

Nebraska—Not Alone

Conservative Nebraska (which isn't as conservative as is commonly thought) often gives the impression, especially to Nebraskans, of being isolated from other states in its issues of student discussion, debates and drives.

But a quick survey of other U.S. college campuses, via student newspapers, reveals this impression doesn't hold water.

Other colleges in the U.S. are discussing Viet Nam and the draft, tuition hikes, evaluating faculty, and the desirability of final exams.

Other colleges are crusading for liberalization of women's hours. They are plagued with faculty resignations and lack of adequate space. They are working for more effective student governments.

A sampling of editorials and articles that appeared last week in college newspapers brings this point closer to the University.

"Staff as well as students lack adequate work area," reads a headline in the Minnesota Daily. The Wayne Stater reported the resignations of two prominent faculty members.

Purdue University passed a no-hours policy for women and Iowa State is crusading for a no-hours policy for juniors and seniors. (Presently at Iowa State, senior women can be out until 6:30 a.m.)

Tuition hikes and the probability of future raises in college costs were the topics of large articles in the Washburn University (Topeka, Kan.) and California State Polytechnic College.

Every paper carried articles and comment about the draft, deferments, and the Viet Nam war.

And the Purdue Exponent, the Daily Kansan and the Daily Illinois (among others) carried editorial comment about the detrimental aspects of final exams.

Admittedly, the University of Nebraska is not always discussing, debating and changing at the rate of other colleges and universities, especially in the areas of women's hours and faculty evaluation.

But, University issues do conform generally to the national trends of student thought and discussion.

Nebraska is not alone.

IT'S SURE
A RELIEF
TO KNOW THAT
ALL THIS'LL
BE TAKEN
CARE OF IN
A COUPLE
YEARS
OR SO



Sorry About That!

Being a compendium of farce, absurdity and comment, selected arbitrarily by the Editor . . .

Historical note of the day: In 1643, Floons, Belgium, Otto Hannah invents the oboe, wishes he hadn't.

Almost everyone hates campus policemen, except maybe their mothers. After all, a man whose job is to hand out tickets at least—see the need for a campus police force.

But we sometimes wonder if they further bitterness at times. Strict readers of the book give tickets in a 15-minute loading zone after 17 minutes.

Purposeful and intent on their work, they give tickets to students who park in a half-empty faculty lot on a Saturday morning in the rain. (Although perhaps in these cases the rules are more unreasonable than the officers.)

This is not to say that campus cops are not helpful and considerate at times. But sometimes we can't help wondering if campus cops are just naturally obnoxious or if they really make an effort at it.

Jacket reports that, according to a recent survey, "as the sale of alcoholic beverages increases, it is in direct proportion to the increase in the sale of Bibles."

Just goes to show you: The family that kneels together, reels together.

There is no truth to the rumor that Goldfinger is alive in Argentina.

One thing that the University needs is an Apathy Club. Meetings could be held once a week, and anyone attending would be subject to immediate dismissal on grounds of showing interest in apathy.

Have you ever stumbled through a course in Shakespearean lit, not quite sure of what was going on? We've selected a passage at random from Hamlet, to show how easy it really is to figure out the characters' universal problems:

"For who would these fair fardels bear, if not for that undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler ere return."

Translation: "What the hell am I going to do when I get out of here?"

Some of the University's sophisticated coeds might find interest in a recent coat ad aimed at collegiates:

"Casually yours . . . this coat captures beautifully that fine air of informal unconcern."

The coat pockets yawn every fifteen minutes.

The AWS board at Purdue University recently passed a no-hours policy for coeds. The AWS president was quoted in the Exponent as saying, "I am moved to tears by the decision that has been made."

We wonder if parents of freshmen women students wouldn't express the same sentiments.

To anyone that we've omitted to offend today, Sorry About That!

Morse: Superficial Sense

By JON KERKHOFF
Night News Editor

(Editor's Note: See story on Wayne Morse's speech on Page 4.)

Wayne Morse, the senior Senator from Oregon, presented a view in Lincoln of the Viet Nam conflict that contradicted the present administration's policy line. As a speaker he was eloquent and interesting. As a supposed policy-maker, his speech was full of inconsistencies.

