

An Encouraging Trend

Stiffer Probation Policy Will Aid Academic Excellence

Twenty-five hundred students is a sizable number to be on probation. As one administrator said, "The professors know how to cut enrollment figures."

More than the professors, the University itself seems to be taking a welcome move toward stiffening requirements to stay in school. For some time, upper-class students who are below a 2.0 GPA have been placed on probation. Now, the records of all freshmen below a 2.0 are automatically reviewed at the end of Winter term, and again at the end of the year.

If the freshman is between a 1.5 and a 2.00, previously his record was not reviewed to see if he should be flunked out. Now, everyone below a 2.0 is reviewed.

This means that several more freshmen will now have their records closely scrutinized. In this process, those persons below a 2.0 and already on probation will have their grade slips referred to the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women, who are both members of the Scholastic Deficiency Committee. The deans go through the non-academic information on the student to see if there is a possible explanation for the low grades (such as finances, illness in the

family, or living conditions). If there seems to be a good explanation, the dean will refer these cases to the Scholastic committee who will then examine the reports and decide whether the student will be allowed to stay. Where no good explanation is available, disqualification is automatic.

If the significant improvement in GPA from one term to the next is accomplished, however, the student may continue while he is a freshman, even though he is below a 2.0.

We are pleased to see the University of Oregon become a little more difficult as far as staying in school goes. Other such attempts to limit the size of this student body on the basis of academic ability, rather than the ability-to-pay, would be equally welcome.

—Footnotes—

Grades last term were pretty low, and the Emerald women's page editor thinks she knows why. She pointed out that along with the low grades was an unprecedented number of pinnings and engagements. Being rather shrewd (and engaged) she thinks this is more than a coincidence.



THE COMEBACK KID

Letters to the Editor

Anti-Bridges

Dear Chairman Teasdale:
Via Emerald Editor.

We the Young Republicans of the University of Oregon would like to congratulate you on recently being elected Chairman of the Young Democrats. Since history has shown that a two party system is the key Republican success in America, we enjoy having the Opposition represented on this campus and we extend to you WITH GREAT VIGOR our heartiest congratulations on your recent election.

In reference to the lead editorial in Wednesday's Oregon Daily Emerald, we would like to remind you that in addition to the objective of increasing and stimulating political activity and thought on this campus, one of the major responsibilities of University political clubs is to uphold the reputation of the University of Oregon.

Last year the Young Democrats asked the Young Republicans if they were interested in jointly sponsoring the appearance of Gus Hall on this campus. Our answer then was that we were not interested in inviting Gus Hall as a speaker, but that we did not object to his appearance on the campus.

Even though your potential guest speaker, Harry Bridges, is probably more closely allied with the Democratic party than was Gus Hall, we call upon you to urge your club to reconsider this invitation. Whereas, we recognize that hotly debated topics and controversial speakers have provided the impetus for much of the political activity and thought on this campus, we fail to recognize the merit in inviting a controversial speaker simply for controversy's sake.

In a year when all of us are concerned with the amount of money the Democratically controlled legislature will appropriate to Higher Education, we suggest that it would be less than responsible for your club to invite Harry Bridges on the University of Oregon campus.

Tom Hoyt,
University of Oregon
Young Republicans.

Over Generalization

Emerald Editor:

From all evidence, I would say that Mr. Davis (letter Jan. 23) seems to be suffering from

a malady which, I'm ashamed to admit, seems to strike with unusual force among the young Freuds (or young Junges) on campus: that of over generalization.

Psychology, you see, sometimes has a rather difficult time defending itself as a true science, and perhaps it is because of this lack of science orientation that some undergraduate psychology majors have a difficult time using reason or logic. I certainly am not above irrationality at times, but, even at my modest level, it was an easy task to see where Mr. Davis used those two devices so characteristic of many amateur psychologists: overgeneralization and ambiguity.

First: Mr. Davis assumes that lack of participation in religious forum week means that "many students do not want... or need religion." This is like saying that a short line at the S.U. cafeteria means that many students do not want... or need food. There are other cafeterias, Mr. Davis.

Consider those who attend one or more religious meetings a week and prefer to use their remaining time for different activities. (Not everybody's interest is limited to one field.) Consider also those that weren't interested in the specific topics being discussed. A lack of interest in Beowulf would not preclude an interest in English literature. These are but a few of the possibilities overlooked.

Second: after Mr. Davis states that many have "no need for religion," he immediately proceeds to a tirade against Christianity. What do you consider Judaism, Buddhism, etc., Mr. Davis, if not religions?

As for Mr. Davis' views on Christianity, he is entitled to them. Contrary to his belief, not all Christians try to force their views on others. (And, from the evidence of his letter, it appears Christians are not the only ones guilty of this practice.) There is, however, one point that I just can't pass by without a written comment: Mr. Davis states that Christianity "curses all forms of earthly pleasure." Well, my libido is smiling from ear to ear, Mr. Davis. But tell me... how's yours?

