

18-Year-Old Voting?

A member of the United States House of Representatives from Georgia, Charles Longstreet Weltner, has introduced a constitutional amendment which would set eighteen as the legal voting age in all of the fifty states. The proposed amendment is now before the Judiciary Committee.

In his remarks to the House when he introduced the resolution, Representative Weltner explained his reasoning:

"Young people, ages 18 to 20, have proven themselves worthy of the awesome tasks we place upon them. They are a generation of dedication and ability.

"They can do many things, but there is one area where they are excluded. For except in Georgia and three other states, they cannot vote.

"They can fight and die . . . but they cannot vote.

"They can represent this great nation in some remote outpost of civilization . . . but they cannot vote.

"They can sacrifice their time and energy in ministering to others . . . but they cannot vote.

"A Congress so firmly dedicated to the principle of voting rights should move now to extend the franchise to these young Americans. We have placed upon these Americans the duties of citizenship. Let us now extend to them the basic right of citizenship."

What Representative Weltner says about 18-year-old voting does make

sense — at least to the legislatures of four states.

We agree that generally eighteen-year-olds should be allowed to vote. We feel that the maturity of today's eighteen-year-old and his knowledge of government and current affairs—and possibly even his interest in government—surpasses that of the eighteen-year-old of a generation or two ago.

But we feel that extending the franchise to those eighteen and above should be left to the states' discretion. In the 178 years that the Constitution has been in effect, only 25 amendments have been added. And eight of these amendments were added as a Bill of Rights.

Therefore, we believe that a constitutional amendment must be made only in the case of an extreme need, and it must be made only after there is sufficient evidence that an evil will be corrected and a great amount of good will be derived from it.

We believe the majority of eighteen-year-olds to be capable of knowledgeable and intelligent voting. But it is not for us to say, nor for the Congress, that this is true of the majority of youth in every state.

Thus, we would encourage our own state to evaluate its voting age requirements, along with other states, and then have each state to franchise their eighteen-year-olds as they see fit. The issue does not necessitate a constitutional amendment.

A Progressive System

Editor's Note: We would like to see the University adopt a program similar to the one outlined in the following article. It's a sensible system.

—Rochester, N.Y.—(I.P.)
Undergraduate students in the University of Rochester's College of Arts and Sciences may elect to receive a grade of "satisfactory" or "fail" in one course each semester, starting with the spring semester.

The new system, which has been authorized by the faculty of the College, is designed to reduce the pressure for grades and to enable students to become more "venturesome" in their choice of courses, according to Dean Kenneth E. Clark.

It is being initiated as the result of studies made by two faculty groups of the college and a student committee.

Associate Professor Rob-

ert G. Sutton, chairman of the Committee on Academic Policy, said the new grading system was "an effort on the part of the faculty to lessen the stress on grades as a means to an end." He said it is designed "to encourage students to elect courses in which they are interested but which they believe might be difficult for them."

(University of Rochester undergraduates customarily take four courses each semester; of these, only one can be graded under the new system and the rest will be graded according to the traditional marking system—A,B,C, etc.)

Professor Vincent Nowlis, chairman of the Committee on Improving Instruction, said the reduced emphasis on grades "hopefully will motivate the student to explore areas which he might avoid if he were essentially interested in maintaining his grade point average.

"It allows him to become

involved in independent research or honors courses which he might otherwise shun. It permits him to have the experience of learning the essential core of a course without the intrusion of 'grubbing' for a grade," he added.

Professor Nowlis noted that it has been found that students work as hard in courses under systems like the new Rochester plan as they do under traditional grading systems.

Under the University of Rochester plan, an instructor will submit a letter grade (A,B, etc.) for students who elect a course on the Satisfactory-Fail basis as well as for other students.

These grades will be kept on file and only the S or F grade, as appropriate, will be reported to the student and recorded on his transcript. This procedure will enable a student to obtain his specific letter grade at a later date if he so desires.

Lost Cool

By LIZ AITKEN

To some people this column is going to seem as if it were nourished on that perennial fruit that grows so abundantly on the campus—sour grapes. But may I assure you that this is not the case, or at least not consciously.

It has been my observation on this campus that certain interview procedures are dead wood. They are useless wastes of time and serve no real purposes. Mind you, I said certain interviews.

I can see the reasons for interviews that make their selections from masses of workers or that have as their duty the selection of queen candidates. There is no other way to choose among people from such a wide scope and with whom you've had so limited contact.

No, I'm talking about interviews that take place between stepping-down top executives of an organization and committee chairmen or their equivalents. If these executives have done any sort of job at all, they know each of the candidates and their work.

They know which ones have merely been filling a position and which ones have been truly beneficial to the organization. These executives know (or should know) which applicants can fulfill the necessary requirements of administrative work and which ones are

in accordance with the basic goals and premises of the group.

These executives know all of this information long before interview time rolls around and they have a pretty good idea who will fit which position. Well, the time for the change-over comes and what happens?

