

The way it is in Supernation

We stack 'em up.
Killing, not free enterprise or free love, is the American Way of Life. We do not discriminate. We kill our presidents, our radicals, our paupers, our preachers.
We kill in small groups (16 in Texas, eight in Chicago) or larger groups (43 in Detroit, 23 in Newark.)
We started November 22, 1963. That day we killed John F. Kennedy. Since then we've killed Lee Harvey Oswald, Malcolm X, George Lincoln Rockwell. Last night we killed Martin Luther King. Last night the rioting started again. In Memphis. In Miami. In Harlem.
America. Beautiful! America. Like a giant tree with the saw of violence ripping through her middle. Our country. Rich. Civilized. Dangerous.
The question is knocking on the door again, louder than ever. Can we have peace in Supernation?
What is happening?
What the Hell is happening?

Jack Todd

Senatorial endorsements

No one is talking about the Senate election—except the candidates and even they are speaking in hushed voices and trying to determine why no one is beating a drum or organizing rallies down 16th St.
The answer isn't hard to define — no one has talked about Senate all year, because no one knew what was happening, within the quiet Senate chambers in the Union ballroom.
This year's administration can be soundly condemned for their communication failures within the Senate and within the University community. Unfortunately the Senate is only now beginning to realize their shortcomings, and the damage has been done.
Probably the saddest consequence of the Senate's breakdown in communications is that few people will ever believe that this was the most productive and progressive year that Senate has had—and it was.
The list of accomplishments is very impressive when viewed as a whole. Senate sponsored or co-sponsored Vietnam Week, World in Revolution, the Drug seminar, Model UN, a much more significant roster than in the past.
The amount of legislation and good constructive action taken is most significant — the disciplinary procedures bill, the massive educational reforms proposed, the publication board investigation, proposals for revising the advisors system, the Student Academic Freedom committee, the investigation launched into racial discrimination in housing and in Greek systems and the Special Projects committee which supported such campaigns as the minimum standards housing code.
But probably one of the most important bills will prove to be the communications bill passed last week. If the bill is carefully enacted next year senators will be available to their constituents more frequently and their committee work will be made more public. The days of the quietly gunning senator are over.
The placidity displayed by students toward the elections next week is not surprising but it is frightening. Many of the students who are running for office are unknown and the number of incumbent senators running is pathetically small. Because a candidate is earmarked with a party signature after his name it is not automatically qualify him a prospective senator.

The following candidates have been endorsed:
Business Administration: Tom Morgan, Tom Wiese
Teachers College—Curt Donaldson, Carole Maas,
Engineering and Architecture Bill Chaloupka, Arts and Sciences—Jim Humbleck, Dave Landis, Mary Lyane Neison, Rick Russell, Diane Theisen, Margaret Van Cleve, Bob Zucker.
Cheryl Tritt

Campus Opinion

Dear Editor:
In reply to the editorial dealing with Senator Kennedy's speech expressing his views of agriculture.
I believe there were a large number of students who were interested in what the Senator had to say concerning his agriculture policy.
Whether the people of this state or nation like it or not agriculture is the largest single industry as well as the largest single consumer of raw and manufactured goods in the United States.
40 per cent of the jobs in the U.S. are directly or indirectly related to agriculture. I believe agriculture is the basic reason why this country enjoys the highest standard of living of any country of the world.
I think it is about time the people of this country quit complaining about agriculture and instead support it.
I thought all Senator Kennedy's views were reasonable, well accepted, and especially appropriate to his audience of students at the University of Nebraska. A land grant university supported primarily by a state where agriculture is by far its largest industry.
Sincerely
Kent Anderson



