

Editorial

Comment

Bulletin

Commentorials

... from our readers

Dear Sir:

Whether the British blockade is unnecessarily inhumane is a debatable question that might well be the topic for a forum discussion. However, in view of your denial of both ignorance and intentional misrepresentation, a correction of some of your statements may be helpful. You have twice misquoted Hoover, the second instance making it possible to imply that he stated that he had been contacted by the governments of the five democracies. At that time he made no such claim.

Today the sole contact with their governments of which he speaks is with a Belgian which did not then exist. Your quotations of Petain attributed to him a statement he did not make, and omitted to mention statements by both Petain and Darlan acknowledging the German pressure under which they act. The other authority you cite in your reply to my letter you apparently have not quoted, but at that you have misnamed it.

If food can be distributed without aiding Germany it should be, although not "for the vanquished alone." Spain and Finland certainly deserve as much consideration as unoccupied France. A proposal to feed the peoples of Europe, however, should not term with misstatements, condemn the English while finding no blame in Germany, and give that country credit where it is not due.

Neither Hoover nor the National Committee on Food has made the attacks on the English ("cruel as they come," "British obstancy," "shameful acts," "unnecessary inhumaneness") you have thought advisable. The only hint of possible German misdeeds I can find in your two editorials admits they have carted out goods. "Germany is doing everything in her power to feed the vanquished peoples" may be forcefully stated but it is not properly over-emphasized. It is false.

Any decision upon the proper issue ought to be made after consideration of a number of questions. One of these is concerned with German misuse of relief supplies in 1914-1918. Hoover and other informed Americans give contradictory accounts both of which should be considered. The German imports of food from the conquered countries today and the fact that until recently at least their soldiers were consuming Belgian supplies in Belgium is another issue.

Indirect gains such as those from forced labor and from dumping thousands of unwanted souls out of Germany into Poland and unoccupied France is still another. The different circumstances in the different areas, must be understood. In Finland, for example, the blockade is only a minor obstacle. Hoover should explain clearly why he dropped his prerequisite that Germany return the stocks she had seized.

The English people too are suffering from the failings of former governments. Should the German blockade be relaxed for them in proportion as they relax theirs of Belgium? We freely adopted last November a policy of aiding England. Should we, who are not shedding our blood, overrule the considered policy of the English? Certainly before any discussion is made both sides of these questions ought to be studied.

G. W. GRAY.

At the close of a weeks debate in the DAILY editorial columns on "aid to the small democracies," during which authorities were questioned rather liberally, and charges of ignorance and maliciousness were cast about on all sides, Dr. Gray and your editor got together yesterday afternoon, to decide who had the best grounds for the statements he had made.

An hour and a half of discussion proved only that there are good authorities for either side, and debatable rumors on the question that a conclusion either way must be based upon an individual's own judgment.

For instance, the DAILY'S copy of a letter signed by members of the 1918 Belgium Relief Commission to the effect that a similar plan had been successful then, was met by Dr. Gray's quotations from other members of that same committee declaring such aid had been advantageous to Germany.

The memorandum from the National Committee on Food For The Small Democracies declares that Belgium, Dutch and Polish exiled governments in England have endorsed the plan, Dr. Gray has a similar statements from the British government to the effect that the Polish and Dutch have thus far not expressed themselves either way, and Queen Wilhelmina has in fact opposed it.

Again the statement in TIME magazine that 800,000 bushels of grain had already been shipped into Belgium and that Germany had agreed to ship 1 million bushels monthly so long as the relief program lasts, was countered by equally au-

thoritative statements that large amounts of food-stuffs were being confiscated for German use.

And the quotation from Petain which is disputed above was discovered to have been attributed to Petain in the Omaha World Herald and to Darlan in the New York Times and several other publications.

If abundance of material means anything, Dr. Gray certainly has that. For he has been collecting dispatches relative to the food question since last September. Nevertheless there are these other conflicting statements from rather authoritative sources that leave plenty of props for the humanitarian argument.

Since the quotation of authorities is apparently of little weight, and a scholarly decision relative to giving these countries aid must be based upon the judgments and reasoning of individuals, the question of aid to the small democracies makes an excellent question for debate.

That all sides to the question may be explored, and all who are concerned in any way with it may express their ideas, the DAILY is preparing a student roundtable discussion. Chairmanship such a roundtable will be Dr. Gray himself, who because of his research into its backgrounds, will be able to bring out the major issues involved.

If there is to be a constructive discussion however, men who know something of the problems and who are interested in the principles at stake must cooperate in putting it across. Names of such interested parties should be turned in at the NEBRASKAN office at once.

Then will the voice and reasoning of the students themselves reach conclusions of this question. Authorities may mean nothing. But the discussion of evidence before an interested round table group should sort the wheat from the chaff, and leave everyone with at least a clearer idea of where the responsibility of giving aid should lie.

Food for Germany, regardless . . .

Dear Editor:

I have been following with great interest the arguments of the past week in the DAILY considering the question of shipments of food to France or Belgium. The British have been condemned for refusing to consider the possibility of relinquishing their blockade.

The arguments for the proposal can be boiled down to the fact that there is a belief that it would be possible to see that all of the food got to the French people who needed it and none would get to the German people or to the German army to be used for food or for the extraction of products which could be used to build up German military strength.

It should be obvious that the Germans are allowing the French, and for that matter the people of all the countries under Nazi domination, only enough food to keep them alive and possibly to keep them from being too rebellious.

Are we to assume that these people would be allowed to procure the same amount of food from the Germans, if they were getting food from other sources. I personally feel that just the opposite result would be obtained. The Germans would undoubtedly take away for their own use just about as much as was given by the United States.

