

Editorial Comment

An Apology

Regarding the Student Tribunal Charter, the Daily Nebraskan printed on November 11 of this year that there had been an alteration in the charter between the time it was printed on May 1 and the second printing on May 6.

The editorial continued, "For as far as we can see the only source of the error is the pied type which a member of the council of last year had juggled by some printer."

The editorial had implied that the council member was at the same time a staff member of a local newspaper and, therefore, had access to the galleys of type.

For this erroneous judgment on our part, we most sincerely apologize.

There is absolutely no evidence that the individual so charged was responsible for the typographical error which appeared in the charter printed Monday, May 6.

The consideration of the Daily Nebraskan in printing the editorial was not to defame any individual. Rather, we believed then—as now—that it is important for the University and the students to have the best possible charter.

Since the two versions of the charter differed, we presumed—and wrongly so—that more than the mechanical fragility of a linotype machine was involved. It is obvious this is not true.

The Daily Nebraskan in making this apology does not, however, change its stand that there are some definite inadequacies in the charter and that the work being done by the charter committee at the present time is not being wasted.

We had been led to believe that until the charter was approved by the Regents, it could be altered. It is evident from the statements of the chairman of the charter committee that it probably will be changed.

This committee is gathering material from all over the nation which it will digest and from which it will cull the very best ideas.

The activity is essential to developing a strong and honorable Student Tribunal which will serve the University on the highest of plans.

But for the oh so human error which this newspaper made in its judgment and accusation, we apologize.

Pat On Our Back

The old phrases about American complacency were hurled back at us by Colin Jackson, British analyst, who visited the campus during the latter part of last week.

Jackson, who has journeyed to the shores of the U.S.A. six times and was a visiting lecturer in political science here at the University cited specific instances of where the American public is complacent.

And it seems that he is absolutely correct.

Concerning this topic, the Daily Kansan from KU comments, "KU students have been accused of complacency so frequently of late it is a wonder that Watkins Hospital isn't flooded for requests, not for Asian flu shots, but for blood transfusions."

Jackson, who has watched the American people react to Sputniks as well as to the British and French activity in the Middle East, said Friday that the older generations of citizens here are willing to sit back in their country clubs and be inclined to look at the president on television and not really hear what he is saying.

He implied that the universities are the only refuge of individuals anymore. Rather pessimistically, he wondered if even the professors are listened to by the students.

The Briton made a good point when he implied that the present structure of American society is a vicious circle. "If people's bellies are filled, then they will not be critical citizens. On the other hand, the problem we face is keeping the bellies full and the individuals critical."

Jackson believes that there is a nucleus of Americans—maybe ten per cent of the population—who care what is going on.

"There's hope here," he added. "It might even be chaotic if everyone were displeased with the affairs of the world."

And well it might. University students, you might well guess, are within the ten per cent the commentator is concerned about. "If you young people could get a little made out of the present situation, if you could compete with the Russians not just to meet their standards but to better our own, if you could realize that the world around you is in danger, then we've got a hope for the future," he stated.

But, as usual, most persons who hear words such as these will say, "Fine and good. Now get out there (meaning someone else) and do something about it!"

We certainly live in an interesting world.

The Closing

It seems strange that the Library, one of the few refuges from boredom during the vacation period, is going to be closed over Thanksgiving.

Of course, to many students this will mean little. They will be gone from the campus and possibly far from the thought that thinking can be done on a full festive stomach.

But for the professors and the students who have much to do and the proverbial short time to get it done in, the Library's closing is near tragic.

Certainly the weeping should stop on our part. We suspect the Library's management has not made the move to close the building during the vacation out of spite toward anyone.

Extra hours of keeping a building open, extra working forces, extra costs make the maintenance of an open library over the holi-

days probably impractical.

Perhaps we're a little too practical sometimes, though.

When young people with eager minds or young people with simply curious minds wish to direct their attention to gaining new knowledge from books, new self-discipline from the use of a library, new confidence in their ability to search critically the pages of great books, they should be encouraged.

We are curious as to how many who would have used the library during the holidays would be willing to say anything about it to the librarians. We are curious as to whether the desire for knowledge would have any precedence over the "practicality" of keeping a building open.

We would like to have the facilities of the library available to the students during the holidays.

from the editor—

First Things First...

by Jack Pollock

At least we won one-fourth of the game Saturday. The Huskers bowed but had little to bow their heads about. For 18 seniors, it was the last time they'll don a Husker uniform. Lincoln Star sports writer Don Bryant pointed out that both teams have not been up to par this season—it was Oklahoma's worst season in five years and the worst in NU history. At least local sports writer Dick Becker won't have any "student apathy" pictures to print this week—maybe he'll have to stick to sports pics . . . with the exception of our uniformed cheerers, almost the entire student body—and alumni—remained until the final seconds of the game this week.

