

THE TROUBLE:

With Rush Week

Delayed rush, with a pledge week at the beginning of the second semester, or an organized open rush, seem to be the only answers. At least, Spring Rush was not and the Interfraternity Council, as usual, seems lost for ideas.

An outline of 1964 Spring Rush: rushees were expected to select 10 houses to attend the first day for 20 minutes each, then select three of those to which they were asked to return for the second day. In all, three hours were spent with each rushee, if he returned the second day.

If a rushee had not been active in open rush, or was a sophomore or upperclassman, it is hard to imagine him formulating sound opinions of any of the 10 fraternities.

In Fall Rush, if a rushee had not been active in summer rush, the same situation prevails, except he spends probably two hours more time at the fraternities of his choice.

Fraternity men who have been through three or four rush weeks and open rushes are pretty good at evaluating rushees with their fraternity's philosophy in mind. But, every year there are cases, exceptions to the rules, who just do not fit. This hurts a fraternity as much or more than the pledges who do fit in help it.

With more high school graduates coming to the University every year, summer rush, a financial burden on fraternities, which are non-profit organizations, is not an efficient method through which 24 fraternities make their philosophy known to all rushees as well as vice-versa. Certainly, the three day Fall Rush and abominable Spring Rush through which those fraternities just lived, are not efficient methods either.

In both cases fraternities concentrate on rushees they have had previous contact with and make hurried guesses on others about whom all they know is (1) they have done well in high school or in their first semester at the University and (2) they are well groomed.

Fraternities across the United States have lost charters because of an unwillingness to change. As soon as society completes its movement against hazing, you can be sure it will attack another phase. The word "fraternity" has obviously and sadly come to mean "discrimination" to society.

But the system here remains strong, despite weaknesses in its administrative organization. It will remain up to each fraternity, it seems, to initiate and carry out changes that they must in order to survive strongly.

The purposes and accomplishments of the fraternity system, with respect to each individual member, cannot be denied or underestimated.

They remain, here at least, a prominent factor in the process our sociologists call "socialization". The lifelong friendships and social and business contacts that are cultivated through a fraternity lend not only to a member's "socialization", but to his opportunity.

In order to remain such in the future, they must change. And the next change should come in rushing, the kind that is fair to both rushee and rusher.

One solution would be to let the fraternities pledge rushees anytime during the course of the school year, after a certain time, at their own and the rushees' discretion. Maybe a better one would be to organize open rush to make certain that the rushees have the opportunity to visit each house and time to formulate a valid opinion. Both necessitate the demise of "rush week".

FIRETRUCK:

Girls Themselves Block Reform In Hours Here

By Arnie Garson

I have been told by a senior member of Associated Women Students (AWS) that for once the University is not at fault.

Jane Tenhulzen claimed that the girls themselves have been and are still stumbling blocks in the way of an even greater liberalization of women's hours and standards.

She was quick to point out, of course, that senior keys are still an awfully long way off and that the University might not advocate such a move immediately. But the fact remains that AWS Board has conservative philosophy.

It is this conservative philosophy, held by a majority of the AWS board members, which has deprived University coeds of proving that they are actually capable of managing their own affairs and using their better judgment.

The Board's attitude contrasted to the University's position is perhaps best evidenced, according to Miss Tenhulzen, by the fact that AWS court decisions tend to be more liberal when Dean Snyder is present than when the girls conduct the court in her absence.

So once and for all, let me allay the rumors and suspicions that Helen Snyder, associate dean of Student Affairs, the University administration or any factor other than the girls themselves is responsible for the slow and rocky road which hours reforms are traveling.

About two years ago, Friday night hours were

lengthened from 12:30 a.m. to 1 a.m. Last week juniors were allotted 11 p.m. week-day hours. This indeed is a slow process, considering many Big Eight and Big Ten schools have had senior keys for several years.

But the real question is: is AWS, by blocking additional reforms, really reflecting the wishes of the majority of University women? Miss Tenhulzen said that administration is usually willing to go along with the wishes of the girls, so long as they remain within reason. On the other hand, many junior women were not accepting the proper responsibility by campaigning about hour extensions.