Thus it would seem clear to me that we might as well send food directly to the Germans for that would be in effect what we would be doing. Obviously, we can not excuse the British for making their decision on any humanitarian grounds. But is it likely that the Germans would give just as definite a "No" to any proposal to release food to the British people by lifting their blockades. I personally feel that that is what we are asking the British to do for the Germans.

This whole problem breaks down the one basic question: Who fights a war? The answer is obviously everyone. That is the way the world is constituted at the present time. Obviously, no one likes to see people starve for the purpose of national honor and national pride, but that is just one of those facts of war we can't get away from.

It should be understood that I am not attempting to justify either of the two belligerents except on the basis of one criterion, namely, that of winning the war. That seems to be the basic problem at hand.

CHARLES OLDFATHER.

The this argument has not yet been presented in the DAILY I presume it is the basis of the Hoover demands that the Nazi government send food-stuffs into Belgium monthly so long as the relief program lasts.

According to TIME magazine, the German government has agreed to send 1 million bushels of grain into the country monthly, and has started off this program with a shipment of 800,000 bushels already.

If Germany lives up to her agreements as evidence from civil authorities suggests she did in 1914-18, then this does not present a problem. If she fails to live up to these agreements, the National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies contends that further aid will not be forthcoming.



Ordal



Olson

Behind
the
News

Washington vs. Berlin

President Roosevelt's Saturday night speech calling upon the nation to sacrifice in the interest of "unqualified, immediate, all-out" aid for Britain and others fighting aggressors has been received with acclaim in this country and the anti-axis nations.

Both American and foreign papers praised the strong, decisive stand outlined in the speech. The independent Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger called it "an admirable summary of the administration's anti-axis policy." The Republican Los Angeles Times responded by saying, "The nation must answer the president's call by making a sacrifice necessary. . . ."

London and Athens papers hailed the speech as a definite pledge of vigorous aid in their fight against Hitler, and the Athens radio declared that the president's words "officially and irrevocably signed the death warrant of the new order."

Axis opinion was just as definite, though of a decidedly different tenor. Adolf Hitler, speaking 24 hours after the president, declared: "No power and no support coming from any part of the world can change the outcome of this battle in any respect. England will fall."

Meanwhile congress moved rapidly to make available the seven billion dollars requested by the President for operations authorized by the lease-lend bill.

Already approved by the House appropriations committee, the bill is expected to pass the House Wednesday. Senator Byrnes, administration strategist in the upper house, predicted passage by the Senate next week, though Senator Nye served notice that he would attempt to reduce the amount of the appropriation below seven billion.

Senator Nye also speculated to the effect that the president's promise that England will get the munitions America makes might mean convoying cargo vessels by the United States navy.

Replying to this Senator Glass of Virginia said he did not think convoys were meant, but added: "If the president means convoys, I'm in favor of sending convoys. In fact, I'm in favor of doing anything that would beat hell out of Hitler."

Next Tuesday . . .

Susies come to campus

... 690 strong

Nebraska men who aren't dated up and who want to make a date with one of the Stephens Susies who arrive here next Tuesday will have to move fast for available dates are going like the proverbial hotcakes.

The women from Missouri are coming 690 strong, according to Pat Lahr, Union social director, and will be entertained at a two hour dance session by Nebraska men.

To arrange a date, men should see Pat Lahr. They will have their pick of all girls not already dated—and they are given heights as well as names and home towns of the girls so Mr. Nebraska at a

quick five feet four won't find himself squiring Miss Stephens at five feet eleven.

Leave at 6 p. m.

The women on this trip have a full schedule before they reach Lincoln. After the tea dance the women leave Lincoln at 6 p. m. and arrive in Columbia at 6:30 the following morning, Thursday, they will resume their regular class schedule.

Their two weeks tour began last Thursday. Itinerary included Santa Fe, New Mexico, Grand Canyon, Hopi Indian country, Los Angeles and Hollywood, San Francisco, British Columbia and the Northwest.

Coeds shudder
when prof brings
snakes to class

Minus flute and robe, Prof. M. J. Harbaugh of the zoology department, has first year biology students believing that he can rank with the Orientals in snake charming.

Professor Harbaugh and his little snakes put on their exhibition at the weekly biology lecture period this week as a part of his talk on the biological importance of snakes.

Coeds in the front row were nervous when Prof. Harbaugh first mentioned the subject and when he pulled a black snake and a garter snake both non-poisonous, out of a small cage, they were really jumping.

Professor Harbaugh left a poisonous rattlesnake in the cage, but told students about the time he was experimenting with one. "While I was stroking his head, I placed my hand to close to its mouth, and he bit me," said the professor as student eagerly waited for the results. After a pause, he answered, "Well, I'm still here. But the snake died, right afterwards."

Sigma Alpha Iota
inducts 12 women

Sigma Alpha Iota, honorary musical sorority, held initiation last Thursday inducting 12 women into the society. On Friday Founders Day banquet was held at the Cornhusker hotel.

Speaking at the banquet was Mrs. Clarence Sale of Dallas, Tex., the national executive secretary.

Those initiated were: Dorothy Hendricks, Barbara Miller, Wilma Vail Miller, Evelyn Nerud, Aldyth Francke, Mary Ellen Monnich, Nelda Michael, Pat Kent, Idella Johnson, Virginia Clarke, Aronita Dachovsky, and Ardis Freeman.

The
Daily Nebraskan

FORTIETH YEAR.

Subscription Rates are \$1.00 Per Semester or \$1.50 for the College Year. \$2.00 Annual. Single copy, 3 Cents. Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice in Lincoln, Nebraska, under Act of Congress, March 3, 1879, and at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1102, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized September 30, 1922.