

Nebraskan Editorials

Final Exams In One Week?

A plan in Chancellor Hardin's mind to reduce the present two weeks of final examinations to one week has definite good points in its favor. The plan has not been publicly announced, but the administration is seriously airing arguments on both sides.

Pro: A majority of students—more than would admit it—do not need two weeks of preparation for tests. In the spring, particularly, a great deal of this time is spent on recreation.

Con: This is not so. Students spend every minute of the two weeks in preparation for tests and in finishing up loose ends of the semester's work. Moreover, even though much of the time is spent in recreation, this is good for the student psychologically. After a heavy semester schedule, breathing time is required for good preparation for tests.

Pro: On the other hand, psychologically speaking, it is a well established fact that the best work is done when a reasonable amount of pressure is exerted upon the student. If the students had to take tests in one week, they could do it.

Con: But wouldn't such a plan mean that the possibility of a student having two tests at the same time be increased?

Pro: Not necessarily. Such a plan includes a reduction in the time for each test to two hours instead of three. In such a case three tests could be given in each day. That way, the number of test periods would be much the same as they are now, so that no duplication for one student would be any more necessary than it is now.

Con: And where would the student who had three tests in one day be then? Preparing adequately for tests would be practically impossible for him.

Pro: This is possible, but such a chance exists

now on a different scale. Moreover, a two-hour test would require much limitation in scope, so that not as much preparation would be required. The effect might even be that less emphasis for purposes of grading would be placed on the final exam.

Con: What's wrong with the schedule we have now? What benefits could be derived from of different one?

Pro: Every year students moan because long, drawn-out exam schedules prevent them from going home in February, or leaving school early in June. Both faculty members and students are forced to stick around even though they may be wasting time in between tests. This is a real problem on campus this year. One example is a coed who wished to take her tests early because her wedding was scheduled to come soon after her originally scheduled last exam. The administration has set up a policy that prevents a student from taking a test before it is scheduled. The reason is that too many students would require the same, and teachers haven't the time to make out new tests. Such a policy is justified. On the other hand the request of the coed was justified since other factors forced her to set the date when she did. The result is a dilemma; both are right and both are wrong.

While the plan to limit test week to one week would not completely solve the problem, it would alleviate a great deal of it. Students could be free for summer jobs much sooner. Basically such a plan is economical for both student and professor.

Unfortunately, some students would be hurt by the plan. On the other hand, many would benefit. Once students became accustomed to it, and planned their time accordingly, all would benefit.—K. N.

Case For Senior Honoraries

Ivy Day is here again, and the conspicuous absence of one Innocent, and the reverberating criticism of the past few months against the Innocents seem to be overlooked in the curiosity over next year's Innocents and Mortar Boards.

It might still be wise, however, to try to evaluate these senior honoraries whose influence at this time of year pervades every phase of student activities. Obviously, they are as influential as ever, and obviously, they are as strong as ever. And perhaps, they are as necessary as ever.

Mortar Boards and Innocents, which call themselves—like every student organization—a "service organization," are not, under keen analysis, demanded and maintained for their services to the University. Certainly both organizations do perform many valuable services, but one wonders whether these services are enough to justify two such powerful and large organizations. One, in fact, doubts that the two senior honoraries exist merely as "service" organizations.

Yet, they are undoubtedly necessary phases of college life. Many of Nebraska's activities—and this is probably true for most other colleges in the nation—are emulations of successful organizations which have built up traditions at the older, Eastern colleges. Scholarship honoraries, fraternities, college humor magazines, and secret senior honoraries were all originated

in the East, and were copied by Western schools. This may be one reason for senior honoraries at Nebraska.

Behind this reason, of course, lies the fact that humans seem to crave secret fraternal organizations. This desire to nucleate into exclusive groups, with all kinds of mysterious lore and "mumbo-jumbo," seems to be a universal trait, and one especially popular in the United States. This desire is stimulated by the need for close companionship, and by the difficulty in creating such companionships in a confusing, untrusting society. And these desires are the forces behind fraternities, sororities, honoraries and lodges of all kinds. They give diverse people common grounds for fellowship.

And finally, senior honoraries seem to be necessary to maintain the structure of the activity system at Nebraska. This coveted and prestige-filled position as a recognized campus "leader," in an ultra-exclusive organization gives impetus and meaning to the often drudging and difficult work of activities. Many people would undoubtedly forsake activities hastily if there weren't a reward at the end of the road.

