

# on other campuses

## Nobody loves compulsory drill—do you?

(Editor's note: Below is an editorial reprinted from the Daily Californian, University of California, which should be especially interesting to basic ROTC students since it points out the basic fallacy in compulsory military training.)

The main intention of ROTC is not to create leadership or citizenship training, nor is it primarily for the physical advantages it allegedly possesses. Its purpose is for national defense. The Morrill Land Grant Act and subsequent acts make this quite clear and so do the statements of military authorities in the country. Says Major George Fielding Elliot, "I regard a properly constituted Officers' Reserve Corps and a Reserve Officers Trainings Corps to act as its (the regular army's) feeder, as essential to this country's military set-up." Even closer to home, we have the statement of Colonel Elvid Hunt, former commander of ROTC on this campus. "It must be remembered that the aim of ROTC is to turn out Reserve officers for our army and navy."

This being the case, we submit that ROTC could best serve its purpose by being on a voluntary basis. On thorough investigation, we find that even military men are not committed in favor of compulsory ROTC. Typical is the statement of Ray A. Hill, representative of the War Department. Hill says, "The War Department does not say you must have a required course or an elective course. They (the colleges) are given a choice."

Even further, it should be pointed out that military training received in the basic course is negligible. Major Kenneth E. Walser, U. S. Field Artillery, says, "We regard military training of three hours a week during a two year school or college course as of negligible usefulness in training officers for war. Any army officer can teach this much in a week of intensive training when the emergency arises."

Thus, it is even admitted by army officials that the basic course is not essential for national defense purposes. What are the reasons for keeping it compulsory against the objections of those who oppose it on religious, political and other legitimate grounds?

Major Enoch B. Garey, former commander of the John Hopkin's ROTC says, "I am opposed to compulsory ROTC because it is so damn dumb. I am for a national defense that is strong and effective, that can do at the time needed the thing that ought to be done. Compulsory military training thwarts that."

There is nothing more that we can say. Military officers, in particular Major Garey, have said it for us.

## Great thoughts

(Editor's note: The following article answers a question every one must have wondered about at their freshman convocation. We credit the Minnesota Daily.)

Malcolm M. Willey, university dean and assistant to the president, finally revealed yesterday what the great and the near-great say to him while they're standing on the stage in Northrop, waiting to be introduced.

The thoughts he is always privileged to hear are:

"My, it's a big auditorium, isn't it?"

"My, it's a big audience isn't it?"

"What time did you say? 12:20?"

And Dean Willey, as you have noticed, always nods his head and says, "Yes."

## Ferguson will discuss curricula at Reno meet

Dean O. J. Ferguson of the college of engineering, president of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, will speak at a meeting of the Pacific southwest section of the organization at Reno, Nev., Dec. 27. The dean will discuss the activities of the society and the aims and scope of present engineering curricula.

From the University of Nevada he will go to Berkeley, Calif., to help arrange the annual national convention of the society which will be held there next June. Saturday Dean Ferguson attended the Chicago meeting of the aims and scope committee of the organization.

## To subsidize or not to subsidize

### No, never

"There is only one thing to be thankful for; we are not backing up the line for the University of Chicago." Probably President Hutchins would not think this comment very funny, and to anyone who looks beyond it to the the situation to which it refers, it is not.

The fact that the University of Chicago has one of the worst football teams in the country, a team which has been the butt of all sorts of jibes ever since the season began, is more than a personal tragedy to the berighted members of the Chicago team. It is not their fault; it is not the fault of the coaches. It is simply the result of a university policy which places a premium on brains whether accompanied by brawn or not.

The University of Chicago is, as a matter of fact, at a very crucial stage in its development. It is facing the consequences of a strictly amateur athletics policy quite in keeping with a reputation as an educational institution which, according to the *Atlantic Monthly*, is second in the United States only to Harvard's. Chicago is showing the way to the nation in its athletic purity, but it is paying a heavy price for its decision.