A/F or why grading fails

Editor's Note: This paper was written by the author, John DeFrain, to explain why he boycotted an hour exam. The professor later told the class that the paper had convinced him to change his methods. The professor now plans to let the students give themselves the grade that they think they deserve at the semester's end.
If one accepts David Hume's argument that because everything has a cause there can be no free will, then I think it follows that the notion of grading one for his scholarly efforts is absurd. If one's behavior is determined by external factors of heredity and environment, as many psychologists believe, then praise or blame does not logically follow.
Students differ widely in educational background; it hardly seems fair to put one from Harlem up against one from barbecue-pit suburbia (when the standards of measurement are of a middle-class genre). One study has shown that ghetto children oftentimes score low on tests simply because they do not understand the words—the New Republic had a quiz for ghetto kids that I miserably flunked.
Rewarding a middle-class student for excelling when his background has all the cards stacked in his favor, and punishing (that is what grades are) the slower student, makes as much sense as having me race Jessie Owens in Berlin-1936 and beating me 20 times with a whip when I come out 40 yards behind in the 50-yard dash. When one works to his capacity—and who is to say when he is not—why punish him?
But then there will be the argument that backgrounds aside, some students are just plain lazy; students serve as a stimulus. A. S. Neill (Summerhill) suggests that no one is really lazy; they just lack interest in the work.
And he continues to argue that if one is not interested in a task, one will not learn. This makes sense. If I do not want to learn trigonometry, I will not learn it. If I really want a good grade, I probably will memorize the methods the night before the test (learn to "juggle figures," as a friend of mine says he passed chemistry) and forget them soon after.
Maybe one learns the stuff for an instant and forgets it

the instant after the reurgitation session (test). Nothing gained, really. Or, one could be interested in the subject, and with this internal motivation (grades are an external motivation), he will learn what he wishes to, ignore the rest. If he thinks he needs it, he will remember.
The point being that people remember only what they use. Any attempts by teachers to the contrary are fruitless, and the argument of grades as a motivator is destroyed if students want to learn the material in the first place.
Maybe a better way to look at the problem would be to ask, exactly what is the use of grades in our society? This brings up the question, what is the purpose of education? By our society's definition, education could not have much to do with happiness; with the high rate of student suicides it is obvious life in the multiversity is not much fun. Maybe the rewards of higher education (\$) will increase one's happiness, but the pursuit of knowledge as it is today cannot give much satisfaction, according to the barons of education, for without grades no one would study.
With the emphasis on letter-grades and gold stars and Phi Beta Kappa keys as a higher end than knowledge (can this not be true when one's thoughts are graded by percentage points), the virtue of contemplation is reduced to an absurdity.
I think grades do not measure what one knows; more, they show how much guts one has. The people I am acquainted with who get fantastic grades may be smart—most of them are—but this is irrelevant. Their primary characteristic unanimously is a tremendous ability to fol-

low orders, dig, dig, dig, read, read, and read more stuff that they could not care less about.
To me, they appear to be masochists. But there is method to their madness: in a few years, they will be the people who will count in society, the in crowd (2.7 TV sets, 1.4 before-dinner martinis, a Camaro). They will have proven that they know something, but more so that they can follow.
Ask any student and he will tell you that probably four out of his five courses are disasters. He has zero interest, zero motivation. Someone told him to take the course; he does so if he wishes to graduate.
It is the potential PBK, the student with guts, who crams all the worthless (to him) information into his brain. The others will scratch through any way they can (88% are not against cheating at NU).
I think one must throw out all of his idealistic notions of education when it comes to our schools in reality. Learning to think, preparing for life, developing individualism, happiness, what-have-you—forget it.
Ronald Reagan's definition fits the situation perfectly: the university's purpose is to perpetuate the existing society. And the existing society needs docile, hard-working people (do not attribute this to the governor) who can allow orders—"stupid bloody Tuesday men," in the words of the Beatles.
If universities were to produce thinking individuals, society would be in trouble; Henry David Thoreau simply would not take cigarette butts out of Coca-Cola bottles, or advertise "New-Improved Gleam" on the TV tube.
If one is not predisposed to

