

Summer Nebraskan

Member
Intercollegiate Press

The Summer Nebraskan, and The Daily Nebraskan, are published by the students of the University of Nebraska as expression of students' news and opinions only. According to Article II of the By Laws governing student publications and administered by the Board of Publications, "It is the declared policy of the Board that publications under its jurisdiction shall be free from editorial censorship on the part of the Board, or on the part of any member of the faculty of the University, but members of the staff of The Daily Nebraskan (and the Summer Nebraskan) are personally responsible for what they say or do or cause to be printed."

Subscription rates are \$2.00 per semester, \$2.50 per semester mailed, or \$3.00 for the college year, \$4.00 mailed. Single copy 5c. Published daily during the school year except Mondays and Saturdays, vacations and examination periods, by the University of Nebraska under the supervision of the Publications Board, Published weekly during summer school, for eight weeks. Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under Act of Congress, March 3, 1879, and at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 8, 1917, authorized September 10, 1922.

EDITORIAL

Editor Louis Schoen
Associate Editor Charles Klasek

BUSINESS

Business Manager Chet Stinger
For any information regarding news content of the Summer Nebraskan, call Summer Nebraskan office Monday or Tuesday afternoon or evening, or call Louis Schoen at 2-3583 or Charles Klasek at 2-7915.
For information regarding business or advertising call Chet Stinger at 3-6818.

This Is Democracy?

News Item: Colonel Dean Chase, 24, was broken from sergeant to pfc, and fined \$450 by an Army court martial for writing a letter to Gen. Mark Clark denouncing UN handling of the Kojie Island prison riots.

Friday, the United States of America will celebrate its 176th anniversary.

One hundred seventy-six years ago, a group of never-to-be-forgotten men put their signatures to a never-to-be-forgotten document. That document provided, for the citizens of this nation, a number of well defined freedoms—freedoms which few of the earth's people had previously experienced. It was a new experiment in government—an experiment which has since proved greatly successful.

One of the well defined freedoms which this document set forth was Freedom of Speech and Expression—freedom for every citizen of this vast nation to express his views on any given topic in any way he wished, as long as he did not advocate the overthrow of the government, and as long as he did not willfully and publicly damage another person's reputation. This freedom precluded the right of the individual to write to another individual, expressing the former's views on any topic, regardless of whether it directly concerned that individual.

NOW, 176 years later, we see this freedom denied, not of just an ordinary citizen, but of one who is in the service of his country and fellowmen—one who is offering his life for his fellowmen if his life is needed.

If this action on the part of a number of officers in our armed forces is allowed to go unheeded by the men in the government who are in charge of the armed forces, our freedom may be greatly in danger. If one court martial can get away with it, another will be willing to try; and if the second one is able to get away with it . . . and so on.

At a time of strife such as the present, the people of the free world—whether they be civilians or military—need to combine their forces to offset any threat to their freedom. To a military mind, this means physical force. To a mind which has the welfare of the free world in consideration, it means mental force—a force far greater than can ever be produced by industrial machines.

If all military men in the world realized this, wars would be the definite exception rather than the rule.

L. S.

Politics At A Glance

By LOUIS SCHOEN

Pre-Republican Convention Special

As this publication goes to press, the GOP National Committee, largely dominated by supporters of Sen. Robert A. Taft, is in the process of determining who—Taft or Retired Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower—should be given the support of 72 contested delegates—representing seven states—to the national convention.

Over half of the disputed delegates—38—compose the hotly contested Texas delegation.

At the time of this writing, Taft is way out in front, and it looks as though he will stay there throughout the bickering.

A major occurrence at the committee hearings was the banning, by the Taft-dominated committee, of TV, radio and press photography coverage of the hearings. This raised the pressure of the already steaming Ike-men.

Developments of the past week, it seems, have only aided in spreading farther apart the two wings of the Republican party.

Ike-men, in addition to previous charges which they have hurled at Taft, have warned that the Ohioan would have little chance of winning the November election if he were nominated at the convention. Eisenhower, on the other hand, they say, could easily win against any Democratic contender.

And pollster George Gallup confidently supports their views, coming out daily with results of polls which "prove" these allegations. The Ike-men confidently predict that the retired general will win the nomination on an early ballot, but the Taft-men seem to hold the same opinion regarding their candidate.

Taft himself has said that he now controls within two or three delegate votes of enough to win on the first ballot at the national convention, which gets under way Monday.

Taft managers, of course, are indignant when it is suggested that he could not win in November. And Taft himself has charged that the Gallup polls are being used for Eisenhower propaganda purposes.

There seem to be a few exceptions to the confidence among supporters of the two presidential aspirants that the Republican party can win in November. Governors Alfred E. Driscoll of New Jersey and Walter Kohler of Wisconsin have recently warned that "it won't be easy."

And Gov. Allan Shivers of Texas has admitted that the squabble among Republicans has helped the Democrats' chances of winning in November.

During all the bickering between presidential aspirants, the naming of a vice presidential nominee seems to have been cast into the background. There have been reports, however, that a quiet move is under way among Taft supporters to nominate Gen. Douglas MacArthur, keynote speaker of the convention, as vice president.

Bearing in mind the support MacArthur has given Taft throughout the campaign, such a move seems quite feasible. And what has been MacArthur's reaction when informed of such a move?

"Let it never be said," the general drawled in his usual over-dramatized manner, "that I shirked a call to duty."

It might cause far less trouble if they would forget to nominate a candidate for Veep altogether.

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

TV And The Conventions

It is estimated that 50,000,000 people—almost one-third of the nation's population—will see some part of at least one of the national party conventions on their television screens.

NU students are especially fortunate to have the large television screen available to them in the Union Lounge.