So it seems that even if the two senior honoraries, Innocents and Mortar Boards aren't necessary to the University, they probably are necessary to the students in the University.—R. H.

Campus Circuits

Commonwealth Status Possible Compromise For Alaska, Hawaii

From The University Daily Kansan
Lawrence, Kansas

The House Rules committee has recently resumed consideration of how and when to bring up the bill that would authorize statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

A Democratic leader predicted that the committee probably will send the bill to the House with a closed rule, which means there could be no amendments.

Many persons are in favor of making either Alaska or Hawaii a state but not both of them. Hawaii has been predominantly Republican and might add two Republican senators to Congress. However, Alaska is mostly Democratic, so the gain would be canceled. For this reason the bill, in order to pass, almost has to be for both.

Hawaii has taken the lead in efforts to gain statehood. Hawaiians seem to feel that they are entitled to statehood because Hawaii has a larger population and pays more federal taxes than some of the present states. Of 500,000 residents, 85 per cent are American citizens.

Some of the opposition to statehood for Hawaii has arisen because in time it would bring two senators of Asiatic extraction to Congress. Some Southern Congressmen fear that it would encourage racial voting.

The Communist control of organized labor in Hawaii also has been against the territory.

Others feel that if Hawaii becomes a state there would be no reason to keep out Guam, the Virgin Islands, and other territories.

Alaska's size has hurt her in regard to statehood. Texas, in its typical attitude, does not want to lose its title of being the largest state in the Union.

The territory is 570 miles from the United States but only 60 miles from Russian Siberia. For this reason President Eisenhower has said he would prefer to grant statehood to only the

populated area of Alaska rather than the entire territory.

One reason that many persons are against admitting either territory as a state is that according to the Constitution, statehood is irrevocable. If the territories became states their status could never be changed.

Those who are in favor of statehood feel that it is desirable to eliminate hampering and discriminatory federal controls over the territories.

But more and more persons are beginning to agree that statehood is not the only solution to this problem. They feel that if Hawaii and Alaska were granted a commonwealth status, it would correct the problems that exist now without bringing on the complications that statehood might incur.

Alaska and Hawaii both voted for statehood, but they had only two choices—for or against. Many persons feel that they should have a chance to express themselves on the issue of commonwealth.

In 1954 a proposal for commonwealth put forth in Congress was defeated 60-24. Another proposal for referendums in each territory to determine what they wanted was rejected 59-36. At that time a Hawaiian delegate said Hawaii would demand a refund on federal taxes since 1900 if it were made a commonwealth instead of a state.

If the territories were made commonwealths, they would operate under a plan similar to that of Puerto Rico, which has a self-governing status to fit its needs. Congress could provide for a minimum of federal control and define the manner in which it should be administered. Other advantages of statehood, such as federal tax exemption, could be granted.

This session of Congress no doubt will take up the issue again, but it looks as though it will be a long time before the American flag will have more than 48 stars.

The Nebraskan

FIFTY-SECOND YEAR

Member: Associated Collegiate Press

Intercollegiate Press

Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated

The Nebraskan is published by students of the University of Nebraska under the authorization of the Commission on Student Affairs as an expression of student opinion. Publications under the jurisdiction of the Sub-

committee on Student Publications shall be free from editorial censorship on the part of the faculty of the University, or on the part of any person outside the University. The members of the Sub-committee shall be personally responsible for what they say, or do or cause to be printed, September 24, 1952.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: John Harrison
Editorial Page Editor: Ray Kelly
Managing Editor: Mortimer Hansen
News Editor: Dick Farnham
Sports Editor: Bruce Brownson
Copy Editor: Fred Blair, Roger Hinkle, Sam Jensen, Marilyn Mitchell
Art Editor: Marilyn Mitchell

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS

by Dick Bibler



"Don't let th' housemother know we have any beer—I only brought enough for the four of us."

Globetrotting

Mud In Public Eye, Inscrutable Yanks

By CHARLES GOMON

"You can't make any sense out of what the Russians do; nobody understands the Russian mind except a Russian. Besides, what is the State Department for?"

With this casual observation most Americans are apt to dismiss the "Russian Question" to some omniscient, if fancied, committee in striped pants hidden in Washington's Old State Department Building.

