

The loss of a President

The loss of a president, what does it mean? There's no simple answer, but there are a number of areas which deserve some evaluation at this time.

As most people are well aware, the functions of university presidents and administrators have changed considerably in the past few years of campus conflict. Traditionally, the job of president of a university was one of prestige. The president of a university was respected. The notions of prestige and respect were popular, if not appropriate, because of the traditionally apolitical nature of the job of the president.

University presidents of days gone-by were above the filth of politics. Today they cannot escape the political liabilities and responsibilities of academic institutions—enter the politicians and mediators.

It would be nice for the record if we could say that President Joseph Soshnik left the University because he had become disgusted with the politics and frustrated with the moral compromises which were forced upon him. If these were the reasons, we could all sympathize with President Soshnik. And perhaps more importantly, if these were the reasons, we could all profit from such a bad commentary on the University.

Unfortunately, however, we don't know the exact reasons for President Soshnik's leaving. We can only speculate. We can only wonder why a man who has dedicated his life to improving education, a man who during his years of tenure at our university fought hard to thwart the depersonalizing trends of education, would want to leave.

Mick Moriarty

dear editor

Dear editor,

This letter is in response to the article in last Friday's *Daily Nebraskan* by the Women's Action Group. Even though anybody or any group in this country has the right to say what they feel about the actions of other persons or groups, such as the window art done by the Delta Upsilon fraternity men, is all this noise really going to do any good when directed towards these people (not all the DU men, I might add)?

I agreed with a lot of the positions held by women's lib, but I keep pondering to myself the question of where, then is the identity of a man and a woman? I personally feel that it's permissible to be able to tell a woman from a man in some other ways besides the fact that they look different, and I don't consider myself a "male chauvinist, either."

Scott Yahnke

Dear editor,

Responsible journalism practices require that reporters give accurate accounts of events they cover. When an account of a meeting is published, names of those who spoke must be correctly connected with the things they said.

I also might add that the possibility of passing such a law is highly unlikely. There will always be men who consider women as sex objects.

I really think that men are more vocal in expressing their sexuality than are women, but I also believe that there are women who think in these same terms.

Two wrongs don't make a right, so to speak, but there's no law that prohibits a sorority or other women's group from retaliating with a party advertised in the same form as the DU's did, only considering men as the sex objects in this case. It would be interesting to note what kind of reaction ensued.

In the account of the March 5 meeting of the Arts and Sciences faculty that appeared in the March 8 *Daily Nebraskan*, the reporter was not careful in note-taking. At no time during the meeting did I speak in opposition to the motion to postpone action on Professor Lyon's motion regarding Professor Rozman and the Regents. Neither did I at any time express frustration that I have had no chance at faculty meetings to vote on a resolution that expressed an opinion of the Regents' action. Such statements were made at the meeting, but I did not make them, nor do I agree with them.

For publishing a reporting error of this kind, I expect a published apology or

correction of the story.

William J. Wayne
Associate professor
of geology

March 5, 1971

Dear editor:

In my article in the *Nebraskan* of Tuesday, March 2, there was omitted a single paragraph. That paragraph follows: "At almost the very hour that Chancellor Varner was consulting the faculty over the Rozman case and claiming a real concern for improving the procedure by which Rozman-cases will be handled in the future, the University's counsel, Flavel Wright, was down at the legislature removing safeguards for faculty from the law proposed by Senator Holmquist of Oakland. Mr. Wright's amendments took away the right to a hearing for an untenured faculty member who was fired because he took part in campus disorders."

I hope we will hear more about this attempt to eliminate elementary due process for university people from state law. It should be added that faculty committee representatives were unable to find out in advance what position the University Corporation lawyers would take on the Holmquist Bill, and that the Corporation counsel even denied the request of faculty representatives to see what the proposed amendments were, at the time they were proposed. This kind of action by the University counsel contradicts Chancellor Varner's expressed concern that there be proper procedure in faculty disciplinary actions.

Nelson Potter

Good bye, Joe

It was back in the happier years when I first met Joseph Soshnik. He was the first administrator I ever interviewed as a reporter for the *Daily Nebraskan*. I can't remember exactly what we talked about during that afternoon in February 1968. It was inconsequential. But I remember being awed by such an influential man, at the time the vice chancellor for business and corporation secretary for the Board of Regents, who would take more than an hour to explain a complicate budget matter to a young reporter.

Those were the years when he had time to talk to student reporters. Those were times when the University and its chief administrators were not under almost daily fire from the governor, the Unicameral, the people and the demonstrators.

After Soshnik became president I increased my professional and personal associations with him. We talked frequently throughout 1969 and the early months of 1970. It was obvious that I was not talking to the same Soshnik—he just wasn't the same man who in 1968 savored every minute of his job and showed it. Of course there were challenges and problems back then, but nothing he and the University couldn't handle. By last year at this time I could see the gray creep into his hair and the lines find their home on his face. He lost the relaxed manner that characterized him several years ago, and he began to show the nervousness his job bred.

I think the end began last May, when in anger over Nixon's invasion of Cambodia hundreds of students occupied the Military and Naval Science Building. By midnight that fateful night, the President was forced into long, hasty, emotional, loud and bitter negotiations with the occupiers. It was a new experience for him, and it was just not the way Joe Soshnik did business.

