

The Bill Of Rights

On the day which many students have been nervously anticipating for some time — the Bill of Rights vote in ASUN — the most controversial issue is still in a muddle.

Student Poll

A student poll by the Daily Nebraskan on housing indicates that most students favor choice in living environments (Article V of the Bill of Rights), but gravely question the feasibility or desirability of extending this choice to freshmen.

The Student Conduct Committee, in its final vote of the article, reflected this ambivalent attitude by splitting five to three, the minority holding that the section should be worded to allow for the maximum choice possible, but not unlimited, in order to account for practicality.

A petition which has been circulated by more determined liberals demands that the Student Senate pass Article V as it is and that the students endorse this position with their vote.

University Poll

Another poll is being mailed out to all parents of University students under 21 years of age by the Administration asking them what they think about housing.

Meanwhile the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Housing is deadlocked over the question of sophomores. (The committee has reached agreement that juniors and seniors and students over 21 will have choice in housing.)

Arguments which have been heard show that there has been a great deal of thought and obviously confusion over this issue. There are many aspects to consider on the nature of the final goal for which students are striving. There seems to be even more aspects in deciding what means should be employed to gain these goals.

Stop Hedging

Because the Senate must definitely decide today what to do with Article V, it is time for everyone including the Daily Nebraskan to stop hedging.

The Ad Hoc Committee must bring the question of sophomore choice in housing to a vote immediately. If the vote, including the administrators, is in favor of letting sophomores move off campus, the concept of students participating in policy decisions will justify itself and the road toward freedom in housing choice will be partly traveled.

If students on the committee are unable to convince Dean Snyder and Russ Brown that their arguments are reasonable and sound, then the committee should dissolve itself and the Senate will have to find another approach.

Dorms Should Sell Themselves

The desirability of dormitory living has come under question during the controversy over current University housing policy.

Not Meeting Needs

Obviously dormitories are not meeting the needs of students if many feel so strongly that they should be able to choose their own living environments.

Presumably some students would simply move out. However, a large number of students support Article V of the Bill of Rights because they think that dormitories would have to improve their facilities and programs in order to make them more attractive to students who have a choice of living environments. These students do not picture moving out, but getting a better experience in the dorms.

In other words, freedom of choice in student housing hopefully will make the dorms sell themselves and increase the educational benefits that they might offer — benefiting both the small number of students who might want to live somewhere else and the majority of students who do find the dorms satisfactory.

Practical Choice

If students could decide, many would find dormitory living a practical choice — they are centrally located, provide essentials such as food and laundry facilities, and have space for meetings and informal socializing. However, through detailed planning and reform, competitive dormitories could become an ideal choice.

Ideas for dormitory improvements, which will be discussed in depth by the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Housing, appear to be limitless: better food preparation, more single rooms where pri-

The Daily Nebraskan feels that today the Student Senate should pass the bill of rights as it stands.

Last week when motions were made in Senate which insisted that students be given the immediate freedom of choosing their own living environments, the Daily Nebraskan could not completely support these motions. But in the Bill of Rights, Article V is not asking for immediate implementation, but rather it is stating a principle which is certainly valid and should be used as a guideline by Student Senate.

If Article V is passed by the students, it cannot possibly mean that students can immediately move out of the dorms. The reality which students must face if that policy, as opposed to philosophy, will have to be formulated by the appropriate people, sometimes at an unfortunately painstaking pace.

The principle of freedom of choice for all students should be a direction of policy.

As to the question of freshmen, the Daily Nebraskan feels that most freshmen probably should live in dorms, but the authority to place them there should come from the parents and not the administration. It has already been decided by the housing committee that parental approval will be required for all students under 21 to live off campus.

Furthermore a qualification eliminating freshmen in Article V is contrary to the concept of a Bill of Rights. If a qualification were inserted in the statement, then housing choice would not be a right to which students should be entitled, but rather a privilege which the administration grants—supposedly in the case of all students but freshmen.

It is, of course, highly desirable that freshmen do live in dorms because of certain educational advantages which help develop most young students, as well as other advantages outlined in the following editorial. But students if they were not compelled to would probably take greater heed of these advantages.

Article IV

However student senators feel, they should also realize it is their duty to pass Article V in order for the students to decide on its fate. If it is not passed by the students it would not be the end of student concern over housing because Article IV, which surely will be passed, will call for student participation in University policy-making decisions. Participating in housing decisions would then fall under this section.

