

Today's need: Initiative

Editor's note: The following essay by Jeffery Johnson, University student and Harper Hall resident, is an observation on the plight of the student at a university.

Can the student, in today's vast multiversities, still find himself as an individual, or is he destined to become a computerized punch card filling a space in the monolithic amphitheatres of today's universities?

This is a question which sociologists, students, and laymen alike have put before themselves, to try to arrive at a sound reevaluation of our educational system. Has the race for lunar supremacy with the Soviet Union forced the student's own originality and sensitivities into a place subservient to that of the all too important grade point?

The answers to these questions have really very little bearing on the individual, for through such euphemisms as "total education" the rulers in the vast labyrinth of administration have glossed over the problem with a veneer of faulty reassurance that the students' growth is of utmost importance. As they vie amongst themselves for the glittering research grants and the intellectual prestige of power the undergraduate is literally thrown into the sea, whether he can swim or not.

They, through their deep-rooted negligence for the undergraduate student, have placed the individual in a position of finding his own place in the community, and all the deliberation of sociologists (doubtless on a research grant) are of little importance to the individual trying to find his place in the multiversity. Or is the student really trying to find his place, trying to nurture his own seeds of individuality?

The student today, well aware of his position in the community, through the constant reminders of the news media, can very easily not attempt to find himself, and can prepare a fairly valid rationalization for his position through the ceaseless barrage of charts, reports, and statistics which are ever shedding new light on the plight of the student.

The stench of conformity which surrounds a university campus accurately illustrates the insecurity which the individual harbors, and instills in him a set of values which clearly belong to no single individual, but, rather, the values of the "group," a species which is becoming increasingly common across the country.

The "group's" philosophy has given refuge to the countless numbers on administration files. It has allowed the students to sing out a uniform cry of appeal for greater individual freedom. But what could be a richer field than the salutary neglect by administration for the individuals' growth?

In other words, the neglect by the university has laid open a boundless area for intellectual growth on the part of the student. And it is, therefore, up to him to find himself, to develop in a way both rewarding to himself and beneficial to society. It all hinges on the fact of whether he is willing to use this opportunity or become stagnant in his growth.

John Reiser

Dick by default

You're now reading in the space where I planned to give instructions on aiding the Rockefeller candidacy, which is no more.

Unless something completely bizarre or unforeseen happens, Dick Nixon will be nominated by the Republican convention in August.

Hearts and Hands



All interest in the Nebraska primary will now be on the Democratic side, since Americus Liberator is as strong as anyone challenging Nixon on the Republican side.

All this is pretty disheartening for me. It is a hard thing to exert oneself on behalf of a candidacy which never materializes.

What the moderate-liberal wing of the party will do now is uncertain. The candidacy of Pat Paulsen will gather steam—particularly with this dynamic leader scheduled for a timely appearance in Nebraska next month.

Some of us may write-in Tom Scantlebury, who possesses the virtue of being the most exciting basketball player I've ever seen. Johnny Carson may garner home-state support.

Probably the most realistic course for moderate Republicans is to attempt to work within their own party and to exert its much influence as possible upon Richard Nixon. This is the course most will choose, I'd guess.

As far as a race for the nomination goes, the Democrats now have the "only game in town" and some Republicans may choose, just for the devil of it, to play in that game.

For those who choose to try to beat Johnson with Nixon, whoever their previous favorite, the only course is to vote for Nixon on May 14th.

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 91, No. 53 March 22, 1968

Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. TELEPHONE: Editor 472-2388, News 472-2389, Business 472-2390. Subscription rates are by per semester or \$4 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 ownership by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraska are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor Cheryl Tritt; Managing Editor Jack Todd; News Editor Ed Jensen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Editorial Page Assistant Jane Wanner; Assistant Night News Editor Wilbur Getz; Sports Editor George Kaufman; Assistant Sports Editor Bonnie Bonneau; News Assistant Lynn H. "Shy" Smith; Staff Writers: Jim Evings, Barb Martin, Mark Gordon, Jan Parks, Joan McCullough, Janet Maxwell, Andy Cunningham, Jim Pedersen, Monica Pehony, Phyllis Addison, Kent Cocksam, Brent Simes, Nancy Wood, John Dvorak, Keith Williams; Senior Copy Editor Lynn Gottschalk; Copy Editors: Betsy Pennington, Dave Hill, Jane Datta, Molly Stewart, Christie Schwartzkopf; Photographers: Mike Horvath and Dan Lebeck.