individualism and an unshackled search for knowledge, the present system is well. But I think it carries with it the seeds of its destruction.
We cannot go back, but always must be moving forward. But without fresh ideas, stagnation is inevitable. Mass-men (with apologies to Ortega Y Gasset) just do not cut the mustard. The great ideas common to our time were in the minds of only a few individuals not long ago. But grades stifle individualism.
What if we did not have grades? First of all, corporations would have to spend a lot of money making up tests for job applicants that universities have been doing for them for free. Tough darts.
Second, students might start thinking their own thoughts, instead of repeating professors'.
Students might not study per se so much, for study is to be abhorred. They would be learning, but it would be fun.
This reminds me of a speech Konrad Lorenz described in On Aggression: a group of scientists was honoring a noted member for his achievements and the fellow told them praise was silly.
He did what he did, not out of the goodness of his heart, but because he had fun doing it. If it wasn't fun, he would not have done it, he explained.
Many potential PBKs would be out drinking beer instead of booking. But that does not matter, for with the elaborate system of rewards and punishments taken out of the schools, a great revolution in our whole society would be at hand.
The thinkers, the seekers would be sought. It would be ever-changing, reform-minded society in which yes-men would not be needed.
With men free to explore their own minds, dignity would become an element of student-life.
The grading system is a huge, repugnant game: the hapless players are forced to play or else they lose the chance of gaining the glories our society has to bestow; they play by the instructor's rules, on his field, using his playing equipment with him as the only member of the audience; and, then, he has the audacity to be the only referee — he, who hardly knows me, tells me what I am worth.

Men like Hatfield, Lindsay, and Percy hold a great deal of promise for the GOP. The Republicans also are the only party with a realistic contender for the first Negro president—Edward Brooke. But instead of men like these, they pick losers. Nelson Rockefeller was once a promising progressive for the GOP, but he is aging, and 1968 may be the last time he will even be considered.
Once again, it seems that the Democrats will be the most vital party in American politics.
John Reiser
With Us Always
A good man is dead.
Dr. Martin Luther King joins the list of martyrs, black and white, who have given their lives that all men might be free.
Justice Holmes said that courage was the price of liberty. Dr. King personified courage. He had spoken before of the dangers in what he was doing for his country. But he went on. And so must we.
I remember watching on television as he addressed the "March on Washington" rally in 1963. In the shadow of the Lincoln Memorial, he said that America had given the black man a check marked "freedom, equality and opportunity," but that the check had come back marked "insufficient funds."
The unfinished business surviving Dr. Martin Luther King is for America to honor that check.
He was, of course, more than a civil rights leader. He was an example for all humanity. His Nobel Peace Prize was but a recognition of the non-violence which was his trademark. In a time marked by increasing use of violence, he was steadfast in his adherence to non-violence and that's what I mean by an example for all humanity.
Perhaps the worst part of all is that a man who lived by non-violence should perish as a result of senseless violence.
One man, probably, pulled the trigger, but many others loaded the gun. Hatred, vicious scar on the face of America, killed this good man as surely as a bullet. Too large a part of this nation nourished that hatred.
Too, all those who still today think that the work Dr. King started will end with his death, let the word go out: The struggle which he served—the struggle for the dignity and worth of all men, black and white—shall be won. The march upon the conscience of America will continue. More will come to succeed Martin Luther King, Jr. He did not live or die in vain.
To say that anyone could replace him would be to tell a great untruth, but we shall try to carry on. We shall overcome.
To say that he will be missed is the greatest understatement.
He shall be mourned wherever and whenever men of good-will gather. In death, it is possible to say of this good and Godly man, Martin Luther King, that he shall with us always be.
For that we may be grateful.

April sees resistance

(CPS)—Following is a calendar of anti-war events scheduled for April:
April 3 — Draft resistance demonstrations in major cities in which young men will turn in and burn their draft cards.
April 7 — Martin Luther King's poor people's campaign begins in Washington with the possibility of some accompanying antiwar demonstrations.
April 15 — The last day to file income taxes. The War Resisters League is urging opponents of the war not to pay their taxes or at least that part which supports the war.
April 15-16 — "Academic Days of Conscience" called by Resist, the group that has been encouraging young men to resist the draft. Demonstrations are expected at 400 campuses and will include a commemorative service for American and Vietnamese troops killed in Vietnam.
April 21-30 — "Ten days to shake the empire," a series of local demonstrations and organizing efforts against the war, sponsored primarily by Students for a Democratic Society.
April 25 — International student strike called by 900 student activists and co-ordinated by the Student Mobilization Committee in New York. At least 100 U.S. campuses are expected to participate plus student in foreign countries.
April 27 — Nationwide demonstrations against the war in at least 12 major cities, sponsored by the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee.

