

From the Editor:

# A Liberal View

By Herb Probasco

The author was disturbed by Student Council's handling of the interviews Wednesday for student positions on the Publications Board. The questions and, in several instances, the conduct of the Council members showed both a lack of knowledge of the organization for which they were selecting persons and of the caliber of the applicants.

With a few exceptions, the same bloc of members consistently asked questions of the applicants. Few of these questions allowed the applicant a chance to show whether they really knew anything about the Pub Board. The individual applicant's ability to slip in a few comments on the side was the only way in which he or she could actually show that he or she had the necessary qualities. For instance, the question of how much time a person would put in if he or she were chosen is rather senseless when the Council member asking it probably had no idea of how much time the job takes. The only answer to such a question is, "As much time as is necessary to do a good job." Only about half of the applicants used that answer.

When a grade average requirement is put on a position as it is in this case, it would seem that the Council would only be concerned with whether the applicant had an average above the requirement, not whether he or she had an 8.3 or a 6.6. Public announcement of a high average tends to unnecessarily influence a person, when the candidate with a 6.0 could be much more qualified than the candidate with a 8.1. Many campus leaders have chosen to devote their time more to activities than scholarship and for that reason may not have as high an average but are just as qualified if not more so.

The conduct of the Council in its selection of the junior member was highly improper and in poor taste, in this author's opinion. The author is not attempting to show prejudice one way or another. However, it is safe to say that Council members had their minds made up before the candidates were even interviewed, on the basis of the fact that one of the two applicants had previous experience on the Pub Board.

The author is not attempting to make a martyr out of the defeated applicant, but she was not given a fair interview because the Council had made a premature decision. Experience should not be the only criterion in judging a person for appointment to any office. This has been proved time and time again by representatives of the people in positions of importance in our government. If experience were the only criterion considered, Earl Long would have been elected Lieutenant Governor of Louisiana and Adlai Stevenson would have been nominated again for the Presidency. (This statement is not intended to place the two men in the same category as far as intelligence). The author would not dwell on this point so long were it not for the fact that a member of the nominating committee, which interviewed and selected the finalists, told the author that he thought experience alone in his case was enough to qualify the applicant.

Secondly, in the author's opinion, except for the experience aspect the applicant who was selected possessed no more qualifications than the defeated applicant and has not demonstrated an interest in the publications other than attending the meetings of the board, and possibly reading them. In other words, he has not discussed with the author, the editor of The Daily Nebraskan in this case, what improvements if any could be made in the paper that he as a Pub Board member might attempt to put into effect.

Finally, the attitude of the Council toward journalism majors has been carried to an extreme exaggeration of the writer at hand. It is clear to this

author that members of the nominating committee who have had experience on campus publications have exercised unfairly their influence in regard to this question. For this reason, questions were asked such as, "If two persons were equally qualified for a position on a publication and one was a journalism major, which person would you select?" In the first place, to propose such a hypothetical case such as this is assuming that such a situation might occur and this is highly unlikely.

Secondly, this is a loaded question in the light it is asked, because the Council has demonstrated anti-journalism feeling in the interviews and as such would likely be against a candidate who answered that he or she would select the person with the journalism major.

It would seem only logical that since the publications in question do require a certain amount of journalism depending on how far one advances, the journalism major would naturally be more qualified on the basis that he or she knows the subject on which the publications are based. This is more true in the case of The Daily Nebraskan than in the Cornhusker but nevertheless, it is applicable to both publications. The majority of staff members in the past, from the first editor of The Daily Nebraskan to the present, have been journalism majors or have taken many journalism courses and entered the field. The paper does not seem to have suffered. This is not to say that there have not been outstanding persons on the staff who have not been journalism majors, but even the simplest rules of reasoning would suggest to a person that being a journalism major is an asset and should be considered as such rather than a handicap.

As for the charge that journalism majors on Pub Board will create a situation where non-journalism majors will not be treated equally, this is ridiculous and results from personal grudges formed by several individuals. After all, what is the School of Journalism besides 150 students and seven faculty members? A matter of much greater concern would be present if two or more members from one fraternity or sorority were on the board and used this as a means to "load" the staff with fellow members. If the great bond exists as the Council would lead us to believe, between journalism students, this author is not aware of it.

Needless to say, the author was not satisfied with the manner in which the interviews were conducted. As for improving the situation, the author offers the following suggestions. Instead of Student Council interviewing and appointing the members, place this task in the hands of a body more qualified to judge the applicants, such as Pub Board itself. The faculty members would be able to judge the applicants more intelligently and would not be inclined to let politics enter into their decisions.

