

Not a Dull Wait

You have four chances left to see Steve Belko's improved basketball crew operate at home before finals, Christmas and Rose Bowl intercede—and tonight and Saturday evening make two of those opportunities.

Utah State's Aggies are this weekend's Mac Court guests, followed next Tuesday and Wednesday by the San Jose Spartans. Any or all of the four games should be worth your pre-finals attention, and don't forget the tall, talented Frosh team either, who just could come close to matching last year's undefeated Duckling team.

But to the business nearest at hand: that two-night stand with Utah State. From Oregon's first non-PCC, non-conference foe, Coach Belko expects colorful action; the aggressive, rapid-shooting variety best suited for a couple of interesting games. The Aggies of Cecil Baker are in a height-class with Oregon, but have a trio of plusten point-scorers back from last year's team, Frank Polak, Hal Theus and Larry Bailey.

Against the Staters, and later against San Jose, Coach Belko expects to throw a varied troupe: some old hands, and some promising new people playing their first season for the varsity Ducks. Charlie Franklin, Hal Duffy, Bud Kuykendall and other familiars will be there, and so will a group of newcomers from the Frosh and JC ranks who could have a lot to do with Oregon's successes this winter: sophs Chuck Rask and Stu Robertson, and transfers Dale Heron, Otis Davis and George Padovan.

Nobody expects the lack-height Ducks to take the PCC by storm, and chances are that they won't. But we'll take Steve Belko at his word: "We are better than a year ago." Not only that, but consider the Oregon basketball program as a whole: what

looks like one of the stronger sophomore contingents on the Coast, plus a Frosh team that includes most of the top Oregon prep stars last year. It appears that we can afford to wait, but in the meantime, don't think for a minute that this year's Oregon basketball squad will make the waiting dull and uninteresting.

See for yourself, this week and next.

Dry and Legal?

And now the legal (or not) aspects of the controversial dry zone will be examined by the state attorney general, Robert-Y. Thornton—apparently to aid the Oregon Liquor Control Commission in further decisions.

The appeal to Thornton's judgment may or may not be significant in the further processing on the issue, depending on the outcome of his study. A verdict may be known within two weeks.

The dry zone issue was seemingly calmed recently when the OLCC rejected four Eugene grocers' bids to sell beer within the zone area, despite a previous go-ahead by the Eugene City Council.

Thornton's opinion may or may not be utilized by the OLCC in future action, as it sees fit. To date, the commission has indicated it would make no move to abolish the zone unless the University agitated for it.

The sudden request for legal information might be a final try by the grocers to win their point. Or it could be an OLCC-initiated attempt to get further support for its stand.

For the sake of University public relations (of which we know a little) we hope that this latest development will allow the dry zone issue to have full legal backing, along with whatever moral support exists.



"I JUST BOOSTED THEIR MORALE... I TOLD THEM SOMEONE IS GOING TO PASS."

Letters to the Editor

Emerald Editor:

I very much regret the publication Wednesday of a completely erroneous report regarding the Teke house at Oregon State.

Boyd Davis, president of the Oregon State chapter, told me "that to his knowledge, no one has ever been depledged by that chapter due to alumni pressure, and that the chapter practices no discrimination."

In a call to a well known Negro football player at Oregon State, I was told that to his knowledge, no Negro in the past three years has attempted to pledge a fraternity, although both he and other Negro friends had been invited to fraternities for dinner.

Wynn Dahlgren
Graduate in
Political Science

sonally and give him their ideas. I am sure he would appreciate it. How about really cooperating with him and helping him rather than sitting around and complaining.

I only wish there were some way of showing these blow-hards what a truly fine person Mr. Stables is. Even though I have never met him personally, I admire him for trying so hard. He is doing a fine job in my opinion.

Let's all give him the praise and credit he deserves instead of dragging him through the mud. Don't you, the students, think it is a shame that a minority group of people are running down Mr. Stables, and the majority aren't standing behind him very steadfastly?

Phyllis Farstad
Freshman

Emerald Editor:

Mr. Dahlgren has discussed with us the facts given him for his recent article appearing in this paper.

The information as written was given to Mr. Dahlgren by a close friend whom he chose to believe. We must admit that such a course of facts doesn't admit good journalism, but as it stands we accept Dahlgren's retraction as appears in this column.

Greg Kesterson
President
Tau Kappa Epsilon

Emerald Editor:

In the past couple of weeks, your column has been filled with letters running down our yell king, Dick Stables. What has happened to all the people who like him? Did they lose their voices, or are they just too chicken to speak their piece? I think it's about time someone said something for him.

All of my friends and I agree that Mr. Stables is tops. He deserves a pat on the back instead of a slap in the face. We would like very much to see him continue as yell king, because he really has what it takes.

If a few of the complainers tried to control a whole student body at a game, they would find out that the job is harder than it looks. Maybe then they would give him the high praise he really deserves.