For Your Information: The second bouquet presented Nebraska Sweetheart Ruthie Gilbert Friday night at the Kosmet ceremonies (the first bouquet was from Kosmet Klub) was from the disbanded (?) TNE's.

Thought for the day: Only 13 more school days until Christmas vacation.

Students at Pitt are complaining about some campus signs that are cluttering the lawns. The signs say, "Let's Keep Our Campus Clean."

Homecoming Queen at Washington State College was a Swedish exchange student, Ingrid Oretorp, who expressed her preference for certain Swedish dating customs over those she

found in America.

Said Ingrid, if a boy asks a girl for a date in Sweden, "It means much more interest in her." And at dances in her homeland girls are quite likely to go by themselves, rather than with a boy.

"I think I like the Swedish plan better," she said in an interview with the campus paper "Daily Evergreen," because you never dance more than one or two dances with a boy. At least you can't get stuck with a bad dancer for the evening."

Evidently for lack of anything else to discuss, students have been debating pros and cons of motives for joining (but not necessarily participating in) campus activities. At Kansas State College, one coed, a junior in elementary education, in a superb summarization of her profound judgment said, "A student should participate in only those (activities) in which he is genuinely interested."

Which actually does have some merit. Let those who want activities join to their heart's content. Let those who want to study study—no one's forced to enlist for campus activities. For those who are genuinely interested, or who engage in activities to gain experience in their vocational lines, let them join so far as they can help themselves. For those patriots who actually join to serve the University community, bring along your friends with similar aspirations . . .

Daily Nebraskan Letterip

Alumnus Sounds Off Via Mail

To the Editor:

Although my copies of your journalistic joke are received somewhat later than on campus, I have followed your articles on the Student Tribunal with some interest. My former connections with that Charter should give me some bases for observations.

1. The original draft of the Charter was written during the winter of 1956 by Sam Van Pelt and myself after we had attended the Big Seven Student Government Convention in December, 1955. In May the student body overwhelmingly authorized the Student Council to work on a tribunal proposal. The mandate was accepted by the Student Activities Committee of the Student Council, which gathered materials and discussed ideas for most of the last school year, 1956-57. A Charter was written, and that Charter was discussed with the Student Council advisers as well as Dean Colbert and Mr. Pittenger. The Student Council submitted that Charter to the student body last May, and it was adopted.

2. Your editorial pages have recently made a so-called expose of typesetting manipulations by members of the Student Council last year. I choose to call your statement of the facts an inaccuracy rather than a lie. The editor at that time was Fred Daly, who had in a series of editorials dating back to the spring of 1956 supported a tribunal. The night that the proposed charter went to press Daly was out of the city. At that time Mr. Shugrue, the editorial page editor, took it upon himself to write an extraordinary front-page editorial against the proposed Charter. When two members of the Student Council were made aware of this situation, they made every effort to contact Fred Daly, who finally reversed Mr. Shugrue's usurpation and did not run the editorial. There were no alterations

made in the proposed Charter.

3. The recent advocacy by certain members of the Student Councils and of the newspaper to radically change the proposed charter is a direct disavowal of the opinion of the student body. When the student council submitted the proposed charter to the student body, it was asking its electorate to accept the charter. At that point the Student council resigned control of the charter by submitting it to the students. As stated above, the stu-

dent body accepted that Charter last May. How is it possible for the elected representatives of the student body to deny the actions of the student body as well as the actions of the previous Student Councils? The student body has not asked for a new charter; it accepted one already, and it has a right to expect its representatives to see to the immediate implementation of that Charter.

4. The accepted Charter of the Student Tribunal is a workable and

worthwhile plan. In spite of the trivial flaw of a too high average requirement for Law School representatives, the Charter provides for a reasonable system of student self-discipline. The Charter assumes a degree of mutual confidence between student and administration in the deliberation of cases to the Tribunal. Some have qualification could lead to an emasculated Tribunal; however, if there cannot be confidence in administrative sincerity on this point, how can one expect greater sincerity in a stronger plan or even sincerity in allowing a stronger plan? Both the students and the administration will have to prove themselves, but this can be done as witnessed in the functions of AWS, Student Council, IFC, etc. There can be no perfect Tribunal, but this one allows for growth and responsibility within a reasonable framework. This plan is not so radical that it lacks any chance for administrative acceptance.

I regret that this letter has grown so long, but it takes space to correct easily made mistakes. I hope that the personal whims and spites of a few will not destroy a plan that was made for and accepted by the student body.

Marvin Breslow

The Galley Slave

dick shugrue

No man is good enough to pass judgment on his fellows unless the evidence which will support the charge is true.

No man with honor will maintain that he is right in accusing another of petty and malicious action unless he can penetrate the mind of the accused.

