

+ + Letters to the Editor + +

(Continued from page two)

they are, fraternity members cannot expect that their claims that they can handle the discrimination problem from within can be taken very seriously. If only the "miserable" fraternity man will demonstrate the willingness to work for the elimination of discrimination, then we cannot expect meaningful change to take place from within.

In reply to the Emerald's question concerning court action about discriminatory practices in fraternities and sororities, my sources are Mr. Fadely (and his law books) and an article from the November 9, 1956 issue of "U.S. News and World Report," from which I quote: "Legally, there has been only one real test in the courts so far on the racial issue confronting fraternities and sororities.

In 1954, a three-judge federal district court upheld the right of the University of New York to ban national social organizations. The U.S. Supreme Court, without opinion, sustained that opinion." New York University banned these organizations because they failed to comply with deadlines for the elimination of racial clauses in their constitutions.

Paul Metzger
Graduate in
Sociology

Editor's Note:

We are pleased to get the legal aspect straight. To say that a university has the right to ban social organizations is quite different than the claim that fraternity racial discrimination is illegal.

Emerald Editor:

One of the great pleasures that men and women know in our society is the privilege to

choose their associates and close friends. Fraternities and sororities are just a manifestation of this truly American desire, and exist among those who share certain attitudes on life, and who have certain beliefs on the social nature of the individual.

They, too, exhibit something else that is truly American in nature . . . social Darwinism. I speak very humbly as a fraternity member when I say that I am truly sorry that all of those who desire to, cannot, for one reason or another, belong to one.

We do not eliminate some groups to be snobbish; we do so merely because we have found that by selecting people from more or less similar cultural and environmental backgrounds and similar interests, we have our greatest chance of promoting harmony and mutual well-being.

Gentlemen, you will not enter our fraternity by force, and only verbally will you ever force us to relinquish our standards of membership.

In actuality, gentlemen, you will do nothing but embitter us and make us more convinced if we are right. If you wish, it is your prerogative, gentlemen, to form your own fraternities with your own rules . . . but please be considerate enough to leave us with ours.

Gary Canova
Graduate in
Sociology

Emerald Editor:

May I comment on your editorial note to the Holloway and Kuroda letter.

Two of your implications are statements of what you read into the context, not what was there.

We do suggest that the Senate committee is a fact-finding committee.

We did not imply that the Senate is opposed to an "evil" status quo.

We did suggest that you have yet to offer a positive or effective "first-step" to the solution of racial and religious discrimination (unless we accept your "let nature take its course" proposal.) One can no longer accuse the Senate of this complacency, for they have appointed a fact-finding committee, a very logical first step it would seem.

The third editor's comment may result in a semantical discussion of what progress is. We heartily agree, however, that the removal of formal "white clauses" will not ipso facto produce racial integration. In fact recent letters to the editor readily indicate the pride some people (a minority it is hoped) take in belonging to a "fraternity" that racially and religiously discriminates and are satisfied with its continuance.

Mr. Lowthian and others apparently are laboring under the confusion that discrimination along racial and religious lines is no different than "personal" discrimination, e.g. likes, tastes, etc., not realizing that personality attributes cut across racial and religious lines.

Nevertheless, the removal of said clauses does have the three effects we mentioned, partially absolving criticism of university recognition of fraternities, providing a lever for a demand for change by the local groups, at their national conventions, and forcing the fraternity members to evaluate their practices in light of their beliefs—thereby removing one more rationaliza-

tion about why they discriminate.

Robert G. Holloway
Graduate Student
in Sociology

Emerald Editor:

The overwhelming Senate majority in support of an ASUO inquiry into formal racial discrimination on this campus, and the composition of the inquiring committee gave good reason last week to hope that the committee would be allowed to operate in a calm atmosphere.

This hope is gradually being withered away. Inflammatory, accusing letters have already appeared in the Emerald.

The ASUO Senate set into motion a democratic process capable of expressing majority opinion and protecting minority rights. The Senate should be supported by thoughtful discussion, pro and con, not impeded by inflammatory outcries.

The fact that most responsible campus leaders are withholding judgment until the committee submits its report lends credence to the belief that most campus leaders, without regard to their own affiliations, want the ASUO inquiry to proceed in a calm atmosphere.

I appeal to the Emerald to use its journalistic judgment in refusing to print inflammatory, accusing letters in its columns.

Herb Matthews
Graduate in Physics

Editor's Note:

The Emerald's policy has been to print all letters of half-way reasonable length, simply because we believe everyone should have the right to express his opinion for publication. We have maintained this policy even when we were thereby made

the victim of a planned publicity campaign (three letters were brought in together from a single department recently).

The Emerald expresses its opinions in the editorial columns. We maintain letters to the editor as a means of getting a great variety of opinion. We assume that the majority, after reading the views of many, can better determine truth.

Senior Awarded Danforth Grant

Charles O. Burgess, senior in history, has been awarded a Danforth fellowship for the coming year, according to John L. Hulteng, associate professor of journalism and liaison officer with the Danforth foundation.

Burgess was chosen as one of 74 Danforth fellows from among 500 applicants. He will use the fellowship to do graduate work in American history at the University of Wisconsin.

The fellowship is presented to undergraduates planning to enter the field of college teaching. It pays for graduate work and provides funds with which the recipient may build a personal library after he gets his Ph.D. In addition it grants expense money allowing him to attend meetings.

A continuing fellowship, it may provide up to \$300 a year. Recipients are selected on a basis of academic ability and intellectual vigor, personal qualities giving promise of success in the classroom, and serious inquiry with the Christian tradition.

This is the second year in a row that a University of Oregon history student has been selected as a Danforth fellow. Last year Robert Tostberg was awarded the fellowship.

You smoke refreshed A new idea in smoking...all-new Salem

Created by R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Company.



- menthol fresh
- rich tobacco taste
- most modern filter

Take a puff—it's Springtime! Light up a filter-tip SALEM and find a smoke that refreshes your taste the way Springtime does you. It's a new idea in smoking—menthol-fresh comfort . . . rich tobacco taste . . . pure, white modern filter! They're all in SALEM to refresh your taste. Ask for SALEM—you'll love 'em!

Salem refreshes your taste