

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

### Appropriate power

Once again it's time to talk about happenings in the Greek system of this University. Actually, the action to be discussed is nothing new; the legacy of adviser intervention is strong. But this time there's a difference.

Recently it was decided that sorority membership quotas would be reduced from 90 to 85. In effect, this closes open rush to those houses with 85 or more members.

The quota reduction stems from the fact that some houses are not full at this time. It is argued that the reduction will encourage a more even distribution of members in all sorority houses.

Perhaps this logic is valid. The success of this tactic will not be known until spring or possibly next fall. So we can only wait. It could be pointed out that this fall all girls were asked to look at all houses during open houses in hopes that membership numbers would equalize themselves. Obviously, this did not work.

It may, in fact, be true that the student panhellenic delegates would have come to the same decision. The real problem here is how the decision of limited quotas was made.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. Jayne Anderson, panhellenic adviser, asked for "the support" of panhellenic after making the decision to limit membership in each of the sororities. It should be made clear here that Mrs. Anderson is an employee of the University, her title being Assistant in Student Affairs.

This decision was made by asking for the support of panhellenic delegates who are elected representatives of each sorority. There was no opportunity for each delegate to return to her house to determine the popular opinion of each group. In the great tradition of representative government, these delegates should consistently tap the opinions of their constituencies.

What is even sadder is the atmosphere which allowed the "approval" to be registered. Panhellenic is, after all, a student group. It has student officers. But for years, groups of officers have come and gone, taking their roles from the status quo and office atmosphere. They have been weak.

Panhellenic should be run by stronger, responsive student officers. Until this is a reality, policies of that organization will be nothing more than rubber stamped student concessions to University wishes.

Laura Willers

## OPINION & COMMENT

### THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

Editor: Gary Seacrest. Managing Editor: Laura Willers. News Editor: Steve Strasser. Advertising Manager: Barry Pilger. Publications Committee Chairman: James Horner.  
Staff writers: Bill Smitherman, Carol Strasser, Bart Becker, Linda Larson, Roxann Rogers, H.J. Cummins, Randy Beam, Duane Leibhart, Steve Anvanette, Cheryl Westcott. Sports editor: Jim Johnston. Photographers: Bill Ganzel, Gail Folds. Entertainment editor: Larry Kubert. Literary editors: Alan Boys, Lucy Kerchberger. East Campus writer: Terri Bedient. Artist: Al Chan. Copy editors: Tom Lansworth, Jim Clemons, Sara Trask, Jim Grey. Night editor: Leo Schleicher. News assistant: Carolyn Mull.

Coordinator: Jeri Haussler. Ad staff: Greg Scott, Beth Malashock, Jane Kidwell, Mick Moriarty, Jeff Aden, Steve Yates, O.J. Nelson, Suzi Goebel, Phil Merryweather, Larry Swanson, Laurel Marsh, Kris Collins, Secretary: Kathy Cook.  
Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 472-2589, advertising: 472-2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Nebraska.  
Subscription rates at \$5 per semester or \$9 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and 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, editorially 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.

## THE FULLY-AUTOMATED, HAWAII-HATING, MIDNIGHT-RAMBLING NEBRASKA *fan.*



### KEY.

- ① RADIO TUNED TO KLIN.
- ② SON'S RADIO ON KFOR.
- ③ MOM'S RADIO AT KLMS.
- ④ SPARE RADIO.
- ⑤ FAVORITE BEVERAGE.
- ⑥ COFFEE.
- ⑦ NO-DOZ.
- ⑧ SOMNIFEX (TO COUNTERACT COFFEE & NO-DOZ AFTER GAME).
- ⑨ CIGARETTES (CIGARS OR PIPE OPTIONAL).
- ⑩ COWBOY HAT.
- ⑪ STRIPED PJs.



doug voegler

## Coed visitation

Over 5,000 students, almost one-fourth of the University population, lives in dormitories. Liberalization of coed visitation is an issue which will directly affect all of them.

Few issues have been so persistently followed through by students. All aspects of student government have become involved: the Residence Hall Association, the Council on Student Life, and ASUN.

There can be no question in anyone's mind that students are overwhelmingly in favor of self-determination over the non-academic aspects of their University experience. Last May, a poll taken by The Daily Nebraskan showed 77% of the students responding favored the concept of liberalized coed visitation. Seven thousand letters sent out to parents last Spring, showed 56% of the 2,200 who responded supported the students' position.

The usually large numbers of students who have attended various meetings when coed visitation was on the agenda is another indication of interest over this matter. For example, in October over 200 students attended a CSL meeting at Abel Hall on coed visitation.

Finally, the commitment of students on this issue has been shown by the serious

contemplation of massive protests of the current visitation policy. Determination has also been shown in the discussion of legal action, which can be both slow and costly.

At their November meeting, the Board of Regents apparently responded to increasing student pressure and reopened the visitation door, shut in the student's face last July. A committee was appointed, and efforts are now being directed toward the formation of some form of coed visitation policy that can be submitted for approval.

Any proposed policy will be contingent upon parental support. President Varner has stated that if over 50 per cent of the parents respond favorably to the new policy, he will recommend it to the Regents, and it is assumed that in this case they would go along with it.

It is very important for students to maintain a concerted effort at informing and educating their parents about the new coed visitation policy when it comes out. Students must dispell the many fears parents might have and point out the advantages of the new policy over the present system.

Student pressure certainly is an important means in bringing

student problems and needs to the Regents' attention. But as they have decided to perceive their roles as elected state officials, the paramount obligation for them is to the voters who supply the institution's finances. They have many concerns and interests to balance and they walk a political tightrope.

Ultimately, the Regents make the decision whether the students will have coed visitation or not. They have the authority to say "yes" or "no." By making the adoption of any proposed policy conditional upon 50% parental support they are shifting the making of this decision (on the surface) elsewhere. It will then be politically viable for them to say that they can't endorse coed visitation because parent's do not support it or have not shown enough interest. If parents do support it then there is no problem in answering outstate critics of the new policy.

Students have worked long and hard for liberalized coed visitation. They have taken a sensible approach to the matter and their efforts have shown great maturity and deserve to be commended. Their past efforts are testimony that they will not fail in this new task of securing parental support.