Leanne Stallman,
Sen. in Psy. also.

Clarification

Emerald Editor:

I would like to say, in reply to Mr. Stone, that his strained analogy between military basic training and fraternity hazing begs critical reexamination.

Having seen both ends of the "stick," the fraternity and the military, the incomparability of the two is obvious. It is needless to go into the functions of the military, but one must at first note that the function of the college fraternity is primarily social in nature, having lost its historical military significance. Perhaps the hazing tradition is a carryover, a cultural lag, from this former military tradition.

If Mr. Stone, the accounting student, will grant the fraternity's social function as today being primary, then the unifying basic training program of the fraternity should be socially oriented as well, not an embodiment of the anachronistic militarism.

There is much to be said for fraternity hazing as being a parallel to the "bush schools" of many sodalities in some areas of the nonliterate world. The parallel breaks down, however, when one finds that the nonliterate "bush schools" serve an overall integrative function to the society of which they are a part, usually a society which requires that its male members be able to endure the harsh conditions of their day to day existence.

I therefore submit that hazing in a soladity of a modern culture is representative of a test of devotion which was required during the incipient stage of the sodality's growth. When the primary function of the sodality changes so must its corresponding test of its member's devotion.

The problem exists, as Mr. Stone points out, when hazing provides an expressive outlet for persons who are not properly devoted to an ethical social cause which would be beneficial to their fraternity's and the university's continued existence; and for persons who get their "kicks" out of being a power figure for perhaps the first and only time in their lives. Hazing, possibly a universal characteristic of human social interaction, requires controls over its forms which may be

Letters to the Editor

Reply to Stone

Emerald Editor:

In reference to Mr. Stone's rather emotional letter of the twenty-third, I should like to compliment him on using some of the one-sided publicity that he so eloquently derided. There are, however, some minor points with which I disagree.

His argument that the Army uses some of the same methods of hazing as the fraternities with the same goals in mind makes one examine the purposes of the fraternities. Certainly young Clyde Bubblegummer, fresh from high-school, does not need the esprit de corps of the Army. He is not being trained to have discipline under fire, not initiated with the idea that he will be trained to kill. The need for such hazing in the Greek system is beyond reason, unless fraternities fear something of which I am not aware. There is also the fact that Army conditioning is done under the direction of fairly mature, experienced officers, rather than fresh-faced college boys with a touch of perversity. Granted, such an initiation does produce a feeling of unique accomplishment. It turns my stomach to imagine the sense of accomplishment felt by those initiates that had to engage in those activities. Hacking may be physically painful, but it has none of the moral psychological or emotional implications stemming from some initiation practices. The fact that no one was too sure just what constitutes hazing is no excuse for suspension of morals or good judgment.

Mr. Stone also felt that the President's Council did quite well by themselves to condescend to public opinion. He

permanently injurious to the hazed and to the society of the hazed. Even the military provides such controls.

Another problem exists when jealous dissident factions jump upon a moral bandwagon to banish the likes of fraternities. Fraternities, now suffering the brunt of attacks against discrimination and hazing, are often prejudicially categorized as moral abominations by the ever-present reductionists. Fraternal organizations can and very often do provide a social education to their members, something which is badly needed in this all black or white academic subculture.

There is no "fence-straddling" intended herein, only a plea for clarification of the position of the moralists on each side of this issue.

T. C. Hogg,
Grad. in Anthropol.,
1st Lt. USAR.

might do well to reflect on the validity of the public opinion in a democracy as well as its power.

As far as giving the fraternity system a chance, he forgets that it has already been given chance after chance, with the result that conditions kept worsening until the present condition has been reached. Asking to let the system adjust to having "the beliefs of others forced upon it" makes one ask just why the established morals, beliefs and customs of American society are so alien to fraternity men. Surely, as Mr. Stone states, fraternity men cannot "be so wicked now." What exempts the Greek system from standards of good taste, physical and mental comfort, and personal freedom?

Mr. Stone might do well to concern himself with one aspect of the problem which might involve an injustice. That is, the fact that some fraternities which limit their initiation to an impressive formal initiation, with little in the way of informal activities, are going to be ranked in the public eyes right alongside those who have used some of the worst judgment possible. A fraternity which uses an occasional hack paddle will be liable to the same penalty as that house which uses the basest of initiation methods. He might also contemplate the overall publicity, both good and bad (or true or untrue) given to the whole fraternity system.

Mike Powell,
Soph. Speech.

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 Editors
GEORGE BIGHAM, Photo Editor
LINDA BROWN, Entertainment Editor
RON COWAN, CATHY NEVILLE, THORA WILLIAMS, Associate News Editors
EDITORIAL BOARD:
Ron Buel, Phil Cogswell, Ted Mahar, Everette Dennis, Dave Sands, Dulcy Moran, Linda Brown, Ed Carpenter, Bob Forsyth, Grant Ledgerwood, Doris Ragen, Janet Goetze, and Bill Hatchington