If Article V does pass, it would be a firm statement of students' belief on the specific issue of housing.

vacancy would be maximized, more but smaller study areas where concentration would be easier, floor arrangements which would place students of similar interests and ability together, expanded coed visiting hours and liberalized women's regulations.

One large possibility is building dorms with suite-type room arrangements for students, especially upperclassmen, who want more intimate living conditions. As dormitories approach apartment design they would become more attractive to many more students. They would combine the conveniences and possibilities of group interaction which are now provided with the privacy of more secluded living.

Fulfill Goal

Possibly these types of dormitories would do more toward fulfilling the University's intended goal of providing an atmosphere which enriches the student's education. A student would to an extent learn to interact in group living but he would also be able to more easily pursue his academic work.

A facet of education which so far the University has overlooked in its argument for dormitory living is that students must learn to depend on their own company and their own resources in handling every-day life. While apartment living teaches these lessons quickly and thoroughly, dorms could conceivably do the same in a limited manner.

Of course, even with greatly improved and diversified programs, dormitories would not be ideal for everyone. Students must be able to choose. When they are, those who choose dorms will undoubtedly get more for their money.

A Letter

The Daily Nebraskan received the following letter last Sunday in its office and found a reprint of the letter in its paper boxes on Tuesday. The letter in the paper boxes read:

"This Letter To The Editor Was Not Printed In The Daily Nebraskan. Dear Editor:

The article in the Friday, March 10, 1967, Daily Nebraskan revealing the Party for Student Action platform and the editorial lauding the actions of eight Nebraskans were, in my opinion, premature that other capable candidates will file for ASUN elective offices, and to already endorse two candidates is an example of biased reporting.

On most campus issues, the Daily Nebraskan does an accurate job of reporting, but in political elections it is easy to allow prejudice to enter a newspaper. The students at the University have a right to know all the issues—even if they are not in agreement with the Nebraskan's editorial staff.

I hope that in the upcoming election we get both sides of all the issues instead of the biased reports we have often received. The Nebraskan can be either a detriment or an asset to the campus—this campaign will provide a fine opportunity for the paper to prove which it is. Carol Bartlett

This letter is such an obviously "dirty" campaign trick by some candidate that the Daily Nebraskan really hates to even waste the space in the paper for a reply.

The first sentence, "This Letter To The Editor Was Not Printed In The Daily Nebraskan," is supposed to have great significance, but, of course, the letter's author forgot to point out that the paper never received the letter until late Sunday afternoon long after Monday's letters were already sent to the printer.

As for the content of the letter, the Nebraskan will praise individuals whenever we feel they are worthy of being recognized. It should be pointed out that of the eight students praised in Friday's paper, no one party was represented and certainly no one philosophical belief. But this is besides the point. If the Nebraskan felt that only one group deserved praise—that is the only one who would receive it on the paper's editorial page.

The Nebraskan did not consider that editorial endorsement of any kind—nor could anyone except possibly those people running for ASUN offices who realize they deserve no such recognition.

As for the news content of the paper, every reporter on the Nebraskan staff knows that all news—especially political news—must be objective. We will continue to report news on all announced ASUN candidates and the organization of any political parties.



BOB SAMUELSON'S

All The Lonely People

Maximum choice within existing framework. In my opinion, this is the goal of housing which students should be seeking.

Complete Choice

There are many who maintain that University students should have final and complete choice in their housing. This leads the way, they would say, to ultimate student determination of all policies and regulations which affect students.

After considerable thought and much soul searching on this subject in order to determine what I feel is in actuality in the best interests of University students in particular and the University as a whole, I have had serious misgivings about total student determination of life outside the classroom at this time.

With the CFDP's first policy statements on this idea last spring, I immediately reacted unfavorably against such a proposal. Then I began to consider the implications on such statements with less adverse reaction to them, and I became convinced that if enough students could be made to favor this extreme point of view things at the University might begin to change. Idealistically there is no logical argument against such a philosophy.

But as students of a University, we have surrendered, rightly or wrongly, some of the rights we would possess as individuals outside the confines of this institution. This is true historically and courts have upheld the country's universities' policies of restrictions on students based upon "in loco parentis."

Only recently have courts shown a slight tendency to step back from their original decisions, but it was a long time before the Supreme Court reversed earlier civil rights decisions in its Brown Vs. Board of Education at Topeka decision.

It may be equally as long for the law to change in regard to "in loco parentis."

Article V

The point of all this, and I think the point is pertinent to the situation of housing (Article No. 5 of the Bill of Rights) and other areas of administrative control of students.

