

Open Discussion . . .

Rocky Path

Omaha voters have set the state's educational system on a new path, but that path is not yet without some major impediments.

The major emphasis has been placed on the benefits that Omaha University will receive, and it is probably true that Omaha University will reap the greatest benefits. Because of this, opponents of the merger have argued that out-state Nebraskans should not be forced to pay the burden of Omaha University costs.

Unfortunately these people are the same individuals who consistently fail to look beyond a small inconvenience to the great long-range benefits. If the merger will improve education for those 8,700 students at the Omaha University (and there is every indication that it will), surely the entire state will benefit.

However the real test of the success of the merger will come at the next session of the Legislature when both out-state Nebraskans and Omahans will be asked to adequately finance this new educational complex. Omahans, who may have voted for the merger merely to relieve themselves of the financial burden placed on them will find themselves still faced with the same problem, except that the burden will be spread over more people.

Unless Nebraskans are willing to adequately finance the multi-campus University, not only Omaha University, but the University of Nebraska at Lincoln will suffer as well. The University of Nebraska at Lincoln could be faced with serious financial limitations if Nebraskans do not realize the potential of the multi-campus University.

There are other growing pains that will have to be either solved or endured

by University of Nebraska students as the merger is effected.

Perhaps it will be advantageous to move entire schools or departments to the Omaha campus. Some students may find it very inconvenient to change campuses in the middle of their college career, and some professors might find it rather inconvenient to move their families from their Lincoln home to Omaha.

Likewise, will programs such as the pass-fail system and faculty evaluation, now operative on the University of Nebraska campus, be expanded to include the Omaha campus?

Indeed there are some very real problems, many of them relating to students and professors, that will need to be solved in the next six months. But they can be solved.

The Daily Nebraskan urges Chancellor Hardin and the Board of Regents to recognize and admit these problems at the outset and seek student and faculty help in solving them. Only when students and faculty are assured that these problems are a real concern of administration and the Board of Regents, and only when students realize that their help and consideration is being sought in solving these problems, will the merger become an easier task.

The OU-NU merger has great potential for the state of Nebraska and may be just the start of an integrated school system within the state that will encompass the state colleges and junior colleges as well.

The Daily Nebraskan calls for all concerned parties—the Regents, the administration, the faculty and the students—to openly discuss problems and their solutions now and not when rumors have forced all sides back against a wall.



"THAT'S RIGHT SON. FROM NOW ON YOU HAVE TO BE BAPTIZED A CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR TO GET A 1-0 DEFERMENT."

Who Goes To Heaven?

Once upon a time there were three brothers who liked to save things.

Tom was a miser and worried about saving only bits of string, pieces of tinfoil, old telephone books and money.

Mostly money.

Dick was selfish and worried about saving only himself.

But Albemarle was a born leader and he worried about saving the whole, wide, wonderful world.

Tom grew up to be the richest miser in history and was universally feared. Albemarle grew up to be the greatest leader in history and was universally respected. But Dick . . . Well, Dick didn't grow up to be anything much of anything. And he worried about that, too.

"I wish I were feared like Tom or respected like Albemarle," he would say wistfully sometimes. But, actually, he was too worried about saving himself to give the matter much thought.

He worried about saving his hair, which was growing thin, and saving his waistline, which was growing fat, and saving his liver, so he gave up martinis.

He also worried, of course, about saving his job, so he worked hard; and saving his credit rating, so he paid his bills the first of every month.

But mostly he worried about saving his reputation. So he was pleasant to his neighbors, kindly to the office boys, gave the proper amounts to the proper chari-

ties and tried to take the right stands on the right issues of the day. Though he never did much about any of them.

"You shouldn't be so selfish," Albemarle would chide him. "You should forget yourself and think of others."

Albemarle, being a born leader, was always thinking of others.

As a young man, he thought about the downtrodden peons of Picapeel and led a plot to blow up the Royal Palace. Unfortunately, the bomb misfired and demolished the local orphanage instead, but Albemarle was widely hailed as a leader of the oppressed.

As a great general he led his troops to victory in the famous Battle of Clyde's Corners in which 50,000 men were killed on each side. And in later life, he directed the glorious crusade to free the Hottentots, which he did. Though most of them were wiped out in the process.

At last, the three brothers lay dying and an Angel appeared to lead one to Heaven. "I'm all packed," said Albemarle with his crowd-pleasing grin. But the Angel pointed at Dick.