Such statements on the part of American voters are not only ridiculous, but the misinformation these words betray may invite disaster.

Westerners are prone to forget that Soviet policies are nearly as explicit as were Hitler's. The economic-political bases of Communism are defined by Karl Marx's "Das Kapital" and "Value, Price and Profit." Marx and Engels drafted the "Manifesto of the Communist Party." The party line interpretations of these gospels of Communism were expressed by Lenin in "The State and Revolution" and by Stalin in "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism."

The thoughtful Communists even made rigid ideological discipline a part of their creed. To obtain a single definition of current Soviet policy one need only read a translation of the dullest newspaper in the world: Pravda.

It is ironic that "pravda" means "truth," but as far as conformity with the Communist party line is concerned that is exactly what it is. Our problem of understanding and interpreting Russian events is simplified to a study of one line of statements—the Russian leader's.

Consider the problem of interpretation of world events from a Kremlin's eye view, however. One of the important advantages of American democracy is that it permits 151 million different points of view.

Unfortunately for the conduct of foreign affairs this principle sometimes asserts itself at the top, and the Russians are not the only ones confused. In fact, conflicting statements by various members of the executive and legislative departments of the U.S. government too often blanket Washington like a political smog.

The classic example, of course, was Korea. Secretary of State Dean Acheson declared emphatically early in 1950 that Korea played no part in our Pacific defense concept. That one cost us 137,000 casualties when the Communists misjudged

American intentions and invaded South Korea.

A recent example concerns the proposed cease-fire in the Formosan Straits. On April 23 Undersecretary of State Herbert Hoover Jr., after consultation with President Eisenhower, issued a statement imposing certain conditions on U.S. participation in cease-fire talks, including an insistence that the Nationalist government be represented.

By April 27 Secretary of State Dulles had returned from duck-hunting to concur with several congressional leaders in saying that the U. S. would not insist that the Formosan government be represented at the suggested cease-fire talks.

The present argument over whether this country is or is not committed to defend Quemoy and Matsu is damaging our relations with our allies.

The competition of loyalty review boards and executive agencies over Wolf Ladijensky and Edward Corsi is a disgrace to American traditions of justice.

If the confusion resulting from American political indiscretions produced bald heads and ulcers only in the Kremlin we would have no cause for concern. When our allies begin to refer to us scornfully as "unpredictable" and "inscrutable" it is time for immediate rectification.

This writer would not wish to curtail the right of criticism in America, yet neither can we afford to create the impression that U. S. foreign policy is determined by the latest or largest headline.

Quick Quips

Three turtles decided to have a cup of coffee. Just as they went into the cafe, it started to rain. So the biggest turtle said to the smallest turtle, "Go home and get the umbrella."

So the little turtle said, "I will if you don't drink my coffee."

"We won't," promised the other two.

Two years later the biggest turtle said to the middle turtle, "Well, I guess he isn't coming back, so we might as well drink his coffee."

Just then a little voice called from outside the door: "If you do, when the Communists misjudged I won't go."

Givin' 'Em Ell

Education Woes Lie In Teachers College

By ELLIE ELLIOTT

The dubious state of affairs in our public school system is always a subject of controversy. We have made greater strides in getting more people through school with less personal cost than, possibly, any other nation.

At the same time, however, we must face the fact that the standards of public education have not kept pace with the enrollment. Instead of expecting our students to aim for a high standard, to try to become educated, we have lowered demands in order to accommodate that vast, vague organism known as "the average."

We eliminate subjects and subject matter from our schools under the pretense that it is obsolete or that it contributes no practical information to this so-called average student. The classics go, the foreign languages go, higher mathematics go; they are replaced by business English, driver education and fudge-making. The practical value of these latter activities is undeniable, in terms of future paychecks. But the aesthetic value, the value to the mind and to the soul, is questionable.

Is it possible that we as educators and educators-to-be underestimate this average mind which we are so determined to "educate"? Are we possibly mistaken in trying to teach young people how to earn a living? Might we not try to teach them, instead, how to live?

Much of the problem lies right in our own Teachers College. The situation is becoming a vicious cycle. Students who are poorly prepared enter the University in order to learn how to teach, and they leave again, only to send more students to the University, and into life, just as poorly prepared.

The number of professional hours required by Teachers College is

adequate, and should be maintained, but the content of much of the material in the basic professional courses is not only repetitious, but also of little value from any point of view. Most Teachers College courses are famous for two qualities: "snap" and "busy work." This does not need to be, but it is.