Take it away Democrats

For the last few weeks the usual headline stories—Vietnam and racial unrest—have been shoved into the inside pages of newspapers. In their place the front pages have been covered with names and initials—LBJ, Nixon, RFK—names of people who were doing a lot of talking about Vietnam and racial unrest.
Political speculation ran rampant on editorial pages and in television broadcasts, and much of it turned out to be wrong. Politics has been in the news so much that even this psyched-up liberal political columnist is getting tired of it all.
Sure, there's still plenty to speculate about. But I really don't know what Hanoi will do next; I don't know what's happening to LBJ's ratings in the polls now; nor could I tell you how Bobby and Gene will be getting along next week. If most of the other political columnists in the U.S. were honest with you, they would admit they don't know either.
Since speculation has become so common these days (and so much has been happening that it would probably be wrong anyway) let's pause and look back for a moment.
It wasn't that long ago when the 1968 election was considered to be a farce. It would be an empty choice between Johnson and Nixon. No one would dare oppose Johnson—then McCarthy entered the race. But of course Gene didn't have a chance; then he nearly won in New Hampshire. Kennedy would never oppose Johnson; he'd wait until 1972, right? Wrong again. He was branded as an opportunist but he's a major contender anyway.
Then last Sunday everything fell apart. President Johnson dropped out of the race and we all lost our scapegoat. Now the war in Vietnam may be coming to an end. Who knows what will happen in another year? Maybe there'll be a pro-American coup in Hanoi.
For a liberal, the stories in the papers these days are dream-like fables. There's almost nothing to complain about any more.
Who do we have to thank for all this? It's hard to believe, but the answer is the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is the only party which has openly debated the issues, the only one which has offered the people a real choice. This sounds like a Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner speech, but this year it's true. On top of that, an incumbent Democratic president capitulated to the will of the people last Sunday.
The Democratic Party is really no better than the Republican Party. But for some reason the Republicans never pick their best man. The Republicans probably have a longer list of promising young politicians.

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 91, No. 94 April 5, 1968
Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
TELEPHONE: Editor 473-2128, News 473-2280, Business 473-2280.
Subscription: 75c. a year \$4 per semester or \$6 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 choose to be printed.
Member Associated College Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
EDITORIAL STAFF
Editor Cheryl Tritt, Managing Editor Jack Todd, News Editor Ed Jennings, Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt, Editorial Page Assistant Jane Wassner, Assistant Editor News Editor Walter Gentry, Sports Editor George Kaufman, Assistant Sports Editor Susan Bonner, News Assistant Lynn Placost, Staff Writers: Jim Evinger, Barb Martin, Mark Gordon, Jay Paris, Joan McCullough, Janet Stewart, Andy Cunningham, Jir Pedersen, Monica Pulver, Phyllis Adlam, Kent Cochran, Brent Sitzer, Nancy Wood, John Lovrak, Keith Williams, Senior Copy Editor Lynn Gottschalk, Copy Editor Betty Fellman, Dave Filitt, Jane Barry, Kelly Marshall, Christie Schwartzkopf, Photographers Mike Hayden and Dan Lohdy.
Business Manager Glenn Friesel, Production Manager Charlie Baaker, National Ad Manager Linda Mackay, Bookkeeper and circulation aid manager Gary Hollingsworth, Business Secretary Jan Boatman, Subscription Manager Jane Sims, Salesman Dan Cronk, Dan Looker, Kathy Drenth, Todd Slaughter, Debbie Mitchell, Joel Davis, Lynn Wassner.