

Editorial Page

Help For Turkey

Two University staff members left this week for Ankara, Turkey, where they will confer with officials of the University of Ankara and the Foreign Operations Service to investigate the possibility of aiding that University in setting up a school of agriculture.

Of course, the outcome of the trip and the problems involved in the possible venture are not known, but what the two men will have to say when they return will be instructional.

This is not the first time that the University has had a part in similar tours which are designed to help countries like Turkey and Greece in their programs of technical and industrial advancement. With all eyes on the McCarthy hearings and Indochina events, it is at times forgotten that many countries are in their way struggling against conditions which might give rise to Communist infiltration.

Exactly what does the problem of Communism have to do with a three-week trip of two men? Actually the connection is distant, and yet the trip is significant.

Turkey, which is in a great part agricultural, is evidently striving to increase the knowledge of farming methods in her country and thus aid the economic condition of the country. If we admit that the universities of the United States are the background of our technical advancement, then the completion of the mission of the two University men will be in part the beginning of similar advancement in Turkey.

This time, the plan, which includes the sending of teachers to Turkey, involves no hand-out by the United States. Even if it did, however, the plan seems to be a good one, and an honest effort to aid less advanced countries.

At any rate, the University of Nebraska is not an isolated island of men and women struggling to keep their heads in ivory towers. The teachers and University administrative heads, along with students, support one another in various branches and towards various goals which enable the University to be heard across the ocean.

When the two men return, they will at least bring with them a better understanding of the problems of another country, which is an important link in the defensive chain surrounding the Iron Curtain. The smallest part that this University can play in any program is to this extent justified.



LOST WEEKENDS?

What Do You Think?

McCarthy's Motive Questionable

By DARWIN McAFEE Columnist

One of the great enigmas of the present time is that which concerns Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican Senator from Wisconsin and raucous Communist

eradicator who works officially for the Congress of the United States and personally for John Q. Public, U.S. Citizen.

Or does he? Those who question his motives (his supporters would prefer not to or would rather disappoint them as a means to an end) wonder just why Joe is carrying on his prodigious campaign against Communists. Is he sincerely interested in getting rid of Reds? If so, his record does not indicate that he has actually accomplished a great deal in that department. Or is he interested in personal power? Probably only McCarthy and maybe some of his close cohorts knows the answer, but the facts seem to indicate to this writer that power is his motive.

CHECKING INTO Joe's efforts to get rid of Communists, we find that McCarthy first charged at Wheeling, W. Va., in February, 1950, that there were 205 "card-carrying Communists known to the secretary of state." Next day he changed the figure to 57. And two days later he changed the figure to 81.

The only member of the list of 81-alleged State Department Communists who has been indicated is Val Lorwin, whose indictment has since been dropped on grounds that it was falsely procured.

Undersecretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, recently testifying before Congress, said that no Communists had been found in the State Department.

Although Joe has branded a number of persons as "fifth amendment Communists," few, if any have been proven to be Communists. In a number of cases, as in the case of Mrs. Anna Lee Moss, it has been proven that those he accused have had no association with Communism whatsoever. And as for the rest—it is still a prime principle of law that an individual is innocent until proven guilty.

Nevertheless, implied guilt by association does irreparable harm to individuals accused.

What about the Senator's lust for power? His latest flaunting of that power was his blatant defiance, during the presently televised hearings with the Army, of the President, the Army and the sub-committee in refusing to disclose the informant who gave him secret material contained in a letter written by J. Edgar Hoover.

THE FACT that he has violated the espionage laws does not seem to bother McCarthy. In fact he went so far as to encourage all "loyal" citizens to turn over to him any evidence, secret or not, which might help him in his crusade against the "Red threat to democracy." However, according to the espionage laws, Title 18, U.S. Constitution, Sec. 793 and 794, "the transmission or the revelation of the contents of any classified material in any manner

to unauthorized persons is prohibited by law."

Most frenzied Communist haters do not seem to realize that McCarthy's challenge to the power of the Executive branch of our government and his apparent lack of faith in the principle of the separation of powers is in itself a "threat to democracy." Whether it is as great as the Communist threat depends on how successful Joe is in carrying out his challenge and how unsuccessful are present methods for coping with Communists.

Aside from the fact that the Wisconsin senator seems to have a fifth column in the executive branch which even extends into the intelligence agencies of the armed services, what other steps has he taken to attain his desired power?

For the moment, let's consider two aspects of power which McCarthy has manipulated in one way or another. They are financial solvency and control of public opinion.

Looking at the senator's finances we find, according to a senate investigation report, which at present is in Attorney General Brownell's files unavailable to the public, that at one time in 1946 McCarthy owed the First National Bank of Appleton, Wis. \$170,029.03.

BY NO later than 1952 this debt had been erased. How? Well, in four years, 1948-52, the investigating committee reported, McCarthy deposited \$172,623.18 in Riggs National Bank in Washington, D.C. During this same period, his Senate salary was only \$50,000.

Now, did he come by the money by investments or did he use funds given to him to fight Communism? What do you think?

