

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.

SALLY JO GREIG, SAM VAHEY, Associate Editors CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor

JACK WILSON, Sports Editor GLEN GRAVES, Ass't. Adv. Mgr. CHARMION FORD, Office Manager

EDITORIAL BOARD: Bill Mainwaring, Marcia Mauney, Sally Jo Greig, Sam Vahey, Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle,

Chief Make-up Editor: Al Johnson Women's Editor: Dorothy West
Ass't. News Editor: Cay Mundorff, Joan Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Jo Anne Milligan
Dennis, Nancy Castle, Evelyn Olsen Classified Adv. Mgr.: Arlene Krauss
Nancy Ferguson Photo Editor: Nathan Bull
Feature Editor: Phil Hager Ad Make-up Editor: Warren Rucker

Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Tom Chapman
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley
Copy Desk Chief: Wayne Woodman.

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

Managing Editor DOROTHY BARKER, Adv. Mgr.

CORNELIA FOGLE, News Editor

CHARMION FORD, Office Manager

Chuck Mitchelmore, Cornelia Fogle,

Circulation Mgr.: Sam Vahey
Asst. Sports Editors: Jerry Ramsey, Tom Chapman
Executive Secretary: Pat Holley
Copy Desk Chief: Wayne Woodman.

More to the Housemother Story

As if there weren't already enough controversies (or issues, if you please), along comes the fraternity housemother, which also is the root of all evil, the end of all freedom for the minority (or the majority) and the beginning of un-American dictatorial power by someone other than the guys on our side.

But what of the story behind all this? (Or is that something we should leave out for sake of argument?) The thoughts about men's housemother programs in general were brought out last weekend in a discussion meeting of representatives to the Western Regional Inter-fraternity Council conference here. The discussion was billed on the program as "Housemothers — Pro and Con," but as one of the Oregon representatives noted, it might have been more accurately labeled just "Housemothers — Pro."

It must have come as a little bit of a shock to the five or six Oregon IFC men present that the representatives of the schools which have housemothers (and only a few there didn't), were so hard pressed to find arguments against the system.

They stressed etiquette improvements, scholastic aid, cleaner houses (yes, both ways) and better public relations as some of the advantages experienced since the system was put into effect on their campuses. Disadvantages? Yes, there are those too, the visitors said, but they boil down

to added expense (from board and room to board and room plus a salary up to \$225, but averaging \$100 a month) and getting the woman who will best fit into fraternity life. But trade their housemother for such as a St. Bernard, an All-American rush chairman or basement pinball machines? Never, said the panelists.

This may have been an easy stand to take in the warmth and comfort of a convention several hundreds of miles from the chapter room, but the unanimity of opinion on the subject was still impressive.

And as for the administration "jamming housemothers down our throats" by slipping them in the back door under the guise of "student initiative"? Most of the pressure for the housemother system is coming from fraternity nationals, alumni groups and mothers clubs, says Dean of Men Ray Hawk (although a few fraternity house neighbors would like to see something along this line, he adds). Hawk says the housemother system "may be inevitable" in future years, but more likely through fraternity national decrees (they do rule on things other than discrimination) than through the administration.

More than one Oregon fraternity now has a "weekend" housemother plan. But let's take off the blindfolds before we start swinging baseball bats; we don't have to have the housemothers by sundown or get out of town. (C.H.M.)

Fiery Lectures?



"YOU SHOULD HAVE SEEN HER DEMONSTRATION LAST YEAR."

From the Squirrel Cage

Basic Question: Scope Of Student Government?

By DARREL BRITTSAN
ASUO President

The time is nearing when campus political hopefuls will be asked to express their views on campus problems. Recently

a question has arisen which is not a new one; one which could easily take on more importance this year.

Many will be interested in the candidates opinions as to the scope of student government. Into what

areas should the ASUO probe? The existing Senate's action to investigate discrimination will probably focus added attention on this issue.

Some feel student government should operate within more limited objectives. They would argue that our concern should be with problems which are solely student problems, such as the ski team, Model U.N. and the Millrace.

Others feel that the Senate should be concerned with all problems which affect a significant number of students regardless of their scope. These people would probably praise the action which formed the newest Senate committee, and would urge the Senate to take more responsibility at this level.

