

For 19 voting

After graduation from high school a 19-year-old usually finds himself in one of three situations. He can continue his education, he can join the working order or he can enter the armed services-voluntarily or otherwise.

In Nebraska and in 45 other states a 19-year-old has no voice in selecting the people who appropriate finances for his higher education, the people who approve the draft laws or the people who help formulate tax levels. In short he can not vote.

A group of University students last week launched a campaign for the passage of Amendment No. 1 to lower the state voting age to 19. These students and the several prominent Nebraska citizens who are supporting them feel that 19 and 20-year-olds can vote intelligently and maturely and because of their increasing responsibilities and significance in society they should be given voting privileges.

Several studies have been done on voter responsibility and they have produced some interesting results which enhance the argument for a lower voting age.

In 1963 a Presidential Commission on Voter Registration and Participation discovered that the most delinquent voters are found in the 21-30 age group.

The Commission's rationale for these statistics was that after graduating from today's high school students have reached a peak in their understanding of government and politics. By removing these youths from direct participation in government their enthusiasm wanes and by the time the majority of them reach voting age they have grown apathetic toward politics.

If young adults, however, are given voting privileges soon after they graduate their interest in governmental activities could be sustained and their voting habits would improve in later years. Strong arguments for a lowered voting age have been presented for many years as was shown in 1954 when the U.S. House of Representatives approved a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. (The proposal was later defeated by only five votes in the U.S. Senate.)

Today's youth are better educated, better informed and more involved in national issues than ever before. Thousands of young adults are serving America in the Peace Corps, VISTA and the armed services.

Thousands of others are influencing national programs and policies through well-organized student groups such as the National Student Association.

The young adult's role on a national level has increased to the level where only the absence of voting privilege is retaining him from achieving his full potential in society.

If Nebraska For Young Adults Suffrage conducts an enthusiastic and well-planned campaign (as it appears they will) Nebraska voters should approve Amendment No. 1 next fall. This group has not achieved its goal by a long way, however, and University students should vigorously promote this campaign.

Cheryl Tritt

Craig Dreeszen Student power

Student power can mean almost anything; to me it means students participating in making decisions affecting them and the University. Merely influencing decisions is not enough — students must help make the decisions.

By making decisions students also accept the accompanying responsibility. Some people think that students should be protected from the consequences of their decisions. They seem to be saying that until students are prepared to face the world we should be guided and mothered. Then at graduation time we suddenly are men and women ready to face the world.

But it doesn't work that way. People don't rely on THE AUTHORITY all their lives and then become self-reliant. When students are kept from making their own decisions, they become people who vote Republican just because their fathers did and go to Vietnam just because Father Johnson says they should.

Some people justify treating college students like children on the grounds that it contributes to their "total education." That of course is nonsense.

To what extent do students have power at the University of Nebraska. In the area of academics students are beginning to be involved in the decision making process. There are voting student members on curriculum planning committees and some department committees. Some proposals of the advisory boards and the ASUN Education Committee have been implemented.

We generally can be happy with the progress made in student involvement in education. By continuing to demonstrate responsible judgement we will have more and more to say about how we are educated.

Outside the classroom the students aren't doing as well. Administrators, faculty, and Regents should do no more than advise the students regarding hours, coeducation or the student newspaper. There should be rules — but the students should make them.

The Regents say students shouldn't run their own lives while at the University because it is tax supported and the taxpayers want their children well protected.

I do not accept this for two reasons.

First, no one has ever bothered to discover what the taxpayers want. Secondly the taxpayers. If they do feel that way they are wrong and not much attention should be paid to them. No other state agency operates on the whims of uninformed taxpayers. The Regents should make policy decisions based on educational principles then justify those decisions to the people. We can make changes by working through the channels — nearly every advance so far has come about that way — but they came slowly.

There is an alternative. We should remember power in the form of rent strikes, boycotts, sit-ins that as a last resort students can wield tremendous and general strikes.

We should always first try the legitimate channels of making changes. If those are completely exhausted without results, students can threaten some sort of militant action.



Joseph Alsop . . .

In praise of a great man

Washington — Now that Robert S. McNamara has laid down the overwhelming burden that he carried so nobly and for so long, a farewell word is in order. The first thing to be said is very simple, indeed.

