well-justified ones — and ones more directly reflecting the sound philosophy stated above than many rules which exist today. (M.M.)

...A Right to Expect More of IFC

As a long-time admirer of Inter-fraternity Council's mature and responsible tradition, The Emerald is bitterly disappointed with its most recent action. Its decision to do business behind closed doors, to return fraternity discipline to University officials, and to refuse to meet Rush Week's problems head-on at its meeting last week weakens our faith in its ability.

Its unprecedented ban on news coverage seems inexcusable, especially when it was discussing Rush Week revision, a matter of vital interest to the whole campus community. IFC is very fortunate that it has been given the power to decide when Rush Week will be held; it places itself in an indefensible position when it refuses to make the decision in public. Surely students of this University have the right to know upon what basis such vital decisions are made.

We are also disappointed by its handling of the discipline case involving damage at sororities caused by two fraternities. Two weeks ago we congratulated the IFC tribunal for the mature and responsible way it handled the case and apportioned punishment — social probation. But at its secret meeting last week IFC decided it isn't ready to discipline its own members, that henceforth such decisions will be made by the Dean of Men.

Saddest of all was IFC's unwillingness to deal with Rush Week revision. Fraternities disagreed fall term over just what had been wrong with the recent Rush Week, but nearly everyone agreed that it had been a mess. There have also been numerous suggestions that rushing should be done winter term instead of fall term.

Last year IFC had a Rush Week revision committee. This year it had a similar committee. So what did IFC do? It heard a report which praised deferred rushing (so we hear at least, although The Emerald was not allowed to attend) but said it couldn't be done next year because people didn't know enough about it. So IFC has appointed a new committee, broadened by faculty members, to look into the whole thing. But nothing can be done for next year, it was concluded.

The Emerald is not automatically opposed to fall term rushing, although it has many deficiencies. There are also legitimate arguments against deferred rushing. But to hide behind closed doors and to announce to the campus that there is no time to study the problem and reach a decision before next year would be funny, if not so important.

Why wasn't the committee broadened months ago? And since it wasn't, why cannot the new committee report by the middle of spring term, so that next year's freshmen and Greeks can have the benefit of whatever policy is deemed best?

If IFC's committee can make a legitimate public case for fall term rush, students need have no objection. But we think students have plenty of objection to IFC's unwillingness to face such a vital problem here and now.

IFC has long had a reputation as a strong and independent organization, able and willing to meet and solve the problems facing fraternity men. Its most recent performance was an utter failure.

Fraternity men have a right to expect more of their IFC.

Don't Count on It!



Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

To begin with, let me state plainly that I am in sympathy with the women of the University in their struggle for more liberty. However, as a sympathizer I feel compelled to warn them that letters to the Emerald such as Friday's by Mary Sullivan can be of no help to their cause.

Previously a nice bit of sarcasm on the dormitory fines by Messrs. Cox and Granata was taken literally and assailed by those it sought to aid, and now Messrs. Cowen and Hall have suffered a like fate, after their tongue-in-cheek letter on the dormitory restrictions.

Take care, Mary; when you demonstrate so publicly that you are unable to perceive even the most obvious satire, you add strength to the arguments of those who feel that you should be told when to go to the toilet.

John R. Faust, Jr.

Second Year Law Student

Emerald Editor:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the students and faculty members who helped make Tuesday's Art Shoppe show, "Imagine That!" a success.

We are indebted to the Emerald for publicity, to the cast and sound crew of "Gallows Hill" who showed such fine showmanship in the face of some rather large obstacles, and to those whose work has appeared to be unnoticed by the campus in general.

We of the Creative Arts Committee feel that none of this work was wasted if the show presented an interesting display of "Oregon originality" to the members of the faculty, townspeople and students who attended.

We hope that it did do this, and our biggest vote of thanks goes to that audience which showed its interest in University of Oregon's young artists.

Anne Kirk

Junior in English

Emerald Editor:

Who is willing to defend the proposition that the Emerald and, thereby, the student body, does not have the right to be represented at a meeting which concerns a high student council, potential fraternity rushes, the memberships of all fraternities, and three in particular, as

well as four or five sororities and some faculty? The IFC February 28 meeting concerned all these groups, yet no representative of the Emerald was allowed to attend.

In the interests of the fundamental rights of press freedom, and as one who prefers to read a reporter's account of a news story rather than as "as told by" version, I believe University of Oregon students and faculty should be given full details as to why the Emerald's representative was not allowed to attend that meeting.

Who said the Emerald reporter could not attend? Why? How were such instructions given the Emerald? On whose authority? What is the Emerald's stand? What is the University's official stand? Is this a violation of freedom of the press?

Are the facts concerning the ATOs and Phi Deltas as vicious as the rumors which followed the lack of information concerning their cases in the Emerald? Has a disservice been done, in the case of these two fraternities, by any censorship which did not allow a frank and free report to be published?

Worse yet, are students at the University of Oregon learning to submit passively to press censorship?

Bill Fendall

Graduate in Journalism

Editor's Note:

"We (whoever 'we' is) have decided not to permit an Emerald reporter at this meeting," IFC President Don McClain said, in effect, to reporter Phil Hager, Dean of Men Ray Hawk apparently approved the action.

Reason given was that the group was to again discuss the damage to sororities caused by two fraternities, and that newspaper accounts of previous discussion had damaged the fraternity system. This story resulted from IFC allowing Hager to attend a previous meeting of the "tribunal," which handles disciplinary problems and has traditionally been private. Hager was surprised at this action, but naturally did his job.

The Emerald considers this decision foolish from IFC's standpoint and a break of faith with students who have come to respect the group's traditional above-the-table approach to problems of general interest. Our stand is elaborated in an editorial on this page.