

To Ban Or Not To Ban

At the request of a group of University students from Omaha, Sen. Edward Danner on Jan. 28 introduced a bill in the Nebraska Legislature making it illegal to "... in any way furnish or attempt to furnish any person under the age of 18 certain publications as prescribed ..."

"Prescribed," as qualified in the bill, LB 515, refers to literature which "... in any way tends to depict incidents or sexual perversion of any kind and sexual indecency ..."

In spirit, we support this bill. In letter, we see many pressures and precedents which discourage its passage and defang its enforcement. Nebraska must be able to overcome these drawbacks before the bill would be practical.

"Sexual perversion" and "indecency" must be defined by the courts. "Art" and "satire" must be distinguished from "obscenity" and "pornography." Better men than we have failed to do these things satisfactorily.

LB 515, however, is not an ordinary "book-burning" bill. It prohibits "indecent literature" ONLY from those under 18. We do not believe that freedom of expression would be withheld by this bill, should it become law, any more than we believe that the rights of minors are violated by banning them from alcohol.

Many (from experiences) and many others (from observation) are directly acquainted with the normal teenage mind, which, trying to assimilate the daily bombardment of sex into its everyday reasoning, searches always for the most sensational, most descriptive, most personal

and perverted collections of words available. These budding intellects are grubbing everywhere to (1) satisfy their curiosity, and (2) give themselves subjects for daydreams and air-castles, as shown by the pages which are most worn and dog-eared in the high school library's encyclopedia and other "innocent" publications.

The teenage illegitimacy explosion and steadily decreasing average age for marriages are the product of many factors, and we do not think this bill would have a visible effect on their improvement. We do, however, think that this bill would lessen the unhealthy influence upon developing minds.

"Sophisticated" parents will argue that Johnnie, at 14, is old enough to read the "good parts" of Lady Chatterly's seductions and the "fine character development" in Peyton Place. We disagree, and back Senator Danner in his idea that 18 is a good place to arbitrarily let the "Literature Lovers" really begin to appreciate "literature."

High school students are not ready to read indecency for "literature's" sake alone.

Parents and teenagers will also argue that children will grow up sexually naive if these books are removed from their hot little hands. So much the more shame for modern parents and schools.

An editorial appearing Feb. 4 in the Colorado State University Collegian makes this point to our satisfaction. We reprint it for you below.

FRANK PARTSCH

Take Candy From Babies

By J. Hyde, editor
CSU Collegian

The bookstores — those bookstores other than the CSU Bookstore, bless its puritanical heart—are now sporting pretty pink and white signs proclaiming "We have CANDY." Candy is the latest example of literature being misunderstood by the masses, perverted by the publishers and utilized by the dealers.

The book concerns itself with pornography, and is an excellent satire on literature ranging from love-sick erotica to hard-core pornography.

The publishers have descended upon the work like vultures on a defenseless body — the work having proved itself a "boxoffice success" by getting banned in Paris, of all places.

The authors, using the single pseudonym of Maxwell Kenton, seemed to care little who published their work, and by the time it reached our Golden Door almost six publishers had

begun printing heads and screaming to the public that they had managed to print about the dirtiest thing ever written. Meanwhile they have the hypocritical nerve to exclaim that other publishers are pirating the book and are obviously in the game only for the money.

But, like Hearst, the fault lies not so much with the publisher as it does with the mass that supports him, and this time the mass has responded with its usual keen interest in what it thinks is smut.

The pity lies mainly in that the book was printed in paperback, for the "mass" seldom concerns itself with literature to the tune of anything more than 95 cents (The price of Candy in the paperback.) Now the work finds itself being read aloud to the "gang" in dorm rooms in that kind of hey-gang-get-vice behind the barn type voice that demonstrates so well the

sophomoric quality of the mind that reads it.

For Candy is not pornography, it is satire; Candy is not smut, it is literature. The book exemplifies again the mind that is incapable to handle comfortably any concept of sex. The mind that reads cards in its constant effort to appease its appetite for smut is the very mind that cannot understand why Candy is NOT smut.

To accept sex as a thing of potential beauty would be almost an impossibility for one who only attends Film Classics because he heard it is somehow dirty. Those films, which have attempted to deal seriously with the subject of sex that have been shown at Sunday Cinema—only to meet with the roar of the high school mentality—are the finest example of the unintelligent, crude, unrefined confused and generally terrified attitude towards sex held by a sizeable proportion of students on campus.

As for those students who have read Candy for its juicy passages, and those bookstores who are out to make their fortune on the public's general stupidity, I can only say that it is THEY, mainly, who are satirized by the book they are reading.

Ann Calling

"Madam, good hope. His Grace speaks cheerfully." (John Lonnquist.)

"The wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch." (Larry Frolick.)

"Tyrants themselves wept when it was reported." (Husky the Husker.)

"To be or not to be, that is the question." (Buzz Madsen.)

"Captain Fluelen, you must come presently to the mines." (Kosygin.)

"Foolish curs, that run winking into the mouth of a Russian bear and have their heads crushed like rotten apples." (Mao-Tse Tung.)

"All our yesterdays have lighted fools the way to dusty death." (The Innocents Society.)

"I can suck melancholy out of a song as a weasel sucks eggs." (The Beatles.)

"Dear master, I can no further; I die for food." (Dormies.)

It was a lover and his lass, with a hey, and a ho, and a hey nonino, that o'er the green cornfield did pass." (Love in Nebraska.)

"Let me not hinder, Cassius, your desires." (Sonny Liston.)

Passing Through

One of the most ubiquitous of Lincoln sights in the past few weeks has been the long line of people — mostly students — seeking entry into a local theater which is showing the most recent James Bond thriller — Goldfinger by name.