McNamara, MGeorge Bundy and Dean Rusk were the chief civilian advisers who pressed upon President Johnson the need to enter the war in Vietnam, in order to avoid disaster in Asia and in the Pacific. Contrary to common report, he does not regret that advice today. He is still quite firmly convinced, in fact, that it was the right advice.

A different impression has been conveyed, mainly by far-from-disinterested persons but also for a reason rooted in McNamara's complex and wholly admirable personal character. He is supposed to be an arrogant man, and when he is dealing with statistical tables, of which he is such a master, he is perhaps arrogant. But in the main, he is humble and quick to admit his own mistakes.

He has talked rather freely, in private conversations which have been repeated with additions and distortions of the mistakes he has made during the war in Vietnam. These mistakes have had nothing to do with the need to fight the war,

in order to avert a much larger disaster that might well have led to third world war.

They have instead had to do with McNamara's curious way of looking at all processes, including war, in terms of exact measurement. At the outset, in fact, he obviously thought of the war as something like a computerized chess game, in which a given number of pieces could be expected to produce a given result at the end of a given number of moves.

But since the "war in lace ruffles" that occurred — but only sometimes occurred — in the 17th and 18th centuries, no major war has ever resembled a chess game. All have been slugging matches, in which the best way to win has always been to maximize your input, and to keep on maximizing your input, until the other side gave up.

Being a man who has spent his whole life thinking in terms of carefully calculated inputs producing exactly calculable outputs, McNamara as War Minister has been a very different man from McNamara as Defense Minister. He has been constantly unhappy, in time, he has been downright miserable because of the progress of the war — again all wars — has never been statistically measurable; and statistics

are the only measurement he regards as valid.

Because of this, the war's burden for McNamara, which would have been horribly heavy in any case, for he is a deeply humane man, has been even heavier than it ought to have been. And he has indeed sometimes made mistakes, though they have been quite different in character from the mistakes in forecasting and calculation that so much worry him.

He has been dead right, of course, to resist the fierce pressures for unlimited war from people of the stripe of Gen. Curtis LeMay. He was dead right, too, and damn brave as well, to insist upon a system of graduated pressures at the beginning of the war. The political arguments for this approach, in fact, unanswerable.

But in the light of hindsight, he was wrong not to urge the President to order callup and maybe even mobilization some time ago. He was wrong not to urge more troops for Gen. William Westmoreland, instead of scrutinizing every troop request with a statistically suspicious eye. He was wrong, in fact, not to go to the principle which is basic, that the wider the margin, the sooner a war is always over.

With a different sort of war

leader in the White House, these errors of temperament and bias would have mattered not a whit. In the larger balance sheet, moreover, their importance is nugatory. The plain fact of the matter is that Robert McNamara is demonstrably the greatest public servant to enter the executive branch of the U.S. government since this republic began.

In the war years, with the reservations above-noted, he has accomplished miracles. Maybe they were almost excessive miracles; for he has managed to run a very big war, with everything on hand in time and in good condition, in such a way that the average American with no son at the front has hardly felt a war was going on. But all this has been miraculous, nonetheless.

Still more miraculous was his reform and modernization of the vast Defense Department — that overgrown, bureaucratically diseased monstrosity which appeared to be beyond reform and incapable of modernization, when he boldly undertook the terrible task. He has made a record, in truth, surpassing any other comparable record one can think of. And long after the carping of the Fulbrights is utterly forgotten, history will always remember this record of McNamara's.

Today's music spectrum

Editor's Note: Ken Rose and Mark Dalton are University students and members of a local group 'The Antelope Pavillion'.

One of the most neglected albums on the market today is Love-Forever Changes. Love, a Los Angeles based group, is rather notorious for bad press relations, and seems to have shut off quite a large number of influential people "in the business" with the result being that virtually nothing has been seen in the mass media about them.

Perhaps this is good, though for remaining in the shadowy world of the pop underground, and recording for Elektra, which is still a semi-underground company, has allowed them to develop and grow in a very free environment, without the too-often emasculating necessity of catering to general public taste.

There are eleven songs on the album, nine of them written, arranged and sung by leader Arthur Lee and two of them written and sung by guitarist Bryan Maclean.

All cuts are excellent and a few are almost incredible. This is a beautiful album, in the traditional sense of beauty Not "trippy" or "freaky" or "camp", just plain pretty! Arthur Lee has one of the most versatile voices around and the songs which he has crafted demonstrate his abilities quite well.