How does the senator attempt to control or influence public opinion? Well, it seems that he has managed to plant two friends, John Doerfer and Robert E. Lee (who seems to be shying away from McCarthy somewhat), on the Federal Communications Commission, one of the most important agencies in government. There the two friends are in a position to dominate the airways grant or deny TV and radio licenses.

At the first of the year, one of McCarthy's most powerful backers, H. L. Hunt, Texas millionaire, was granted a coveted TV license. He now controls four radio and TV programs—Facts Forum, Answers for Americans, Reporters Round-Up and State of the Nation. These programs, which get free time and certain tax benefits, are supposed to be impartial and non-partisan but they are said to be subtly following the McCarthy line. Is McCarthy attempting to control public opinion? What do you think?

(The next column will deal with several more aspects of power and techniques employed by McCarthy in conjunction with these aspects.)

Security In Science—Conformity?

By DONALD C. MOORE

(Editor's Note: Dr. Moore, University assistant professor of physics, recently wrote President Eisenhower, asking him to clear the name of atomic physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, who has been declared a security risk by the Atomic Energy Commission security board.)

When Gordon Gray, of the special AEC Security Review said that according to present security regulations, Dr. Robert Oppenheimer should be considered a security risk, he also said that a review of our whole security system should be considered.

The idea of security began with the Armed forces. Its need is not hard to understand. The invasion of France is a good example to suggest the general problem. There were a large number of sites at which it was militarily reasonable to begin an invasion. A decision was made by the Allied high command and once such a decision was made, it properly became a matter of security. The knowledge of the decision was unavailable to any but the persons making the decision or to persons to whom they had entrusted it. Therefore, the enemy could get this information only by espionage or treason.

THIS CONCLUSION has been transferred to our scientific work—without at the same time evaluating the premises on which it was built. It is quite true that we have scientific and technological knowledge which we would like to deny to potential enemies of our country. However, such denial is impossible, for as someone has said, science is an open book which all may read. We can become as

sure of avoiding security leaks as we care to become.

In one extreme limit, we trust no one and have no security leaks. We also make no progress. In the other extreme limit, we will make more progress as we have more competent people working for us. We will also have more security leaks. Obviously, neither extreme makes sense. We might imagine that we start with our ultra tight security system with no leaks and no progress.

AS IT IS loosened up, we begin to make gains because we have more competent people working for us. However as we loosen the system still more we will reach a place at which the gains due to having more competent people working will be equal to the loss due to leaks. It is at this point that we ought to stop. This degree of security would be optimum. To get a perspective, we should examine the number of security leaks and compare it to the gains that have been made by having large numbers of "dubious" people working for us.

During the last war, in which we united with the Communists to defeat the Nazis and the Fascists, it is interesting to compare our security program with that of our enemies. The Nazis and the Fascists, especially the Germans, required party loyalty as a condition for scientific work. We made the decision that we would accept Communist, Nazi, and Fascist sympathizers as aids.

Very large numbers of refugees came to this country—we accepted them all, and our war

effort was materially aided by their contribution. The German effort was hampered very early—by their political commissars. We apparently have no instances of losing information to our enemies, and perhaps two or three instances of our losing information to our Russian ally.

SINCE THE war, we have changed our position. This is occasioned in part by the fact that we regard the Russians as our most likely potential enemy. However, the reasons for our change in position are likely deeper than this one fact. We have become a nation which is unsure of some of the ideals of its founding fathers. We are not willing to allow radical dissenters to stand, as Jefferson said, as a monument to the safety with which our republic may be preserved. Men such as Oppenheimer and Condon are called "security risks," not because of overt actions, but simply because of political views which they or their associates hold.

Had our security program ended there, it would have been bad enough. However, we are beginning to demand complete agreement with the present foreign policy—euphemistically called loyalty—for a man to work on unclassified scientific matter. Linus Pauling, former president of the American Chemical Society was denied an opportunity to work on an unclassified project. It was stated that this was because of his political views. David Bohm, who is probably one of the brightest young men to study in this country, has gone to Brazil because it is impossible for him to obtain work in this country. Our ideas of security began with obvious military common-sense precautions, but they have become an instrument to produce conformity.

Our shortcomings are not mitigated by the fact that the Soviet Union is guilty of the same shortcoming. I abhor these sins in the Soviet Union, but I expect much better things from my country.

I hope that we will see fit to re-examine our position. As President Eisenhower has said, there is no place for witch burners in our country.

Summer Nebraskan

Member: Associate Collegiate Press

The Summer Nebraskan is published by the students of the University of Nebraska in cooperation with Summer Sessions, under the direction of Frank Sorenson, as an expression of students' news and opinions only. According to Article 11 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 the members of the staff of The Nebraskan (and Summer Nebraskan) are personally responsible for what they say or do of cause to be printed."

The Summer Nebraskan is published weekly for eight weeks during summer school. Single copy is five cents. 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 Congress of Oct. 8, 1917, authorized Sept. 10, 1923.

For any information regarding news content of the Summer Nebraskan and business or advertising call or go to the Nebraskan office, Ext. 4225, Basement, Student Union, any afternoon Monday through Friday.

STAFF

Editor ..... Kay Nosky
Assistant Editors ..... Barbara Clark, Darwin McAfee
Business Manager ..... Chet Singer