

EDITORIAL OPINION

Role of Council Finally Realized

Despite our disagreement with the Student Council's meeting behind closed doors, it is gratifying to know that behind those doors somebody is finally lighting a fire under the Council and we may get some positive action other than a report of which organization filed its list of members and which didn't.

It has long been evident that the Council has not operated as a strong organ of student government. Rather it has been more of a clerical organization, supervising elections and seeing that organizations remain in good standing. A student governing body is only as strong and effective as the various issues with which it concerns itself.

For this reason, the points brought out Friday by Chip Kuklin during the executive session of the Council show that the big step has been taken in recognizing that there are many areas into which the Council can branch.

The suggestion that the Council might investigate the merits of compulsory ROTC and take a stand on the issue through a resolution shows considerable foresightedness on Mr. Kuklin's part. Since the students are not organized in a manner to voice their feelings on such an issue, it is vitally necessary that the Council sound out student opinion on ROTC and take a stand for or against.

The suggestions for looking into the quarter system as a possible calendar basis for the University rather than semesters and also the possibility of a five point grade scale are sound ideas. Doubtless, the administration or faculty committees have examined or are examining these changes, and there is no reason why the Council shouldn't do the same on behalf of the student.

Other points which Kuklin brought out are worthy of note, such as sending a Council representative to legislative hearings concerning the University, calling for a report from the Tribunal every two weeks and from the Pub Board after every meeting, promoting the University to high school students in Nebraska, investigating the possibility of one way streets, bringing persons of national interest to speak on campus and having a body familiar with the Publications Board and the Student Tribunal select or aid in the selection of members for their respective organizations.

Requiring more of each individual member, such as having all responsible for knowing and understanding the constitution of the Council, having representatives talk with the deans of their respective colleges and earning the respect of the University all show an interest in seeing the Council take on the duties that it has long been neglecting.

Admittedly, there are some points that would not have a place on the list of Council responsibilities. But in the light of the other points, these can be ignored. What is important is that there is someone who is aware that the Council cannot be any stronger than it is now, unless its members recognize that their duties consist of more than just coming to a 30 minute meeting every Wednesday plus a short committee meeting before or after the regular session.

The ball has started to roll and it is up to the Council to get behind it as a group and keep it moving. There is plenty of room on this campus for an effective student voice through the Council and if we don't hear it soon, we will look elsewhere. Spring Days are fine as are official migrations, but more than ever the student's role is increasing in this day and age and there is no reason why we at Nebraska should not play a mature part in this role.

Nebraskan Letterip

The Daily Nebraskan will publish only those letters which are signed. Letters attacking individuals must carry the author's name. Letters may be 150 words or less. Letters should not exceed 300 words. When letters exceed this limit, the Nebraskan reserves the right to condense them, retaining the writer's views.

Reader Replies To Letterip

To the Editor: In regard to Dick Stuckey's letter (Oct. 19) may I say it is nice to have friends. It is obvious in Mr. Stuckey's letter that this is the source of his remarks. It might interest Mr. Stuckey to know a bit about Mr. Boroff's experience. Outside of his classes in Temple Building he spent the past summer in professional summer stock. The purpose of a review is not, I repeat not, to say nice things about everyone so they will be happy but rather to state what is good and bad about the performance.

A true critic takes for his standard an ideal performer, in this case "the ideal Review." He then proceeds to point out the areas where the actual performance fell below the ideal standard. These standards are set by the critic himself and not by the little god called Temple. These standards are within the realm of his experience and if his experience is only in off colored jokes and ill at ease presentation then he would no doubt agree with you.

However, there are some (even outside Temple) that desire higher standards. The point of this is to point

out to Mr. S. that his only real complaint of Mr. Boroff's review was that it happened to tell the truth. Do you then, Mr. S., object to the truth when it says your friend did not M. C. the show as well as he could have? Come on, Mr. S., a college student should realize by this time that truth is not necessarily flattery. I'm sure that Mr. Boroff did not go out of his way to insult your friend. It would not be assuming too much to say that I am also sure that if one of the professors of Temple gave a performance similar to that of your friend he would have had the same things said about him.

I would also like to point out that if Hollywood made a motion picture of the Bible starring the original cast that they probably would glamorize it completely out of proportion. However, I don't see what this remark had to do with your attack upon Mr. Boroff. Maybe you were using it to climax your otherwise illogical and irrelevant argument against the critic.