His lyrics demonstrate a realistic sort of optimism that has been depressingly absent in current rock. For example in "You Set The Scene", certainly his most ambitious

work to date, he states:

"Everything I've seen is rearranging and for anyone who thinks it's strange,

Then you should be the first to want to make this change.

And for anyone who thinks that life is just a game, do you like the part you're playing?

Another interesting cut is "The Red Telephone" which takes its theme from the music in Marat-Sade, and is a gentle plea for a little sanity in the world at large.

Gentleness plays a large part indeed in Love's music. The songs by Bryan-Maclean, especially "OLD MAN" have a gentle beauty unmatched except, perhaps by Donovan at his best. Maclean has a lovely tenor voice and uses it to good advantage.

To sum up, Love is a group of some of the most polished, dedicated musicians in the country, and this is one of the finest albums on the market today.

Another album which con-

tains no less than 19 songs is the new Vanilla Fudge album — but is this a bargain? Hardly.

Apparently, what the Fudge is attempting to do in this album is a sort of musical "history" (a college of musical knowledge perhaps?) In Phase One, we progress from Mozart's "Divertimento No. 13 in F Major" to "Old Black Joe" to "In the Mood" to four early Beate songs.

Most of these songs are less than one minute long and the point the Fudge tries to make is lost in this desperate attempt at "high camp".

After suffering through Phase One, Phase Two is a welcome relief. The fudge do a fantastic job on Beethoven's "Für Elise" and "Moonlight Sonata". Mark Stein, the organist-pianist, deserves special mention, as his interpretation is both creative and technically proficient.

Tim Bogert, bassist also deserves credit for his tasteful, simple bass lines. The Fudge almost ruin the whole thing, however, by updating the final measures of "Moonlight Sonata". There's nothing

wrong with updating an old classic, but in this case it sounds cute.

On to Phase Three. Here, the Fudge do something fairly interesting called "Voices In Time." It begins with Neville Chamberlain's pre-World War II speech in which he says England and Germany are "never to go to war with one another again." These words become a ghostly echo as Nazi rallies in Berlin, Churchill's vow to teach Germany "a lesson," the announcement of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, the first atomic bomb blast, and Kennedy's funeral are heard.

"Voices In Time" is not music but it is a good, rather ironic documentary of 20th century man's good intentions and noble causes — and ultimate bumping.

Phase Four, the last and longest, is also the most distressing. (Rod McKuen fans will want to take note.) In this section, each member takes a turn to "express himself in a meaningful" way.

This means that Vince Martell, his voice choking with emotion, reads sickly-sweet poetry, that Tim Bogert tells us "what's happening on the scene", that drummer Carmine Appice reads from the Old Testament (at this point the Fudge needs spiritual guidance), and that Mark Stein makes funny laughing noises.

When the record mercifully ends, the listener is left with the idea that "The Beat Goes On" is a fine novelty album, but a lot of gimmicks cannot make up for too little music.

Roger Stark

The streets of Stockholm

For sheer natural beauty, Sweden ranks high among the nations of Scandinavia and the rest of Europe. Latitudinally, it lies slightly north of the U.S. and looks very similar to Minnesota, with its many lakes and wooded areas.

Stockholm is the capitol of Sweden, and, with approximately one million residents, is its largest city. The city is built on a series of islands, which only enhances the charm of this strategic seaport. It is an exciting experience to walk along the main streets of downtown Stockholm and pass directly in front of ocean liners from all parts of the world.

A walk in the suburbs of Stockholm, however, is a frightening experience, but one that leaves an equally big impression. For after leaving the city proper, one passes nothing but row after row of uniform, high rise apartment buildings, and row after row of barrack-type, uniform duplexes.

The "ticky-tacky suburbia" of American cities is heavily criticized, yet it compares in no way to the impersonal, collective, government housing of nearly 200,000 Stockholm residents.

The economic situation of Sweden is another alarming item, characterized by rising taxes attempting to curb rising inflation. Their standard of living is second only to that of the U.S., but due to their extreme sales tax, the average family of five persons spends about four dollars a week more than the American average.

Added to this, not only is their wage scale lower than ours, but they also pay a considerably higher income tax.