Coupled with this change would be an alteration in the length of the term the student member would serve. In order to allow for experienced members, provided they are qualified, a system where by the interviewing board would proceed to select a senior for a one year term, a junior for a two year term and a sophomore for a three year term. Each year, one sophomore would then be chosen for a three year term, thus eliminating the situation where a member has to leave the board about the time he has caught on to the situation. This, coupled with the suggestion that Pub Board interview the candidates would place two students on the board during interviews for the sophomore applicant each year. Individuals and groups concerned would do well to consider these recommendations seriously, because the present situation cannot exist, effectively, any longer.



WAITING FOR THE CUE

## Letterip

### Foreign Student Voices Objection

To the editor:

The writer expresses deep regret through the esteemed columns of the Daily Nebraskan over the "Penny a Minute" news item which appeared Monday, Oct. 10, on the front page of the paper.

The Mortar Board and AWS representatives must have given enough thought to decide whether a fine of "penny a minute" imposed on coeds living in the University recognized houses returning late after 12:30 p.m. will do them good. The writer frankly admits his ignorance about the final results of this imposition and how much good lies in it. But, the use of the above collection deeply concerns any of the foreign students.

Here in the University, an average foreign student pretty much lives in his own little world with little contact with the true American life. The American boys look for American girls and vice-versa and there is rarely a close friendship between an American and a foreign student. Such being the case, the utilization of the above fine collection for helping to take the foreign students around the state of Nebraska will certainly cause bitter feelings among the American students toward foreign students, which the foreign students do not want and will never appreciate. Therefore the writer suggests that this fine should be used in improving the existing living facilities of the homes or halls and not on foreign students. There are 101 other ways by which foreign students can be taken around the state if it is absolutely necessary.

A Foreign Student. The penny a minute is not imposed as a fine, rather it is a periodical event which allows a girl to stay out one hour past closing time, if she or her date pays a penny for each minute she stays out past normal closing hours. Students do not consider this a fine. Instead, most men are happy to have an extra hour to spend with their date and do not resent having to pay 60 cents. This project has been sponsored by Mortar Board for several years and no student develops any bitter feelings toward his foreign counterpart from having to pay the penny a minute. On other nights, no fine is imposed on a girl who is late. Instead, she is assessed late minutes, which if a certain amount are accumulated result in a campus. The editor.

## Early Opening

Considering the large number of tickets sold for the Fall Show, KK will open the doors at Pershing at 7:00 tonight to accommodate voting for Prince Kosmet and Nebraska Sweetheart.

## Inside View

By Phil Boroff

Current Lincoln motion picture theatres are offering films with little interest for the college student. This evening's Kosmet Klub "Historical Hysterics" and tomorrow's Army football game will attract the largest college audiences this weekend. However, for those few persons who may wander into a motion picture theatre during the next few days, here's an analysis of current film offerings:

**The Subterraneans**, a Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer picture starring Leslie Caron, George Peppard, Janice Rule and Roddy McDowall. In Jack Kerouac's novel, the basis for this film, beatniks of San Francisco's North shore were fairly interesting people; in this film adaptation, they are completely dull. Leslie Caron, of "Lili" and "Gigi," and the entire cast get so involved with their stereotyped parts that they achieve nothing but talk. "Like, man . . . it's a drag."

**Desire In The Dust**, a Twentieth Century-Fox picture starring Raymond Burr, Martha Hyer and Joan Bennett. With a title like this, what can a view possibly expect? It's obviously an imitation of the screen adaptations of the writings of William Faulkner. But even its "fratricide, insanity, adultery, and suggestions of incest" are trite, unreal situations. At least Raymond Burr gets to play a part different from his highly successful interpretation of TV's "Perry Mason."

**The Crowded Sky**, a Warner Brothers picture starring Dana Andrews, Rhonda Fleming, Efram Zimbalist, Jr., John Kerr, Anne Francis, Kegan Wynne and Troy Donahue.

This past summer your reviewer was employed at Alton Wilkes' Lakes Region

Playhouse, a summer stock theatre in Laconia, New Hampshire. Among the plays given was a fine production of "Two for the Seesaw" with Dana Andrews in his Broadway role of Omaha Jerry Ryan. During one of several informal conversations with Andrews, "The Crowded Sky" happened to be mentioned. Andrew's immediate reply was, "It's a bad picture." After viewing the film, how can anyone contest his observation?

**Prisoner of the Volga**, a Paramount picture starring John Derek, Elsa Martinelli and Dawn Adams.

This completely uninspired foreign "epic" import of Czarist Russia joins "Hercules," "Hercules Unchained," "The Giant of Marathon," and similar entries as among the worst pictures ever released.

