

Nebraskan editorial page

Adam C. Powell—the best decision?

As things stand now, Adam Clayton Powell will not be coming to campus. In one sense, this is probably good. For the time and money it takes to sponsor such a trip, the East Union Special Events Committee could find someone just as well-known with something more substantial to say. A speaker without a bombastic emotional display and of a higher quality of personal integrity is desired.

However there is a more basic item that needs to be considered. If the committee members, as student representatives, definitely want Powell, then he should be allowed on campus.

It would be impossible to tell how much, if any, administrative pressure was placed on members of the committee. Many persons have said there was no direct pressure and that the student members decided on their own not to invite Powell. Others say at least some subjective and indirect pressure was placed on the members of the committee.

Hopefully, there never was nor will be any under-the-table administrative skulduggery. One would like to conclude the best decision was made fairly.

Dear Regents: why living rules?

Talk at the University of Nebraska over the years about women's hours and keys, visitation and coeducational dormitory lounges is, at best, academic. When the Board of Regents gave approval to the coeducational lounge proposal this week, many persons felt that it was an important step to solving hours and visitation problems.

But what one should ask is why regulations are needed.

Possibly the Regents and University administrators think they are protecting the morals of students by establishing regulations. Or perhaps they want, as Regent Dick Herman says, "to insist that the privacy of all students is protected at all times and that study time is not to be interrupted."

Housing and visitation regulations exemplify an amazing paradox at the University. On one hand, students are expected to be "adults" and to be an effective force in society.

On the other, college students are so regulated that they become a group of grade school kiddies who can't be trusted. Then, only at that magic moment when the diploma is issued, does infantile student become grown up adult.

For the mature student, the large majority, housing and living regulations are neither needed nor wanted.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone Editor 472-3588, News 472-3589, Business 472-3590. Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$4 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods at 24 Nebraska Union, Lincoln Neb. Member of Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government.

Editorial Staff
 Editor: Roger Boyer; Managing Editor: Kent Cockson; News Editor: Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor: J. L. Schmidt; Dave Filipe; Editorial Assistant: Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor: Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor: Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers: John Overak, Bill Smitherman, Sara Schweider, Gary Seacrest, Steve Sinclair, Bachitar Singh, Linda McClure, Mike Barroff, Sue Pettey, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers: Dan Lacey, John Healscher, Jim Dean, John Hollenbergs, Mike Hayman; Copy Editors: Susan Jenkins, Susan Masick, Connie Winkler, Susan Schlichtensier, Val Marina.

Business Staff
 Business Manager: Ed Iaconigro; Local Ad Manager: J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager: Margaret Ann Brown; Bookkeeper: Ron Bowlin; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager: Janet Bowman; Circulation Manager: James Stelzer; Classified Ad Manager: June Wagoner; Advertising Representatives: J. L. Schmidt, Margaret Ann Brown, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.



"They're to prevent any militant take-over of this office...!"

Ron Alexander... RAPPING at random

The two largest colleges in the University, the college of Arts & Sciences, and Teacher's College, require all students to take at least two courses in the natural sciences. Science is the most disliked of the requirements with the possible exception of language.

Most liberal arts students feel the science requirement is a waste of time. It is a waste because the material is relevant only to those who need the tools for further work in their scientific field. It is wasted effort for non-science majors because they will never use the information in a normal living situation.

Basic information rarely stimulates the intellect, this material is learned not because it is interesting or exciting but because of the requirement and the needed grade. If the science courses provided thought-provoking material they would be worth the time investment.

For liberal arts majors it is difficult to justify taking science courses in lieu of other courses that meet the concerns of today. The information gained from a science courses is useless on this count.

Resulting from this irrelevant material is a distaste for the sciences. Courses in which the students study only for the grade lose their potential for meaning. The sciences suffer as have the languages, in having to gear down courses so the majority of students will pass.

Departments end up worrying about minimum standards instead of maximum intellectual challenge.

Important also is the inequality of competition. Beginning courses pit engineering and science majors against education and liberal arts majors. The former have a vested interest in learning basics for their careers. Whereas science and engineering

majors have specific courses in the liberal arts designed for non-major requirements such as English 21 & 22 or History 91 & 92, no such options are available for liberal arts students in the sciences.