Professors seeking response to literary allusion find students far more knowledgeable about Ian Fleming than William Shakespeare, another sign of Bond's status. Why should this be? What is the attraction?

The Fleming formula is very simple. The hero, Bond, doesn't really say very much nor does he actually do very much. He is often behind the action and frequently out of it. Bond is supreme—ahead of the action—only in one respect, namely as a lover of truly gargantuan proportions.

If Bond has one salient quality, it is that he keeps his head. His world is difficult, full of surprise, but through it all Bond maintains his composure—which extricates him from the most impossible situations in many instances. Bond operates alone—from bedroom to barroom—a quasi-existential figure in a world unmanaged and unmanageable.

Bond is the antithesis of Mike Hammer, the literary figment of Mickey Spillane's imagination. Unlike Spillane, Fleming constantly seeks out the uproarious satirical qualities inherent in the violence and sexuality of which both build their plots.

Both Fleming and Spillane are merchants of escape, but Fleming never lets his readers forget that he is dealing in make-believe. In Goldfinger Bond finds himself in the midst of a truly improbable plot to explode a nuclear device at Fort Knox—an enterprise designed to drive up the world price of gold to the benefit of Communist China and the villain in the piece—Goldfinger himself.

Perhaps the secret of Fleming's appeal is that he is a latter-day composer of fairy tale—for adults only.

What, then, accounts for the widespread student interest in James Bond? My guess is that students identify in Goldfinger and similar epics a kind of comedic switch on the world as they take it to be. The world is seen by them as populated primarily either by fools or villains.

They see no real prospect of altering this condition. How to survive in such an environment? Bond survives by taking full and complete pleasure in sexuality, by avoiding commitments of a binding character, and by keeping his head.

He does not transcend situations; he floats through them. He is a non-hero in a world no longer amenable to change by individual enterprise and dedication. He has a little fun while avoiding the tedium of the everyday. He does not make an issue of social significance, although he is on the side of the angels.

Bond experiences constant danger but never surrenders his poise; he has no illusions, but his world still seems basically worthwhile. Perhaps Bond is attractive because he has worked out a minimally viable means of existing with at least a modicum of style and grace. Many students would like to accomplish a parallel enterprise.

DAVID F. TRASK

CAMPUS OPINION

Time For Change?

Dear editor,

I read with interest the column by Lee Marshall in Friday's Daily Nebraskan. And I agree that at least these two "representatives" of the College of Arts and Sciences are not representing me. I doubt if they are representing many other Arts and Sciences students.

The column concluded "it's time for a change — either in their (Susie Segrist and John Cosier) policies or in Arts and Sciences' representatives." These two representatives have indicated their persistent irresponsibility. The only hope seems to be for a change.

Fortunately, there is provision for such an action. Article V, Section B, subsection 7 of the renumbered Student Council constitution provides for the recall of elected representatives. The typographical error in the present copies of the constitution is clarified in the Daily Nebraskan of April 4, 8 and 26, 1963 on page one.

The College of Arts and Sciences may recall their representatives by petitions signed by 35 per cent of the enrollment of the college.

Perhaps now is the time for students to assert themselves. In effect, the college of Arts and Sciences, entitled to five representatives, is not being represented by at least two of them.

I, for one, am willing to attempt to remedy this situation. If there is sufficient support within the College of Arts and Sciences, it would be possible to recall Cosier and Miss Segrist.

This could easily be the best chance the student body will have to express itself this year. Do you, the students of Arts and Sciences, approve of the way in which you are represented?

If not, you will soon have an opportunity to express your discontent — when you are given a chance to sign the recall petitions.

Robert Cherny

Stooping Low

Dear editor,

I left a sack containing a pair of slacks and a blouse in the ladies' room of Andrews Hall. Discovering in class that I had forgotten the package, I hurried to go pick it up. It was not there.

To many University students, the loss of a slacks set would mean nothing, for it was considered a cheap set. To me it means a great loss. Needless to say, I am completely disgusted—both because of my carelessness and because someone stooped low enough to become a thief.

"The Campus Handbook" quotes the Board of Regents policy on student conduct: "Students are expected to obey the laws of the state and nation, to conduct themselves in accordance with the rules of morality and decency which obtain in well-ordered communities and to refrain from any conduct injurious to the good name of the University."

The book goes on to mention that dishonesty in course work, rioting and brawling, illegal possession of alcoholic beverages and library and parking violations are forbidden.

Stealing is a very definite problem; this shouldn't be disregarded. It should be mentioned explicitly and not just grouped under the generalized Regents' Code.

I know very well that the University can do little about this stealing — it would be impossible to treat 14,000 University students as kindergartners, to check to see that each had only his own money, books, clothing and so forth.

Rather, I think it's time for each student to discipline himself, to raise his moral standard to the mature adult level — in a word, to have enough character to be able to say "no" to the temptation of stealing.

Maybe I'm expecting too much; maybe these University kids have all the bone in their heads and none in their backs.

R.B.

This summer, adventure through EUROPE TWA has the right tours at the right prices.



Don't stumble through the literary classics! CLIFF'S NOTES will help you make better grades! These study aids give you a clear, concise summary and explanation, chapter by chapter. CLIFF'S NOTES are now being used by high school and college students throughout the United States. There are 100 different CLIFF'S NOTES covering the literary classics.

\$1 at your favorite bookstore or write:

Cliff's Notes
BETHANY STATION
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA 68503

Nationwide Worldwide depend on



For the finest service in men's haircuts & hair styling

Bob's Barber Shop

1315 P Street

Winners of four haircutting trophies at the 1962-63-64 State Barbers' Convention.

Razorcuts, flatops and Ivy League are our specialties.

Ray Wittrock, Frank James, Dick Olson, Wayne Krouscher

appointments available call 435-2000