BUSINESS STAFF

Business Manager Glenn Frensdorf; Production Manager Charlie Banzler; National Ad Manager Leota Machey; Bookkeeper and classified ad manager Gary Hollingsworth; Business Secretary Jan Boudreau; Subscription Manager Jane Ross; Salesmen Dan Cronk, Dan Looker, Kirby Dretsch, Todd Slaughter, Debbie Mitchell, Joel Davis, Lynn Wondolka.

Campus opinion

Dear Editor:

This letter is in regard to Al Spangler's column as it appeared in the Nebraskan last week. I should be made clear at the beginning that I dislike appearing to defend Governor Wallace, but Truth makes her own demands and the shortcomings of his position need some correction.

In his first paragraph, he suggests that Governor Wallace crossed into Nebraska with the intention of causing a riot, I infer that this suggestion is based on the fact that a riot took place after he had spoken.

He notes that Governor Wallace permitted the demonstrators to disturb the proceedings just long enough to turn the crowd into a mob. Two questions arise: one, what would he have said if they had been kicked out on the mere suspicion of anticipation of trouble? And, two, why couldn't the demonstrators have sat quietly as they had been invited to, or have ostentatiously but peacefully walked out?

I submit that the fifty or so who were expelled by the police were under no obligation to play into the Governor's hands, yet his article gives the impression that if the Governor had lost an eye to one of the placards jammed at this face, he would accuse him of skillfully manipulating the crowd's sympathies.

Robert Kemmy

William F. Buckley Jr. . . .

And the race is on . . .

The entry into the Presidential race of Senator Robert Kennedy has greatly excited European observers, some of whom have decidedly deep views on American politics. The routine observation that here is the Bobby we all used to be familiar with, coming through as the opportunist par excellence, is little meditated upon, perhaps because Europeans believe that it is innocence beyond the call of duty for sophisticated people to remark opportunism in a politician.

What else if not opportunistic? They are uninterested in that feature of the Kennedy candidacy. And the news that he was booed by people who cheered him a year ago at the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York is put down as yet another sign of the charming naivete of Americans.

The focus, pure and simple, is on the likely effects of Kennedy's entry in the race, on Johnson's chances of re-election, and the Democratic party's performance in Chicago and, finally, in November. The assumption is that Kennedy and McCarthy will make a deal, that although it is true that McCarthy and Kennedy do not particularly like each other, and true that the moral initiative is securely in McCarthy's hands, the dynamics of the political situation are

both clear and compulsive: They are that the two must somehow arrive in Chicago having fused their votes.

How else could they behave considering that their appeal has got to be based on the idealistic desire to replace President Johnson? How, in the weeks and months to come can Senator McCarthy or Senator Kennedy say: "Vote for me not because you love me, or because I desire to be President, but because the future of the Republic depends on the replacement of Lyndon Johnson" . . . when it is tacit that the proviso dangles. However, "better Johnson than McCarthy."

In other words, the moral plausibility of the two gentlemen is bound to depend on their arriving at terms on the basis of which the support of the one will go to the other at the crucial moment. Those terms will be negotiated — an act of negotiation only just less difficult than the negotiation that everyone so ardently seeks between the North and the South Vietnamese. Kennedy is likely to say: "Let the polls, or the actual primary votes, determine which one of us is the front runner. Let the runner-up drop out." Mr. Kennedy has every reason to be confi-

Professors speak . . .

Greener grows the grass

Editor's Note: Today's contributor, Dr. Harry Cannon, is the director of the University's Counseling Service.