The derision which has greeted the Chicago football team this fall is but a sample of what is probably yet to come. And yet football is the only sport where the application of the plan has failed to produce a team good enough to compete in Big Ten circles. If sportswriters persist in dishing out wisecracks at Chicago's expense, the university athletic council will soon be forced to make some sort of decision in regard to its athletic policy. According to *Pulse*, an undergraduate publication, the authorities have three alternatives before them: (1) to abolish football completely on an intercollegiate basis; (2) to lower the university's scholastic standards; (3) to sever connections with the Big Ten and play in an easier league.

The first alternative seems to us unwise, for football is a fine competitive sport. To relax its stringent academic requirements in order to introduce a little brawn into the undergraduate body would be an admission of the defeat of the university's present idealistic program. There remains but one choice: to withdraw from the Big Ten conference. Chicago is obviously outclassed by its present opponents and there is no reason why it should have to take a shellacking every weekend or that the teams it now plays should be forced to battle under such a David-and-Goliath setup.

Chicago has set an example, but not such a bad example as the sportswriters would have us believe. It prefers to remain a college with a football team, rather than, as one columnist so aptly put it, a football team with a college. The Big Ten will miss Chicago's healthy influence, but Chicago will not miss the Big Ten.

Editor's note: (The reprint on the right is an editorial from the Daily Princetonian which is interesting in that it throws light on one side of the controversial question of paying athletes, in opposition to the editorial on the left, taken from the Daily Illini which supports a mild form of athletic subsidization.)

### Yes, ethically

General tenor of the resolution adopted Saturday by the University of Illinois Lettermen's association was encouraging to those who believe good Varsity athletic material may be secured without sacrificing existing ethical standards of either the University or the Big Ten conference.

The problem of subsidization of college athletes has covered an extensive, complicated ground since college football first became big business. As generally interpreted, subsidization carries with it a slightly off-color connotation. Yet certain forms of subsidization can be strictly legal, above board, and highly desirable from the viewpoint of all concerned.

There seems little objection to that form of subsidization which helps needy athletes honestly to work their way through college—provided always that they receive money for fulfilling the requirements of a REAL job; not merely becoming athletic bums sitting back on their heels waiting for a monthly pay check covering hypothetical "work" on a non-existent "job."

There can be no objection to athletic scholarships that assist to defray partially scholastic expenses—provided that eligibility for the scholarships rests upon an academic-achievement plane higher than most run-of-the-mill awards.

Particularly in college football is subsidization a fundamental problem. Modern college football has created gargantuan stadia with attendant costs of maintenance. For better or for worse, college football exerts powerful influence upon the alumni—and upon the national reputation of a university in the popular mind.

Subsidization, then, presents a question of formidable proportion in the operation of any large university. Since subsidization of some sort seems an essential requisite if the school intends to remain in intercollegiate athletic competition, it must decide which path of subsidization it prefers to follow.

In their resolution Saturday, the I-men plainly indicated they believed it possible for the University to follow the ethical path of subsidization—and still get sufficiently good athletic talent.

At the same time, the resolution implied that no unnecessary barriers should be erected by the University against the strengthening of legal, desirable subsidization.

The I-men's resolution was more than timely; it was authoritative. More thoroughly than does any other group connected with the campus, the Lettermen's association realizes the problems of athletics and athletics in a large university. Their resolution should carry considerable weight in the formulation of future University athletic policies.

## We hate war, but will this time ever come?

(Editor's note: Stanley Frankel, editor of the Daily Northwestern, is one of the ablest supporters of American neutrality among all collegiate editors. The following editorial is reprinted from his column in the Daily Northwestern.)

Note: The policy of the Daily Northwestern is to help make sure that the following story could never be written.

The joint session of the senate and the house was suddenly very still. It was April 4, 1940. The members had been called to a special session to hear the president.

The president began, "I hate war—but the time has come when we must join the democracy—and peace-loving nations of the world to make the world, again, safe for freedom."

That was all. The senate and the house were hushed for many minutes. The significance of the president's words had struck home.

