

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

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

Result of 'White Clause' Pressure

The fight is on to force fraternities to eliminate their "white clauses" or else leave the campus. At least this is the aim of Charles Koburger, chairman of the new ASUO committee to investigate racial and religious discrimination. Although it is very unlikely that the ASUO Senate would recommend such action, Koburger's aim is probably to attract attention to the problem, and hope for such a directive by the administration or the Legislature.

Such action has been taken at several colleges, where fraternities have been given deadlines beyond which they cannot exist with "white clauses." Thus national fraternities must remove such racial restrictions or else give up chapters at all such institutions.

But, accepting that "white clauses" are wrong, is such pressure for their removal contributing anything to racial brotherhood? We don't believe so. One need only look at Oregon's 16 sororites, none of which have such written restrictions, to ascertain what "progress" follows such physical removal.

The fraternity answer to such pressure is removal of the "white clause" from the public constitution, placing it instead in the secret ritual. This has been done by several, and because of this pressure other nationals are expected to follow suit. And it's about all anyone could expect under the circumstances, for one might just as well admit that millions of Americans have strong feelings of racial prejudice. At a fraternity convention an undergraduate who fights the clause on principle (removal, not disguise) finds himself needing a two-thirds majority to amend and opposed by all Southerners and most older alumni members.

But the fraternity, to get around the type of pressure which Koburger recommends, hides the racial prejudice of some of its members in its ritual. Thus it can hypocritically face the world supposedly without racial discrimination.

But much as we hate hypocrisy, it is not the worst results of such pressure ill will is stirred up within fraternities, which will likely delay the time when true racial brotherhood will there exist.

Most fraternity members feel, rightly or wrongly (that's a legal point), that what they do is nobody else's business, when outside groups force them to adopt subterfuge (the only result possible, since real progress cannot be made until changes take place in the minds and hearts of their members), fraternities become bitter. This strengthens the hand of the extremists, who would hold out for centuries if given their choice. Such ill will weakens the position of those within fraternities (and there are many) who are working for true racial equality in their memberships.

That's why The Emerald disapproves of the aims of those who are presently trying to pressure fraternities into removing "white clauses." We believe they are damaging the cause which they should be working toward — true racial brotherhood throughout society.

Fraternity critics should remember that in most fraternities no man is pledged unless he is accepted unanimously by the chapter members. Discouraging as it may sound — with or without constitutional restrictions — the time when every member would accept those of other races is probably many years away. But the eventual goal is worth any effort.

Something in the 'Good' Class

It's supposed to be convenient and nicely safe from controversy for a newspaper to endorse editorially such things as professorial lectures, university traditions, sunshiny days and the American flag. But the ease of supporting these items makes for difficulty when the writer wants strongly to recommend something in that general category.

Maybe it would be best to say that tonight's University-Concert Music performance is a return engagement, made so by popular demand. But this probably would not excite students who didn't know she

was here the first time. Or maybe the writer should note that Gina Bachauer is considered one of the top women pianists of the day. Or possibly we should say that the students might show more of an interest in the concert series if they remembered that these free concerts are supported by money — an amount recently increased — from fees paid by the students themselves.

But such arguments are too straightforward and sincere to use on the cynical University students who know better than to follow up on something in the "good" American flag, sunshiny day class.

(C.H.M.)

— Letters to the Editor —

Emerald Editor:

Brittsan has invited comment on his recent column. Here's mine.

What does Brittsan mean when he says, "the tax committee was presented with many impressive statistics showing that Oregon fraternal groups are eliminating discriminatory restrictions?" The only statistic I saw reported was that about half of the fraternities maintained race clauses in their charters. This is surely not an "impressive statistic." I would say that it was most disappointing.

In the next paragraph Britt-

san says, "We must realize that very few individuals in (fraternities) can make them entirely discriminatory regardless of their written laws." Brittsan fails to turn this coin over and point out that "written laws" often prohibit the members of a fraternity from extending the hand of brotherhood to non-caucasians when the local membership may wish to do so. The result is that the members of such a fraternity are denied the right to choose their own associates.

As a member of a fraternity I have been denied the right to choose non-caucasians as fra-

ternity brothers by the "written laws" of my group. Can anyone say that my free choice of associates has not been denied in this case? Don't tell me that I must choose either caucasians or non-caucasians as friends, but not both.

Bill Alexander
Graduate in
Political Science

Emerald Editor:

I am very much pleased to see that the ASUO Thursday night passed Senator Koburger's resolution. The students' interest in their own welfare

(Continued on page three)

Out of Cigarettes?



"Wake up, Ethel, it's Spring."

Interpreting the News

Knowland Continues Role Opposing Ike's Program

By JAMES MARLOW
AP News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—Sen. William Fite Knowland, the 48-year-old Californian who may seek the presidency someday, continues what he's been doing since he became Republican leader of the Senate in 1953.



He continues to criticize and oppose President Eisenhower's program when it suits him, which is often. If it seems strange that the Senate Republican leader should buck the Republican President, Knowland has offered an explanation:

He thinks, he said, it's his job to bring about a meeting of Senate minds on the President's proposals. He was quoted in Look magazine as saying he will agree with the President "unless it involves a matter of deep personal principles."

And he has said he has supported Eisenhower's program most of the time. Two years ago he claimed a 90 per cent record on that score.

Eisenhower has avoided a break with the senator, who must be a thorn in his side many times. Diplomatically he said of the differences between them that they are really more a matter of method than of principle.

Knowland announced not long ago he would quit the Senate when his term ends in January 1959. He had his eye on the White House in 1956, until Eisenhower said he would run again. Knowland hasn't denied he'll look in the same direction in 1960.

Knowland has repeatedly been critical of the United Nations. Eisenhower has tried to build it up and puts a lot of reliance in it.

This year Knowland wants to cut the President's budget and his foreign aid program. He also is against giving Communist Poland economic aid although the administration invited the Poles over here to discuss aid.

When the administration talked of sanctions against

Israel unless it got out of Egypt, Knowland called this immoral unless sanctions were also invoked against Russia for not getting out of Hungary. Israel pulled its troops out; Russia still hasn't.

Going backwards to 1953, here were some other Knowland positions:

He objected to Eisenhower's sending Gen. Nathan F. Twining to Russia on a visit. He said the United States "retreated from principle" in agreeing to a "package deal" which let four Communist and 12 non-Communist nations into the U.N.

He doubted beforehand, the wisdom of Eisenhower's Big Four meeting with the Russians, British and French in Geneva in 1955 and cautioned against a "sell-out." He objected when Eisenhower that same year said he was willing to talk to the Red Chinese about a cease-fire around Formosa.

When the administration released the Yalta papers — the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin wartime talks — and Eisenhower said he hoped they would not be used for political purposes, Knowland said, "I don't agree."

He derided as "nonsense" Secretary of State Dulles' statement that this country would not defend the Matsu and Quemoy islands off Formosa unless they were used as stepping stones for an attack on Formosa itself.

Knowland wanted this country to blockade the Red China coast to bring about the release of captured American fliers and to serve an ultimatum on the Red Chinese, backed by "effective action," if they were not released.

He got neither wish. Eisenhower said such a blockade would be an act of war. And Eisenhower left him talking to himself when he one time called for a diplomatic break with Russia.

In 1954 he was so displeased with the Eisenhower-Dulles handling of foreign policy that he called for a congressional review of it. And he voted for the final version of the Bricker Amendment — opposed by Eisenhower — which would limit the President's treaty-making powers.