So on what grounds can the AWS Board justify (1) not reflecting the wishes of the girls—that is if the majority of women are not conservative and (2) not recognizing college women as young adults. (The DAILY NEBRASKAN pointed out editorially last week that society generally does recognize college women as young adults.)

For myself, the truth of this matter has been quite a shock. But clearly, the blame is with the students themselves rather than Administration. And before reforms are brought about, the girls themselves (not the boys who currently do most of the complaining) are going to have to convince their representatives that they deserve the adult privileges and that it is in the best interests of the University and society to grant them.

Cont'd on Page 3

Insight Elsewhere—

A chance to look again . . .

by kenneth tabor

Returning to South Viet Nam for the third time in five months, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara is working on a reassessment of our position in that sector of the "cold" war.

It has been plain for a long time that something was amiss in the South Viet Nam conflict. Reports from that country report U.S. troops anywhere from near victory to near defeat.

McNamara's return to the battle area is probably only a token gesture—an attempt to find out first hand what the situation really is combined with profuse assurances to all involved that all is, or at least will be, well.

The cause for this particular visit seems to be an incident last week in which one Viet Cong platoon stood its ground against 2,000 troops of the Viet Nam government, the end being that the Viet Cong crack soldiers burst through the lines which surrounded them, killing and wounding many as they made their forced exit.

There have been some actions of late, however, which have not been simply gestures on the part of our government. Soon after the Viet Nam government had made of few of its own changes (a five-day cease fire for a "New Year" celebration followed by a pay increase for its enlisted men) we began some efforts of our own.

The first change made from our camp was the replacement of the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Previous holder of the post Roger Hillsman seemingly came to it with a host of recommendations from neck to knee. With his intellectual training from Yale and his military experience from the Far East, he became well liked by both his immediate superior Averell Harriman and Kennedy himself.

Unlike Kennedy, who refused to accept Hillsman's resignation, LBJ was evidently not so taken with him. At least his passage hasn't seemed to be disturbing to Johnson. In fact, very few cared much for Hillsman. As quick with lectures as he was with facts, unpopularity seemed to become him.

The job has gone to McGeorge Bundy's brother, William P., former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. It may be of great help in attempting a solution providing McGeorge retains his position as Presidential aide.

One of the objections which has been leveled at our handling of the Viet Nam situation has been the internal and eternal squabbles between the Defense Department and the State Department (one of many such arguments including

such organizations as the CIA, DIA, etc.). McGeorge is a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. Such a combination as McGeorge and William Bundy might work very well together even to the point of ending some of the bureaucratic bickering.

Another change has been the creation by the Johnson administration of an entirely new post and a new department. This new department is to evaluate our past actions in Viet Nam and report them directly to Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

One of Averell Harriman's assistants, William Sullivan, will head this force, which is to be connected with more than one department involved in the South Viet Nam crisis. It should contribute to a relieving of tensions; if not between Viet Cong and Viet Nam forces at least between the State and Defense departments.

Whether these changes are practical or political is hard to tell; perhaps they are a combination of the two, which would be strange indeed; not nearly so strange though as the changes themselves as they relate to the problems at hand.

It is hard for most of us to see how changing the head of this department is going to do away with the things which seem to hinder American victory. The problem we face in South Viet Nam is the need to wage a warfare of guerrilla tactics without much experience for that sort of thing.

Knives and mud balls seem to be typical weapons in the warfare there, and what our troops need more than anything is time; lately this need seems to have been filled. Patience is the keynote in Viet Nam.

This is the warfare in the field. In the towns and cities a action varies anywhere from window pot-shots to blowing up softball games—not what we would usually call warfare. But it is an insurrection that seems to befuddle the U.S. troops stationed there.

In addition to this, the war in Viet Nam does not restrict itself to the military. In Saigon, it is the policy of the Viet Cong to attack and destroy as many Americans as possible, whether military or civilian. Again this is accomplished by small sabotage crews picking off individual people.

Further adding to the American plight is the instability of the South Viet Namese Junta under General Nguyen Khanh whose own forces are divided in their loyalties so that any time his position could be usurped.

