

# Prove Them Wrong

The Student Conduct Committee of the ASUN, delegated last fall the complex job of drafting a student bill of rights, has conscientiously been doing its job.

It has interviewed administrators, faculty members and student leaders to find out what the specific policies concerning student life outside the classroom are and where tension between students or student groups and the administration lies.

It has filed through volumes of magazines, journals and articles in an effort to comprehend what the concept of student rights means on other college campuses and how the problems and student sentiments on this campus apply to that concept. It has researched the legal implications of a student bill of rights in connection with the power of "in loco parentis" delegated by the state to the Board of Regents.

The committee has compiled the information, philosophically interpreted the needs and desires of the students, and come up with a commendable, though not perfect, rough draft of the Student Bill of Rights.

This much was done by November. The committee then began to set the groundwork for passage of the document. It held a series of discussions with University administrators and professors in order to explain the student point of view and negotiate for the desired changes.

This phase of the work has ended. The administration, though cordial in tone, was unwilling to admit to any significant changes. It kept the students on the Conduct Committee entangled with small and

somewhat technical points, refusing to take them off the defensive and look at the philosophical foundation for the Student Bill of Rights.

What is more important, the administration seemed to believe that the students were only airing personal gripes and not voicing an urgently felt need of the majority of the student body.

The Daily Nebraskan now wonders if the administration is right in this respect. Do the students at Nebraska care if their position as inferiors in the University community is examined and hopefully altered? Do they want a strong bill of rights which will show the administration that students are serious in their desire to be treated as responsible adults in this academic community?

If students do care, the place to show concern or express an opinion on the issue is the Bill of Rights Assembly being held by the Student Conduct Committee on Feb. 19. In this session and those which follow, the final draft of the Student Bill of Rights will be completed.

The Daily Nebraskan urges all living units to carefully select their delegates to this assembly. However, as it is important for all students to understand the basis for the bill and the specific points in it, the Daily Nebraskan hopes that there will be a large attendance from the entire student body.

The term "bill of rights" has been tossed around the campus for months. It is now necessary for the Student Conduct Committee to clearly explain to the student body what it is. It is the responsibility of the Student senators to study it, discuss it, and bring it to a vote on the Senate floor. Most of all, it is vital that all students understand and take a stand.



AND IF IT WAS BIG ENOUGH FOR ME...

## Our Man Hoppe

### Turn On And Pass Out



Arthur Hoppe

SCENE: The Grey Submarine, a noted hangout for members of what has come to be known as "The New Middle Agers." In the dim, smoky light, men and women, most of them in their forties, can be seen lounging about in chairs and sofas. A sign on the wall says, "Never Trust Anybody Over 60." The group's leader, Dr. Timothy Leering, peers into an ordinary looking brown paper bag somewhat furtively and speaks.

★ ★ ★

DR. LEERING: We've got the real, genuine stuff tonight, gang. There's enough here for everybody to turn on.

BOB BABBITT (hopefully): Marijuana? I've always wanted to smoke some marijuana.

DR. LEERING (testily): Smoking marijuana is kid stuff. You've got to face up

to the fact that you're too old to be a hippie.

BOB BABBITT (defensively): I just wanted to see what it was like. I mean it's not habit-forming. And it doesn't cause emphysema, heart disease or lung cancer.

DR. LEERING: Exactly. It has no permanent effect on you whatsoever. You merely achieve a temporary state of euphoria which goes away, leaving you the same middle-aged slob you were before.

BOB BABBITT (hanging his head): I guess I wasn't thinking.

DR. LEERING (offering a filter-tip cigarette): If you want to smoke, smoke these. Remember our motto: "I'd Rather Die than Switch."

DAPHNE DARLING (excitedly): But tell us about the stuff in the bag, Doctor. Will we really turn on?

DR. LEERING: At the very least, I think I can guarantee you a genuine psychosomatic experience. (frowning) Of course, I should warn you that some of you may have a bad trip.

BOB BABBITT (nervously): A bad trip? What's that?