"Me?" said Dick, surprised. "But I'm thoroughly selfish and have done precious little good whatsoever."

"Good gracious!" said the Angel. "We don't reward men for the good they do in their lives, but rather for the harm they don't do. Otherwise, there wouldn't be anyone in Heaven."

Moral: If you want to save the world, be selfish: think first of yourself.

Motion Pictures Need Etiquette

BY LARRY ECKHOLT

There comes a time when it is necessary to expound on the relationship of the viewer and the motion picture to each other. Although it would be impossible to enforce, nothing would serve the motion picture as an art form better than to lay down specific rules of etiquette in viewing the motion picture.

The other art forms have unwritten laws for the audience. I have never been a member of a concert audience that blatantly offends a soloist if he makes a mistake. I have never witnessed an art exhibit where persons who dislike a particular piece of art outwardly express that dislike to the point of desecrating it.

But I have been a member of many a movie audience in which certain people show their disgust, and in many instances, their immaturity, when they do not like a certain movie. I am not attacking an individual's right to express himself on his likes and dislikes, but I am voicing my dissatisfaction of those who think it is perfectly within their rights to ruin a motion picture for others.

When it boils down to equality, every viewer at a Lincoln theatre has paid the same price for the ticket at any particular performance. This gives each the same right to enjoy a movie at his level of enjoyment. But with trends in the motion picture moving as they are, it is becoming increasingly evident that people are going to have to choose more discriminatingly which movies they want to see.

One of those trends is the sprinkling of nudity that is finding its way into more and more theatres across the country. Since "The Pawnbroker", the first American movie released with the Motion Picture Association of America's seal of approval to contain footage of non-nude bare-breasted women (!), more movies contain more nudity. Before, the MPAA seal was needed by most movies to be shown in a "respectable theatre" in the U.S. Now, many are released without seals, and still are booked in "fashionable theatres" without any trouble. These movies get such publicity and should not cause the waiting of horror-stricken viewers' comments immediately after flashed on the screen. "Blow-Up", "Reflections in a Golden Eye", "Hawaii," and "The Bible," all have one thing in common: they contain controversial nude scenes that send some people to the restroom in disbelief. How could such a thing be shown in Lincoln?

Many times the acting, the story, the music (or the lack of it) bother people to the point of audible reaction in the theatre. Granted, many times the actor may not be getting across and deserves critical attention. But it is necessary for the viewer to grunt and groan, hiss and howl, just because Marlon Brando is having a hard time communicating to that viewer?

In "The Family Way" four impish teenyboppers sat across the aisle from me, and nearly drove those around them to the point of frenzy. Although the movie was about the sexual problems of a newly married couple who were also teenagers, it could not be classified as the right type of movie for four immature girls to pass the time away. They showed their maturity by guffawing at every scene that embarrassed them.

People's reactions to "Ulysses" were predictable. Never had such language been brought to the screen. But never had such skill been used to undertake the filming of a piece of art like "Ulysses" and been so successful, and the general public was "warned" before seeing it.

My latest experience with the "lazy audience" was Friday night when seeing "Accident." This movie seemed to be over the head of just about every member of the audience. It is quite possible that many thought they were going to see "Grand Prix" but went to the wrong Cooper theatre. Nonetheless, there were some who made noisy, inane remarks about the plausibility of the movie after they themselves had walked in after one-quarter of the film was already shown. For the first time I noticed an uneasy feeling about the audience when a movie was vying for only visual perception rather than a combination of the audible and visual that most people experience. Many times the movie had little or no sound, and I heard people remark that there must be camera trouble.

So, in summation, I offer five suggestions: (1) Don't walk in a movie after it has started; you lose much of its aesthetic value. (2) Be more discriminating in your selections, but if you make a bad judgement don't take it out on the rest of the audience. (3) Remember that actors and directors make mistakes often, and rarely is there a perfect movie. (4) This is a time when many new experiments are being tried in the art of the film, so put things in the proper perspective, and (5) There are still plenty of westerns, spy movies and grade-B comedies to keep anybody entertained. People won't mind noisiness there. They probably won't know the difference.

Pass-Fail Receives Mixed Reaction

. . . Freshmen Anxiety Drops

By INTERCOLLEGIATE PRESS

Amherst, Mass.—The Office of Institutional Studies recently conducted a national survey of the "pass-fail" option at the request of the chairman of a Faculty Senate subcommittee on the campus of the University of Massachusetts.