Personally, I would agree with those who ask more of our student government. It is charged with the responsibility of action to promote student welfare. Thus, a problem which would affect many students, no matter how broad its scope, is a problem for the Senate.

There is still another point of view as to what should concern student government. This year the Senate and Cabinet have answered negatively requests from many colleges and universities to join them in writing letters supporting or opposing certain national political actions. Our action was based on the belief that these items did not significantly affect the students on this campus.

I would encourage all political candidates to consider this question and decide where they stand. Should our student government limit itself to wholly campus problems? Should it concern itself with all problems which affect students? Should it intend that its responsibilities include issues on the political scene?

Such a decision is a very basic one in our approach to student government. For this reason both candidates and voters should evaluate the arguments and reach a conclusion.



+ + Letters to the Editor + +

Emerald Editor:

This letter refers to Sam Vahey's "Swan Song" column in a recent issue.

"Wheel-barrow races and house decorations" are not part of an "alien way of life," but are American. When you consider how many people from the community drive over to see these decorations and talk about them, you realize it is not necessarily "divorced from life."

When you consider all the married students, those who work part-time and those on the G.I. Bill, as well as many other serious ones, your statement that students don't know the "value of money" and think "life is a bed of roses" is misleading. How can they believe this and still feel the Oregon economic recession, as you also said?

These same students who "lived" through the 1939 "boom" which lasted up to present times, also "lived" through an era of the world's most destructive warfare with friends and relatives killed. That kind of "prosperity" I can do without.

"Perhaps a depression right now might do our country some good" is a dangerous overstatement. Whereas a mild recession might purge our prolonged inflation, a depression would give Russia her dream of opportunity. Anybody who lived through the last depression would tell

you that never again is too soon, too ill a wind for the "good" it brings. I hear they don't go for sport cars or cashmere in drab, conformist Russia.

Don Easton,
Junior in Education

Emerald Editor:

In reference to your editorial entitled "Result of 'White Clause' Pressure" in the April 8 Emerald, I would like to clarify the position of Delta Upsilon. We realize the article was not directed at individuals, and we do not intend to argue the principle involved.

In your editorial, this statement was used: "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."

In 1834, Delta Upsilon was founded on both anti-segregation and anti-secrecy. If there is any doubt of our stand on this issue, we invite anyone interested to attend our non-secret chapter meetings or our next initiation ceremony. Anyone interested can contact me.

Rod Wadman
Senior in
Political Science

Emerald Editor:

First let me say that the fraternity to which I belong has laid down certain requirements

which must be met by any one wishing to become a member. That person must be a male, first of all. Now I don't see that this has worked an undue strain on those that are not males, for groups labeled sororities have sprung up with requirements that their members be females. Other groups which don't meet this requirement have likewise formed with requirements of their own, but we shall not bring these little clubs into the debate.

We also demand that the males be capable of graduation from this University, though we don't deny people the right to band together either, for indeed, we lack that power altogether.

We like to say that only "good guys" can become members also, the definition of a good guy being openly debated in many circles. However, I do not remember ever being openly chastised for not passing on a fellow I did not feel to be a good guy. Some organization may disagree with me and think that this fellow is the best guy in the world and make him president of something, but I will never say they are wrong.

We require our members to be Caucasian too. We do not say here either that non-Caucasians should be denied the benefits of fraternity living. I couldn't, if I wanted to, prevent a non-Caucasian, an ig-

noramus, or a female from either pledging or forming a living, drinking or eating, organization. This is the right of every man, as guaranteed by the principles this nation was founded upon.

Now, by writing this letter I have further convinced myself that there is no issue at all, and have probably left out some very convincing arguments. For this I apologize to those who read the Letters to the Editors in hopes of finding a letter that coincides with their own beliefs.

One further aspect needs to be investigated before calling a halt to all of these attempts to gain national acclaim by writing letters to people who feel obligated to print them due to year-long associations. We must, I think, get to the basic question of whether or not fraternities and sororities, as they exist on THIS campus, are good or bad.

We must decide whether they do good or evil by encouraging other students to attend this school; taking the biggest share in supporting the functions which insure Oregon's good name, such as Homecoming, Junior Weekend, Duck Preview, etc., at which time this campus is flooded by thousands of very impressionable people; and finally whether the atmosphere within our different living groups, whether they impress

(Continued on page three)