

Should Rush Be Deferred?

The Best Interests of the Students Should Be the Prime Consideration

Today President Flemming's staff may discuss when fraternity and sorority rush should take place. The President has promised a decision on the matter during January or early February.

Last October 17, the Emerald devoted its editorial page to columns on the subject. We did not take a stand, however.

Since that time, IFC President's Council has voted unanimously to recommend keeping rush during its present time in New Student Week. The ASUO Cabinet has supported IFC's decision.

Also since that time, a survey by the Campus Planning Commission has shown that the sentiment among freshmen leans toward a deferred rush week. Dormitory Counselors and members of the ASUO Senate also favor a change in the present time of rush, according to the survey.

The practical arguments bearing on such a decision are varied. Advocates of deferred rush claim that early rush forces decisions without adequate knowledge of houses or the Greek system by those students rushing. They claim that deferred rush allows those who do not pledge to already be involved in other aspects of campus life, including classes.

Opponents claim that deferred rush necessitates cumbersome rules and regulations which are hard to enforce. They point out that deferred rush would be held during the regular school year and would detract from classes. They note that house membership would be reduced during fall term, causing monetary problems. The opponents also quote an evaluation of an attempt at deferred rush by the University in 1951, which states that deferred rush was an "utter failure."

It is our belief that these arguments do not penetrate to the heart of the matter.

The decision on whether or not to defer rush week to a later date than its present time during New Student Week is a decision with far greater implications than appear on the surface. A decision to defer rush would deal a hard blow to the power which fraternities and sororities presently have in the University student's value system.

Earlier in the year the Emerald was convinced that fraternities and sororities were making real efforts to take progressive steps toward accepting the norms of the academic community. Recent knowledge about fraternity hazing and some serious reflection on what is indicated by the lack of progress in this area require re-evaluation of this conviction.

When a freshman arrives at the University, he is at an impressionable age. He tends to acquire the values of those in the University community whom he associates with and admires. The Greek system is naturally an integral part of this value orientation.

While the members of fraternities and sororities place much importance upon grades, freshmen unconsciously learn through association with their sorority and fraternity peers, that grades are more important than learning, that no one attends concerts or lectures, and that the main topic of interest should, of course, be Friday night's date or Saturday's ball game.

While this idea of orientation fraternities give to incoming freshmen is a vast generalization, and is not true in every case, there is enough truth in it to cause a questioning of rush week's position in New Student Week.

Would incoming freshmen tend to accept the academic values of this University community more readily if they were not immediately exposed to the fraternity and sorority culture? Would students tend to take a longer, slower look at why they are here, and maybe refrain from getting caught up in a social whirl? Are fraternities and sororities slowly but surely recognizing that they must line up their objectives with that of the University if they are to continue to exist? Do they need a push in this direction?

These questions are difficult to answer. But the President's staff, the deans of the various school of the University, could come to a thoughtful and rational decision on deferred rush by addressing themselves to such questions.

They should realize that how they answer them will have a significant long-run effect upon this University.



Cathy Neville

Our Contemporaries

Quigg Newton, President of the University of Colorado, has come under fire for dismissing Professor B. E. Lauer, head of the chemical engineering department at that school.

Last term Newton dismissed the editor of the Colorado Daily and drew a large protest from many quarters.

In his letter to Lauer, Newton said, "You have been asked to resign because all members of the Department of Chemical Engineering, the dean of your college, and the provost of the University have no confidence in your leadership. I concur in that opinion."

Lauer has contested the firing and said that he will definitely appear before the Board of Regents to tell his story. Lauer questions Newton's right to fire him. The professor has been battling requests for his resignation, according to the Daily, by contending that when he assumed the job, it was understood to be permanent.

Regent Charles D. Bromley, of the state board of Regents, asked for Newton's resignation and blasted the president as "having the power to fire nobody." Newton, when informed of Bromley's statement, said that it was a continuation of Republican Bromley's political attack against him.

Bromley called Lauer "the most qualified man for the job."

The city council of Boulder, Colorado will vote on a proposal to permit sales of hard liquor within the city limits. Students and University officials at University of Colorado, in Boulder, were either overwhelmingly for or had not comment on the change of policy. Some of the comments were:

Basketball standout Milt Mueller: "I can't say too well in my position. I'll have to pass on my comment."

Sometime poet Frederick Daniel Wilson, Jr.: "Passing this ordinance could help drinking become an integral part of education on this campus."

OSU students gained statewide recognition two weeks ago when they staged a protest demonstration over dormitory conditions. An Inter-Dorm and Inter-Hall council meeting held last week brought some of these complaints.