With these thoughts in mind I read the letter from a former student at the University who is now attending some Ivy League school. That individual charges that I, through personal spite and whim, during the last semester tried to halt the student tribunal.

This is untrue.

I have been willing to give my whole hearted support (whether that be much) to the student tribunal. I have attempted to carry out my duties as editorial page boss of this rag in light of the needs of the University, rather than my personal ambitions (and we're all ambitious). I had an opportunity to examine the charter which was passed by an unconscious student body last spring and I found that the charter is not only unworkable in its present form it borders on the ridiculous.

I was erroneously informed by the author of the letter on this page as to the nature of the charter, however. He told me that the passage of the charter merely meant that the students wanted a charter, not necessarily this charter and that the council of this year could work out a suitable form. This was the understanding of the personnel at the newspaper in general.

It has been charged that the editorial opinion of the newspaper is such that it is discouraging the tribunal. I would suggest that the individual who has been so quick to fling the charges talk with the chairman of the tribunal committee for the truth.

In regard to the charges that a member of the council was responsible for a typographical error in the charter as it appeared in the May 6 Nebraskan, we have apologized.

Circumstantial evidence, which

sometimes sends men to the galleys, led us to make the charge. The individual involved was at the printers, he may have had cause to change the charter for he wanted it to be passed, and the changes were made.

However, we accept his statement that he had nothing to do with it for he respected as a man of honor.

That should close that episode.

As far as we are concerned it is closed now that a public apology has been made. I personally won't demand an apology from the writer of the letter on this page since there are more important things to do than to boost my own ego by such a demand. But I will say that I don't think the charter as it stands can work for the good of the University. As this newspaper has mentioned before, Chairman Dave Keene of the charter committee is polling all the universities and colleges in the nation which have tribunals to discover how they operate, within what borders they function, and just about any other material regarding the charters he can.

This seems to me to be the sensible way, the prudent way, to handle the charter. One can't write a document like that and expect to reflect the sentiments of the University at large if he has merely one helper. But with hundreds of persons lending suggestions, complaints, criticisms, the charter should be much more successful.

Now Keene has stated that he wants gripes from the students about the charter. These should be substantiated rather than mere opinion. In other words, if a student is dissatisfied with a particular section he should say why the section seems wrong to him and make some suggestion for its improvement.

Some persons have charged that a tribunal can never work at the University.

Hogwash. It can and should, if the student body works together to make it a strong tool which will establish and enforce a uniform code of justice for the students.

The Gadfly

Sara Jones

The current intra-college controversy over the certification of teachers brings into sharp focus two problems long recognized and yet long ignored by Nebraska citizens.

First, Nebraska's requirements for a teaching certificate are among the lowest in the nation. Second, secondary teachers are generally underpaid, overworked and accorded little social standing.

The eleven professors have not come up with any new and shattering statement. They have only stated that which everyone knew already—there is a teaching problem in Nebraska. Sputnik came as no surprise either, but suddenly America was forced to realize that her smug confidence in her own superiority was ill-founded — that thirteen stripes and forty-eight stars were no protection against a superior technology.

Consider the facts. Starting salary for a secondary teacher in Nebraska is about \$3500. Social standing of a school is almost nil. Retirement plans do not provide the security which students—rightly or wrongly—are demanding. As one Arts College instructor put it, "Any physics major who graduates with a degree in Arts College and decides to teach is insane."

The proposal of the eleven will not solve anything. In the first place the issue is already being obscured by petty rivalry between the two colleges involved. Secondly, only the most vehement proponent of the liberal arts philosophy would maintain that all teaching methods courses should be sacrificed to courses in subject matter. Every college student can name four or five of his instructors, past or present, who are skilled in their subject matter—

and hopelessly inadapt in presentation.

Possibly out of the controversy may come a method by which highly gifted individuals in Arts College may be able to gain a certificate by means of a shortened teaching course. This would at least provide a few extra teachers, of the type that would like to teach a few years but not make it a permanent profession.

But the long-term solution can come only from the citizens of Nebraska and from all the University students.

First of all Nebraska must realize that she gets just what she pays for. Every school district must be willing to sacrifice a few buildings for a few teachers, must raise the levy and do without. Maybe a few Touchdown Clubs could donate their \$25 and \$100 for better teachers instead of better football teams.

And then, most important, University students must realize that the only way we can have good teachers is to have good students go into that profession. Those Teachers College students who chose that college because the courses were easy, or jobs were plentiful can get out. Arts College students who sneer at the profession can remember that they are contributing to problem — and can take a long look at themselves and re-evaluate the profession they have chosen and maybe decide their services are needed more in another area.

But above all, this is not a time for petty intra-college squabbles and inert agreement that something really is wrong. It's time for Nebraska—and for the University which should mold Nebraska—to act.

The educational reform measures which are being called for by national leaders in lieu of alarming Russian scientific advances will have to come from the people, both of these men stated.