Results: At Pomona College, juniors and seniors have had the pass-fail option available in elective courses outside their major for the past eight years. All freshman seminars are graded pass-fail. A student is allowed up to two courses a semester under this option with a maximum of four such courses to count toward graduation.

VALID USES
The respondent felt that although a few students try to manipulate the option to improve their grade point average (GPA) — neither pass nor fail is registered in a student's cumulative average — valid uses far outnumber possible abuses . . . making the program a general success.

At Ohio State University, seniors, graduate students and professional students have been allowed to take certain courses under the pass-fail system in selected schools and colleges including the graduate school and the Schools of Medicine and Education for "several years."

SPECIFIED COURSES
Included are all courses in medicine and specified courses either in or outside the student's major, e.g., thesis, minor problems, special seminars. There is no specific policy on the number of such courses a student may take and while the students will receive credit hours for an S (satisfactory) neither the S nor the E counts in his GPA. The respondent regarded their program, as outlined above, successful.

The California Institute of Technology began a pass-fail grading system in the fall of 1964 as an experiment to "encourage the development of an attitude in which a student sees himself as a self-guided scholar rather than as a competing grade-getter."

NO OPTION
Their program is unique in that there is no real option — all courses in the student's curriculum, which all freshmen must take are graded this way but no upper division courses (with the exception of one) area available under the pass-fail option. This policy was so successful

that it became permanent in May, 1966 as a result of a "unanimous less one" faculty vote.

Among the reasons for adopting this policy permanently was the fact that the freshman attrition rate decreased considerably and that freshmen anxiety was not as evident. The morale among sophomores who had participated in the pass-fail program was also considerably higher. One negative effect was that some freshmen had "so conditioned themselves to the top awards that they suffered a real psychological shock when these awards, in the form of grades, were not obtainable."

ONE TERM
Of the remaining six respondents presently offering the pass-fail option, only Stanford University, with one year of experience, has had this policy in effect longer than one term. At all six schools the option was available to both juniors and seniors and all but one to sophomores as well.

All freshmen at Stanford and the University of California (Berkeley) and second term freshmen at Tufts University are allowed to participate in this program. At only two of the six institutions was the option limited to selected schools, but four of these respondents limited the option to courses outside the student's major.

MAJOR CONSENT
At Berkeley students were allowed to take courses in their major for a pass-fail grade with their major department's consent. At Oberlin College, although the option is generally available only in courses outside the student's major, "a faculty member may elect to have the Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory grade option apply for all students in a course. Enrollment in such a course does not deprive the student of his option."

At Tufts, Mount Holyoke College and Lehigh University, students were also allowed to take distribution requirements under the pass-fail option although at Lehigh foreign languages are excluded.

ONE PER TERM
At all six institutions a student was limited to one pass-fail course per term. Mount Holyoke restricts the number of such courses in a student's college career to three, Lehigh to four and Tufts to eight. At none of these schools was a grade of Pass entered in the student's GPA, but at Tufts,

Lehigh and Mount Holyoke "Fail" is included in the GPA.

Conclusions: Most of the respondents felt it was too early to judge how successful their policy had been. One school, however, although feeling it was too early to justify any firm judgment, felt that all students were not using the pass-fail as had been intended.

SAFE PASS
While the faculty had hoped students would use it as an opportunity to "explore new fields and broaden the base of their education," many students appeared to be using it to schedule a safe pass and reduce study and grade pressure.

Although there are many variations on the regulations governing pass-fail, several practices seem widespread. Generally, freshmen are not allowed the option. The student, is usually only allowed one course a term, frequently with a maximum number of credits to be earned this way, and then not generally in his major field.

Practice seems split on whether it should be available in all schools. There is some indication that individual schools or departments should be allowed to decide which courses will be available. And finally, although a pass does not affect the GPA, fail often does.

Dear Editor:

Regarding Hyde Park's obituary notice in your Friday paper. Before Hyde Park is done away with by editorial fiat of the Daily Nebraskan, a few things should be considered.

The Nebraskan, with the typical journalistic eye for the sensational, bemoans the lack of articulate and controversial speakers (Carl Davidson), the dwindling of the crowds, and, nostalgically laments the end to "the novelty of it all." Hyde Park, in other words, is no longer front page copy, and the Nebraskan's reporters despairingly ask spectators "How am I supposed to write up something like this?" The fact that Bruce Giles and Julie Morris no longer find Hyde Park worthwhile or "entertaining," however, seems to be insufficient reason for calling for its replacement.

