



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, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school 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. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor; initialed editorials by members of the editorial board.

Prep Stanines Do Make Sense

The atmosphere of myth and misunderstanding surrounding the University's system of "high school stanines" as a method of rating all entering freshmen should be cleared up in the students' minds once and for all.

Too often have we heard the comment, "Those prep stanines are based only on A's. Can you imagine anything so unfair?" Or, in other cases, "I can't believe that they consider only A's. Someone will have to prove it to me."

Since fall term of 1951 the present system of prep ratings has been used. It is based primarily on the number of A's earned in high school by the entering freshmen. And, excepting one aspect of the method, it seems to be a fair one. Fair, that is, only when one first understands its how and why and then accords to it as much importance as it deserves.

A ratio between the number of A's earned and the total units completed in high school is used to determine this stanine. When a student with no A's on his record is being considered, the number of B's is used. However, an average of only 20 per cent of the freshman class come without A's on their records. Approximately 75 per cent of most entering classes are in the upper half of their high school graduating classes, statistics show.

The reasoning used by our admissions office to justify their use of A's only, which convinced us the process is fair enough, is logical.

They feel that the high schools in our state have more uniformity in assigning A's than they do in their use of any other letter grades. Various reasons besides poor work can enter into a student's getting very low grades, they say, but ability and hard work are the main factors entering into a student's earning an A. A conscientious teach-

er thinks twice before giving an A. High grades make the difference, the admissions office thinks. The more high grades which a student earns in high school, the better he will do in college.

Above all these theoretical reasons is the fact that this system works consistently better than any other ever used here in accurately predicting a student's college success. Averages show that it does prove out.

The single aspect of the entire rating system which we referred to as unfair is that, aside from one-quarter credit for A's in physical education, full credit is given to all other A's, in trigonometry and home ec alike. No extra weight is given academic subjects over vocational and activity-type courses.

Let us quickly add, however, that a revision of this is presently being considered by the admissions office. Although more complex, the new system would be worth many times the extra work it may take to carry it out. We feel it would definitely leave far less room for complaint about the system, if not eliminating the gripes altogether.

The plan is to consider first the A's earned in academic subjects, since they are the best indication of college ability, next to weigh the A's in vocational subjects, then the B's in academic subjects, and finally the B's in vocational subjects and A's in activity classes (chorus and band, for instance), the latter two categories approximately equal.

Only when this revision to the process is made will we be able to shout the praises of our prep rating system as the best possible estimate of what the entering freshman can do in college, as the very best measure of his future success. We're not saying that the present method is not good. It must be or the statistics wouldn't prove it to be so accurate. But we would like to see our admissions office go ahead with this one improvement. (M.M.)

No Wastebasket Problem



"WITH SO MANY NEW FACULTY COMING IN—YER LUCKY YOU EVEN GOT AN OFFICE."

THE SKEPTIC TANK

Rushee Finds Brothers At Halfa Pi Fraternity

By BRIAN BOOTH
Emerald Columnist

Dear Mom and Dad,

Well college is really going to mean something to me now. I've just pledged a fraternity. And I can't tell you how happy I am to have gotten into such a great house as Halfa Pi. I want to tell you all about the way it happened.

Remember when I left home you told me to have an open mind in considering what each fraternity had to offer. And you warned me not to fall for any high-pressure salesmanship that some fraternity men excel in. Well I abided by your warnings and as a result I know that Halfa Pi is the perfect fraternity for me.

I learned about Halfa Pi the first day I got here. By a coincidence two upperclassmen happened to be in my room when I moved into Earl Hall. They were two of the friendliest fellows I had ever met and they really set me straight on the ins and outs of fraternity "rushing" (that's what they call what I've been through.)

Lots of what they told me about fraternities was what you had warned me about. But they elaborated more and told me lurid details of the extremes some houses will go to in an attempt to land pledges.

I don't have space to go into all the dirty rushing tactics they warned me of, but their stories sadly shook my earlier conception of what rush week would be like.

They told me about houses that would grab a freshman just because he was a good athlete or because his home would be a good place to have a rushing party. These fraternities were just a collection of talented individuals and had no semblance of brotherhood, my two new friends told me.