But no few minutes of hushed silence marked other governmental activities. The war department immediately sent wartime instructions to every U.S. industry. All newspapers, all ministers, all educators received government notices, "asking (under penalty of imprisonment) that all effort, all words, written or spoken, be directed toward the successful prosecution of the war."

Thruout the land, an immense draft was begun. In one week, every man between the ages of 21 to 35 was registered. In one more week, six million of the eight million men registered were chosen for active service. And by June 1, 50,000 American soldiers were in France.

Included in the first batch were some Northwestern students. Dick Trenbeth had been given a gun instead of a graduate fellowship. Fred Mamer went overseas to fight instead of to study. Dick Richards, Corne Arts, and Bill DeCorrevont would play no more football this October. They would throw hand-grenades instead of pigskins; they were to block cold, hard bullets instead of opposing linemen; they were backing up the trench line—instead of the football line.

The troops were greeted at

Havre by an aerial bombardment. Their first taste of actual warfare was a picture of disemboweled children, desolate mothers, half-crazed old men.

The American troops were sent to the western front. A very bad flu epidemic had broken out. The mortality rate of those with flu was almost 70 percent. Dick Trenbeth was the first N. U. student to die—ingloriously—of pneumonia on a mud-coated hospital bed.

In an enemy offensive, the Americans "acquitted themselves nobly." Fred Mamer, however, will not be able to accept his Wharton scholarship. He was bayoneted,

## Hey paw! where do you come in?

(Editor's note: The following warning to all males is reprinted from The Dartmouth.)

Things look pretty black for the male sex, and this being a college exclusively for males we think we ought to warn you.

A couple of scientists have perfected a fatherless rabbit, according to a magazine we read last night, and by 1951 they expect to perfect a fatherless human. It's all done with a special salt solution, which not only dispenses with males for procreation but turns out nothing but females.

If this thing catches on, it's not hard to see where the male sex will become a useless appendage to the human race and eventually totally extinct. And if that happens, where will Dartmouth college be? That's one problem we'll bet the Ad building hasn't figured out yet—what to do when there aren't any more men.

Pure science is pure science, and the spirit of research should rise untrammelled above personal considerations, and all that. But there are limits. The extinction of the male race is one. We just thought we'd warn you.

—Dartmouth.



## Spied at Miller's

(of particular interest to men) Haven't finished your Christmas shopping? Not even for your very best girl? Shame on you, you don't deserve this consideration, but anyway, we did a little scouting just for you, because we have ideas about what girls like.



JEWELRY is always a thrilling gift, and we have such a wide range of types that you will look no further. And if you have that department store phobia, it's of interest to you to know that our jewelry counter is right inside our east door entrance. INDIAN JEWELRY, silver set with genuine turquoise, \$1 to \$10. LOCKETS, \$3 to 8.50.

LOUNGING ROBES and HOUSECOATS are a college gal's delight. Regardless of the price you can pay, we'll find one for you that's a tribute to her loveliness. 5.95 and up. Robe section, third floor.



If she likes things soft and cuddly, and warm as a kitten curled on the hearth, give her a slipper that's really a FOOT MUFF, with its electrified lambswool inside and out. \$5. Shoe section, second floor.

PERFUMES, as exotic as you wish or with a fragrance gathered from an old fashioned garden, in beautiful gift bottles, \$1 to \$10. Toilet Goods, street floor.



CANDY always carries sweet wishes, and you now you're sending the best in candies if you make it WITCHING HOUR CHOCOLATES. Fruit, cream and nut centers. 1, 2, 3 and 5 lb. boxes. 1B. —\$1. Candies, street floor.

Watch For "Spied at Miller's" in next Wednesday's Daily Nebraskan



MILLER & PAINE

**Hotel Cornhusker**  
UNDER SCHIMMEL DIRECTION

We are proud to be the host of

**SIGMA ALPHA EPSILON FORMAL**  
Wednesday Evening

HOME OF THE TASTY PASTRY SHOP