

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

In Desperation, Misrepresentation

The Emerald is too busy with campus affairs to follow every leap about the political stage of Oregon's senior Senator. But occasionally he says something so completely misleading that comment is appropriate.

His latest outburst on Hells Canyon would have us believe that the administration has contradicted itself in its opposition to the high federal dam (imagine the Senator exposing inconsistency). Because the Secretary of the Interior has commented favorably on the flood control benefits of the proposed Nez Perce Dam on the Snake, the Senator believes he's uncovered a giant hoax. He would have us believe that flood control at Nez Perce is analogous to flood control at Hells Canyon. In so doing the Senator is either displaying great ignorance of Idaho geography or is deliberately misleading his constituents.

Hells Canyon Dam would be located above the mouth of the Salmon River, the Snake's mighty tributary, and thus wouldn't "control" any of its spring runoff. It would "control" only the upper Snake River, which contributes almost nothing to Northwest floodwater, since it is the best controlled major river in the nation. It and its tributaries have well over a score of dams which hold the spring runoff for the irrigation of millions of thirsty acres in Southern Idaho.

Nez Perce Dam, however, would be located below the mouth of the Salmon River, and thus could hold its runoff. This stream flows for several hundred miles through mountainous Central Idaho, where snow

is deep and there is no irrigation. It is almost completely uncontrolled, and in spring is a raging torrent which contributes heavily to Northwest floods.

Thus the proposed Nez Perce Dam would have much flood control value, while Hells Canyon would be almost worthless in this respect. But the Senator implies that because both would be located on the Snake River that the two are a valid analogy.

There is also an attempt to make people believe that Hells Canyon would serve some irrigation function. But a glance at the map shows there is nothing but canyon walls below Hells Canyon to irrigate. Power "revenue" could be used to pay for the proposed Mountain Home irrigation project it is argued, but so could Post Office "revenue" if Congress was so inclined. Furthermore, Mountain Home would cost about \$1,000 per acre to develop — at a time when the nation is burdened by farm surpluses. Southern Idaho farmers, who overwhelmingly oppose a federal Hells Canyon Dam, have not been fooled by this line.

Hells Canyon Dam, whether it is built by the federal government or substituted by three low-head dams of Idaho Power Co., is essentially a power project. To represent it as a needed flood control measure, or as an irrigation project, is misleading.

Sen. Morse is leading a desperation effort to "save" a federal Hells Canyon Dam, either for its electrical power or political power potential. But misrepresentation is not justified — the means does not justify the end.

— Letters to the Editor —

Emerald Editor:

In Friday's Emerald Mr. Paul Metzger wrote a nine-paragraph letter with two topics. The first seven paragraphs were devoted to twisting, contorting, and taking out of context specific phrases of my letter of the previous day, and using these twisted, unreal phrases for his own purpose.

Mr. Metzger, you may continue to use personal insults of me in your letters; they will do nothing but show the campus how less close you are to the Almighty in your ability to dictate how fraternities may choose their members.

And you may use two long words for one short one when possible. But the average Oregon student is too intelligent to let the issue be clouded by high-sounding phrases.

But to take another person's words out of context and twist them around, omitting the main facts, and drawing conclusions from them which were never there or NEVER INTENDED TO BE there, is the worst type of propaganda. It is a close kin to slander.

This letter of mine doesn't deserve to be placed before the student body. It shouldn't have to be. But since Mr. Metzger has mis-used and mis-stated almost everything I have said in the Emerald in the past two weeks, I feel a public reply is necessary.

I am not in any way trying to qualify any stand I have ACTUALLY taken. Only those which have been taken for me. I will again say that I think

fraternities which believe they can attain a more representative brotherhood by abolishing racial clauses (such as my own has done) will do so. And that those maintaining any restrictions they believe desirable, either at a local or national level, should be allowed to do so. This is the only real issue in this entire discussion of fraternity racial clauses.

I might add, also, that the place a national fraternity's constitution can be changed is at the national convention. When a majority of the representatives, voting for a majority of the chapters, vote to abandon discrimination they will do so. Then, fraternities will be ruled by a majority of their own members, not a self-seeking minority not even a part of the fraternity. In fact, this is the way many national constitutions have already been changed.

There are always a few who can twist even the most direct and clear statements. I hope that this letter is so direct as to defy the efforts of those who would clutch any straw in an effort to damage the fraternity system.

