



"I NEED MORE SPEAKIN' LINES."

Then and Now . . .

The Generation of Silence?

EDITORS NOTE: In a 1956 Daily Nebraskan, an editorial writer commented on the charge that college students are the "silent generation." In 1963, the same charge is still being made.

Men have dubbed the present breed of college students "the silent generation," deploring their apathy, detesting their conformity, deriding their sense of values. And, perhaps the derisive title has been earned.

Certainly the legendary student radicals, fiery and idealistic, filled with ideas for reforming the world, are a dying race. Maybe the pursuit of knowledge is slowing to a weary walk. Perhaps the mind of the average student is only a mimeograph, faithfully reproducing the stencil of society.

But before "silent generation" is deplored, one ought to go back a little further. Is the conforming student a breed apart, or does his presence on the campus merely indicate the extent to which

conformity in all society has gone?

If non-conformity is synonymous with trouble-making, in the mind of society, and if trouble-making is the worst of all sins — if even non-conformity begins to follow a pattern of conformity — why then should not the student be expected to reflect the patterns of his society?

Are we the silent generation — or the silenced generation? Did the tradition of conformity begin with us, or are we the first crop of students to have been reared in its pattern?

If the latter is true, and perhaps it is, then the problem of conformity becomes sharply acute. For if the rotting cancer of silence producing fear and apathy has reached even into the campus — the last ground of idealists and radicals — then we can only conclude that the whole of society has been or is being caught in its fearful growth.



Reader Questions 'Old Guard' Views

To the Editor: Sometimes one wishes old soldier would fade away — or maybe even die.

Yesterday was one of those days.

I hope the term "old guard" doesn't apply to seniors, but just to people who have been around for more than four years. Because I, for one, would hate to think Don Ferguson presumed to speak for me. I guess he missed lambasting YWCA and Red Cross — but that's about all.

Maybe IFC presidents just get narrow-minded — at least that one did. The only admitted worthwhile organization for Ferguson is Fraternity. Therefore, all women and all male independents are out of luck, I guess. We are doomed to hopeless degeneracy. Worst of all,

not only are we not FRATERNITY, we are not INTERFRATERNITY. Woe is us!

The best thing to do, I guess, is just step aside and let the FRATERNITY men run this old world. After all, there's nothing to be gained from working with welfare families (that's Project), from getting to know the state solons (that's Student Council), from participating in Coed Follies (that's AWS), from putting out information for the students qualifying for Regents exams (that's Builders — and First Glance is non-profit, I might add).

Only FRATERNITY is worthwhile. FRATERNITIES never cut each other like sororities, you know. I've never heard a Phi Psi cut a Phi, have you?

As for the lack of top-flight entertainment complaint . . . did you see the crowd at Ahmad Jamal when he was here? You can't blame the Union for being cautious after losing money on those projects time and again. Good entertainment costs money, and Nebraska students will not pay.

And I can think of no reason why the Innocents shouldn't redecorate their room; at least some of them have worked hard to get where they are. The graduate seminar and graduate scholarships offered by the Mortar Boards look like worthwhile projects to me.

Maybe the PGD's will elect Ferguson national president. I'd even campaign for that if it would take him off this campus!

—Vicky Cullen

In Order To Be Specific?

To C. K. F. L., and G. R. L.:

We shall attempt to correlate three different definitions of justice:

- 1. Courtesy of Gerwirth
2. Courtesy of the milkman
3. Courtesy of "Bigots and Balm," closed edition, Oxford Press.

- 1. "Ultimate moral norms . . ."
2. It takes a heap of living . . .
3. Once upon a midnight cautious . . .

- 1. Which dictate how and where . . .
2. America for Americans . . .
3. Nobody to Who . . .

- 1. Persons have a right . . .
2. Cecil B. can split the sea, but . . .
3. "Life is a formal word for other peoples problems . . ."

- 1. To be treated . . .
2. To be treated . . .
3. Shall we re-live the Battle of Saratoga.

- 1. Both in themselves . . .
2. I am alone in a world of thorns . . .
3. They who are antisocial of the Lord . . .

- 1. And in relation to others . . .
2. When we are all dressed up with no place to go, like some dead atheists . . .
3. Let us not loosen our Belts . . .

- 1. Period.
2. Beastiality, existentialism, and the "H."
3. Only those with wood tar in their galoshes.

—J.R.

INDE-structible

—by roger dodson

stereotype of the Independent is that he neither has the class, wealth, personal appearance, nor college spirit — this, too, is false.

What then is the difference between Independent and non-Independents (Greeks)?

Approaching it from the idea that the affiliated students enjoy their feel-

ing of family or belonging as brothers and sisters may be the main difference. However, non-affiliated students do live in dorms, apartments, etc. with others who they enjoy being with. They are most certainly not the non-gregarious recluses their affiliated friends would make them out to be.

why not?

In the beginning State created the buildings and the grounds and the classrooms and the desks and the laboratories and the parking lots. And he called his creation University. And on the last day State created Student.