DR. LEERING: Well, it affects people differently. There's a chance it may just make you nauseated. Or it may strike the central nervous system, causing tremors, syncope, paralysis and even death.

DAPHNE DARLING (with a delicious shudder): Oooo! And will we become addicts?

DR. LEERING: Some of you will. In that case, you will develop a physiological tolerance, experience a cute withdrawal symptoms and hallucinations and suffer permanent brain damage.

BOB BABBITT (dubiously): Golly, I don't know if...

DR. LEERING (with fervor): Have courage, Babbitt! Remember that it's a symbol to us Middle Agers of our rebellion against the oppressions and frustrations of these crass times in which we live.

BOB BABBITT: I don't see why marijuana...

DR. LEERING (angrily): Act your age, Babbitt. Marijuana's illegal.

DAPHNE DARLING (trembling): Oh, please Doctor. Please give it to us now.

DR. LEERING (mollified): All right. But it's most important that it be prepared with extreme care. (removing two bottles from the bag) Now, let's see—eight parts gin, one part vermouth, a twist of lemon...

## Bob Samuelson's

# All The Lonely People

Student Power: How and when should it be used?

Lately we have heard many definitions and distinctions of the term "Power," when it is used in conjunction with some sort of group that has a special vested interest. I am speaking, of course, of "Black Power," "White Power," and many other interest groups that have since adopted the phrase.

For our purposes, we shall assume there is a conflict between an existing condition, and a condition which university students would consider more desirable.

It is a statistical fact that among the largest interest groups in the nation, and one that has been receiving much political interest and speculation recently is the group of people who are presently attending colleges and universities around the nation.

When they have been adequately organized, student pressure groups have been among the most dedicated, intelligent and successful of all the interest groups.

The word "Student Power" is a dangerous and volatile one, however, especially in a traditionally conservative state like Nebraska, and as such explosive term, it should be used prudently.

But even as the term should be used prudently, the administration of the power must be precise and intelligent. A major praise of President Kennedy's handling of the Cuban missile crisis was his precise definition and handling of power. Conversely, a criticism of President Johnson's treatment of the uprising in the Dominican Republic was that he used power imprecisely.

Teddy Roosevelt is suppose to have admonished the United States to "walk softly and carry a big stick" and at the University of Nebraska students would do well to take the Rough Rider's suggestion to heart.

There are many levels or types of "Student Power." Indeed, there is being formed on this campus an undefined and in some cases untested hierarchy of steps of student power toward an established goal. If "Student Power" is to become an effective reality on this campus, these steps must be well defined, and well understood by all persons involved.

Perhaps the first step toward true "Student Power" is informal discussion with the body which the conflict involves. This step is often the last, because through such informal discussion and definition of the conflict a workable solution is often easily obtained.

A second step is in the realm of mutual discussion on a more formal level

such as a sponsored question-and-answer period or a panel discussion.

A third step is a formal list of grievances presented from one side to another.

A fourth step in action is a formal resolution or statement recommending an action by another group, and a fifth step is demanding that action.

A sixth step requires mass involvement, often in the form of petition or other quiet form of mass support.

A seventh step is representational meetings in which a relatively small number of representational students meet to discuss what steps should be promulgated for the best interests of the students. (This is not merely a student government action, but an action drawing from un-uniform representation of a purely electric nature.)

An eighth step is a mass meeting where students gather for a specific purpose of airing disagreements with existing situation, and for discussing means to alleviate them. (This is a true democracy, and not a republican form of student involvement.)

A ninth step is organized protest of an intolerable situation that takes the form of marches or picketing.

A tenth step is rioting, with no regard for solution of the problem, but only for demonstration of abhorrence at it.

It should be specifically pointed out that steps should not be by-passed without great and careful consideration, for possibilities of achievement are greater at the lower levels, and diminish at the higher levels whose use becomes justified only by the negation of the lower levels.

