

6-15-1928

Kenyon Collegian - June 15, 1928

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.kenyon.edu/collegian>

Recommended Citation

"Kenyon Collegian - June 15, 1928" (1928). *The Kenyon Collegian*. 1640.
<https://digital.kenyon.edu/collegian/1640>

This News Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College Archives at Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Kenyon Collegian by an authorized administrator of Digital Kenyon: Research, Scholarship, and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact noltj@kenyon.edu.

Kenyon Collegian

VOL. LIV

KENYON COLLEGE, GAMBIER, OHIO, JUNE 15, 1928

NO. 10

STUDENT BODY PROTESTS

The Kenyon Collegian

Founded in 1856

Published MONTHLY during the collegiate year by the students of Kenyon College.

(Member of the Ohio College Press Association)

Editor in chief—

THEODORE F. ROSE II, '29.

Associate Editor—

J. BRADDOCK STURGES, '29

ROBERT E. BAXTER '29

Sophomore Reporters—

ROBERT E. KENYON '30

CHARLES MALCOMSON, JR., '30

ANDREW W. ROSE '30

WILLIAM K. SMITH '30

Business Manager—

CHAS. M. COTT, '29

Assistant Business Managers—

HAROLD COFFIN, '30

ROBERT DOUGLAS '30

GEORGE JONES '30

For Subscriptions and Advertising Space

address the Business Manager, Gambier, Ohio.

Subscription, One Dollar and a Half per

Year, in Advance. Single Copies

Twenty Cents

Entered in the Postoffice at Gambier, Ohio,

as Second Class Matter

From the Press of

The Republican Publishing Co.,

Mt. Vernon, Ohio

JUNE 15, 1928

Representatives of the alumni are certainly not unaware of the storm of vehement protest which the proposed plan for the segregation of freshmen has evoked from the student body. Through various channels of information they have evidently heard of the almost unanimous opposition offered to this proposal by the college men. In the last issue of this paper we did our best to present to the alumni an accurate statement of the local feeling on this important matter; we tried to explain that attitude; and we gave the arguments which are most frequently and most logically raised in opposition to freshmen segregation.

But apparently this earnest and perfectly legitimate opposition has not influenced in the least degree the determination of a small group of the alumni to put their plan into effect. At the present time it looks very much as though freshmen segregation will become a fact in spite of the many portents and objects which are unfavorable to its adoption. And if such an unwise step is taken by the alumni, we predict that their plan, in the very first year of its operation, will meet with such concerted and discouraging opposition as to rout it utterly. The student body is more than unfavorable to segregation now. It has voiced its objections, and apparently those objections have been ignored. It believes that one of its prerogatives has been abused, and is, in consequence, thoroughly indignant. If this plan is introduced to Kenyon, it will begin its doubtful career under the worst possible conditions from the standpoint of student co-operation.

Therefore, we take this opportunity to present to the alumni once more, in an independently published issue of the COLLEGIAN, the position which an overwhelmingly large majority of the Kenyon undergraduates have taken with regard to the segregation plan. We urge all of the alumni to read these arguments carefully; try to appreciate the student point of view, which we firmly believe to be the logical and rational attitude toward the proposed plan; and think the matter over carefully before they vote against the sentiment of the men who see the college as it is, not as it should be.

STUDENT PROTEST

The following resolutions are proposed by the Executive Committee of the Alumni Council for a vote of the alumni June 16th.

1—That the freshman class be segregated in the college dormitories throughout each academic year, and—

2—That such segregation being accomplished, the initiation of freshmen into fraternities be deferred until the sophomore year and until they shall have acquired at least twenty-four credits for freshman work.

The matter has been presented to the students by Mr. Ralph Ringwalt and Mr. Thomas Goddard, with related arguments, and much literature has been circulated through the various divisions. WITH BUT FEW EXCEPTIONS THE OVERWHELMING CONSENSUS OF OPINION AMONG THE STUDENTS IS STRENUOUSLY OPPOSED TO SUCH A PLAN OF SEGREGATION. The COLLEGIAN, as an official student organ, wishes to present the gist of their arguments.

