

Thursday, January 16, 1964

GUEST EDITORIAL:

Ethical Cow?

Is there a question of ethical integrity in a campus figure who attempts to influence opinion through newspaper columns and public comment? Campus leaders have discussed this issue behind closed doors for quite some time.

The problem is not new, nor is it unique. Business and professional men as well as campus leaders across the country face the issue daily. Honesty is a valid criteria for judging all persons who vie for the public spotlight.

These behind-closed-doors discussions at Nebraska have been mainly centered around Jim Moore's Sacred Cow, this year.

Students and administrators agree that individuals who have placed themselves in a position of talking for the students as a columnist or spokesman must adhere to time honored principles of honesty and integrity.

Moore, now a DAILY NEBRASKAN columnist, was a candidate in an invalidated election for Builders' Student Council Representative. He is no longer a member of the fraternity to which he was activated.

But yesterday, in an attempt to influence Student Council's decision on whether or not to dissolve the drinking study, Moore said that he had talked to Fred Ware, Executive Editor of the OMAHA WORLD-HERALD, and that Ware favored a change in state law allowing 3.2 beer at age 19 and was awaiting Council action on the issue.

Ware revealed in a phone conversation that, "I have never heard of Jim Moore. I have never spoken to Jim Moore. I wonder who this Jim Moore is." Ware continued that he was opposed to any change in existing Nebraska liquor laws.

Moore, fighting for the preservation of the drinking study, attempted to influence a decision which affects 12,000 students.

The question of whether or not the drinking committee should exist does not come into focus under this editorial. Rather, we, as students first, do not want a man who stoops to such levels and tactics of persuasion to speak for us.

Furthermore, we do not feel that Moore has an ethical right to exert influence, either as a columnist or spokesman, on the students of this University.

DICK WEILL GARY POKORNY ARNIE GARSON

What's Happening In College?

EDITOR'S NOTE: William Buckley, a noted conservative and editor of the National Review, wrote this report of the American Campus scene for the Jan. 14, 1964, issue of his magazine.

By William F. Buckley Jr.

What is going on at American colleges and universities? A lot — is of course

the easiest and safest answer. At one level I speak with devastating authority. The college in America with a visiting lecturer's program, an auditorium, and three conservative students with mischief in their eyes that has been spared a speech by me during the

past ten years can count its ironic blessings.

Freshest in my mind is a sojourn early last month, at the University of Texas, where I spent a week as a Visiting Resident among some of the kindest and most enjoyable persons I have ever met.

The University, like other great state universities only more so, is bursting at the seams; with energy-intellectual, physical, and acquisitive. The students are bright and curious, responding proudly to the implacable decision of their faculty and president to lift the standards of learning, slowly but surely. State universities tread a delicate line between the demands of the electorate, which seem to call for an academic degree for any one prepared to spend four years in residence (a B.S. is a birthright, democracy says), and the inherent meaning of a degree (give a degree to everyone, and it ceases to mean anything).

What are modern students primarily concerned about — yes, yes, I mean beyond the conventional concerns of physically normal young Americans? The answer, at Texas as elsewhere, has really to do with the question whether anything is knowable. So much time has been given over in our recent intellectual past to pounding home the necessity for freedom of speech, to celebrating the value of dissent, to singing the praises of academic freedom, that the impression is given that what they have most to look forward to is the process of flux, or the changes that dissent and academic freedom will bring in.

If, out of piety for the First Amendment, we end up encouraging man to use his freedom to cultivate and evangelize whatever is his belief — Communism, say — we are actually very close to saying that our own disbelief in Communism is less strong than

our belief that Communism should have continuing opportunities to win over a majority; we are renouncing, implicitly, our belief that our indictment of Communism is sufficient for all the ages. If man is to be encouraged to exercise his freedom to deny the bases of American life, the bases of American life are presumptively suspect. Students are being encouraged to exercise their academic freedom in such a way as to encourage the notion that the operative ideals of our society are suspect.

Suspect because we cannot really know (as Thomas Jefferson is thought to have implied) that our own way is right; because we cannot really know (as John Stuart Mill is misunderstood to have believed) that the many in 19th-century England were right, while the few were wrong; because (as Oliver Wendell Holmes quite truly believed) the only test of truth is its ability to win acceptance in the marketplace.

And so the American student often appears as though his principal duties are a) to prepare the way for some chiliastic discovery, tomorrow, or the next day — and who knows, Gus Hall may be its prophet, and b) to deplore those, those — those — Absolutists (the 20th century's anathema) who insist that while all the truth is not now known, nor is likely ever to be known, we know now, even now, enough of the truth, to assert proudly and confidently the general direction in which we should think and act; that

Continued on Page 3



The New Guard:

Two Parties? Or Do We Have Four?