I think it is quite obvious that the higher one goes on the levels of "Student Power," the more ill-will is generated on both sides. If the goals are kept clear, and it is possible to ascertain when they are achieved, there is nothing any true believer in democracy can say to disparage this hierarchy of involvement. Conversely, students must be willing to submit to the retribution of society if they are foiled at all steps.

In the 'fifties, campus involvement on a mass-student level took the form of adolescent forms of frustration-removal as panty-raids. Now, in the late 'sixties student involvement has taken a mature turn. Whether students are involved enough to commit themselves to a hierarchy of "Student Power" such as outlined above only remains to be seen.

Two areas which may require such dedication this spring are the University budget appropriations, and the student bill of rights. Now are the times that try men's souls.

# Campus Opinion

## Reconsideration Is In Order

Dear Editor:

I read with interest your editorial on "Student Attendance." I agree that every individual should take advantage of the experience provided by seeing the legislators in action. I agree that anything resembling a "student march, rally, etc." might trigger some sort of adverse reaction on the part of the Legislature or the people of Nebraska.

The torchlight rallies of Bryan's era, the sit-ins in the Legislature in Roosevelt's time, these are all a part of Nebraska's past. We cannot, at the present time, risk any kind of Legislative paranoia.

We can ask whether a governing body that reacts to outside pressure in such a manner is truly stable.

I wonder if it is as much a good idea to encourage students to attend the Legislative hearings today. I have heard that galleries sometimes groan or laugh at inane statements made by legislators. What if this happens? What if the Legislature misconstrues and crawls into its shell and we are "accused" of a rally, or even worse—a demonstration!

Perhaps a reconsideration of Monday's editorial is in order.

T. J. Riley

## Man Dead, Not God

Dear Editor:

According to his letter, Mike Thompson cannot understand why religion is such a hotly-debated subject.

Perhaps the "hotness" of the issue stems from the fact that Christianity is a subjective experience of a relationship with a person which affects every aspect of an individual's life.

It is true that God created the universe and man. Man turned against Him, and (yes, Mr. Thompson) God died. He died in Jesus Christ so that you and I could know what it means to live. With God, man is very much alive—without Him, man is dead. (Mr. Thompson admits this—"We come from nothing and we go to nothing." "There is no immortality.")

No, modern man has not "created the theory of God out of his fear of the unknown," but the existence of God is undeniable from modern man's experience of the known.

I can only say to those who insist God is dead, that I know He's alive because I experience Him daily. God is not dead—man is.

Cathy Wertman

## No 'Educational Kick' Here

Dear Editor:

We're not all anti-Nebraska liberals—I personally agree with Sen. Batchelder who has said that Nebraska doesn't spend more money on education because we are not on the "educational kick" that is sweeping the country. We should be proud of Nebraska for not spending more money.

A Proud Conservative

**THIS TRAGI-COMIC WORLD**  
By Doyle Niemann

The other day as I was digging through a huge pile of old papers in my attic, lo and behold, what should I find but an old yellowed manuscript with the following essay upon it. Although I can't say that I entirely agree with all the sentiments expressed in it, it does raise some rather persistent questions which each person has to answer. There was no signature only a scrawled initial which looked like K.M.

A specter haunts the world—the specter of enslavement. The history of mankind hitherto has been a history of class struggle. In this struggle it is not the proletariat which has suffered the most.

There has been one class which has suffered a much more odious oppression than that of the proletariat. This class is composed of those intelligent men, relatively rare in society; the intellectuals, thinkers and sages; in short, those men who have made active use of their native intelligence.

These men, ironically referred to as "enlightened ones," have, in actuality, been the greatest dupes in history. They, whom one would suppose the most free and independent of men, have, in fact, been the most abject of slaves. They have been duped and tricked by that collective mass of mediocrity which has composed the major part of mankind throughout the various ages.

If you look at the history of mankind it is easily seen that every advancement, every particle of progress no matter how infinitesimally small, has been the result of these men. Every invention, every advancement in government, every discovery in science, every rise in the world's living conditions has sprung, at one time or another, from the minds of these men.