1—The postponement of initiation until 24 hours credit have been earned by freshmen has its advantages, and the brunt of the student argument does not hinge on this second resolution. In fact, as a whole, they favor such a move, seeing the inevitable raising of scholarship standards.

2—The student sentiment is most bitter in regard to the possible plan of freshmen segregation as proposed in the first resolution. Their main argument centers around this point—DISCIPLINE CANNOT BE ENFORCED PROPERLY OVER THE FRESHMEN, IN ANY HOUSING ARRANGEMENT POSSIBLE.

The freshmen are to be separated from the rest of the college by one of two means:

(a)—Either they will be grouped together on the first floor of each of the separate fraternity divisions, or

(b)—They will be combined into a single unit in Middle Kenyon between the Wings.

There seems to be no other alternative, because there is NO FRESHMAN DORMITORY.

If Plan b. were adopted, it would mean that the non-fraternity upper classmen would be forced to room on the first floor of fraternity divisions, an obviously uncomfortable adjustment, which would further augment the fraternity and non-fraternity distinction.

If Plan a. were adopted, discipline could not be properly enforced. Why would discipline be lax and influences poor under this arrangement? A senior council could not march around keeping order. The responsibility for discipline, as conceived by the alumni, rests with the head of each division in which freshmen are housed. Would the chapter head do this well? Here again, two possibilities must be considered.

Either the freshmen would be pledged at the first of the year as at present, or their pledging would be postponed until the second semester.

Let us consider that the men are pledged at the first of the year. Then this situation would arise; a Deke, a Beta, and a Delta Tau pledge are rooming with a non-fraternity freshman, under the alleged discipline of the head of the Psi U's. The head of the Psi U's is bound to be indifferent to the scholastic endeavors and the conduct of these freshmen from other divisions, so long as they make no noise. If these freshmen went to their various divisions for discipline, they would observe it as long as they were in their divisions and in their rooms would again be indifferent to authority.

If pledging did not take place until the second semester, the same indifference is bound to develop among the division heads. Rushing possibilities will continually be in the backs of their heads. To enforce discipline on a group of cocky, irresponsible prep school graduates, a nasty harangue is occasionally necessary. Would the division head harangue possible pledging material, or just the undesirables who are seldom cause for such discipline? Although strict rules would be enforced at first, indifference would develop. Rules may be strict, but if there is no enforcement, they are useless. If discipline is enforced as it should be, criticism would scatter like wild-fire among the freshmen concerning the crabbedness in certain divisions. Enmities and prejudices would arise. A student, no matter how much of a man's man he may be, hesitates to condemn another student. The division head will not enforce rules which bring him personal enmity and enmity toward the chapter on rushing possibilities, who scoff at the "unauthorized interference of such a division head." The alumni cannot seem to see the inevitable situations which would arise if discipline were attempted by fraternity heads over a group of rushing material. Discipline would without a doubt be lax.

In summary of this first student argument, that DISCIPLINE CANNOT BE ENFORCED PROPERLY OVER THE FRESHMEN, IN ANY HOUSING ARRANGEMENT POSSIBLE, it may be well to state that in practically all colleges where freshmen segregation is enforced, freshman dormitories and proctor systems are employed. Kenyon cannot be compared with Dartmouth, Amherst, and Williams. Kenyon has no freshman dormitory. Until she has one, such a system is not feasible.

