

# Editorial — Comment — Bulletin

## Commentorials

### To bring out both sides student writes a defense of Innocency

Dear Editor:

Very often those who have been trampled on by a particular organization or who have been unable to bend it to their own wishes, turn sour towards it and seek to avenge themselves and their pride by openly ridiculing it. Here are a few facts that may have colored Mr. Wintroub's evaluation of Innocency.

1. As a big wig in the Greek faction, Mr. Wintroub made the statement earlier in the year that the faction must control the Innocents. Despite his efforts to gain such control this year's society thumbed their noses at Mr. Wintroub, neglected to ask his permission for the things they did, and tried to hold themselves above politics.

2. Mr. Wintroub aligned the faction behind him to get the vice-presidency of the Senior Council as a political plum. The Innocents commendably broke the factional block and elected Norman Harris organizer of the council and perhaps the most interested man in its success, in his place.

3. Formality at the Junior Senior Prom became a party issue, and as the big wig in the Greek faction Mr. Wintroub wanted the Innocents to keep it strictly formal. In order to let barbs attend and thus to make it an all-university function, the Innocents made formality optional. Perhaps this is the reason Mr. Wintroub can say nothing good about the first Prom in several years to have a big name band and yet break even.

4. And finally in choosing men for the new society, that body in giving credit where credit was due eliminated the man that Wintroub was championing.

The above letter makes light of the challenge issued to the incoming society. But when the bases of Mr. Wintroub's evaluation are known, this year's society can be proud that it has held itself in a position to incur his ridicule.

Every society will confront men who will seek to make inroads upon it. To stand against such men and keep the society above politics is the true challenge an honest Innocent must take.

Bob McNutt.

### Men in public eye cannot expect exemption from attack

Dear Editor:

I suspect that you misjudge the times in hoping that editorials like that on Mr. Lindbergh can pass without question. Though it is customary in some circles to deplore the personalities from which Mr. Lindbergh has suffered, he has in fact been treated with a reasonable amount of considerations, far exceeding, for instance, that which has been granted to President Roosevelt. The personalities which have hitherto been mentioned are strictly relevant to the issue, since they concern his loyalty to the democratic idea and the degree of his information on the questions of international politics and military strategy which he publicly discusses.

Why should Lindbergh expect gentle treatment after he had answered a radio address of the president and called it "hysterical chatter of calamity and invasion"? Why should Wheeler after he had called a policy of the president "assinine"? Do you remember the attacks on the president's family in the last campaign? Why should Lindbergh be peculiarly sacred? He speaks to the American people not as one of their elected representatives, but as the best known personality of American life.

Is it in the least degree irrelevant to point out that this personality has known fascist leanings which forbid his giving counsel to a democratic state in complete good faith, that he has admitted sympathies for Nazi Germany, that his public reputation is based solely on a feat of athletic heroism and involves not a single moment of experience either in war or in foreign affairs?

You say in your answer to Mr. Winnacker that "wars for vague ideals are too costly?" Was that true of the American Revolution or the American Civil war? If people won't fight for "vague ideals" (liberty, democracy, collective security), they will soon find themselves fighting hopelessly merely for survival against barbarians who fight for conquest. Why do you say that people are no happier for the American and allied victory in 1918? They had twenty years of peace and security as the result of that victory. Germany was flat on its back then.

How did it rise to power? Wasn't it solely because of pacifists and isolationists?

Thomas M. Raysor.

Lindbergh was used merely as an example of a case where attack upon a man's personality was intended to break down his argument and shut him up. Certainly the same criticism that was made of his attackers could be leveled at those attacking the president's family, the president or any other person conscientiously expressing his opinions. It is the principle of freedom of expression and the rational discussion of important issues that we were defending, not necessarily Lindbergh himself.

Editor.

### Only the message of the firm can move the common crowd

Dear Editor:

Perhaps it is beneath my dignity as an alum to note what the undergraduate mind wallowing in Cambrian mud, has to say. However, your editorial "Ridicule or Reason" in the May 8 issue of the Nebraskan annoyed me a trifle. Now that I've been away from those ivy-hung cloisters for a year I may have lost what sense of tolerance I acquired in a purely somatic fashion. You see, I've been associating with business men.

Professor Lancaster used to ask us if tolerance wasn't the virtue of not caring sufficiently about anything. At any rate, it does seem to have a degree of passivity about it. And I'm sure that a goodly amount of our so-called tolerance is merely mental laziness—a kind of inability to carry a given premise thru to its logical conclusion. Now your beautiful philosophy that no one is right and no one is wrong is all very well. But today there exist certain groups and peoples who are only too willing to exploit this liberalism for their own ends. Doubt, uncertainty, and differences of opinion are egrets for their mills. When the thief is ready to steal the turnip from your hands, it is pure sentimentality to weep over his hunger.

When you say "Whether or not what Mr. Lindbergh believes is right or wrong is immaterial," (You should have said "relatively right or relatively wrong," in view of your philosophy). I think you are underestimating Mr. Lindbergh's influence. Surely a man with his hero's halo (slightly worn now, I admit), his charm, and his seeming sincerity must be rather influential. And is it so immaterial if he uses that influence in a manner many people believe is harmful to the good of his country? However, when you say that if he speaks in good faith he should be given a chance to speak and to be listened to, you expose an Achilles heel. There are those who doubt that he does speak in good faith.

Dorothy Thompson goes so far as to say that his actions have all the trimmings of a future Gaultier. At any rate, his actions do seem suspicious for a patriot, as, for instance, his advocating the abandonment of Britain—and the loss of our Atlantic fleet. If, as you say, material which is written or spoken with malice should be censored, I hear several nominations for the amputation of Mr. Lindbergh's speeches.