By Bob Weaver

One of the strengths of the American political system is considered to be the two party structure. But do we actually have two parties except than in organizational form? James MacGregor Burns in his book, The Deadlock of Democracy contends that in actuality, the United States is faced with a problem of four party politics.

The members of this four party system, are considered to be the presidential and congressional wings of the Democrat and Republican parties. Each party has its own electoral strength, though not wholly separate from its structural partner, and separate characteristics.

From where does the four party system receive its tendency? Burns answers this question by examining American political party history. The competition of the so-called Madisonian and Jeffersonian tendencies, is the parent of our present structure.

Upon examination the Madisonian system yields these characteristics: Personal factions would grow around each office seeker and holder and these factions would support the constitutional system of checks and balances. The offices

themselves would give stability to the system. As forces brought temporary crises, the system would reorder itself into, basically, the same patterns afterward. The result of competing factions, of course, has left our politics fragmented. Governing is done through coalition, consensus, and compromise.

It is the Madisonian system which has generally given birth to the two congressional parties.

The Jeffersonian system, subject to the control of the majority is the competing system of the Madisonian tendency. Power is organized more on a hierarchical basis with built-in leadership. A national party exists which is able to provide more free and vigorous leadership.

As the name implies the Jeffersonian system had its beginning while Thomas Jefferson was organizing political strength for his election campaigns and for his administrative programs. The Madisonian system is a result of the constitutional system of checks and balances largely conceived by James Madison.

The Madisonian has been the controlling system and is so today despite the efforts of certain presidents such as Jefferson, Jackson, Wilson and both Roosevelts.

By establishing two levels of political competition, state and national, the federal system broadens the impact of the Madisonian system. A state's political complexion is controlled by and can be out of step with the national situation, the greater the sectional feeling which exists among voters.

Certain political and national storms, such as Civil War, have increased the disarticulation of the state-national picture and have resulted in numerous one party congressional districts. This creates centers of power in each congressional party at variance with the presidential leadership.

The last factor which denies real order to the system is the popular differences between the various economic and way-of-life issues. The prevailing Madisonian system provides representativeness, flexibility, and accessibility at the "expense of leadership vigor, speed and effective and comprehensive national action."

Each of the four parties has its clearly recognized characteristics. This is not to say, however, that some characteristics don't overlap even between the congressional and presidential groups.

The presidential parties are oriented towards the presidency, seeking broad national support. Its main buttress is the national convention. It is interesting to note that Warren G. Harding is the last of the so-called congressional Republicans to gain the nomination.

This has interesting implications for Senator Barry Goldwater, a member of the present congressional Republican party. Each congressional group has its roots in Congress and in turn in each Congressman's local district where he gains his local electoral support. All the machinery of Con-

gress, including its main lubricant, the seniority rule, is the congressional parties' national arena.

In electoral behavior, the presidential parties must deal with the electoral college and therefore must cater to the heavily populated urban states with their liberal dogma. Although members of the presidential parties, they are elected from marginal districts and on presidential coattails. Thus it makes it difficult to gain reelection as with Eisenhower Republicans who lost in 1954.

Certain congressman such as Jacob Javits and John Sherman Cooper, and Jaul Douglas and Herbert Lehman can be classified as being in the Republican and Democrat presidential parties respectively.

Ideologically the presidential parties are generally liberal domestically and internationalist in foreign policy with the Democrat group prevailing over the Republican as to degree. At the other end of the spectrum, the congressional Republicans are the most conservative domestically and isolationist in foreign policy with the Democrat congressional party running a close second.

There are other characteristics such as career lines where presidential members come from universities and urban law and banking firms.

The congressional members tend to come from small town law firms and other small town beginnings. Each group has its own press corps and each of the presidential parties tend to be more oriented toward Europe in foreign policy while congressional parties, especially Republican, have an Asian orientation.

Geographically, the congressional Democrats are from the South and congressional Republicans from the rural Northern

areas. The presidential Republicans and Democrats come from the urban areas of the Mid-West, Northeast and West; Republicans have a heavier emphasis in the middle class suburbs.

Party committees tend to be in the hands of the congressional groups, especially when that party is not in the White House. The president usually remains in command of his own party machinery while in and for the party out of office the presidential party lacks real leadership since it has no one leader in office.

The threat of international communism in foreign policy and the ever increasing problems of the urban areas domestically demands that vigorous leadership be given the United States. This leadership, of course, is inherent in each presidential party.

The situation therefore demands that certain steps be taken to insure the availability of that leadership. This might be done, according to Burns, in various ways. Through broadening the electorate by insuring Negro and other minority rights, the degerrymandering of Congress, elimination of the seniority rule, effective party control of Congress, and better Congressional action through a vigorous leadership and parliamentary procedure.

