

Editorial — Comment — Bulletin

The Daily Nebraskan

FORTY-FIRST YEAR.

Subscription Rates are \$1.00 Per Semester or \$1.50 for the College Year. \$2.50 Mailed. Single copy, 5 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 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized September 30, 1922.

Published Daily during the school year except Mondays and Saturdays, vacations, and examinations periods by Students of the University of Nebraska under the supervision of the Publications Board.

Offices.....Union Building.
Day—2-7181. Night—2-7183. Journal—2-3330

EditorMary Kerrigan
Business ManagerBen Novicoff

Member

Associated Collegiate Press

Distributor of

Collegiate Digest

Member Nebraska Press Association, 1940-41
EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

Managing EditorsMorton Margolin, Paul Svoboda
News Editors.....Marjorie Bruning, Alan Jacobs,
Marjorie May, Helen Kelley, Bob Schlater.
Sports EditorBob Miller

BUSINESS DEPARTMENT.

Assistant Business Manager.....Phil Kantor
Circulation ManagerErv Friedman

Represented for National Advertising by
NATIONAL ADVERTISING SERVICE, INC.
420 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.
Chicago Boston Los Angeles San Francisco

Generalities—Bah!

A number of charges have been hurled at the Daily Nebraskan since the appearance in yesterday's issue of the report on Wednesday's Student Council meeting and the editorial headlined "We Vote No." A lengthy letter from a Student Council member incorporates a large number of these charges and appears in today's Campus Forum column.

First, the letter accuses the reporter who wrote the news story of partiality in putting in the objections to the amendment to the Student Council constitution that is being proposed by some of the members of the Barb organization, and not the favorable comments and answers to criticisms.

It might be well for those who criticized the coverage of the story to try sometime to write a story from both sides when none of the comments in favor of the proposal are clear enough for the reporter, or anyone else for that matter, to understand. It was obvious, from what those in favor of the proposal said at the meeting, that they were there merely to get the proposal across, without knowing any concrete arguments in its favor. After all, the reporter can only write what he hears and understands.

In answer to the letter's question: "Be honest, editor, was not this story purposefully colored?" The story was not purposefully colored. If those who favor the proposal have a group of concrete arguments to present, although they did not make them clear to the Student Council, they are still invited—no, urged—to write them down in clear form and send them to the Daily Nebraskan. They will be printed on the front page of this newspaper.

As for the charge that the council should not approve or disapprove the proposed amendment we say that the Student Council, being the student governing body of the university, and being interested in student government, on the whole, has a right to investigate anything that might change the student governing body in membership, organization or policy.

This right is guaranteed to any legislative body including the Congress of the United States from which have come all 21 amendments to the constitution of the United States. We suggest that those who criticize the Student Council on this issue use a little common sense and gather a little governmental knowledge before they condemn those who are governing.

Yes, the editor of the Nebraskan has a right to "voice whatever opinion he desires." This was done in the editorial, "We Vote No." Much thought went into the editorial and it was not thought along political lines. The disadvantages of the proposal were seen and pointed out, as you will see if you read the editorial again—carefully.

You speak blithely of "glittering generalities," with no basis for your condemnation. If you will read the editorial again, you will see that such "glittering generalities" as "elections have been cleaned up," "if this proposal goes through, it will junk all of the progress made in the past ten years in improving the council," "representation from all colleges on the fairest basis possible," and "women are not guaranteed representation," were backed up with facts. Your own advice that we should look back in the 1938-39 Nebraskan files proves our point that elections have been cleaned up. The files of the two years following that show the statement to be true.

We still believe the second "glittering generality" that if the proposal goes through, it will junk all of the progress made in the past ten years. It is (or should be) obvious that if the entire constitution is changed, as

the amendment proposes, the progress that has been made on the present constitution will have gone for nothing. We can see nothing "general" in this statement.

As for representation, it is quite clear that the amendment makes no provision for representation by colleges or by sex, but only by political parties. This was made clear in yesterday's editorial—that no college or sex was guaranteed representation. (Ag college excepted.)

The few—we say few, because a large number of barbs either are opposed to the amendment or know nothing about it—who are trying to put the proposal through, have been claiming all year that it was not a political move, that it was merely meant to "improve student government." They are admitting now that it was political all the time, but that they hoped to put it through without opposition. Now that there is opposition they are saying "We must give logical arguments to those who require logical arguments and propagandize the rest." That is a direct quotation from a barb leader and cannot be denied.

The Daily Nebraskan, particularly this year, has been careful to avoid political issues and did not intend to make a political issue of the proposed amendment. We merely saw evils in the proposal and endeavored to place them before the student body. The Nebraskan is neither Barb nor Greek and since so many barbs are opposed to the amendment, we feel justified in saying that the criticisms against the plan were not brought out because the newspaper represents a political party, but because we honestly are against the proposal because it will break down student government.

Welcome, NSFA

The west central regional convention of the National Student Federation Association will start with a breakfast in the Union this morning and will continue, with meetings, discussion groups, and informal gatherings, until tomorrow evening when it will close with a banquet at the University Club. The convention is sponsored by the University of Nebraska Student Council, which, though not a member of the association, is anxious to gather helpful ideas and suggestions on student government. We extend a hearty welcome to the Student Council representatives from other schools who will attend the convention and we hope they can carry back to their various schools as many ideas as our council hopes to hear about.