The officers of the organization schedule interviews for the prospective office-seekers. The candidates file in, one by one, and present themselves before the interviewing board which consists usually of the outgoing officers and the group's faculty advisor.

The interviewee then is subjected to a questioning period that lasts anywhere from nine to twenty minutes. Now I ask you, what can that interviewee say in such a short period of time that can change the collective mind of a group of people that has seen him do his work, whether it be good or bad, for an entire year?

He can say absolutely nothing to change a negative opinion of him and if the board is already in favor of him, his words are merely redundant.

Why then do the candidates themselves and the members of the interviewing board continue to play a time-consuming charade? (After all, the candidates usually waste several hours preparing for the interview and the board has to chalk off one entire day.)

I suppose the reason lies

in some sort of need to establish an alibi of democratic procedure for the selection of the organization's new executives. But a democratic selection is a lot of hogwash, both realistically and in theory.

Both you and I know that selection of officers is not done on a democratic basis, nor should it be. The qualities needed to adequately fill certain executive positions in campus organization's workers.

What's more the candidate's record of year-long work is a far better basis for picking and choosing than a fifteen minute monologue of memorized facts and "goals of our organization."

No, it is not a matter of condemning interviews or what goes on in their process. It is more just a matter of simply deploring the waste of manpower that goes into the institution of interviews simply because people don't want to be realistic and face the facts.

JSK

(Just Slightly Korrekt)

Just out of curiosity . . . why is the SS Board taking fingerprints with the draft tests? To discriminate the test-takers—or to be prepared to ship the demonstrators off on a moment's notice (i.e. Michigan University)?

Sorry About That!

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

Historical Note of the Day: In 1899, Kibitz, Hungary, a pack of starving wolves attacks the Phi Alpha Pi Annual Hayride and Rush Party. In 1958, University of Nebraska, a pack of deranged students attack their professors just before vacation.

Thought for the Day: Only 15 hour exams and five term papers before vacation.

Did you know: Students no longer come to classes just to get good grades. Their grades are now sent to them.

I think it's idiocy to say that university students get no experience which suits them for the business world. They get abundant experience in cheating.

I have an instructor whose words are immortal. They never seem to end.

Is the Greek system really deteriorating? Of course not, as all Greeks know who heard the speaker, (that is, bothered to go hear the speaker) at

the Greek Week convocation Monday night. Then there were the two or three fraternities who attended.

Al Capp is just slightly fantastic. On the Johnny Carson TV program Monday night, he discussed his visit to the University. He told Carson that he visited 27 fraternities here who told him that Carson was one of their alums.

Nebraska University students were a little strange, according to Capp. "They were the only kids who didn't bombard me with questions about sex. Either they aren't interested or they know all the answers."

The Colorado Daily bannered the headline: "Spring Break Canceled." The top story headline read: "University Student Found Dead in Elevator" and the lead read, "Well-known student activist Argyle Plimpton was found starved to death Thursday night inside the UMC elevator."

Another headline proclaimed: "CU Students Seek Beer, Sex, Kicks." The issue was CU's version of a Pink Rag. (But they didn't quite have the Nebraskan's class. It was printed on the usual white paper.)

A while back, we said that Chancellor Hardin's house was the house which the students' jack built. Since then, we have been duly corrected—funds for the house did not come from students. To the Chancellor, we're Sorry About That!

Another Viewpoint—

Class Attendance

Iowa State Daily

Several weeks of classes have crept by. Students now have had time to discern—whether their professors take attendance and/or care whether anyone shows up for class.

Some instructors tell students to be there every class period unless excused by an affidavit from a surgeon, with the threat of an otherwise lowered grade. Other professors wouldn't mind lecturing to a vacuum as long as the students came to the final—but this breed of instructor is more rare.

Should a professor take attendance into account when giving a grade? Consider his arguments. If a student is not in class, he cannot gain from the lecture or discussion.

This is true, if the instructor doesn't act as a mouthpiece for the textbook and if he provokes worthwhile discussion. Also, the fewer students present, the fewer people to contribute ideas to make a discussion—a valid point.

However, required attendance may be a matter of the professor's pride, not concern for a lack of sponges to soak up the ma-

terial or to contribute. Perhaps the professor knows few people would show up if given a choice. But a classroom of sleeping, but dutiful, notakers is a poor alternative to a mass of empty seats.

Admittedly, there are some classes where absences only handicap the student—a lab class where the information gained is by doing, for example conducting an experiment, giving a speech, drawing, or in physical education class, where practice is essential.

Some professors, wanting their students to come to class and yet wanting to avoid any ultimatum, use other tactics. At the beginning of the quarter, they announce that pop quizzes will be given, and advise that these shouldn't be missed.

Possibly they let the students know they will randomly call on class members, and that they take a dim view of their questions passing unanswered.

The results from the approaches are the same. Attendance becomes a bonus for those who never miss, fate for those who've skipped.

Is it safe for the profes-

CAMPUS OPINION

Letter Correction

Editor's Note: Due to a mechanical error, a line was lost in a letter in the Daily Nebraskan Monday entitled "Senior Honoraries' Purpose." It was written by Shirley Voss, president of Mortar Board and Skip Soiref, president of Innocents.