Under present Board of Regents By-Laws, the Board can require all freshmen to live in on-campus housing. There is nothing we as students can do about this except to oppose the law in principle and wait for the courts to catch up with our thinking.

In the meantime, we must work within the system for maximum flexibility. Total student control of students desirable or not, is in the future, not the present.

Equitable Participation

We can, however, demand equitable participation in those decisions which affect us, and as courts liberalize, our definitions of what is equitable and what is not may rightly change.

Happily and rightly the University's Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is quite willing to share his decision-making powers, and he has demonstrated this willingness.

The most important election issue on campus this spring should be how students can gain some reasonable (and equitable) voice in rules that affect them, making sure that the bodies on which they serve have a real and final voice (subject to the proper channel of appeals) in the areas in which they work.

Committees which are only advisory are not, repeat are not, acceptable. This is the real issue at hand: How do we achieve this equitable participation—the maximum choice within the existing framework with a real voice.

Our Man Hoppe

Sir Ronald's Enchanting



Arthur Hoppe

Well, as you remember, Sir Ronald and his faithful squire, Sancho Notzger, had barely entered The Tangled Thicket in search of the Unruh, that fearsome creature who dwelt somewhere within its murky depths.

White Charger
Sir Ronald had dismounted from his handsome white charger and with his famed Swinging Sword he was cutting a brave swath through the magical Bureaucratic Brambles, which screamed pitifully at every nick, almost as though they were human.

"Hola!" said Sir Ronald suddenly, raising the tinted visor that kept falling down over his eyes. "What manner of enchanted vision is this! Idescry far off to the East?"

"What does it look like, Sire?" said Sancho.

Mirage

"Why, Sire," said Sancho, frowning, "it would seem to be a big white house that somehow shimmers and glitters, advances and recedes, looms large and fades. A mirage, if I be not

mistaken."

"Oh, no, Sire," said Sancho happily. "It is the Tantalizing Treasure! How fortunate we are. While all shining knights who pass this way see it, few have drawn this close. Look, it is now almost within your grasp!"

"Hmmm," said Sir Ronald. "Why should I grasp for it?"

To Horse

"Why, Sire," said Sancho surprised, "it is filled with fame and power and treasures beyond one's imagination, Quick, to horse! We must pursue it least some other knight captures it first."

"Hold, there, variet!" said Sir Ronald irritably. "I have pledged my sacred word to serve the people of my beloved Golden State for four long years, here in The Tangled Thicket. And I am not about to sneedaddle off after some Tantalizing Treasure."

Sancho was amazed. "But, Sire, the Tantalizing Treasure always casts an enchantment over any knight who sees it. Invari-

ably, he flies off in all directions spouting oratory, slaying mythical dragons..."

For Purity

"Oh, I felt the temptation," said Sir Ronald, nodding. "But I merely mumbled my battle cry, 'For Purity! For Righteousness! For Just Plain Goodness! And I gave no further thought to yielding.'"

"But, Sire, the fame, the fortune, the..."

"A pox on fame and fortune; I shall not seek the Treasure."

Of course you might keep an eye on it, Sancho," he added, "in case it comes seeking me."

"Verily, sometimes I think I serve the most clever of masters," said Sancho to himself proudly. Then he scowled and scratched his head. "Either that, or he's some kind of nut."

All right, children, sleepy-pie. No, you," just have to wait and see how it all comes out. There, there, I know you can hardly wait. Daddy feels the same.

Quiet Desperation

...by Jerry Olson

Once again the time draws near for the student body to select its leaders in the ASUN for the upcoming year. And for the third time in as many years, a new political party is born. Two parties have come and gone. But what will happen to the third?

Lasting Influence

The Party for Student Action (PSA) is, from all indications, destined to become a lasting and influential campus political party. It has drawn from the failures of its predecessors and patterned itself after national political parties. PSA is not a one issue party to be committed out of existence. Nor is it a mutual election society to be dissolved immediately after the April elections.

PSA is based on a variety of fundamental concepts: a firm commitment to the welfare of the students in the University community; practical and reasonable proposals to effect change and fulfillment of long-range plans; and experienced leadership which will be sensitive to the desires of the students.

The outstanding attribute of the Party for Student Action is its attitude of commitment to the student and his pragmatic approach to the accomplishment of long-range goals. The founders of PSA are people with a long record of service in student government.