A few questions. Could not the present "slump" in Hyde Park be, not an aberration, but rather a reflection of the whole status quo at NU this semester (e.g. therapy of Vietnam Week (and every other), ASUN and, in the Nebraskan's words, its "dead senators" and indeed the stagnation of virtually every campus organization this year)? Would not "R.I.P. U. of N." be more appropriate?

Are the oratorical offerings of the speakers any less significant simply because they do not ripple glibly from the tongues of a charismatic Carl Davidson or a budding Bill Buckley?

I commented to a Nebraskan reporter that many of the arguments at Hyde Park had been reduced to the level of cliches. I have not changed my mind since then, but to paraphrase Bel Kaufman, "If everything sounds like a cliché, perhaps you have been around too long."

CAMPUS OPINION: Whose Orbit?

To the freshman just in from Two Forks High (or Omaha Westside, for that matter), who has seen things only from the viewpoint of the Kiewit Daily and his DAR-approved civics book, the "clichéd" arguments may be a revelatory and educational experience.

The fact that something may be boring or trite does not preclude the possibility of learning from it. (Those disagreeing can build a beautiful bonfire with the texts of English 1 and 2, Poli. 20, Economics 11, Math 105, etc.)

And what is the Nebraskan's alternative?—"A monthly student panel featuring administration or student government representatives or campus personalities who currently figure in a campus issue." In other words, a structured, exclusionist panel with inherent limits to the variety of topics open to consideration.

To me, the weakness of Hyde Park is, ironically, also its strength and best factor. Its unstructured nature allows anyone to speak on any topic he pleases, not just on some "issue" The Daily Nebraskan or Administration may consider worthwhile at the time.

And are the Daily Nebraskan's motives in calling for the abolition of Hyde Park beyond question? As the Nebraskan and anyone who has attended a few Hyde Park sessions is aware, the Daily Nebraskan itself is often a target. Speakers occasionally complain about the letter(s) to-the-editor not printed, the columns that were arbitrarily cut, the "Pro-Left" or "Pro-Right" bias of the paper, etc.

One should be wary I think, when those in the positions to shape and influence opinion call for the elimination of their only, if crippled, competitor.

Joe L. Olson

Dear Editor:

In your Dec 8 issue, you note that Sen. Al Spangler has contended that there would be no student demonstrations against campus recruitment for the Armed Forces if recruiters were barred from the campus.

A principle this penetrating deserves extension into other areas of University problems.

There would be, for instance, no poor grades if all students deserved 4.0 averages; no student apathy if all projects and organizations were disbanded; and an end to one of the principle sources of intellectual buffonery on the ASUN if Sen. Spangler were to serve the remainder of his term in silence.

Robert P. Kemmy

P.S. General Hershey feels there would be no student demonstrations if student demonstrators were drafted.

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 51, No. 51
Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Telephone: Business 472-2582, News 472-2589
Subscription rate \$75 per semester or \$150 for the academic year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations 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 Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.
Member: Associated Collegiate Press National Advertising Service. Incorporated. Published at Room 51, Nebraskan Union, Lincoln, Neb. 68515
EDITORIAL STAFF
Editor Bruce Giles, Managing Editor Jack Todd, News Editor Cheryl Pratt, Night News Editor Alan Plesman, Editorial Page Assistant Julie Morris, Sports Editor Mark Gordon, Assistant Sports Editor Charlie Davies, Assistant Night News Editor Randy Gray, Staff Writers Dave Boutan, Andy Corzian Gary Gilen, Ed Jennings, Sherry Melan, Jan Parks, Christie Schweickhardt, Louise Matthews, Brent Skinner, Kent Cookson, Senior Copy Editor, Dick Testimier, Copy Editors, Lynn Gottschalk, Betsy Penmore, Jim Evinger, John Schmidt, Photographers Mike Hayman and Dan Ladley.
BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager Glenn Frenzel, National Advertising Manager Roger Boye, Production Manager Charlie Santner, Editorial Page Assistant Julie Morris, and Classified Ad Manager Subscription Manager James Rosen, Circulation Managers David Kovacs and Gary Meyer, Sales Managers Don Crum, Kathy Drath, Rick Henschel, Ken Miller, Warren Moore and Ray Pyle.