Letters to The Editor

Dear Editor:

The political breezes that swept through the student council Wednesday night carried with them a terrific odor. But after being worked over in Thursday's Daily, the breezes had increased in velocity until they were of hurricane-strength, and the odor carried with them increased in like proportions.

It was ironical to read the student council story and then glance to the right of it and see: "Official student newspaper of more than 7,000 students." I didn't know the Greek faction was that strong.

"Dafoe refused to explain the petition article by article because of its length and complexity," your reporter editorializes. The reporter was there and must have heard Burton Theil, council president, state that Dafoe would be limited to a ten-minute explanation. Therefore it was not because of the "complexity" of the amendment that Dafoe did not explain it, but because he wasn't allowed the necessary time.

The objections were given in the news story, all of them; but favorable comments and answers to criticisms were obviously lacking. There were retorts to the remarks of R. Donald Steele and Marion Aden, but the replies to these opponents were not printed. Be honest, editor, was not this story purposefully colored?

Not only do I condemn the Nebraskan for this deliberate coloring of a news story, but also the student council for acting, not as representatives of the students, but as politicians. Why was it necessary for the council to act on the proposed amendment? Was approval or disapproval necessary?

If the council is to be consistent then why should not all students who file for positions, all amendments, and everything else that is to be voted upon by the students, be approved or disapproved by the council?

How did it happen that just this one item was brought up? It was because the political leaders and members of the council pre-arranged this matter so that the student council could go on record as being opposed to the amendment. We should remember that this action was taken by a majority, not a unanimous group in the council. And the group who wanted it brought up for a vote had no reason, other than political, to have that amendment voted on.

Did your reporter mention that the council president stated that "there will be no vote on this measure?" The president knew, I knew, and everyone else in council meeting knew, that there would be a vote on that issue. That is why this proposition was discussed, as a political

issue mind you, for practically the entire meeting-time. And yet we call the council efficient.

Re: the Thursday editorial, "We vote—no."

You, as editor of the Daily Nebraskan, have a right to voice whatever opinion you desire in your editorials. Therefore I do not condemn you for your standpoint. However, I do condemn you for the many "glittering generalities" voiced therein.

"If this proposal goes through, it will junk all of the progress...made in the past ten years in improving the council," you maintain. Where, I ask you where, are your facts substantiating this statement?

You also say that "elections have been cleaned up." I question that, and ask you to get out your files of the Daily for 1938-39. Do you prove your statement that "a system of student representation from all colleges worked out on the fairest basis possible?" Note: "on the fairest basis possible." That is a very broad statement.

"Women are not guaranteed representation on the council," you say. Have they not the same opportunity as men? Are they not strong enough politically to sponsor and elect candidates? They are on the same basis as men, which is as it should be.

Why would the engineering executive board "and other such organizations" be in danger of annihilation? I can find no facts, editor, either in the proposal or in your editorial.

Twenty members, working efficiently, and not wasting hours of time in political planning, could accomplish just as much as the present council, although you contend differently.

I have three recommendations: 1) that the student council refrain from its political maneuvers lest its powers be delegated to a body totally apart from the students, 2) that the Daily Nebraskan refrain from coloring any news stories in the future, 3) that the Nebraskan editor write more facts and fewer "glittering generalities."

Donald E. Bower
Student Council Member.

Behind the News

By David Thompson

Oil Is Important

What of the very valuable oil fields in the Russian Caucasus that are now threatened by the German attack which has already proceeded into the valuable industrial Donets river basin?

That is an important question to consider. The importance of the oilfields to Russia herself cannot be measured, and their potential importance to Germany is even more immeasurable. That being the case you can expect a very decisive stand to be made in the Caucasus region. In that regard you are likely to say that if the Russians can't defend Moscow in winter fighting conditions, how is an inferior Russian force going to hold the Caucasus? It seems quite clear that the remnants of the Russian fighting force around Moscow cannot aid in the southern defense since their hands are more than full in the central front.

The answer to the problem of defending the Caucasus depends on two things. First and foremost is the probable direction of the German attack if and when it manages to cut off the Donets basin from the rest of Russia. She has two alternatives; either to turn northward in an endeavor to complete the encirclement of beleaguered Moscow, or to move into the Caucasus oil fields. The first alternative will depend, of course, on whether or not Moscow still stands when the campaign in the Donets basin is completed, and whether or not the German oil supply still holds out.

Germans Next Move.

Most observers feel that the demand for oil will be more important than the immediate capture of Moscow, and that as a result the German move will be into the Caucasus.

In that event the Germans will not only have to contend with the Russian army in the south, but they will face a British expeditionary force of nearly a million completely equipped men now stationed in Persia. The British and Russians will be favored by a supply line open to American and British shipping in the Persian gulf, while the German supply line will be strung out all across Southern Russia where there are few railroad lines available. With those conditions in mind, you can rest assured that even the highly efficient German mechanized forces will be faced with a task they may not be able to complete.

The benefits of the German campaign in Russia then begin to look very meager viewed in that light. The Ukraine, Russian "bread basket," is nothing but scorched earth and will provide no supplies until next year at the earliest. What else but the oilfields did the Germans expect to get from Russia? The removal of a threat at their backs perhaps, tho that seems doubtful since Russia was more than peaceful when suddenly attacked because they refused to feed Germany. The Germans still won't be fed by the Russian campaign, unless to the extent that there will be less German soldiers to feed.