They have been the scientists, doctors, philosophers, and guides of mankind. It is to them that any credit for humanity's advancement must be given. Without these superior men mankind would still be swinging from the trees.

But, I ask you, what have these men ever gained in return for their labors? Sure, you may answer that the world has bestowed wealth and fame upon them. But are these things really of such great value when compared with what they are forced to go through?

From the time a child first shows any spark of intelligence, any characteristic which distinguishes him from the mediocre mass, he is indoctrinated with a set of ideas which determine his future condition of slavery. He is taught that he must use his talents to advance humanity. He must do something useful with himself. Moreover, he is given the materials to do so, he is taught to question, to wonder, to see out answers, to think for himself. He is taught to look critically at society and, then, most importantly, to strive to change and improve it.

What is the effect of this educational process (only the least part of which is received in the schools) upon the child and the man he becomes. He is taught to look critically at his society and the world in general. What he sees usually does not satisfy him.

The world is like a stupid, irrational beast stumbling in the dark refusing to accept any proffered assistance. The intellectual sees much that is wrong with the world, and, because of his indoctrination he seeks to change and enlighten it. However, he rapidly discovers that the world does not want any help and that it rejects both him and his offer.

But he fights on since that is all he knows how to do. Perhaps, eventually he may succeed in effecting some changes, perhaps not. But what happens to the intellectual in the process, is he satisfied and content even if he does succeed?

The answer is a resounding NO! He may have money, fame, material comfort, but he lacks the one ingredient to true happiness—peace of mind. Because of his conditioning he can never stop seeking, never stop questioning, never be completely satisfied with anything. So long as he accepts the premise that he has a higher duty to society he will continually strive for a better state of affairs and he will continually be rewarded by frustration, despair, depression and unhappiness. He can never free himself of the worries and problems of the world.

Compare this to the non-intellectual. He just sits back and reaps the fruits which the intellectual secures for him. If he does anything at all, it is to hinder and destroy what the intellectual is trying to do.

His only concerns are those things which beset every man (even the intellectual) involved in the daily processes of life. Unlike the intellectual he does not bother himself with abstract ideas and questions. He does not worry about right and wrong, good and evil, truth and justice except in so far as they immediately affect him. He is easily satisfied and quite content with things as they are. He has no real desire to change the world. In fact, he rarely even concerns himself with it, unless it directly affects his existence. He is quite happy to let other people correct its wrongs.

This, then, is the state of affairs in which the intelligent man finds himself. He is the pawn and slave of the masses. And, what is worse, he has been so conditioned that he fails to see his own bondage and, instead, actively desires it. He has been duped into doing the work of the advancement of the world while receiving for his trouble only frustration and bitterness.

The time has arrived when the intellectuals and thinkers of the world must throw off the bonds which have held them for so long. They must act upon that realization. Why should the intelligent man be expected to carry the full load of the world upon his shoulder? Why should he be expected to work for the ignorant masses who, at their best, merely tolerate him and yet, still live off the fruits of his labors?

What is this tremendous lie that an intelligent man has a duty to advance the cause of humanity? Why? Of what benefit is it to him? Revolution is the only answer. The intellectual must revolt, not by seizing power (that would be to fall into the world's trap) but, by rejecting this imposed role of leadership.

He has no obligation to mankind. There is no higher law which says that he must sacrifice himself for that mass of fools which composes the bulk of humanity. The intelligent man, then, must turn from society and concentrate upon bettering himself. He must seek peace within himself for that is where his salvation lies. He must advance and improve his own mind and senses. He must work for himself and not for society.

Intellectuals of the world unite, cast off the chains which have held you to a ridiculous society, instead, seek thyself for that is the good.

**Daily Nebraskan**  
Vol. 90, No. 26 Feb. 8, 1967  
TELEPHONE: 477-8711, Extensions 2588, 2589 and 2590.  
Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated. Published at Room 51, Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Nebraska.  
Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1912.  
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 Subcommittee or any person outside the University.