Morse speaks as a moralistic idealist and there is little doubt that he believes 90% of what he says. He states that the United States has lost its ideals—those bits and pieces of homespun logic that have made the United States what she is today.

But this is exactly where his logic fails. Because of our position in the world we should not, indeed cannot, reverse our aims and allow the freedoms of Viet Nam and South East Asia to be lost.

The speech states that we have broken the Geneva Accord in defending Viet Nam. Yet the United States never ratified this treaty that ended the French War in S.E. Asia. Eisenhower did say that we would support it as part of interna-

tional law, but it was never ratified by the Senate.

At one moment Morse tries to make it sound as if this should be binding on the United States, but at the next moment states that no treaty is binding unless ratified by the Senate, under its Advise and Consent power.

The international law which he supports so fervently was first broken by the Viet Cong who were supplied by China, another foreign power who is not supposed to be active in Viet Nam. International law agrees that if a nation is attacked, it gains the right to attack the invaders (infiltrators) and their supply bases in its own defense.

Morse suggests that we should give away the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own welfare by reconvening the International Control Commission under the auspices of the United Nations. It should be obvious at this time that such agreements need the trust and support of both sides to work. Failure of such has led to crises in Laos and Viet Nam.

In summary of his Viet Nam views—he is critical

without presenting alternatives of action. His logic is true only on the surface. His sophomoric view of history gives pat answers to general problems, but too often paints his pictures in blacks and whites without comprehending the gray area of necessity.

While "telling the American People all the facts," Morse doesn't bring up anything that can't be found in the weekly newsmagazines. He uses Wilson's statements about open diplomacy, openly arrived at, but fails to mention that Wilson later changed his feeling under the stresses of world politics at the Versailles Peace Conference.

He views party politics with hypocritical views. At first he called the President amoral and spoke in "righteous indignation" of his politics. Later he vowed his full support of the administration, seemingly forgetting that Johnson is a very pragmatic politician.

Morse's policies could very well lead us back into isolation; a sleeping giant interested only in ourselves, uncaring of any world conflict that would take American lives and riches.

Lost Cool

By LIZ AITKEN

The hardest thing about any kind of writing is titling it, and a column is no exception. The title for this column refers to the current slang phrase "to lose one's cool", but may I quickly add that the title is something of a misnomer. Never having had any cool to lose, the title may be somewhat misleading but at least it effectively describes my situation.

Having been asked to write an editorial column this semester, I feel it is my duty to inform the reader a bit about the column as it will be and about myself as I am before expounding any great words of wisdom.

First of all, I am mildly horrified about thinking of enough subjects to write on throughout the semester. I assume (and pray) that this matter will take care of itself. The subjects that are chosen will be entirely subjective and often of a very personal bent.

The column will be of no particular genre; one week it will be critical comment, the next week it might be merely thoughts and another week it may perhaps be some favorite poetry—who knows? I certainly don't.

As you have probably already noticed, I have chosen to refer to myself in the singular rather than the editorial plural. This is because I feel that I have neither the insight nor the power to refer to myself in any other manner.

Also, I hope that the singular will give the column a feeling of conversation because that is all I really intend for the weekly discourse to be. I have no intentions of setting myself and my ideas up as examples to be followed by every student at Nebraska. Heaven forbid! Rather, I would like to simply exchange ideas with the reader—although it will be obviously a one-sided affair.

The views which I expound may be sophomoric (especially seeing as how I am a sophomore) and slightly naive, but I promise you that they will be honestly felt and never presented merely for shock effect.

Should I express an opinion that is faulty or inadvertently based on an incorrect assumption, please don't just sit there and swear at me, write me a letter telling me off or setting me straight. I am open to suggestion and am willing to change my stand—publically if need be.

But enough of advance apologies and introductions. I'm loading my guns and will start firing next week.

Another Viewpoint— U.S. Academic Freedom

(Editor's Note: The following article was written by William E. Jackson Jr. of Columbia University and appeared in the California State Polytechnic College newspaper, El Mustang. While the University if not greatly plagued with the very real problems of freedom of speech evident on other campuses, academic freedom is a national student topic that should concern all university students.)

Across the land, from Ohio to North Carolina and from New Jersey to California, the real meaning of academic freedom is being debated.