If Mr. Metzger is willing to state his views as his own, and not attempt to re-phrase them and use them as mine, perhaps we will be able to bring this discussion up to the high level he requested earlier in the Emerald, rather than pull it down to the level of a business school undergraduate.

Jack Marsh
Junior in Business

Emerald Editor:

In reply to the article by Mr. Casanova, I would like to say that we, by no means, want to force ourselves upon fraternities. What we want is a law forbidding racial discrimination by fraternities.

This would not force fraternities to accept any particular individual; it would prevent such a group from arbitrarily rejecting an individual because he was an Asian, Jew or Negro. If this law can be passed, then a student would simply be a student... good, bad or indifferent from the fraternity point of view.

The fraternities could reject the bad, ignore the indifferent and choose the good, just as they do now with the exception that race would no longer be a factor.

We, the minorities, are quite aware that racial prejudice cannot be legislated from the minds of men, but we can legislate against racial discrimination and that's what we intend to do.

Loren Miller, Jr.
Sophomore in History

Emerald Editor:

After living and studying in the Portland area for a time, I find that the article written by Munk, Novogrodsky, Field, West and others is strangely reminiscent of the tone produced by uncut Reeds adding to the wall of the wind.

Jerry D. Bakke
Junior in Physics

OSC Coffee Date?



Swan Song

Basis for Pride in UO For Many Is Social Life

By SAM VAHEY

Emerald Associate Editor

In spite of all the effort by various groups on this campus to "revive school spirit" and "restore campus tradition," only one tradition seems to stand out and carry over from year to year. That tradition is a suave, pseudo-sophisticated attitude which arises out of the over-stressed social merry-go-round.

People down here are always boasting of the University's "aggregation-of-culture," as compared to Oregon State's "agriculture." Perhaps this boasting might be justifiable if the boosters were thinking primarily of our liberal arts program, our humanities departments, and our fine arts schools in music and art. These, in themselves would give rise to a reputation of cultural superiority.

Unfortunately, however, the people who boast of our high-toned culture are not basing their words on these grounds. (As evidenced by the poor student turnouts at many of the concerts, lectures and assemblies.)

These boosters are basing their words on a high-stepping social atmosphere that includes such things as cocktail parties, the latest in clothing fashions, and a schedule of dances that barely enables the student to recover from one in time to attend another.

It holds such importance for many students that it is the most popular topic of conversation at the dinner table, between classes, and over a cup of coffee. Instead of discussing the academic content of their books, the men discuss the alcoholic content of their drinks.

Unfortunately, the new student does not create this atmosphere when he arrives here. It's all prepared for him. He steps into it, and after faltering a little, accepts it as the "way of life" down at the University.

He, in turn, passes it on to the next class, with perhaps a few additions; and everyone takes on a smug, high-brow attitude that this is the "Utopia" of social achievement.

If I may repeat: The University has every reason to be proud of its fine heritage of liberal arts, fine arts, and the humanities. These are properly

the cultural values of the University, as distinguished from a more technical school, such as Oregon State.

Our social activities, however, should not be the basis for our belief that we're better than our "Country Cousins." Being realistic about it, I doubt sincerely whether we have much of an edge on our neighbors in that respect. If we do, it's not one to boast about.

Quote from Associated Press columnist Hal Boyle: "Education reaches its peak for most students in the kindergarten—from then on they memorize more than they discover."

Many folks on campus, myself included, were disturbed to read in the rules for the all-campus sing that no religious songs could be sung. Religious songs were defined as any song that is regularly sung in church.

I think this rule is quite arbitrary, and rules out many of the most beautiful and inspiring songs of our civilization. You can be sure that our mothers who will be down for the weekend, are going to notice this deletion; for the Sing is one of the most popular items on their agenda—particularly because of the many beautiful religious songs.

Another regulation on that same light requires some explanation. Why can't graduate students sing with a group? Just because they have attended school a little longer than the average student doesn't make them better singers. A monotone is a monotone—whether he is a freshman or a graduate. Why keep those who want to sing from taking part?

Campus Capers

University of Akron Buchtelite writer Jeanne Donovan criticizes "the American way" in her "observations" column.

"Mister Average Citizen," she says, "selects the easiest jobs and the easiest methods of doing these jobs. And he uses the same basis for the selection of his leisure activities..."