The tragedy was that Soshnik sympathized with much of what the students were saying. But they didn't know it and he couldn't get it across to them. They were demanding reforms—many of them good reforms that Soshnik advocated and believed in—but things that he as President could not hope to deliver. And on the war, students didn't realize that Soshnik was as against it as they were. But his convictions against taking a public stand on Vietnam, or any issue he felt was political, were so longfetched that his integrity would not permit him to be pushed into something he felt would harm the University of Nebraska.



William F. Buckley Jr.

President-talk

Concerning the presidential contest, a few observations.

1. The disparagement of Mr. Nixon is concentrated, but somehow unimpassioned. It cannot compare with the quality of the disparagement of Lyndon Johnson a year before the 1968 primaries. On the other hand, Lyndon Johnson established at least temporarily a tradition of presidential instability which although the circumstances are greatly changed, endangers Mr. Nixon. Johnson was tumbled by his own party, following the New Hampshire primaries. There is no foreseen challenge to Richard Nixon from the Republican Party. Even so, the shakiness of Johnson carries implications of instability for any incumbent. In that sense Mr. Nixon is shakier than normally a President is at the completion of his first term; or so it would appear.

The formal popularity of Mr. Nixon is put at 49 per cent, down 10 points over a year ago. The obvious reason for the drop is natural public restiveness. A particular reason is the internalization of American distress during the past season. A year ago the campuses were exploding, and the intellectuals were signing their manifestos of estrangement. Now we undergo what has been called the Cooling of America.

The Cooling of America

This means two things. For one, the agitators are exercising restraint, whether because they believe it to be strategically useful or because they are worn out doesn't matter; the fact is, their resentment is unshaken. For another, those who respond to defend the stability of American institutions feel a certain release. It becomes less necessary to defend the establishment if you believe that the essential stability of the republic is not being challenged. This means that many Americans will be looking to Mr. Nixon in the ensuing months demanding that he seduce their support, rather than extending it to him automatically as a gesture of resistance to the agitators.

2. Senator Muskie's strength and his weakness issue from the same attributes. He is this season's Liberal Alternative, which puts him in the mainstream, and does not

Throughout the frightful ROTC occupation and the days later when the University was filled with protest, I could see that Soshnik was a different man. Perhaps his greatest problem was his greatest quality—immense sensitivity. He was sensitive to the students and their likes and dislikes. When they cursed him and screamed at him it cut deeply. He was also extremely sensitive to internal criticism from the Board of Regents on the handling of the May protest. When the hate mail began coming in from the citizens of Nebraska, that too cut deeply.

The repercussions from May were continuing when the Michael Davis case arose this fall. Without regard to proper procedure, the Board of Regents decided to halt the pending appointment of the Michigan graduate student to a post in the Lincoln campus' philosophy department. Hardly had that episode died down when the Stephen L. Rozman case hit—and it was with this case, far more than in the Davis or Duke Hubbard affairs, that Soshnik caught the most flack from his campus community.

Some teachers and deans felt betrayed because their President had let the Board of Regents, again without regard to proper procedure, reach onto the campus and make a political scapegoat out of Stephen Rozman, a respected teacher who had done nothing wrong. Although I felt Soshnik could have handled the affair more forcefully, he knew that he could have stood on the Broyhill Fountain and proclaimed support for Rozman without changing the outcome of the affair. His voice would only have been added to others that were already too loud.

But I think the one incident that may well have convinced Soshnik to resign was a hunger protest staged outside of his Love Library several days after the Rozman firing. It concluded with the campus police, directed by Soshnik, arresting Ron Kurtenbach for trespassing. For more than an hour before the arrest I stood beside Soshnik, watching him almost in tears go through the formal disciplinary procedures before the arrest was made. I'm convinced that sorry incident, more than anything else in Soshnik's reign as president, persuaded him to become an investment banker.

Soshnik made his resignation decision some time before the budget war really broke out; he could foresee the coming of the biggest battle in the history of the institution. And he had put up with enough fighting.

John Dvorak
News Editor

the flight

begins?



Chescon
1971

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

MICK MORIARTY, editor
CONNIE WINKLER, managing editor
JOHN DVORAK, news editor
GENE HILLMAN, advertising manager
JAMES HORNER, chairman, publications committee

EDITORIAL STAFF

Staff writers: Gary Seacrest, Bill Smitherman, Jim Pedersen, Steve Strasser, Dave Brink, Marsha Bangert, Carol Goetschius, Charlie Harpster, Mike Wilkins, Jim Carver, Marsha Kahn, Bart Becker, Dennis Snyder, Vicki Pulos, Roxanne Rogers, Ann Pedersen, East campus editor: Mariene Timmerman, Sports editor: Jim Johnston, Sports writers: Steve Kadel, Warren Obr, Photographers: Mike Hayman, Gail Folds, Entertainment editor: Larry Kubert, Literary editor: Alan Boye, Artists: Linda Lake, Greg Scott, Design editor: Jim Gray, Copy editors: Tom Lampworth, Laura Willers, Don Russell, Night news editor: Leo Schleicher, Night news asst.: Rodney Wortmann.

BUSINESS STAFF

Coordinator: Sandra Carter, Salesmen: Steve Yates, Jane Kidwell, Greg Scott, Ray Pyle, Bill Cooley, Business assistant: Pam Baker, Distribution manager: Barry Pilger, John Waggoner, John Ingverson, Telephone editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Nebr. Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday through Friday during the school year except during vacation and exam periods. Member of the 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. Address: The *Daily Nebraskan*, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.