The controversy surrounding the question has become a critical issue in the politics of several states and, indeed, the nation at large. The debate engages not only heretofore obscure professors but governors, senators, and presidential candidates. Academic freedom is once again a national issue.

Freedom of speech on college and university campuses has been the broad question of freedom to dissent in our society, and for many is linked to specific movements of grievances: the communist threat, civil rights, Vietnam and the Dominican Republic, Berkeley.

In North Carolina, a

"speaker-ban" law was hurriedly pushed through the state legislature in the closing hours of the 1963 session. This unique law prohibits "any known member" of the Communist Party, or anyone who has invoked the fifth amendment's protection against self-incrimination in loyalty investigations, from speaking on state-supported college and university campuses.

The proponents of the law were motivated by diverse concerns, ranging from anger over civil rights demonstrations in the state capital participated in by some University of North Carolina faculty and students to general popular unrest over the "liberal" teaching at the state university.

One of the chief backers of the law, State Senator Thomas White, has candidly commented: "I don't believe there's a Communist over there (Chapel Hill), but there might as well be as long as the people think there is. They need to reassure people along this line."

A special commission appointed by a Democratic Governor Dan Moore has held public hearings and is now considering proposals to modify or repeal the law; its recommendations are due very soon. The Southern Association of Schools and Colleges has hinted at with-

drawing accreditation unless control is returned to the trustees.

The heavy hand of such a law (or ruling to the same effect) is felt in its administration. Narrow minded college and university administrators, worried about maintaining good relations with state legislatures, can virtually control the flow of speakers from the outside.

This danger is illustrated by Ohio State's "gag rule" and modifications thereof, which in effect denied access to the campus to any speaker not acceptable to the conservative administrative tyranny has prevailed under which the President of Ohio State, Novice Fawcett, bans from campus anyone distasteful to a fraction of the trustees led by former U.S. Senator John W. Bricker.

However, a student protest movement led by the Free Speech Front and Students for Liberal Action appears to have been successful this year. In August, the trustees voted a rule change which vests final authority to invite speakers in recognized student groups and faculty advisers, with no limitation on who may speak. A rebuttal can be prescribed by the faculty council.

CAMPUS OPINION

Women's Hours

Dear Editor:

Now that we have the new "progressive" hours for women, let's see how progressive they are. The hours for women at Northwestern University are:

Freshman and sophomores: weekdays, 12 a.m.; weekends, 2 a.m.; and Sundays, 1 a.m.

Juniors and seniors are issued keys and are expected to sign in by noon the next day. For all women there is no limit to overnights and out-of-towns.

Golly! You mean Nebraska freshmen can actually stay out until 9:30 on week-nights?

Just sign me as:

"Filthy Rich"

Evaluation Book

Dear Editor:

Before the bandwagon of faculty evaluation picks up more speed perhaps a few stones of doubt should be cast under its ambitious wheels. The concept as well as the sampled execution of this enterprise (at least as it was described in the Daily Nebraskan, February 3) may be seriously questioned in terms of both its utility and its propriety.

What at first glance suggests a handicapper's form sheet, upon closer inspection turns out to be only slightly more instructive than the Lincoln telephone directory. If a student, for example, were asked to select an instructor from among the five sample evaluations given, it would not be easy to make an intelligent choice in spite of all the information provided.

One reason for this is that the sample evaluations are weighed down with educational trivia. Surely there must be more discriminating reasons for deciding whether or not to take a course than whether the instructor is a "fair grader" rather than a "v. fair grader", or more earth-shaking reasons than the degree of overlap between lectures and reading assignments.

(What might such reasons be? Whether or not a student is interested in the subject matter which the course addresses might be considered as a starter.)

And how is a student to interpret such a well-considered analytic comment as "Great!"? And what exactly does "approached dull subject with cool head" mean? If most students are going to decide whether or not to take courses on the basis of "tests too long", "can't bluff way through fact that the tests are 60 per cent m.c.t.f., 40 per cent essay", then perhaps much more is in need of examination than the faculty's teaching methods.

Other questions about execution can be raised. For example, upon what principles are the hundreds of questionnaires for each instructor to be abstracted and condensed into two paragraphs? Who is to do this work? How are such persons to be selected? What skills will they bring to their tasks?