(From time to time, I get discouraged. There are too few staff associates to do a job, a colleague or superior is being unusually obtuse and stubborn, and I start to consider other universities where the grass might be greener. Once what's wrong with the University has been fully developed, however, I sometimes move on in my ruminations in the following vein.)

I am a Nebraskan.

In point of fact, I was Pennsylvania born and raised, never quite became a Virginian, and migrated to the Great American Desert with not a few misgivings. My becoming a Nebraskan had mostly to do with the people here at the University. It also has very much to do with being a member of a University community that is experiencing a quiet revolution. For example:

Being a Nebraskan (NU)

means being a part of a Free University program that is one of the largest and most diverse in the country. Honest. A research psychologist friend at the Berkeley Center of R&D in Higher Education tells me that we have more students enrolling in NFU than any institution outside of San Francisco State. And the NFU drop-out rate is no worse than it is at that granddaddy of free universities.

Being a Nebraskan (NU) means having a Nebraska undergraduate (Gene Pokorny) invited as a consultant to an Eastern college seminar on experimental approaches to higher education. They could have invited someone from Berkeley, or Michigan, or Yale. They invited a Nebraskan.

Being a Nebraskan (NU) means working with students who are trying to instill some hope in ghetto kids. The YWCA, Wesley Foundation, Lutheran Student Association (and others, I'm sure) are actively mucking around

in the despair that is made part of being black. These students are effectively prodding some of us on the staff to develop additional resources to meet the needs of non-white Nebraskans.

Being a Nebraskan (NU) means talking to Nevitt Sanford, Congressman Conyers, Dick Gregory, Senator Carpenter, Joan Baez, Congressman Denney. It means exchanging views with them as disturbed, angry, enthusiastic in face-to-face encounters with people who have intense commitments. It means testing my own ideas in the face of their counter-arguments, and frequently finding my reasoning in need of finer honing.

Being a Nebraskan (NU) means being nagged by students to study the effects of pass-fail, to evaluate the impact of the NFU, to assess the practicality of student-initiated innovations in education. Note that the staff, in this instance, are being asked by students to perform the jobs they ought to be per-

Orangeburg troubles

(CPS) — About 700 black students, the majority of them from South Carolina State College, gathered outside the South Carolina State House this week to present a petition to Gov. Robert E. McNair.

The students, who also intended their presence as a protest against the fatal shootings of their students at S.C. State last month and the arrest of six students who entered the Senate chamber in the State House last week, were met by about 150 police, many of them wore gas masks and carried nightsticks.

There was no violence, although around noon several students rushed up the stairs, leading into the State House, and were turned back by the police.

Gov. McNair refused to meet with the students, but Lt. Gov. John C. West agreed to talk with a delegation. He promised the group of 17 students who talked with him that their list of grievances would be read on the state Senate floor.

The list, in the form of a petition, included a request that open hearings be held into the deaths of the three students in Orangeburg, and that the six students arrested in the Senate last week be tried by the Senators.

The petition said the six should come to trial in the Senate because they were arrested while attempting to present grievances relating to the Orangeburg shootings to the Senators.



Enacting what others ponder

Charles Marxer officially announced yesterday his plans for the Nebraska Draft Resistance Union and some of the reactions he received were painfully typical of the University's usual response to liberal ideas.

It was rather amusing to observe the worried glances of administrators who apparently expected an outbreak of violence after the Union's plans were revealed. There was also a fair gathering of uniformed ROTC enthusiasts mumbling derogatory remarks on the fringes of an unexpectedly large crowd.

Some student reactions were typical, however, and their numbers will increase as the Vietnam War plods endlessly along with no sign of "light at the end of the tunnel."

The Draft Resistance Union is certainly not a Nebraska innovation. They are being formed on many campuses throughout the country to inform and aid the growing number of draft age men who find the Vietnam War and the conscription laws morally unacceptable.

The Union proposes returning of draft cards, draft card burning, non-registration, non-cooperation and induction refusal. These acts of resistance defy the law and its consequences, but these men have selected these actions rather than subject themselves to an undemocratic draft system and involve themselves in an immoral war.