The national government, according to Burns, might control national elections, and national parties must build grassroots support. The congressional and presidential parties of each must merge organizationally and again, a new leadership must be developed for Congress. Parties and candidates should be supported and financed by a broad, popular and systematic basis.

Events of the past year in Congress and of the past two centuries historically show how leaders can be frustrated, even by their own party.

If America is to meet the challenges in the decades ahead, new and vigorous leadership is needed. Regardless of political philosophy and its application, the cure for what ails democracy is "responsible, committed, effective, and exuberant leadership..."

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS



A GUIDE FOR THE GUIDERS

One of the most interesting academic theories advanced in many a long year has recently been advanced by that interesting academic theorist, E. Pluribus Ewbank, Ph. D. who holds the chair of Interesting Academic Theories at the St. Louis College of Footwear and Educational Philosophy. Dr. Ewbank said in the last issue of the learned journal, the Mount Rushmore Guide to Scholastic Advancement and Presidents' Heads, that we might be approaching the whole problem of student guidance from the wrong direction.

Dr. Ewbank, a highly respected pedagogue and a lifelong smoker of Marlboro Cigarettes, (I mention Marlboros for two reasons: first, to indicate the scope of Dr. Ewbank's brainpower. Out of all the dozens of brands of cigarettes available today, Dr. Ewbank has had the wit and taste to pick the one with the most flavorful flavor, the most filitricious filter, the most soft soft pack, the most flip top Flip Top box; I refer, of course, to Marlboro. The second reason I mention Marlboro is that I get paid to mention Marlboro in this column, and the laborer, you will agree, is worthy of his hire.)

But I digress. To return to Dr. Ewbank's interesting theory, he contends that most college guidance counselors are inclined to take the easy way out. That is to say, if a student's aptitude tests show a talent for, let us say, math, the student is encouraged to major in math. If his tests show an aptitude for poetry, he is directed toward poetry. And so forth.



All wrong, says Dr. Ewbank. The great breakthroughs, the startling innovations in, let us say, math, are likely to be made not by mathematicians—whose thinking, after all, is constrained by rigid rules and principles—but by mavericks, by nonconformists, by intuitors who refuse to fall into the rut of reason. For instance, set a poet to studying math. He will bring a fresh, unfettered mind to the subject, just as a mathematician will bring the same kind of approach to poetry.

By way of evidence, Dr. Ewbank cites the case of Cipher Binary, a youth who entered college with brilliant test scores in physics, chemistry, and the calculus. But Dr. Ewbank forced young Cipher to major in poetry.

The results were astonishing. Here, for example, is young Cipher's latest poem, a love lyric of such originality that Lord Byron springs to mind. I quote:

He was her logarithm,  
She was his cosine,  
Taking their dog with 'em,  
They hastened to go sign  
Marriage vows which they joyfully shared  
And wood and veed and pi r squared.

Similarly, when a freshman girl named Elizabeth Barrett Sigdoo came to Dr. Ewbank to seek guidance, he ignored the fact that she had won the Pulitzer prize for poetry when she was eight, and insisted she major in mathematics. Again the results were startling. Miss Sigdoo has set the entire math department agog by flatly refusing to believe that six times nine is 54. If Miss Sigdoo is correct, we will have to re-think the entire science of numbers and—who knows?—possibly open up vistas as yet undreamed of in mathematics.

Dr. Ewbank's unorthodox approach to student guidance has so impressed his employers that he was fired last week. He is currently selling beaded moccasins at Mount Rushmore.

We, the makers of Marlboro, know only one kind of guidance: the direct route to greater smoking pleasure. Try a fine, filtered Marlboro, available wherever cigarettes are sold in all fifty states of the Union.

The Daily Nebraskan  
JOHN MORRIS, managing editor; SUE HOVIE, news editor; SUSAN SMITH-BERGER, GRANT PETERSON, FRANK PARTSCH, senior staff writers; LARRY ARNAN, MARY McNEELY, JERRY O'NEILL, JERRY HOFFENBER, junior staff writers; PATTY KNAPP, ARNIE GARSON, CAY LETTCHUCK, copy editors; HAL FOSTER, photoeditor; MICK BOOD, sports editor; MIKE JEFFREY, circulation manager; JIM DICK, subscription manager; BILL GUNLICKS, BOB CUNNINGHAM, PETE LAGE, business assistants.  
Subscription rates \$3 per semester or \$5 per year.  
Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1912.  
The Daily Nebraskan is published at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday by University of Nebraska students under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from censorship by the Subcommittee or any persons outside the University. Members of the Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.