"Horrors," I cried, when they were through with their expose of the fraternity system at Oregon. "I shall remain an independent and never sacrifice my individuality to a fraternity," I told them.

But when I said this my two friends looked at each other and then in solemn voices told me

of the one fraternity at Oregon where a man is judged by his character and integrity regardless of whether he excels in athletics or some other skill. This fraternity was linked by brotherhood and its name, they told me, was Halfa Pi. I almost leaped with joy when they told me they would see if they could wrangle an invitation to the Halfa Pi house for me.

Later I was to learn that my two visitors belonged to this great fraternity. Yet they never once told me in my room that day. That's what I call real modesty.

The same night two of the friendliest fellows I had ever met came to my room. And imagine my humbleness when they told me they belonged to Halfa Pi and that they were inviting me to their great house the next day.

Well, needless to say I went to the house and it was love at first sight. The members seemed to feel the same way too. They fixed up a cot for me in the basement so I could sleep there and have my meals in the house. And to give me plenty of time to learn about fraternities, one of the members went to the Orientation Week assemblies for me and another did my registering while I was romping at the house playing ping pong in the basement for hours on end. You know how I love ping pong.

Well one day, the president of this great house came down to the basement while I was practicing serves and told me that Rush Week was starting the next day and he wondered what houses I was interested in. I told him as far as I could see Halfa Pi was the only house on campus.

And then, joy of joys, he asked me if I really wanted to be a member because every single brother of Halfa Pi had expressed a desire that I be asked to join. I jumped into the air, clicking my heels twice and screamed my acceptance.

And then he told me that the members wanted me in the house not because I could run the hundred yard dash in 9.5

THE CRITIC'S CRITIQUE

UT Opens with 'Appealing Story'

By BEN TROWBRIDGE
Emerald Columnist

Friday night saw the opening of the University Theater and the return engagement of Clifford Odets' "best play," "The Country Girl," directed and designed by Daniel Krempel. Certainly not one of theater's more eminent plays, but nevertheless an appealing story, or as Brook Atkins of the New York Times places it, "A plain human story."

An alcoholic, spineless actor making a comeback, his martyred wife, who with little else in the world to cherish, attempts to save the remnants of a brief and long-deceased dream, a brilliant but immature prodigy director who knows the hidden talents of the actor in question. So goes the "plain" story.

Georgie Elgin is the focal point of the play, and for such a new play—it opened in New York in November 1950—the main role has had many interpretations. Sally Call, who assumed the role in this production probably brought more life

and more sympathy to the role than has been previously accorded. Mr. Odets rewrote this particular role twice. His first Mrs. Elgin was, in his words, "a real bitch," it was to this interpretation that the Hollywood production leaned, as played by Grace Kelly. Though considerably more interesting to see, this assumption lost much of the sympathy necessary for Georgie's "crown of thorns." Sally Call brought the plot to life with a warm, silently desperate feeling.

Bernie Dodd, the director in question, and the play's one and only spark of life was excitingly portrayed by Paul Ward. A difficult part rewardingly moulded. Only in the last scene did he seem to drop out of character. Perhaps it was the direction that was to blame and not the actor. When Bernie stood like a little boy that had just snatched some cookies from his mother's cookies jar while Mr. and Mrs. Elgin "discovered" each other, all the Italian fire seemed squelched and he was now no

more than just a little boy in a man's part. Mr. Odets certainly had no intention of leaving this vivid character in such disrespectful immaturity.

Then there was Frank Elgin. In my opinion he was a non-entity. As far as the play was concerned he might just as well have been another "Harvey." His physical presence just wasn't necessary. As portrayed by Leroy Overen the part was well turned, so well-played that at the end I was left wondering just what Georgie had gained through her struggle. Twenty more years of sorrow and belittlement? Life certainly couldn't have held much in store for her if this was her ultimate ambition.

The supporting cast—Judith Hawley, Charles Landskroner, David Elliot, Don Wolvers and David Nale—was in top form.

Staging and directing was very effective though I believe the shabby apartment of the Elgin's was over-lighted thereby losing a great deal of the shabbiness and intimacy necessary for these scenes.