To conclude my comments to you, Mr. Stuckey, don't feel downhearted even if you didn't intellectually score a point; you still have your frat brother as your friend.

Maxine Jabenis

Daily Nebraskan

SEVENTY-ONE YEARS OLD

Member Associated Collegiate Press, International Press Representative; National Advertising Service, Incorporated. Published at: Room 28, Student Union, Lincoln, Nebraska, 68583.

Telephone HE 2-7631, ext. 4225, 4226, 4227. Subscriptions rates are \$3 per semester or \$5 for the academic 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 Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday during the school year, except during vacation and exam periods, by students of the University of Nebraska under authorization of the Committee on Student Affairs as an expression of student opinion. Publication 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 person outside the University. The members of the Daily Nebraskan staff are personally responsible for what they say, or do, or cause to be printed, February 8, 1960.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Editor: Herb Professor; Managing Editor: Dave Callahan; News Editor: Karen Lane; Sports Editor: Hal Brown; As News Editor: Gerald Lamberon; Copy Editor: Pat Dean, Ann Meyer, Gretchen Schilberg; Staff Writers: Norm Reatty, Dave Wolfarth, Julie Wolf, Nancy Brown, Jim Varney, Nancy Whitford, Chip Wood; Night News Editor: Stacy Brown.

BUSINESS STAFF: Business Manager: Stan Ralston; Assistant Business Manager: John Schneider; Circulation Manager: Bob Raff; Classified Manager: Jeri Johnson.



Don't Expect a 'Mistrial' On Grounds of Perjury

By Eric Sevareid

The final or manic phase of the political campaign has now seized the candidates and ancillary orators, the phase in which frenetic politicians regret only those statements that lose them votes whatever the loss of their own dignity or of the country's flexibility of strategy in a warring world.



Sevareid

This brief period is always dangerous and often damaging for men and for national policy. This goes double for the present campaign in which, as we suggested weeks ago, a single remark could decide the outcome. Only mass euphoria obscures the sheer ghastliness of a condition in which the Presidency of the United States may be decided by statements about the presence of Nationalist soldiers on those two offshore islands—soldiers kept there by Chiang Kai-shek in a primary hope of ambushing America into war with Red China, weird as this may sound to those ignorant of what Chiang has been living for these past ten years.

In this phase of a Presidential contest, as in a war, truth is hounded down, disfigured and tattered, by half-truths, exaggerations, innuendoes, cut-rate debating points, impossible promises and a blatant rewriting of history that the editors of "Pravda" must admire.

In terms of the search for truth, it is as preposterous to compare the oral tennis matches on television with the Lincoln-Douglas debates as it is to compare Quemoy with Berlin in terms of the search for world safety. A spectacle of volley and counter volley in which neither man concedes a single point or admits a single error, past or present, by himself or his party, is merely an exercise in point scoring, a travesty on the debating institution in its academic or parliamentary sense. Truth is neither turgid nor neatly packageable; it is elusive, many-sided, a harvest gathered only with patience, humility and largesse.

On and off television the hailstorm of selected facts and claims, exaggerations, lies both little white and big black, is lashing the crop, filling eyes, ears and nose with dust and chaff.

No doubt a desperate plaintiff or defendant (to complete this mixed grill of metaphors) testifying from a witness chair perched on a soap box in a shouting courtroom cannot be regarded as in full possession of his faculties, so a mistrial is not apt to be called after Nov. 8 on grounds of perjury. But, in the absence of the recording angel, let

us perform the functions of the court reporter and jot down a few of the non-truths so far loosed upon the jury.

Considering first those of an apocalyptic nature, reason whimpers in pain at Mr. Kennedy's accusation that Mr. Nixon is trigger-happy, as it does at Nixon's solemn assertion that loss of the rocky ridges of Quemoy and Matsu would lead us into world war three. It was Ike, not Dick, who cut his palm showing Mamie how to fan a six-gun; and Khrushchev's game is blackjack, not dominoes, falling or otherwise.

And if Nixon's observation that three Democratic

presidents led us into war means that they acted arbitrarily, we find ourself troubled by his claim—while defending Ike in the first TV argument—that Presidents only do what the people demand. He might also now rewrite his St. Louis speech of years ago in which he praised Truman's courage for the Korean intervention.