The argument that the science requirement broadens one's education comes into clearer perspective when one considers the equally broadening experience of working in a packing plant or traveling for a month abroad, neither of which is now required.

What is necessary then, is for the science departments to create courses for non-majors which provide a more relevant introduction to the sciences and are of interest to students.

A course in the history of scientific ideas might cover major conceptual discoveries such as the atomic theory, the theory of evolution, and Einstein's theory of relativity between energy and matter. A possible alternative might cover the adaptation of the scientific method to the 'other' sciences such as political social sciences.

Another course might deal with the history of technology, showing the development of technology and the application of it to man's problems: The relationship between society and technology.

Still another course could focus on great men in the field of science. Albert Einstein, Charles Darwin, and Isaac Newton contributed too much to civilization for us to be unaware of their discoveries and the significance of these discoveries.

If these courses were offered to non-majors I think interest in science and knowledge of scientific matters would be increased. Perhaps in offering these courses we could abandon the ideas of requirements.

So we should work to create science courses which will aid non-scientists in achieving a decent respect and meaningful understanding of science.

Inside Report New York City selects a mayor

By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

New York — A sudden loss of support by City Controller Mario Procaccino, law-and-order Democratic nominee for mayor of New York, can be directly attributed to the success of his enemies in goading him out of seclusion.

The battle plan by his managers to limit Procaccino's visibility to the absolute minimum was conclusively demolished last week when he agreed to three televised debates with his two rivals — Mayor John V. Lindsay, running for reelection as the Liberal party nominee after losing the Republican nomination, and state Sen. John Marchi, nominee of the Republican and Conservative parties.

Those debates might well accelerate a decline by Procaccino which has caused far more concern among his backers than they will admit publicly. Privately, they acknowledge that his huge lead of the summer has been severely narrowed. Lindsay has gained a little ground, but the most dramatic progress has been made by Marchi. What just a few weeks ago seemed a certain runaway by Procaccino is now a three-way race where the result is unpredictable.

The reason is the abandonment of the strategy responsible for Procaccino's upset victory in the June Democratic primary: keep out of sight while maintaining an iron-hard anti-crime posture sure to appeal to this terrorized city's middle-income whites. Moreover, simply by staying unveiled, Procaccino gained through the summer to increase his lead.

But after Labor Day, Procaccino began popping up on the television screens with shrill answers to the charges of his enemies. What New Yorkers saw was no steadfast nemesis of crime and anarchy but a highly excitable little man with a weakness for malapropism.

What finally lifted the veil was the charge (made under needling from a TV newsman) by J. Raymond Jones, Harlem Democratic leader who is supporting Lindsay, that Procaccino was a coward. When he heard of it, Procaccino dissolved into tears among campaign aides. Even if it lost him the election, he told friends, he could not bear for his family to carry with them forever the shame of alleged cowardice. Rejecting the advice of old pro Democrats, Procaccino agreed last week to the debates.

Against this chaos, the smoothly-directed, lavishly-financed Lindsay campaign is making some small progress — mainly among lower-middle-income Jewish voters who have turned against the mayor as champion of the Negroes. In recent encounters with generally hostile groups in Brooklyn synagogues, Lindsay has won applause by attacking the Vietnam war. In the past week, Vietnam has become a major theme of his campaign.

But the really dramatic progress has been made by Marchi, regarded as a poor third through the summer.

Coolly dignified and self-possessed (though a bit long-winded), Marchi is making progress among the middle-income whites who detest Lindsay's establishment liberalism but now wonder whether Procaccino really fits the role of mayor of the nation's largest city.

Nothing grows in middle of the road

by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

Washington — It is possible that if Richard Nixon were John Kennedy or Dwight Eisenhower he might be able to make his "middle view" on Vietnam a salable commodity.

But the trouble is that the President has so thoroughly exhausted the old political trick of being in the middle of the road that when he does try to take a position — as on Vietnam — he sounds not as though he were seriously recommending a course of action for his countrymen to follow but as though he were scoring another point in a campaign debate.

It is clear, for example, that the President cannot support the proposal of Sen. Charles Goodell (R-N.Y.) to make the end of 1970 the deadline for American troops to withdraw.

He cannot do this because it interferes with his plan to hold on in Vietnam with decreasing vigor but with determination until Hanoi agrees to the kind of fig leaf he thinks he needs as the price of total withdrawal.