## Alumnus Gives Graduate Review

Two University graduates, and a former Law College Dean are featured in this month's Nebraska Alumnus. Representative Walter Judd (Rep.-Minn.) and Ted Sorenson, strong Kennedy backer, are presented in the October issue by Dick Basoco, a 1960 graduate of the University.

Also featured is Dean David Dow and Dr. Harold Edgerton.

Dean Dow, the tenth dean of the Law College, has planned a program to afford attorneys greater opportunity to continue their legal education.

Dr. Edgerton, a 1925 graduate, is presently at Massachusetts Institute of Technology and is acclaimed as the father of stroboscopic photography.

**GUTCH'S BEST**  
Prince Kosmet, Oct. 14  
John Gutschlag

## Strictly Partisan

By Sam Jensen

Let's return to the Great Debate between Nixon and Kennedy — not just the television part of it, but also the words as they are reported from Billings to Biloxi.

All over the country, Kennedy has been telling America that it is a second rate power and that the United States under the leadership of President Eisenhower has been losing prestige.

This Kennedy theme of weakness might be successful for him under two related conditions. They are that the American voters are made fearful by his talk and then, as a result, the voters seek Kennedy as a Messiah — a man of strength who can save our nation from almost impending nuclear destruction.

But I doubt that even if the American voter is made fearful that he will turn to the inexperienced junior senator from Massachusetts.

This is the junior senator who claims the Administration has been forgetting Africa. He says he knows all about this continent for he is chairman of the Africa committee of the Senate. But, look at the record. In 1960, a year of increasing turmoil in Africa, Kennedy didn't call his committee together even once.

Yes, Sen. Kennedy tells the people in Pocatello that America is weak and has hit a low in prestige — but, the man in the street can pick up a newspaper and read about Nikita Khrushchev at the United Nations and this voter might wonder: "If our prestige is low — is Russia's any higher?"

K. came to the U.S. to achieve Soviet diplomatic victory. What did he win? Nothing.

He tried to put his candidate in as President of the General Assembly. He failed.

He tried to re-establish the Communist controlled government in the Congo and he failed.

Khrushchev wanted to revoke the U.N. by substituting a three-man body

for the Secretary General. He failed in this.

He wanted to fire Dag Hammarskjold. He tried to get Red China admitted. Twice more he failed.

And he failed when he tried to move the U.N. out of New York and when he tried to sell his proposals for disarmament to other nations.

The only satisfaction Nikita probably has had in the last week is in reading that Sen. Kennedy conceded two outposts of freedom off Formosa to Red China. He might have thought that the blackout on Communist territorial expansion over the past eight years would soon end.

During the recent TV debate, Mr. Nixon said: "I remember the period immediately before the Korean War. South Korea was supposed to be indefensible as well. Generals testified to that, and Secretary Acheson made a speech indicating in effect that South Korea was beyond the defense zone of the United States."

But we were forced to defend Korea, indefensible as it was.

The Vice President pointed out that these two islands, Quemoy and Matsu, are in the "area of freedom."

If we get off them, he said, we begin a chain reaction, because the Communists aren't interested in these islands, they are interested in Formosa.

And from there . . .

Mr. Nixon said at Chicago that the only answer to a strategy of victory for Communism is a strategy for victory for the Free World . . . but does our strategy begin with a retreat from Quemoy or Matsu — or does it begin with the drawing of the line — a line that is freedom.

So far, Sen. Kennedy's generalizations of doom and gloom have not been very convincing. Some may wishfully hope that he will soon be able to substantiate his charges of weakness and loss of prestige.

But in the meantime, many of us from all persuasions, will not subscribe to an undocumented proposition that the United States has both hands tied behind its back. We just refuse to be scared by either Jack-o-lanterns or Jack.



Thinline 5000, \$69.50+

LEAN AND HANDSOME HAMILTON FOR HIM

SMART AND LOVELY HAMILTON FOR HER



Kristol, \$68

The slim, trim look in current styling was created on the American campus. To match this modern elegance, Hamilton has fashioned watches which truly complement this bright, young look. And, because they're Hamilton watches, you'll find them dependable, accurate, a joy to own for years to come. At Hamilton Jewelers in the U.S. and Canada. Hamilton Watch Company, Lancaster, Pa.

**HAMILTON**

creator of the world's first electric watch

investigating pipes?

TRY

**CLIFF'S**

SMOKE SHOP

13TH & M LINDELL HOTEL