If these past letter writers have any suggestions as to how Mr. Stables' job should be done, why don't they see him per-

Our Contemporaries

What's cluttering up the lawns at Pitt? "Let's Keep Our Campus Clean" signs are. And students are complaining about it—in letters to the Pitt News and by scattering debris around the little signs.

News columnist Donna Con-sidine recently urged Pitt's student congress to find out who ordered the signs put up and why, and how about getting them removed.

"We wonder what was the purpose of the signs," she says, "since we had no need of them and . . . they are the objects which contribute to cluttering the grass."

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

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

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.

CHARLES MITCHELMORE, Editor
GARY CAPPS, Business Manager
JACK WILSON, Editorial Page Editor
ALLEN JOHNSON, Managing Editor
GLEN GRAVES, Advertising Manager
CORNELIA FOGLE, WILLIAM COOK, Associate Editors
PHIL HAGER, News Editor
JERRY RAMSEY, Sports Editor
JOANNE MILLIGAN, Asst. Bus. Mgr.
EDITORIAL BOARD: Charles Mitchelmore, Jack Wilson, Allen Johnson, Cornelia Fogle, William Cook, Phil Hager, Jerry Ramsey, Wayne Woodman.
Make-up Editor: Wayne Woodman
Day Editors: Joan Kraus, Evelyn Olsen, Pepper Allen, Mike Forrester, Pat Trece.
Night Editors: Dave Lortie, Marlene Perkins, Al Reynolds, Barbara Stepper, Joanne Shore.
Women's Editor: Kathy Cook
Office Manager: Alice McKindrie
Asst. Adv. Mgr.: Roger Smith
Nat'l Adv. Mgr.: Charmion Ford
Executive Secretary: Pat Hooley

Dave Cass

Deferred Rush Plan Lacks Realism

Continuing with a critique of the proposed plan of deferred rushing, I would say at the outset that I sympathize with the immensity of the problem of working out an acceptable rushing system, the best interests of the freshman and the University. But such a plan will not come by glossing over the conflicts that do exist.



Perhaps the most unrealistic aspect of deferred rush is the alleged benefits of such a system to the small houses—and I'm sure you all know what are being referred to as the "small" houses.

At a recent IFC meeting, one member was quoted as saying, "... the present system is working against these houses, not for them." He was referring to the fact that two houses failed to pledge any freshmen this year.

The tacit assumption of this statement and the IFC report is that it is the system and not the houses in question that are to blame for their poor showing in rush. Nothing could be further from the truth, and everybody concerned realizes this, at least in private.

The only way that the problem of the "small" houses will be solved is by administration subsidization of them as living quarters. By no stretch of the imagination will an extended period of rush pull them out of

their dire straits, as is inferred in the IFC report.

The biggest weakness of this report, besides its shoddy handling of the benefits to the system, is the actual system proposed.

The three reasons for the failure of a previous deferred rush program at Oregon are given at the outset. Yet, unfortunately, the report conveniently sidesteps answering how two of these flaws will be met by the proposed system, and presents a remarkable failure to avert the third flaw.

In 1951, as the report goes, one failure of deferred rush was that there was no cooperation by the fraternities. What assures this needed cooperation in 1957? If the program should happen to pass IFC, will the houses voting against it cooperate in the spirit as well as the letter of the system?

For that matter, will those who vote for it cooperate? Self-interest, not considerations of honesty and justice, guides rushing. If self-interest comes into conflict with the proposed system, as it surely will, will any power be able to enforce compliance, particularly when the policing power itself is motivated by self-interest?

As we shall see, the plan makes concessions to this reality, making the plan all but useless.

The second failure of deferred rush was that the fraternities saw summer rushing as useless, and therefore didn't rush. The report doesn't mention this aspect of rushing again, as if a

mention is as good as a solution.

Granted that fraternity summer rush is at times hurtful to Oregon, on balance it probably does more good than harm. The good could be increased by a modicum of control.

At any rate, its good aspects are certainly needed now, as in 1951 when "OSC was hurting us in enrollment." This year's OSC freshman enrollment rose while ours fell. What is the motivation for summer rushing offered by a plan of deferred rush as against the prospect of no gain by this activity?

Without a doubt, the biggest complaint against deferred rush in 1951 involved the very strict rules that made rushing all but impossible. This system proposes to go to the other extreme, recognizing the real problem of deferred rush, the impossibility of actually deferring rush until winter term. What is actually proposed is rushing fall term, but no legal pledging until winter term.

The control of this fall term rushing really isn't too tight. Only group rushing is outlawed except on several specified dates. Individual rushing seems to be allowed, for how else are freshmen to be contacted for the numerous fall term rush dates, the term from which rush is supposedly deferred?

A consistent and legal rush program under these rules becomes too great a burden for the individuals concerned. It emphasizes the importance of fraternity and rush out of proportion to the reality of the fra-

(Continued on page 3)