We note down, but with invisible ink for sheer embarrassment, Truman's claim that Nixon "never" tells the truth, Nixon's sanctimonious concern that Truman's racy language will corrupt our young, and Kennedy's claim that seventeen

(See Sevareid Page 4)

Not Guilty

By Myron Papadakis and Bob Nye

Rest easy all organizations, congregations and unions, for today the core of a custom will be laid bare by our tainted and uneloquent ax. Today institutions can breathe a sigh of relief as their image, although fragile and like glass, teetering like campus spirit, will remain unbroken for a while longer.

To digress for an instant we understand that an instructor in philosophy has used one of our earlier articles to demonstrate incorrect, warped logic and false argument. Good work sir, we are sure it wasn't too hard to find. This week we will make it so easy that even freshmen without any philosophy can pick out the fallacies. One change—the errors won't be in our logic this time.

Today we are going to discuss the ancient traditions of getting lavaliered and pinned. No offense now girls, but a word to (anyone that cares to listen) "Girls are modest to a fault, but among us are faultless."

This being a true statement (false premise, perhaps?) we shall continue. Girls on this campus have one main fault: they collect jewelry. This jewelry comes in many forms, sizes and values (monetary), ranging from neck charms (or necking charms) to safety pin size. The game of put a charm around her neck would be fine if there weren't so many mercenary people on the east side of the street. Apparently the Balfour man will redeem jewelry at 75% cost, and being intelligent he has gotten the word to those concerned. After much searching we found the girls definition of "good work" in our unbiased dictionary. It is the integration from lavalier to pin with respect to the shortest amount of time.

There are many problems posed by these customs. One might be "Which one shall I wear today, or if I don't wear Bob's today maybe George will ask me. (Besides Bob isn't here.)"

Oh well, guys, don't pan-

ic, prices range from seventy-five cents to \$1.25 for cheapies. Forego one lunch at the Union (which will be no chore) and you can give her a lasting symbol of your love.

There is one other problem that confronts this custom. It is not standardized throughout the country. In fact there are many small schools that due to the lack of fraternities have no such item as a lavalier. Does this mean social alienation to these unfortunates? To find the answer we wrote a letter to the president of the student body of Carleton College. The answer states, "no problem exists here at all. Nobody even cares, for as soon as you leave campus it's all forgotten."

And now, a word of advice . . . If it fits, take it off.



LUCKY STRIKE PRESENTS:

DEAR DR. FROOD:

DR. FROOD'S THOUGHT FOR THE DAY: Early to bed and early to rise is an excellent way to avoid people.



Dear Dr. Frood: What should I look for first when I look for a wife?

Searching

DEAR SEARCHING: Her husband.

Dear Dr. Frood: Our son has been in college three months, and we haven't heard a word from him. Not even a post card. I don't want him to think I am too demanding or overprotective, but frankly I am worried. What should I do?

Worried Mother

DEAR WORRIED: Why worry after only three months in college? He's still learning how to write.



Dear Dr. Frood: I am six foot five, 225 pounds, handsome, tanned, muscled, a good athlete. But I can't get along with girls because I can never think of anything to say. What do you suggest?

Brawny

DEAR BRAUNY: "Me Tarzan, you Jane."



Dear Dr. Frood: Don't you agree that every college man has the right, in fact, the duty, to stand up and speak out for the things he believes in? Tomorrow I am going straight to the college president and tell him, politely but firmly, what is wrong here—the inferior teaching, the second-rate accommodations, the bad food. My friends think I am wrong to do this. What do you think?

Determined

DEAR DETERMINED: I applaud your spirit, young man! Had I been able, I would have commended you in a more personal letter. However, you forgot to leave a forwarding address.



Dear Dr. Frood: I am puzzled by the Lucky Strike slogan: "Remember how great cigarettes used to taste? Luckies still do." I've been sitting here for hours, thinking, thinking, thinking, but for the life of me I can't remember. What should I do about this?

Forgetful

DEAR FORGETFUL: I suggest you lean back, relax, and light up a Lucky Strike. I'm sure it will all come back to you—who you are, what you were, where you lived, everything.



FROOD FAD SWEEPS COLLEGES! They laughed when Dr. Frood started the new college craze of enjoying a Lucky while hanging from a coat rack. But now everybody is doing it! Smoking Luckies, that is. Today college students smoke more Luckies than any other regular. Reason: With or without coat rack, Luckies deliver the greatest taste in smoking today.

CHANGE TO LUCKIES and get some taste for a change!

Product of The American Tobacco Company—Tobacco is our middle name!