The corrected paragraph is: "Mortar Boards and Innocents are not campus organizations but rather honor societies whose purpose is to recognize individuals for outstanding scholarship, leadership and service. It is not the intent of the societies to exert political influence as a group in campus issues or organizations. Rather, the individual members of the societies exert influence by virtue of the position they hold or the knowledge they have gained through several years of experience."

The Daily Nebraskan extends our apologies for this error.

Disappointed With Letter

Dear Editor,

I was considerably disappointed with the clarification of the esteemed Miss Voss and Mr. Soiref as to the purpose of the senior honorary societies. It is more than sad that these two individuals see neither the insidiously destructive nature of their organizations nor their failure to stimulate achievement within the University student body.

Both presidents state that their purpose is to "recognize individuals for outstanding scholarship, leadership, and service." Would that were all! Certainly, I would be the first to agree that within their ranks are some of the most talented and capable individuals at the University. Certain of their members have INDIVIDUALLY contributed much to the University community: Buzz Madsen, Frank Partsch, Kent Neumeister, and perhaps one or two Mortar Boards.

If, however, it is not the intent of the societies to exert influence (political or otherwise) as a group in campus issues, why do they? Surely they cannot deny that whenever an idea is presented or a project is attempted that their shadow always lurks behind the person instigating it (especially if he is a junior). He always wonders which Innocent is against this idea or which member of the hooded herd he will impress.

Why does the Society almost consistently express the negative aspects of any idea? Because of this rapid intimidation, fewer good ideas are expressed and fewer positive programs are instituted.

There is also a second reason why I have been disappointed in our senior honorary societies. The two presidents state, "the members of the societies feel that their first and foremost obligation is to the University and to the campus organizations in which they hold positions of leadership."

If so, why didn't Skip Soiref accept the speaker pro tempore of the student senate? It would seem that such a recognized leader would be invaluable as a leader in a new student government. Surely a University cannot exist without its students. If so, then the prime interest of the faculty, administration, and organizations should be the welfare of the students individually and as a group.

Where were the Innocents (with the notable exception of Larry Frolik) when important issues and elections came before the IFC? In whose best interests was the Mortar Board's stand on senior keys? As noted leaders of our campus community, shouldn't they take a more active interest in problems vital to the student interests: the proposed tuition hike, a faculty-course evaluation book, a better faculty, a more perceptive and creative administration?

When was the last time the Society ever made a public statement concerning the role of the student body within the University community? What have they done to promote the kind of climate every University must have if it is even to approach the educational? When was the last time the Innocents as an organization said anything about anything?

Why should individuals, many of whom contributed greatly during the three years before they joined the Society, all of a sudden retire from the active University community? Many a man occasionally gets tired of the constant grind of work and responsibility—but for a year at a time!

Could it be possible that all these men sought was membership in the Society and that once they achieved this they felt they could melt back into the faceless mob, drop all responsibility, ignore any possible greater achievement?

Why is it that seniors outside the Society appear to accomplish so much more than those within? Bob Samuelson, Jim DeMars, and John Lydick (to name a few) accomplished more during their senior years than all of the Innocents combined. Surely there must be better criterion for the existence of these two organizations other than mere tradition.

But what is it? If there isn't any, their perpetuation is a sad commentary upon the organizations, their members, and our University student body as a whole.

Bill Minier

Red Expansion In Viet Nam

Dear Editor,

The Chinese Communist view of world peace is demonstrated by this excerpt from a letter sent to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party on June 14, 1963:

"But how can war be abolished? This is how Lenin viewed it: 'Our object is to achieve the socialist system of society, which, by abolishing the division of mankind into classes, by abolishing all exploitation of man by man, and of one nation by other nations will inevitably abolish all possibility of war.'

"However, certain persons now actually hold that it is possible to bring about 'a world without weapons, without armed forces and without wars' through 'general and complete disarmament' while the system of imperialism and of exploitation of man by man still exists. This is sheer illusion.

"An elementary knowledge of Marxism-Leninism tells us that armed forces are the principle part of the state machine and that a so-called world without armed forces can only be a world without states."

In view of the fact that we believe there is somewhat more "exploitation" going on, in, say, Tibet than in the U.S., that a "world without states" is a rather obnoxious idea to those of us who favor the continued existence of the United States, and that there are grave doubts that Communist world domination would, in fact, bring world peace, these Communist conditions for world peace are unacceptable.

Yet world peace is essential in a nuclear age. So it stands to reason that something must be done to change the minds of the Communists who make the conditions.

South Viet Nam, as has been endlessly pointed out, provides almost perfect conditions for the current brand of Communist expansion. If this expansion can be frustrated there, perhaps the Communists will realize that it can be frustrated anywhere. And then perhaps they will change their conditions for peace to something more acceptable than complete Communist victory.

But if Communist use of force is successful in South Viet Nam we can hardly expect them to suddenly abandon such a useful instrument for world domination.

Ray Wilson