My sister is an architect in Stockholm. Before paying taxes, her salary is about 3/4 that of a comparable American job. After paying taxes (and after figuring the U.S. tax on an American wage), her salary is about 1/2 that of a comparable American job.

Last summer I worked as a waiter in one of Stockholm's largest restaurants. The chefs were the highest paid employees, and they consistently had between 45 and 50% of their salary deducted for personal income tax.

You may say, so what — everyone has to pay taxes. But let's examine the ramifications of this totally socialistic system. First of all, personal saving of money is nearly impossible due to the extreme tax on day-to-day living.

Therefore, upon retirement, everyone is provided with uniform living. It seems very irrational to give the government money all your working life, and then be totally dependent upon that government once you retire.

Secondly, due to their graduated income tax, an over-whelming majority of people in Sweden receive about the same take-home pay. Obviously, there is no need to worry about "keeping up with the Jones' (or the Johnsons)" in Sweden, since the government takes care of this for them.

Lastly, and most important, the socialist system of Sweden stifles the incentive to make money, and consequently, stifles the incentive to produce. The person who earns \$350 a month and takes home \$275 is not willing to produce more to earn \$400 a month and still take home only \$275. It is not uncommon for extremely wealthy persons in Sweden to only work six months a year, because to work any more would still result in the same net gain after taxes.

Anytime a person does not work up to his full potential, progress for all mankind is seriously hindered. In view of this fact, I find socialism very hard to justify.

Campus Opinion

Dear Editor:

I believe we should move towards a system of education in which the college student teaches himself and the teacher shows him how to teach himself-kind of like a counselor.

The superiority of this system is only a hypothesis, and would take extensive experimentation to prove. I imagine that here are also facts which might indicate that a self teaching system of college education might be very poor.

However, in favor of a self teaching system are:

A) Students would be highly motivated, since they knew their education lay entirely in their own hands.

B) Greater efficiency. A student would not be forced to move onto harder material until he felt he has mastered the basic foundation.

C) Greater Freedom. The student could choose the reference material he understood the best and was directed at his level.

D) Broader Education. He would not be limited to specific interest but would move into areas of special interest to him.

E) Greater understanding of education process. Since he would be directing his own education, he would be virtually interested in the whole meaning and methods of education so that he could learn the most and fastest.

F) It might be possible for a student to complete a degree in very short time, since he was not restricted to any amount of time he would have to spend on a topic, but could move on as soon as he understood it.

G) Enjoyment. Matter of education would be the students own thing. (This is especially important to hippies). Teachers could counsel students instead of teach them, giving them more time for their own work.

Joseph Schmit

Dear Editor,

The movie, How I Won the War is one of the best satires of the nature of war in this world to ever come along. I don't claim to be a critic, but it really has a message.

The mixing of music with scenes and the use of stock footage from ancient war pictures adds to the overall affect. John Lennon turned in a magnificent performance.

Does anyone else agree with me?

Cinematically,
Ex libris

Daily Nebraskan
March 4, 1968
Vol. 91, No. 72
Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
TELEPHONES: Editor 472-2588, News 472-2589, Business 472-2590.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$8 for the academic year.
Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during 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 publish.
Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
Editor Cheryl Tritt, Managing Editor Jack Todd, News Editor Ed Isonogole, Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt, Editorial Page Assistant Jane Waggoner, Assistant Night News Editor Wilbur Gentry, Sports Editor George Kaufmann, Staff Writers: Jim Eninger, Barn Martin, Mark Gordon, Jan Paris, Joan McCullough, Jane Maxwell, Andy Cunningham, Jim Pedersen, Monica Pokorny, Phyllis Anderson, Kent Cockson, Brent Skinner, John Dvorak, Senior Copy Editor Lynn Gutschalk; Copy Editors: Betsy Fontenore, Dave Ellis, Jane Heysa, Molly Merrill, Christie Schwartzkopf; Photographers Mike Hayman and Dan Ladsty.
Business Manager Glenn Frenzel; Production Manager Charlie Baxter; National Ad Manager Leeta Marbey; Bookkeeper and classified ads manager Gary Hollingsworth; Business Secretary Jan Roatman; Subscription Manager Jane Rose; Salesmen Dan Cronk, Dan Looker, Kathy Drelich, Todd Slaughter, Dennis Mitchell, Joel Davis, Lynn Womacque.