Finally, thou tellest me, comrade, that too many of us forget they themselves aren't the ones who may be wrong. That negative attitude again. Now who listens to the man who doesn't have a positive message to give? It's the voices of affirmation we listen to, the messages of the men who believe, who have faith. Men like Jesus of Nazareth, Dante, Goethe, Voltaire are the ones we call great. The others are forgotten. For further reference, I recommend for your consumption Carl Becker's article, "The New Order" in the current issue of the Yale Review.

Evelyn Taylor.

### Of Lindbergh again . . .

To the Editor:

In taking issue with the recent article by Donald E. Bower presenting Dr. Raysor's views of Lindbergh's stand, may I ask by what right does Dr. Raysor, as a military authority, stand against Charles A. Lindbergh, the recent colonel. To speak in terms which are absolute, as in this article, is only wishful thinking for they become false in their unconditional terminology.

No debate or argument can best be settled by reflections upon the character or individuality of the opponent rather than his idealism. Yes, the attacks upon Charles A. Lindbergh are a matter of some concern.

According to Mr. Bower's quotation from Dr. Raysor, "The tragedy of the United States . . . is that its chief advisor on the issues in question is Charles A. Lindbergh, is totally without military knowledge or ex-

## Beneath the Golden Dome

by Art Rivin

Réaffirmation of a fundamental principle of democracy, equal rights for every man regardless of race or color, was unanimously given by the unicameral yesterday.

Occasion for the action was the consideration of amendments to L. B. 504. The amendment itself provided that no labor union should be considered a rightful collective bargaining agency if that union in any way discriminated against or barred anyone from membership because of race or color.

A most eloquent plea was made by the amendment sponsor, the Negro senator from Omaha, John Adams, Jr.

Senator Adams pointed out that unions today are practically controlling the right to work and that if a laborer is not a member of the union he is unable to get a job. The senator cited numerous instances in which Negro workers were prevented from joining the union and were thereby prevented from holding a job.

With much emotion in his voice Adams continued: "If this is democracy, why should my people be denied the right to work?" "How," he asked, "can these labor unions pretend to represent all the workers in matters of wages, hours, and working conditions when some of the workers are denied membership in the union . . . and only because they are colored?"

Senator Tvrdik, also from Omaha, read without comment a letter from the Nebraska Federation of Labor. The organization opposed the bill on the grounds that it would deny a voluntary fraternal group with the right to choose its own members.

But what weak and sparse opposition to the amendment was offered was completely smothered by the one main argument of the bill's proponents: Unions control the right to work in spite of the fact that they are voluntary organizations and no man should be denied that right for racial reasons.

The bill was advanced to select file.

Later this statement is followed by this: "De Seversky is one of the most famous designers of military planes in the whole world, while Lindbergh is merely a civilian pilot whose reputation is based solely on a heroic feat of athletic endurance, and whose technical training is that of the self educated man."

Dr. Raysor does not take into consideration that in the work of De Seversky he must design planes which conform to the qualifications which military men say they must meet. Till recently among those men was Mr. Lindbergh. Which is better, the working out of an idea from data or compiling that data through experience as does the self educated man? Who is better qualified to testify as to the comparative figures of military preparedness than he who has had personal and immediate contact with the countries now under comparison, namely the axis powers on the continent of Europe, and England and the United States?

Mr. Lindbergh has lived as a citizen of the United States for most of his life and has grown up with a large part of our military equipment of today. Until recently he served in a manner unquestioned, as colonel in the United States army. He lost this position because he felt those in a higher position did not care to have the advisability of their recommendations questioned by him.

A few years ago Mr. Lindbergh left the United States and went to England to live. Here he lived in close contact with the affairs of England, in a lesser degree he knew the French situation and he contacted the great unknown—Nazi Germany. Now he has returned to the United States, the land he knows to be a refuge from the undesirable. He is attempting to save the United States from the catastrophe that most of Europe now is in.

I am not saying that the former colonel is entirely right, but I, as a voting citizen, am in sympathy with a greater part of his idealism as I understand it. Both pro-Lindbergh and anti-Lindbergh citizens have valuable contributions to make and they must be combined into an idealism which is American. In forming this idealism we must restrict our arguments to the issue and not to personalities. Remember some of our most recognized leaders of today are so recognized because they stood for what turned to be the right.

Very truly,

Glenn E. Clark.

## Inspect-

(Continued from Page 1.)

course covering the entire year. They will also check on practical application by cadets.

Infantry will be examined on Wednesday and Thursday. Company close order drill and command and leadership for infantry students will be checked this afternoon at 4 on Memorial mall.

Thursday morning from 9 to 10, there will be first aid and rifle marksmanship at the stadium for first year basic infantrymen. From 9 to 11, a tactical problem will be carried out at Oak Creek park with a rifle platoon acting as advance guard for a company against an outlined enemy using blank ammunition.

Wednesday afternoon and

Thursday morning, field artillery students will hold field exercise in reconnaissance and position at the ag campus. The Thursday afternoon battery will have a formal mounted inspection at Oak Creek park.

The park will also be the scene Wednesday afternoon of the engineers' field work. Included on the program are construction of a bridge, trench tracing and demoli-

tions. Friday morning from 10 to 11, two engineering companies will demonstrate first aid outside Nebraska hall and field work using shears and gin pole near the 10th street viaduct, and in the afternoon rifle marksmanship and sketching, knots and lashings will be demonstrated on the quadrangle south of Andrews hall.

ALL MAKES OF  
TYPEWRITERS FOR  
SALE OR RENT  
**NEBR. TYPEWRITER CO.**  
130 No. 12th 2-2187