The NDRU feels that academic protests in the form of letters, sign holding demonstrations and 1000-signature petitions are not going to force the Administration to reconsider its Vietnam policy or to change the draft laws—and it is right.

Too many people escape making moral decisions about the Vietnam War by claiming that the subject is so complex it is presumptuous to question the policies.

But more and more students are asking why an American death toll of 20,000 men, a troop commitment of one half million men who are not winning, or a child maimed by a grenade or napalm are such complex situations that they should not only be questioned but acted upon. And these are the men the Union has been formed to help.

The NDRU will not find a flock of disillusioned Nebraskans at its door but they will find a small (growing) number of individuals who have reached the difficult decision that their consciences will not allow them to obey unjust laws simply because they are laws.

The Union and the men it counsels will not find their acts of resistance widely acclaimed in Nebraska and perhaps their methods will not even be effective, but they are to be admired and applauded for having the courage to enact what others only dare to ponder.

Cheryl Tritt

Dan Looker . . .

Up for grabs

The one thing that all Democrats have in common these days is their speculation about what effect Sen. Robert Kennedy's entrance into the race will have. The estimates vary, of course, depending on whether Johnson, McCarthy, or Kennedy backers are doing the talking.

At last University Democrats are going to hear the unadulterated truth — Johnson can only be hurt by Kennedy's bid, McCarthy is still a strong contender, and Kennedy's efforts make stopping Johnson at the convention a realistic possibility.

J. James Exon (a Johnson supporter and Vice Chairman of the State Democratic Party) was quoted in the Sunday Journal and Star as predicting that Kennedy would take away votes from McCarthy. From the results of my own personal poll this isn't true.

McCarthy backers are worse than Tareyton smokers for stubborn loyalty and they aren't switching. McCarthy already has a tremendous student organization in Nebraska colleges ready to campaign for him. There are quite a few Republicans as well as Democrats in the McCarthy organization. Very few students in either party are switching to Kennedy.

Does this mean that Kennedy doesn't have a chance? No, there are Kennedy supporters around, too. Most of them did not throw their weight behind McCarthy because he wasn't "professional" enough and because his campaign seemed one-sided. Many Kennedy backers had been resigned to Johnson until last Saturday.

If McCarthy backers aren't switching and if some of the party regulars are moving towards Kennedy, then how can Exon be so optimistic? It seems that Johnson men are going to be plagued by an embarrassing credibility gap in the next few months.

If both McCarthy and Kennedy are strong candidates, then which one should Democrats support? It's largely a matter of personal taste. The differences between the two anti-war candidates have been exaggerated.

McCarthy has been accused of not being dynamic enough and of conducting a one-sided campaign. Yet, a man who almost won the New Hampshire primary single-handed has to be a courageous forceful individual. The main reason that McCarthy's campaign has seemed one-sided is due to the incomplete coverage he received in the press before he proved himself in New Hampshire.

Kennedy has been cast as a cynical opportunist who let McCarthy do all the work for him. But Kennedy did not make it easy on himself by waiting. McCarthy already has a large delegate block behind him. Since there are only 14 primaries Kennedy will have to get much of his support from professional politicians rather than from delegates elected in primaries. It's one thing to convince the voters that they should reject Johnson (as McCarthy seems to be doing) and another thing to convince politicians that they would risk their careers to reject Johnson (as Kennedy will have to do).

Kennedy knew that he faced an uphill fight when he entered the race last Saturday. Yet, he threw himself into the struggle. It would be hard to say that this, also, does not take a great deal of courage.

In Nebraska McCarthy has the advantage of not alienating disillusioned Republicans the way Kennedy often does. Yet Kennedy has brought the old Phil Sorenson and JFK machinery to bear against Johnson—which can only be construed as a victory for the anti-Johnson forces.

The only advice I can give Democrats is to work hard for the candidate you prefer and don't sling mud against the opponents, you may be working for him in November.