

Uncampaign gets unendorsement

This year's ASUN elections could have marked the beginning of a new phase of campus politics—a phase in which ASUN elections became something more than the first in a long series of fun and games culminating in spring. There was a glimmer of hope that students, now electing a student regent as well as an ASUN president, would be presented with a serious campaign, competent candidates and fresh outlooks.

Any chance of that died early in the campaign. Or was there a campaign? Never have so many (three parties and enough independents to form a football team) said so little about such an important election. The candidates, it seems, were trying so hard to be serious that saying anything at all took on aspects of self-incrimination.

Part of the problem lies with the ASUN Electoral Commission and Electoral Commissioner Gary Hall. This was the year ASUN elections were supposed to be as close to the real thing as possible, a by-product of electing a student regent. This, unfortunately, was the year the electoral process fell apart.

First, there was the question of just who was a party and who wasn't. The Pro-Apathy Party (PAP) and the Amurica Party (AMP) failed to obtain the required 500 signatures to run as a group, a new requirement that made party status difficult and independent candidacies appealing (or necessary). PAP and AMP spent most of the campaign appealing the electoral commission's decision, hardly an activity as profitable as soliciting votes.

Then there was the question of what constituted a legal campaign poster. The electoral commission was straightforward about it—no posters or signs over 100 square inches each. The parties were devious. The United Student Effort (USE) party put a lot of little

posters together to look like one big one, and some of their opponents, rather than argue, did likewise.

If we learn nothing else from this campaign, let us learn that an examination needs to be made of ASUN election rules and how they are enforced.

The real blame for this year's lackluster elections, however, lies with the candidates and parties themselves. Campaigning was sparse, debating was erratic and posters were a lost art. This year we don't have a chance to choose between the good, the bad and the ugly. None of the candidates have been willing to step forward and expose themselves.

Take the USE (Jim Say, president; Mary Jenkins, first vice president; Paul Morrison, second vice president). USE is trying a new thing in platforms this year—no platform at all. Voting for USE is like betting on a roulette wheel with tape over the numbers—you don't know what you've got until it's too late.

What campaigning USE has done has not been so much against this year's opponents as against last year's USE party. They have, at least, revealed support for alcohol on campus and a clarification of the regents' religion policy.

The Sons of Liberty (SOL) party (Del Gustafson, president; Randall G. Jauken, first vice president; David M. Hamilton, second vice president) at least, has a platform. But the platform has only one plank—opposition to collecting and allocating mandatory student fees—and that is a bit too narrow for an entire party to stand on.

SOL seems to be advocating a process of natural selection for groups now receiving student fees support. Students should support only those groups they want to support, SOL says. In other words, those groups big enough and popular enough to

attract support (survival of the fittest?) live, and the others die.

The Cut the Crap (CTC) party (David Thomas Ware, president; Stephen Roger Dager, first vice president; Drey Samuelson, second vice president) comes closest to having a platform—revise the fees structure, support student cooperatives, etc.

But they too support a restructuring of the fees system that would quite probably leave some student group with eager members and meager bankroll.

PAP (IBM 360, president; Ray Walden, first vice president; Rick Horton, second vice president), whose candidates will appear on the ballot as independents, was handicapped by the election process and a presidential candidate (an IBM computer) which is probably logical, but certainly too mechanical for ASUN's flexible needs.

The other would-be party, AMP (Dennis Snyder, president; Peggy Olson, first vice president), also never got much beyond arguing with the Electoral Commission.

That leaves only the independent candidates: Vince Powers and "Big Red" (Charles Rosvold) for president; Clay Statmore for first vice president. Not having the advantage of a party, they have been forced, at times, to be everything from inane to articulate without revealing which they are most consistently.

The problem with this year's campaign is not that there are no qualified candidates but that the candidates have given no identification as to who the qualified ones are. The Daily Nebraskan can endorse no one in today's elections.

Wes Albers
Dave Madsen
Rebecca Britte
Randy Gordon

Abel Associative Living program enlightening

In the spring of 1974, the Board of Regents adopted the differentiated housing proposal for UNL residence halls. A section of that proposal allowed the establishment of the Associative Living program.

Associative Living, which had first been proposed several years earlier, allows males and females to live on the same floor with each sex residing on different halves of the floor. The living arrangement uses the second and third floors of Abel Hall, with the possibility of extension to other floors.

Having had the opportunity to live as a resident and serve as a Student Assistant on an Associative Living floor this year, I can only call the experience fantastically fulfilling and enlightening.

There was a marked contrast between the Associative Living floor and the all-male floors that I have lived on in the past. The atmosphere has been freer and more open this year than anything I have experienced.

It is common to find groups sitting in the halls talking or playing cards. Students have been more willing to leave their doors open as an invitation for others to drop in.

The increased opportunities for daily personal contacts between men and women on a "live-in" basis has helped to modify attitudes towards the sexes. Co-ed living makes it impossible to maintain the old "I've got to look my best at all times in order to be attractive to the opposite sex" attitude. In a living environment such as Associative Living, people cannot always look dateable.

People living with other people come to an understanding that others will accept them whether their hair is in curlers, they are in bathrobes, or whatever. This, I think, has been one of the most healthy and encouraging aspects of Associative Living. Rigid sex roles are undermined by the necessity of knowing and living with people as they truly are and facilitates accepting them as individuals with their own worth and potentials.

rick johnson rhymes and reasons

Since attitudes have been indoctrinated into us each and every day they cannot be reversed overnight, but simplistic and naive sexual attitudes are difficult to maintain when one sees counter-instances every day.

A related aspect of Associative Living is the opportunity for close male-female non-dating relationships to develop. Given the pervasiveness of dating in the university community and in society in general, the chances for close non-dating relationships are limited.

While some dating has occurred, close friendships

have developed and thrived across sex lines. Beyond personal friendships, the diversity and spontaneity of group activities has been almost limitless.

In short, people have come to feel comfortable living with other people—not men, not women—but people. Since we live and work with males and females every day, it seems somewhat unnatural to be cloistered in a dormitory. It seems that Associative Living has restored a naturalness to University living that is often missing.

The residents of Associative Living have proved beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt that they are capable of handling the responsibilities inherent in co-ed living. Therefore it seems that the Housing Office and Regents must before very long face the problem of visitation stipulations.

Associative Living floors have 14 hours of visitation per day. The imposition of such a time line breaks up the positive interaction that this type of living is developing. Obviously card games and rap sessions in hallways and lounges do not involve illicit sex.

Beyond this problem, other hassles such as noise have been limited, and far outweighed by the experience of personal growth that Associative Living offers.

There is nothing that I would like better than to see the Associative Living program expanded—which it will be if there is a demand.

Associative Living fills a need for living arrangements that have been clearly lacking at UNL.



3-18