And both added quite prudently that the motive for this educational metamorphosis should not be the Sputnik alone but a basic desire on the part of the people to achieve greater culture in our present system.

The cry has been asserted long and loud from educators around the country that culture has been lacking in public education for the past few decades.

The United States has for too long been governed by the axiom what is right for the businessman is right for the country.

This maxim of national progress has thus partially produced the desire for what might have been educationally inclined people to pursue more lucrative professions.

One of the results thus being that the educational fields suffered both in quantity and in quality despite those few dedicated and competent men who remained on to assume the leadership of education's battered and torn ship (I grow Churchillian as my zeal increases.)

Of course the lack of culture in educational systems cannot solely be attributed to the less stringent requirements on the part of administrators. A large amount of blame rests on modern conveniences (such as the common car) and their influences on the modern student.

Times are easier and students today (including yours truly) have much more leisure time to drive, and play. Too little time is spent reading and obtaining culture. People complain that too few students are interested in science. Colleges can't force students to become cultured. They can however, by altering their required curricula, at least expose a better brand of education to students and thus warm their appetites.

Senior Survey

ron warholoski

Since everyone else in this office is availing themselves of the free advertisement of a column, I thought that one more wouldn't hurt the already gummed-up works. Besides, I want and need something to defend myself with from the merciless attacks of my colleague in the struggle to get the paper out—Sara Jones.

I'm not really sure just what this column is going to talk about—columns already appearing weekly in our little picture magazine run the gamut from hysterical jabberings to ridiculous nonsense. (As to which columnist I am referring to, I leave it to the imagination of the readers, if there are any.)

I'm rather excited about starting a crusade. The pronouncement of the eleven faculty members who advocated the change of the conditions for granting a teacher's certificate is something that has been needed for centuries around our morbid little university. I have yet to hear any of the people that I know in Teacher's College enunciate one nice word about any of the education courses to which they are subjected.

I must say that eleven professors would have the gumption to jump ahead of the administration in proposing a policy which affects so many people completely surprised me and I must admit that it's an added welcome. It seems that our administration has to be prodded into everything constructive except raising tuition and the idea of having some faculty members of the side of the prodders is a comforting thought.

I'm not really sure that everyone reads the Letters to Editor section of our progressive little paper; but for those who neglected to read that particular section in the Tuesday November 19 edition, I would like to bring their attention to a particularly interesting letter.

M. K. Elias, an instructor in the graduate college had this illuminating bit of wisdom to pass on. The letter read and I quote "there are some aspects in our University of Nebraska, and not so much in our pre-college educational system, that are in dire need of revision."

That statement lets the imagination run wild, doesn't it? Of course, one has to be an embittered senior to realize just what is really meant; for by then, one has seen the procedures of education in other universities and has had time to ponder and wonder about the good old University of Nebraska.

As a closing thought, and since we are discussing the University, I wonder if the proposed staggering enrollment, which was the main reason given for the tuition increase, is going to materialize. I'm betting against it.

Daily Nebraskan

FIFTY-SIX YEARS OLD

Member: Associated Collegiate Press
Intercollegiate Press
Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated

Published at: Room 26, Student Union
Lincoln, Nebraska

14th & E

The Daily Nebraskan is published Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, and one issue is published during August, by authority of the Committee on Student Affairs as an expression of student opinion. Publications under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Student Publications shall be free from editorial censorship on the part of the Subcommittee or on the part of any member of the faculty of the University, or on the part of any person outside the University. The members of the Nebraskan staff are personally responsible for what they say, or do or cause to be printed, February 6, 1956.

Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1913.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: Jack Pollock
Editorial Editor: Dick Shugrue
Managing Editor: Ron Warholoski
News Editor: Sara Jones
Sports Editor: Bob Marcell
Night News Editor: Ernie Hines
Copy Editors: Bob Ireland (chief), Carole Frank, George Mayer, Gary Rodgers, Eric Hines
Sports Writers: Ken Kreed, DeJ Rasmussen, Ben Shoben, Harold Friedman, Bob Wirtz

Staff Writers: Bobbie Butterfield, Pat Flanagan, Emily Limpo, Herb Probasco, Wynn Smithberger, Margaret Wertman

Reporters: Sharon Abraham, Jo Agre, Jan Anderson, Mary Apling, Judy Griffin, Gail Hathaway, Karen Karrer, Roberta Knapp, Sianne Knapp, Marie Koop, Carol Longhouser, Garry Lounsbury, Janet LeVander, Julieanne Nehring, Susanne Reichstadt, Joanne Simpkins, Susan Thompson, Arlene Tuess

BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager: Jerry Scholtz
Assistant Business Managers: Tom Neff, Stan Kaiman, Bob Smith

Circulation Manager: John Norris