If Khanh's position were to be taken by another there

Cont'd on Page 3

ERIC SEVAREID—

Goldwater Most Interesting, And Unexplained Candidate

By Eric Sevareid

However he fares in New Hampshire, the senator from Arizona and the political writers will not be finished with one another for some time. In a certain sense he is much the most interesting of the candidates, yet he has not really been explained.



His views have been explained, and the vision of America that he would like to recall to reality seems clear enough. But the special psychology of the man, the method of his thought as distinct from its substance, has not been revealed.

Nor have we who presume to unravel the daily mysteries accomplished this in respect to others who claim competence to act as first trustee of the fate of millions.

Mr. Harold Stassen is a good example. Who has really detected what it is, deep in his viscera, that makes him stir and paw in his harness every four years like the proverbial firehorse at the sound of the gong? It is something more complicated than simple ambition.

I have often thought that political writers make very poor use of the tools of modern psychology. Sports writers and Hollywood gossipists do better laying bare the inner souls of their heroes and villains than we who write of the characters who perform upon this far more important stage.

One of our troubles is that we are habitually judging political men in their relation to the "themes and issues," as if the warp and woof of their minds consisted of "positions" on this objective problem or that.

This is what we have been doing with the fascinating Goldwater psyche; yet, surely, the interesting and special thing about him is not the conclusions his thought has led him to, but the process of his thinking. Admittedly, getting into this is, for the amateur in psychology, to tread a mine field in poor light. One can booby-trap himself very easily and that may be what I am about to do.

Right or embarrassingly wrong, I have come to the conclusion that in the world of political thought he is the mechanic contrasted with the engineer. Woodrow Wilson once said that government is not a machine but a living thing. He explained that it falls, not under the Newtonian theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life; that it is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton.

Perhaps, after all, the simplest way to explain

Goldwater is to recall his passion for mechanical gadgets—the household panels that slide, the flagpole that lifts at the push of a button, the radio and automobile knobs and panels that respond to his touches.

This is an entirely reputable avocation; the point is that it is the hobby of a human psyche that is very different from the one that paints or writes or gardens, or even the one that creates furniture in the basement workshop. It is emphatically not the psychology of the ponderer, the shaper and leader.

The senator appears to view American society and the stream of world history in static terms. Touch this button, he seems to be saying, and the Cuban problem will be transformed; pull this lever and China will be taken care of; put your finger on this clause of the Constitution and policy X becomes literally and unquestionably unconstitutional.

I have the impression that he sees American society as General Eisenhower seemed to see it in 1952, as if through the lens of an elementary civics book: a fixed mosaic with labor in its place, management in its, industry, agriculture, city and small town all in their proper and appointed spheres, with political philosophies whether "liberal" or "conservative" neat, self-contained and separate, never flowing in and out of each other's main currents.

One gets this impression much more from his extemporaneous speeches and much less from his writings. But the speeches are the pertinent evidence for the reason that his writings are essentially done for him by others.

The mechanistic approach to government and world affairs is not synonymous with the conservative philosophy of life; there are nominal liberals who are governed quite as much by this state of mind, who are

Con't on Page 3

COMMUNITY CONCERT MEMBERSHIP DRIVE

March 9—March 21.

1964-65 Concerts.

Bernard Peiffer Jazz Trio  
Ferrante and Teicher  
Chicago Opera Ballet  
De Paul Chorus  
Birgit Nilsson

TICKETS—\$8.50 ADULTS; \$5.00 STUDENTS

Membership Available Only during Campaign.

Tickets for Single Concerts Are Not Available.

Get tickets at Pershing Auditorium Headquarters

Phone 477-4337 & 477-4548



IN CONCERT

with

RONNIE SCHELL

PERSHING MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM

WEDNESDAY, MAR. 11 8 P.M.

ALL SEATS RESERVED:

3.50 3.00 2.50 2.00

Tickets on Sale at Pershing Municipal Auditorium or by Mail

WE NEVER CLOSE



BALL POINT PENS

15¢ WITH GAS PURCHASE

DIVIDEND BONDED GAS

16th & P Sts.

Downtown Lincoln



THE GLASS SLIPPER