Joel Ivey, president of Weatherford Hall, listed some of the complaints. Waste chutes were described as being too small to empty trash into and Ivey said that sometimes they were so smokey that the fire engines had been called out. He commented that the fire alarms were not

centralized and that one fire official had said that it would take five minutes to alert all alarms. He cited one case where girls in a dorm had paid to have something fixed and nothing had been done in two years.

The council proposed that an impartial professional be hired to suggest methods of improving present cafeteria facilities. President James H. Jensen closed the meeting by saying that efforts would be made to correct any problems which are plaguing the dormitory system.

Tuition and dorm fees increases are currently being opposed at the University of Washington, at Kansas University, and at the University of Texas.

At Washington, dormitory fees were increased \$20 per term. Ernst M. Conrad, University Business Manager, attributed the increase to rising operating costs but said that the rates are still lower than those paid by many comparable colleges. Dormitory fees are now \$780 per year.

The Kansas State Board of Regents voted to increase fees \$15, raising the fees paid by students from \$70 to \$85. Students do not pay tuition at Kansas. The increase is expected to bring in an additional \$1 million.

In Texas, Senator Martin Dies Jr. said, "I'm not for a doubling of tuition for the University until I'm shown a much better reason than I have been so far. If the money raised by doubling the tuition were used to make the University a truly great school, then I might be for it. But it might just be used to finance another mediocre college or junior college."

OREGON DAILY EMERALD

The Oregon Daily Emerald is published seven 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 opinions of the ASUO or the University.

RON BUEL, Editor
MARTY KETELS, Business Manager
TED MAHAR, Managing Editor
EVERETTE DENNIS, News Editor
PHIL COGSWELL, Editorial Page Editor
LARRY WILLIAMS, Advertising Manager
LARRY GRAVES, Sports Editor
DULCY MORAN, Assistant Managing Editor
DAVE SANDS, JIM FRAKE, JANET GOETZE, Assistant News Editor
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
RON COWAN, CATHY NEVILLE,

Letters to the Editor

Lack of Proof

Emerald Editor:

I am delighted that my arguments (sometimes purposefully overstated) in support of wider use of what I have called the Socratic method of teaching appear to have stimulated some thought about the limits of the method. One of your correspondents (see the Emerald of January 30) has written that:

"Some classes, because of size, quality of participants and subject matter, lend themselves to the Socratic method . . . others simply do not."

To use the words of this same correspondent (see the Emerald of January 30), "The only thing notable about this contention is a conspicuous lack of proof to support it."

Robert S. Summers
Assistant Professor of
Law

Need for Lecture

Emerald Editor and Mr. Harrell:

Professor Summers' challenge to the sacred cow of the modern university, the lecture system, is timely. Few will disagree with his strictures, nor with his argument that a primary goal of the educational process is the development of critical thinking.

Professor Summers fails however to recognize the vital role which the lecture method may play in a balanced program of instruction. Ideally, the lecturer brings into the classroom the full fruits of his own reflection on, or analysis of, the problems and issues he uncovers in the subject matter. Such a presentation cannot be duplicated in any reading assignment, nor in the necessarily slow and discursive process of discussion and Socratic dialogue. What is needed is a fuller recognition of the specific contribution made by each of these techniques in a liberal education, together with a recognition, long evident in European universities, that the chief danger to the lecture technique is simply too much of it.

Stanley Pierson
History Dept.

Important Program

Emerald Editor:

While the Young Democrats did not misunderstand the meaning of your January 23 editorial concerning Harry Bridges we could hardly be expected to relish the thoughts behind it.

It should be clear that "boat-rocking" is not the past time of this club nor its intentions. We

have not pursued a policy of controversy for controversy's sake in the past and we do not intend to do so in the future. Mr. Bridges will appear on this campus, but not alone. A holder of opposite views will be there to test wits with him. It is a vast underestimation of the Oregon Legislature to assume that a notorious speaker will profoundly effect a body of men and women so deeply concerned with the serious execution of their office. The fiscal complexities of a state budget are far to important and much more significant than "incidents" at the University.

We can rejoice that the Emerald supports free speech; yet your editorial indicates to us that in doing so you are neglecting to put substance to the meaning or action to the words. The Young Republicans have said much the same.

However, we hope that Chairman Hoyt has seen the error of his partisan ways and that in the future his erstwhile group of Republicans can produce a program of speakers that will benefit our student body. At least we hope so.

As for the Young Democrats,
(Continued on page 3)