In some respects, the video viewer and the radio listener probably will know more of what is going on than the delegates and visitors seated in the hall. During the balloting, for example, TV and radio reporters will keep the public constantly informed of the standings.

With important party officials and political experts frequently facing the cameras and microphones, the audience will be able to spot a trend almost before it is born.

The piercing eye of the television camera undoubtedly will also inhibit delegates' actions. With the rise of Willkie at the 1940 Republican convention, Taft men surreptitiously switched to "We Want Willkie" buttons whenever they approached the eventual nominee's campaign headquarters at the Warwick Hotel in Philadelphia. Such a maneuver would be a daredevil stunt in the TV year of 1952.

ABC, CBS, and NBC have joined forces for coverage of the actual convention sessions. Each will contribute men and cameras to the pool pickup.

There will be six cameras on the convention floor. Three will face the speakers' platform, and three will be behind the platform, facing the crowd in the convention hall.

One excellent fact about the coverage by TV is that the cameras will continue in operation and the stations will remain on the air until the sessions adjourn at 1 or 2 a.m. This type of coverage will truly make the national conventions the "Greatest Show on Earth."

C.K.

Egyptian Freedom v.s. Great Britain

In an editorial under the heading, "No Bargaining Over Principles," the Egyptian newspaper Al Ahram comments on London reports that the Australian Premier was opposed to British evacuation of the Suez Canal Zone. The Summer Nebraskan reprints this editorial, released by the Egyptian Information Bureau in Washington, to present to readers the feeling which is dominant in this Middle Eastern member of the British Commonwealth:

"Although Australia is 11,000 miles away from Egypt, its Prime Minister demands the occupation of Egypt as a protection to his country. Since Australia needs to be linked to the Western World, how can Egypt be permitted to ask for the withdrawal of foreign troops from her own soil?"

"... such a report indicates clearly that Britain and the governments which follow in its footsteps neither appreciate the rights of nations nor the meaning of cooperation without subjugation.

"... this reactionary policy will have its repercussion in the oppressed countries which are seeking vainly democratic aid. . . Fortunately, the democratic horizon glows from time to time with sparkling flashes, and voices are raised in denunciation of imperialism.

"One of those liberal champions is Justice William Douglas of the American Supreme Court who has urged his country to redress the wrongs that weigh down oppressed nations. Al Ahram welcomes Justice Douglas' statement when he said:

"America, proud of her standards of freedom and justice at home, has often been aligned abroad with the forces that make freedom and justice impossible for the masses of people.

"We Americans must never trade our principles for expediency."

Nothing Cookin' But A Stew



—Reprinted from the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

The Republican 'Platform'

With their national convention slated to begin Monday, the Republican presidential aspirants are so intent upon cutting each other's throats that the entire G.O.P. race is turning into a political farce.

After beginning the pre-convention campaigning with a host of presidential aspirants, the Republican party has finally narrowed its contest to retired General Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio.

The humor of the entire campaign is that Taft is so intent in deriding the administration and Eisenhower is so intent in deriding Taft that both candidates have neglected to formulate any objective platform.

Of course from Taft's senate voting record we know that he was opposed to the United States entry in World War II, and from this has gained the reputation of "isolationist." We know too that he favors only limited foreign aid and advocates home spending.

General Eisenhower on the other hand, through his scattered off-the-cuff remarks, has been known to be against overcentralization of government. He is a staunch backer of Universal Military Training, but is against "blanket" Federal education grants to states.

The voters waited patiently for the general to return from Europe and voice his beliefs but their patience was answered with a hodge-podge of generalizations which left the observer as much in the dark as before.

Senator Taft, between deriding the government and Gen. Eisenhower, has given the voters nothing concrete. It might be wise if these gentlemen questioned Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York about what happened to him when he neglected certain vital planks in his platform in both 1944 and 1948.

Both candidates seem to be content with letting their "big-name" supporters do their campaigning for them and let the prestige of these supporters take the place of platforms in their respective states.

Men like Gov. Dewey and Gen. Lucius Clay may carry some prestige for Eisenhower and Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Albert C. Wedemeyer may carry some prestige for Taft. But unless both of these candidates offer the voters some concrete objective planks in their platform they will suffer.

This has been the failure of the Republican presidential candidates since the party's origin. The failure was capped with Dewey's unexpected defeat in '48. If the Republicans even expect to come close to the Democrats in November, they must offer the people something substantial and concrete in the way of a political platform.

C. K.

GOP v.s. Price Controls

A coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats—the two factions which have done the most screaming in this country about inflationary trends—recently attempted to enact legislation virtually ending all price controls.

An end to price controls, at the present time, may seem quite feasible, since few prices are anywhere near their specified ceilings. The primary objective of the move was to do away with the OPS, eliminating a few dollars from the cost of running the government.

The snag in the line is this, however: Once all controls were removed, although prices might remain stable for a time, they would eventually begin edging upward. When they neared the original ceiling, the government would re-enact legislation to re-establish the OPS, and with it, price controls. But—the government would probably fail to take such action until prices came dangerously near to the original ceilings.

By the time Congress had convened and passed the legislation, and the OPS had reorganized enough to effectively set up the price controls once again, the prices would probably be greatly in excess of their original ceilings.

Furthermore, the cost of exterminating and re-establishing the OPS would, in the end, be greater than the cost of retaining the office in the first place. And you know where the money to pay for this added cost would come from—the pocket of the taxpayer.

Let us be thankful that this attempt, on the part of a group of reactionary do-nothings in our government, failed.

L. S.

SUMMER NEBRASKAN CLASSIFIED AD RATES

No. Words	1 Week
1-10	\$.40
11-15	.50
16-20	.60

Business Office—Basement Student Union
or call 3-6818