Since few instructors are received by their students with unanimity, will the evaluations show division of opinion? Will the returns be quantified? And will there be any attempt to find out and make known the grade point average in the instructor's courses?

The entire concept of a faculty evaluation book—at least as that book was described and previewed—is also open to question. The sponsors of the FEB apparently assume there is an identity between who the best and worst instructors are and who most students believe the best and worst instructors to be.

At best this is a debatable

Quibs

Can Food be challenged . . . ? Please send comments on this vital subject to the first IFC meeting.

Amazing . . . students are being given preference on basketball tickets. Would this have been necessary five years ago, . . . three years ago, . . . last year . . . ?

Is there really a Harpoon?

assumption. Of greater concern, perhaps, is that the FEB appears to entertain an over-simple notion of the education process. The relationship between instructor and students in this process is complex and one that is dependent upon the student as well as upon the instructor.

This relationship is apt to involve a variety of factors that are not easy to measure, particularly not easy to measure by the taking of opinion, and certainly not easy to put into a capsule on a "form" sheet.

An equally serious question is the one of propriety. A university is supposed to be a community. As such, students are members yet they are not the only members. As members their interests must rank high yet theirs are not the only interests. Their particular interest in knowing who are the most and the least favorably evaluated instructors is, perhaps, a legitimate one, but hardly one so paramount that it can be pursued without responsibility.

The propriety of publicizing to the community votes of no confidence in individual members of the community ought to be more fully explored by the sponsors of the FEB.

The wisdom of publishing unfavorable evaluations of faculty members may be questioned as much as the wisdom of making public the names of students receiving "D's" or "F's", or the making public of whatever negative conclusions the faculty may have reached concerning a particular student's motivation, clarity of exposition, class contribution, attendance, or general personality.

It ought to be recognized that there is something very much amiss when a lawyer has to be called in to save some members of the community from the possibility of libeling other members.

The problem of poor or otherwise unsatisfactory instruction probably exists on every campus. But the sponsors of the FEB avow they are not interested in addressing this problem. This is regrettable because their considerable energies might be put to constructive use here.

Apparently, however, they can be taken at their word in their disavowal because publishing evaluations of the faculty is not an intelligent way to go about improving instruction, and the sponsors of the FEB are intelligent people.

The problem of informing students about who are the most and the least favorably evaluated instructors is a distinct one from that of improving instruction as the sponsors of the FEB have discerned.

However, it is the problem more easily disposed of. Ever since universities have been in business, the members of their faculties have had to hazard a rigorous word-of-mouth evaluation. It has been rumored that one's fellow students are often willing to express their innermost thoughts through this channel.

If a student doesn't know who the most and the least highly thought of instructors are in a given area, he probably hasn't tried to find out.

Richard S. Randall
A former student

Daily Nebraskan

Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated, Published at Room 51, Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Nebraska.

TELEPHONE: 477-5711. Extensions 2588, 2589 and 2590.

Subscription rates are \$4 per student or \$6 for the academic year. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1932. The Daily Nebraskan is published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacation and exam periods, by students of the University of Nebraska under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from censorship by the Administration or any persons outside the University. Members of the Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor, JO STOHLMAN; managing editor, STEVE HUNGERFORD; news editor, WAYNE KERKHOFF; sports editor, JIM FEARGE; night news editor, JON KERKHOFF; senior staff writers, JIM FEARGE, BRUCE GILES, JULIE MORRIS; junior staff writers, RANDY REY, TONI VICTOR, KIM CT HENDRICKSON, BOB CUNNINGHAM; photographers, TOM HIBBS, RICH EBER, BOB HARRIS, BOB GILES, NOBLE, WALLY LUNDEN, LOIS QUINCY.

BUSINESS STAFF

Business manager, MIKE KIRKMAN; business assistant, CONNIE RAMSEY; SEN LU WALLACE, BRUCE WRIGHT, SHIRLEY BENTON, BOBBER ELM, JOHN RAMSEY, DICK TREFE, CHUCK SALEM, LARRY RAU; night news editor, JIM FEARGE; circulation manager, JIM BUNTY; circulation manager, LYNN HATZEL.