Need For Change

They realize the necessity for change in the University but they also recognize that cooperation and confident student participation in policy-making are the most effective methods of achieving their goals.

What does PSA mean to the student? It means the rational implementation of the Bill of Rights to insure the students have those conditions indispensable to the achievement of their education.

It means that the welfare of the student not only in the University community, but in the local and state communities will be increased through student government. It means the quality of education will be improved through student involvement.

The Party for Student Action is designed to act in the interest of the students. It is a progressive party, but by no means radical. It offers confident leadership toward the goal of a better University which will meet the needs of today's students.

Campus Opinion

AWS Elections A Farce

Dear Editor:

Congratulations to the new AWS Board members, who almost without exception were able to command the blind faith of hundreds of University women at Wednesday's election.

Yes, once again the women on campus have placed tremendous trust in AWS representatives about whom they know absolutely nothing. Once again AWS will be manned with coeds infamous for activity points and large sorority backings. And once again AWS Board members will feel responsible to no one and to no campaign espoused principles. For, with few exceptions, these girls were allowed to be elected without ever stating their views publicly. They made no campaign promises because there were no campaigns.

Poster campaigns were eliminated by the present AWS Board. Limited as this type of campaign is, it would have been something. Also, final elections came as an anti-climax to the primary of last week. These are serious criticisms of present election policy of AWS.

However, the candidates themselves also deserve criticism. They made little effort to present their views on campus issues. Maybe they have no views or positions. Do they realize that they will actually have to vote and go on record sometime after they take office? It must scare them to think that they have no idea who or what they are representing, that they have no mandate from the women on campus because they did no more than put their names on the primary and final ballots.

But in any democracy, the blame must eventually rest with the voters. The candidates were made to take no stand whatsoever on housing regulations or women's hours. They were allowed to avoid each and every issue. It must scare the women voters to know that their fate for the coming year rests largely in chance and the eeny-meeny-miny-mo vote they cast Wednesday.

For all these reasons, AWS Board can no more contend to represent the women on campus than can Dean Snyder. It would be hard to construe the election results as more than a popularity contest. AWS elections this year were a farce and a slap in the face to any thinking coed, indeed, to any citizen of a democracy. And to those women who did not vote this year, perhaps congratulations are in order. Under the circumstances, this was the only valid protest possible.

Toni L. Victor

Parent Speaks

Dear Editor:

Perchance a parent should have no voice here but I do have a question to ask. Recently I wrote to my district senator urging him to vote against an increase in tuition at the University. His reply was that he had made a personal survey of students and of the 33 that he talked with most are not particularly concerned about an increase.

Is there that much apathy on campus? My generation is forever condemning your generation for protesting too much on almost every issue but are you leaving the fiscal protests up to us?

Judging by his letter, my senator is influenced by his constituents' opinions, so here is your chance to be heard. Write to your senator.

LaVerna B. Rush

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 90 No. 78

March 15, 1967

Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
TELEPHONE: 477-8711. Extensions 2588, 2589 and 2590.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$8 for the academic year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacation and exam periods, by the 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. Members of the Nebraska Association of Colleges and Universities are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated, Published at Room 51, Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Neb., 68512.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor: Wayne Krenacher; Managing Editor: Bruce Giles; News Editor: Jim Ekins; Night News Editor: Pat Bennett; Editorial Page Assistant: Susan Phillips; Sports Editor: Ed Jeonagoo; Assistant Sports Editor: Terry Grams; Senior Staff Writers: Julie Morris, Cheryl Trill, Randy Lee; Junior Staff Writers: Mick Lowe, David Buntala, Roger Bove, Jim Evinser, Dan Leuber, Paul Eaton, Mark Gordon, Chris Carlson; News Assistant: Eileen Wirth; Photographers: Mike Hayman, Doug Kester; Copy Editors: Ramsey Buntala, Lynn Ann Gotschall, Marty Dietrich, Jackie Glascock, Chris Rockwell, Diane Lindquist, Ann Hoopmeyer.

BUSINESS STAFF

Business Manager: Bob Gira; National Advertising Manager: Bruce Bove; Production Manager: Charlie Baxter; Classified Advertising Manager: Janet Rostman, John Fleming; Secretary: Ann Bouska; Business Assistant: Bob Carter, Glenn Friend, Sam Fuller, Chris Loupe, Kathy Schooley, Linda Jeffrey; Subscription Manager: Jim Buntz; Circulation Manager: Lynn Balthus; Circulation Assistant: Gary Meyer; Bookkeeping: Craig Martinson.