The academic requirements in Teachers College are not equal to those of the College of Arts and Sciences; yet a teacher, of all people, should have a broad, liberal education. Some of the best students in the University, some of the best potential teaching material, avoid Teachers College simply because they are not willing to sacrifice their minds, their time or their dignity to useless busy work.

The situation could be improved in several ways. The first is to make the entrance requirements for Teachers College the same as the requirements for Arts and Sciences . . . or more. The second is to make the academic requirements equal to those of Arts and Sciences, to include, for instance, a language and philosophy. A third and more immediately possible solution is to make the process of dual registration less painful and humiliating to those Arts and Sciences students who desire to improve the educational situation by teaching, but who also desire a liberal education and the straight arts or science degree that signifies this. It does not seem provident to crucify one's potential allies. And, of course, the professional courses need to be re-evaluated and revised. Then, perhaps, the shooting across the Mall would cease, and those of us who are caught in the middle could spend our time doing something more noble than dodging the bullets.

Where There's Smoke Noted Lawyer-To-Be Expounds Theories

By JOHN GOURLAY

and MIKE SHUGRUE

A rare privilege today is an exclusive interview with Gene Spence, noted law school freshman, upon winning his first moot court case. Gene is a well-known political aspirant in the state.

The questions and Spence's answers follow:

Have not the Thetas been positively identified as participants in the riot? "I'd believe anything about the Thetas."

Was consideration made in their case because of their campus reputation? "They ain't got no reputation."

When will you be governor of Nebraska? "Fifteen years and a twenty-five thousand dollars from now."

Where will you get the money? "From happy supporters."

Why will you run for governor of Nebraska? "I think my state needs my services. I have a broader base upon which to build my administration."

What do you think of Governor Anderson? "A true friend of the people."

Does the fact that you are both members of the Republican Party have anything to do with this? "Only straight-thinking individuals are Republicans."

Would you comment on the recent penitentiary riot as compared to the recent party-raid? "Deplorable situations; they must be remedied."

Discuss for us briefly the dating situation on the campus. "A deplorable situation; it must be remedied. Lincoln General provides my only

Tell us about your 21st birthday. "I arose early, went to the mirror, found myself much more mature. That evening we had a champagne party at which I found out what my friends looked like lying prone on the floor."

What do you think of Senator McCarthy? "I believe as Mr. Knoll that he is a much-maligned gentleman who has been done a great injustice because of his attempts to remedy the evils of communism."

Are you an internationalist? "I'll shake hands with any man."

Are you a rightist? "No, as a matter of fact, I'm left-handed."

Do you believe in specific answers? "In general, yes."

What do you think of Nebraska farmers? "The backbone of the country."

What do you think of the Student Council? "The jellyfish of the University."

What do you think about jocks? "I think they should be worn by all athletes."

Where do you expect to be allowed to go to school next year? "Luther College."

Why Luther College? "I wish to continue in the religious atmosphere of the University."

What is your religious preference? "God."

Who is the greatest living human? "Mr. Ozone (You'd never believe I was 84)."

Who is the greatest person of all time? "Give me twenty-five years."

"IT TASTES GREAT!"

HERBERT TAREYTON CIGARETTES

Filter Tip MODERN SIZE

"ACTIVATED CHARCOAL FILTER, TOO!"

"DRAWS FREE AS A BREEZE!"

FILTER TIP TAREYTON

with the Pearl-Gray Activated Charcoal Filter

PRODUCT OF The American Tobacco Company

USE NEBRASKAN

Classified Ads

To place a classified ad

- Stop in the Business Office Room 20 Student Union
- Call 2-7631 Ext. 4226 for Classified Service

Hours 1-4:30 Mon. thru Fri.

THRIFTY AD RATES

No. words	1 day	2 days	3 days	4 days
1-10	\$.40	\$.65	\$.85	\$1.00
11-15	.50	.80	1.05	1.25
16-20	.60	.95	1.25	1.50
21-25	.70	1.10	1.45	1.75
26-30	.80	1.25	1.65	2.00

Wanted: Couple to work evenings from 4 to 8. Call 2-4922 or 4-5678.

Lost—Kodak Retinette Camera and Case Thursday afternoon by R. E. Edg. If found call George Madson, 2-7767.