Some alumni may say that no discipline is necessary, but these alumni do not know the type of freshman which is entering college today. There are two types of students who enter college as freshmen, the conscientious men and the "smooth-rounders" (unpalatable words, but descriptive). Without doubt, the "smooth-tear-abouters" are the leaders in any freshman class. Well, theoretically the "rounders" will funk out—but, not for at least one semester. Their example has been set. Theoretically, the man's man will weather the storm, but the influence would be bad, and the man's man will weather the storm anyway, whether the alumni plan of segregation is adopted or not. There is a stabilizing influence of a group of upperclassmen upon freshmen, when rooming together; a guide of much assistance, though often unconsciously given. Study hours are enforced in divisions by upperclassmen, and the freshman standing is relatively high.

The freshmen need discipline (not the type prevalent in the days of the alumni when midnight vaudeville shows and the like were used) but a more mature influence. They need the influence of upperclassmen. If there are weaklings who follow the lead of just one man in a group of thirty upperclass-

NO SEGREGATION IS THEIR PLEA

"Resolved that the student body issue a vehement protest to the alumni in regard to the freshmen segregation plan," was the resolution passed by an assemblage of students in Philo Hall at the regular June meeting of the Kenyon Student Assembly, on the fourth day of that month. The overwhelming vote in opposition to the alumni plan was 92 to 3.

Similar resolutions were made in meetings of the Pan-Hellenic and Senior Councils during the succeeding week. The vote of the Pan-Hellenic Council opposed the alumni plan by a vote of 12 to 2, while the senior council went on record as being against the proposal by a majority of 8 to 1.

The various divisions were requested to voice their attitude on the subject. The overwhelmingly one-sided results expressed the student opposition as follows:

Delta Kappa Epsilon: No, 15; Yes, 0.
Alpha Delta Phi: No, 17; Yes, 0.
Psi Upsilon: Yes, 24; No, 0. (This vote was taken on the plan in theory only).
Beta Theta Pi: No, 24; Yes, 0.
Delta Tau Delta: No, 24; Yes, 1.
Sigma Pi: No, 17; Yes, 0.
Zeta Alpha: No, 16; Yes, 1.
Middle Kenyon: No, 17; Yes, 8.

These votes were not taken merely in a spirit of antagonism to the alumni, but in legitimate and logical protest against a plan which has met the unqualified disapproval of the student body.

DEFINITE PROCTOR SYSTEM, WOULD BE FAR WORSE THAN THE INFLUENCE OF UPPERCLASSMEN ON FRESHMEN.

The purpose of this segregation plan was to promote class spirit as opposed to fraternity spirit. Let these two points be made:

1. The fraternity distinctions are not so great and rivalries are not so keen as when the alumni were here. The affectionate friendships made over a glass of beer are not prevalent today, if that is the sort of class spirit desired, but there are many inter-division friendships, and the distinctions are not half so great as when the men of Middle Kenyon cleaned out the Delta Taus, and when the Psi U and Theta Delta Chi broke into the Alpha Delta lodge.

2. Class spirit could be still further enhanced. It is a good point to drop fraternity division lines in the upper classes, which can be done with class banquets and smokers, class plays and inter-class activities. AN INCREASED PATRONAGE OF THE COMMONS WOULD HELP MATERIALLY.

How can class spirit develop when just 12 freshmen stand on their chairs to sing "There is a hell for freshmen?" Just 75 students eat at the commons on an average. Yet this is a valuable means for mixing of fraternity and non-fraternity men. A class banquet and election of a permanent secretary at the end of the senior year will bring class fellowship forward. The upper classes can be mixed still more. The fraternity exerts its best influence with the freshmen. The purpose of the fraternities of any college is to digest the freshman class, mix them up, make them feel at home. The class unit can be developed later.

Another motive impelling the alumni in this plan was the raising of scholarship. The only way the scholarship would be raised would be that more men would flunk out of college. The influence would be bad.

The freshman segregation plan is not feasible at Kenyon.

men, think how they would be influenced in groups of eight freshmen. The upperclassmen are a comparatively select group. Particularly the seniors in a chapter are a more select group.

THE INFLUENCE OF FRESHMEN ON FRESHMEN, NOT IN A FRESHMAN DORMITORY AND UNDER A