Mr. Nixon chose to dispute Goodell, but not head-on, as a man might who had a plan he wanted to sell. He chose instead the slippery argument that the Goodell plan might prevent him from getting the troops out even before the end of 1970. It was a curious debating trick, intended to make the President sound a little more Dovish than Goodell. And it was followed at once by the declaration that he would support the Thieu government, which made him a Hawk again.

It is an old practice of American politicians to denounce the extremes and seize the middle ground. Theodore Roosevelt was a champion at the technique. But it is successful — as it was with Roosevelt — only when the middle position actually represents a strong belief between two real extremes.

Mr. Nixon has mastered the technique, but not the beliefs. Take, for example, his press conference remarks on school integration.

On inflation, too, the President carefully paved two sides of the road in order to predetermine where the middle would be. No serious economist believes that the way to halt inflation is to "jawbone," as the President defined the extreme.

The middle of the road is a fine place, but as James B. Weaver, the Populist candidate for President in 1892 and the first American politician to use the phrase, remarked of it: "The trouble with the middle of the road is that nothing grows there."

Beth Cowgill

Open forum

Dear Editor:

Having read the article in The Daily Nebraskan (Sept. 29), concerning the budget for the university, we have come to the conclusion that it would be advisable for anyone connected with higher education to enter the fields of either coaching students and faculty or coaching football in order to provide for himself an outrageously comfortable living.

H. M. Gilde
Matt Baudler

M, the stadium announcers called the attention of the crowd to the presence of the President of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, asking recognition for him.

We find this action highly inappropriate and objectionable for the University of Nebraska, or for any of its representatives. The Order of Elks is a racist organization. Title III, Chapter 6, Section 144, of its national constitution begins:

"No person shall be accepted as a member of this Order unless he be a white male citizen of the United States of America..."

Even though a private organization may still have the legal right to select its own members, we believe that public recognition of any racist organization by this university is reprehensible, immoral, and beyond all limits of propriety for any institution supported by public funds.

We wish to recommend greater circumspection, in the future, in giving public recognition or support to racially discriminatory organizations.

Michael K. Davis, Del E. Stiles, Ed Strayer, Cherry Kellison, Michael McGrady, William A. Davis, John Weeks, John P. Shaw, Joe Augustine, Nelson Potter

Jr. Phyllis Vergzla, William D. Staley, William C. Saints, faculty members of the Philosophy Department.

Dear Editor: As one of those "women holding babies (who) don't quite understand" to which your article on women's rights referred (Sept. 25), I must say that when it comes to the repeal of abortion laws, no, I don't understand at all.

Perhaps this is because of the very fact that I am a mother — as many repeal advocates are not. Giving birth is an awe-inspiring thing. Through it, one can appreciate the tremendous significance of human life in

perhaps a unique way. Reform is in some ways necessary. But to advocate repeal is to say that human life has no value.

Everyone agrees that to bring about an abortion is to destroy a potential human being. However, abortion advocates pounce on the word "potential," emphasizing that the fetus is not yet human. But when does humanity come?

Physically the human organism is in a constant state of growth, change and degeneration from the moment of conception until death. Mentally, we all know people who have not achieved humanity no matter what their age.

Any sort of line, drawn at say four or five months, after which the fetus is supposedly capable of living outside the womb, has to be purely arbitrary. Isn't the day of the test tube baby close to scientific reality?

It is ironic that on one end of the spectrum we are fighting so hard to save human life, through the repeal of capitol punishment, an end to the war in Vietnam, etc., when on the other end of the spectrum we are

fighting for the right of arbitrarily destroying life if we so choose.

When people advocate the repeal of capital punishment, they usually argue that no matter what the man's crime he does not deserve such a punishment and that the chances of convicting an innocent man are too great. Basically, they are arguing that human life is always too valuable to destroy, and that even if it were not, man is not capable of being a fair and just destroyer. Shouldn't these same arguments apply to the unborn child?

Shouldn't our goal rather be trying to make the world a place in which the child could receive a fair opportunity for life rather than in gaining the legal opportunity of deciding if, from the point of view of our own personal convenience, it might not be easier to have that life terminated?

In his hierarchy of values, each man has one thing which he values above all others. If this is not properly the value of human life, then what can it possibly be?



Madeline Fischer