And State saw University and said it was good.

But Student was not satisfied with just University, but wanted more. So tempted by the Snake of New Ideal, Student bit into the Fruit of Fratern-

alism. And State was patient and said, "Let Student try to undertake such a project and make it succeed."

And Student tried.

Ten generations passed and Student still partook of the forbidden association. And Student was guided by the wisdom of Tradition and the reasoning of the Stagnant and lived his own existence.

And Student closed the doors of Fraternity to Progress and Dynamic Thinking.

And State lost his patience and said, "I have given Student a chance to prove himself and he has failed."

And State sent University a messenger in the form of Psychologist Dean. Psychologist Dean tried to tell Student in Fraternity to change his ways, throw away his bottles, open up his doors, and uncover his eyes.

But Student in Fraternity laughed and said, "Why must I change when the wisdom of Tradition and the reasoning of the Stagnant have guided me and shown me that I am right? How can you destroy me when the king of Influential Alumni is protecting me?"

And State grew angry.

And State said to Psychologist Dean, "Build a Boat of Trust and prepare University for a Holocaust of Modern Reform."

And Psychologist Dean built a Boat of Trust.

And in the ensuing Holocaust of Modern Reform, Student in Fraternity was washed asunder crying to be let into the Boat.

But it was too late.

And Student in Fraternity cried, "Why must I die?"

And State answered, "Why Not?"

—Bailey

Take It Easy . . . But Take it

—by mike maclean

Who's responsible for the mess?

If you pause to peruse any of the local papers today you can see more charges and statements, and just as many counter charges and remanding statements concerning everything from George Morris' confirmation to the present tax structure to the University budget.

So what? What does it amount to? Who is on what side of the respective fences?

For example, I think that the last budget voted by the legislature was inadequate—and it looks like we will have a repeat performance. You probably disagree with some of the actions taken by or not taken by the legislature also. So whom do you hold responsible? The Governor? You can't do that. He's voted into office on a partisan basis and then he allegedly leads or guides men who were voted in on a non-partisan basis.

Should you hold the majority leader responsible? You can't, because there isn't any majority leader—there isn't even a minority party—there aren't any parties at all! As a result you can't hold anybody really responsible—the Governor, majority leader, minority leader, the Republican Party, the Democrat Party, the respective party leaders—nobody.

But, what about the individual legislator? Can't you hold him responsible?

"I'm only one man and only one vote—how can you expect me to achieve an adequate budget or a tax reform. I have no control over what my neighbor does." What an easy way out.

As a result of the present non-partisan organization in the legislature, there are no parties, there are no platforms, few united stands, but most important, there is no RESPONSIBILITY for actions taken or not taken. You can't tell who stands for what, except everyone is FOR mother love, the flag, sex—and apple pie, and from then on there are 43 little governors running around beleaguered by the lobbyists who thrive on the fact that there is not any party organization. You couldn't force the responsibility for a sneeze out of the legislature, much less a budget!

In mine and other opinions, Nebraska is in a crucial period today. She is faced with many problems, the least of which is not the University. These problems are certainly not impossible—but I say that we need a partisan legislature to deal with them.

Then we would have a choice between two platforms that deal with the vital issues of the day. Then a party would have to promulgate achieving an income tax or the like—and then it could be held either voted in or not—depending upon the voters' preference. And if a party was voted in the majority—you could hold them responsible for what they said they stood for. You would be able to perceive where the individual legislator stands in relation to the two parties—and, by voting for or against him, hold him responsible for his stands. At least we would have

a fair chance at progress—which is more than we have now, in my opinion.

Governor Morrison, concerning this subject, stated his belief that Nebraska is a one party state—Republican—and, thus, a partisan Legislature wouldn't work. His very presence in the Governor's Mansion belies the truth in that statement!

The Governor also said that he feels that if there were a partisan legislature, any interest group who could persuade the majority party leader, to their way of thinking would have their way since the rest of the party members would meekly follow in line. In contrast to this, I would give the legislators credit for the ability to think for themselves and not be dictated to by anyone.

This arrangement would make the Governor more effective, since he would have to agree or dis-

agree with the stands being taken in the legislature.

Another advantage the present situation would be that you wouldn't find the Omaha Senators all bunched together against other sections of the state, for they would be of both parties, and thus, mindful of a platform as well as geography.

And, we must realize that the entire political organization of the United States of America, as well as 49 other states in this Union, are organized on a two party, PARTISAN basis. This alone doesn't make it right, but they seem to be managing.

Granted there are disadvantages to the partisan organization. But in my estimation it would save us from what we seem to be doing now—muddling aimlessly into the future.



PARTY TIME IN NEBRASKA

Daily Nebraskan SEVENTY-SECOND YEAR OF PUBLICATION Telephone 477-8711, ext. 2588, 2589, 2590 Member Associated Collegiate Press, International Press Representative National Advertising Service, Incorporated. Published at: Room 51, Student Union, Lincoln 8, Nebraska. 1441 & R