

EDITORIAL PAGE

Could You Use \$100?

Two years ago on this campus a certain boy, with a high scholastic average, became ill and had to miss several weeks of classes.

The modest boy who "hadn't considered it" had great need for financial aid, Dr. Thompson discovered, and he urged the boy to reconsider.

That high-ranking student later received one of the most valuable scholarships offered by the University and the award led, still later, to a much greater scholarship from a larger institution.

The same thing could happen to a number of brilliant students who are either too modest or too timid to apply for scholarships or grant-in-aid. The University offers more than 350 such awards each year through the general scholarship awards committee, of which Dr. Thompson is chairman.

The procedure for applying for scholarships is simple. Joe College, if his weighted average is near seven and if he's normal enough to want an extra \$100 or more, goes to the office of the dean of student affairs in Room 104, Administration building, to pick up a three-page blank.

Politics Vs. Statehood

A rather flagrant misuse of Senate debate rules occurred in the nation's capitol Wednesday over the question of Alaskan statehood.

The vote, carried by the margin of a single decision, sent the bill back to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee coupled with instructions to study a possible constitutional amendment that would give Alaska more self-government and some Congressional voting representation, rather than statehood.

Opponents of the statehood bill say publicly that Alaska does not have the population or resources development to finance state government. Privately, these opponents, one of the strongest of whom has been Nebraskan Senator Hugh Butler, fear Alaskan statehood on the grounds that Senatorial balance of power might be disrupted.

Advocates of accepting Alaska as the 49th state, answer that the territory will remain undeveloped without the privilege of statehood to attract population. They also contend that Alaska needs to be taken into the United States statehood immediately because of its closeness to Russia.

The action to send the Statehood Bill back into the committee from whence it came nearly kills any further consideration of statehood for Alaska during this session of Congress. If this action of the Senate stands, January of 1953 would be the soonest time at which statehood for this territory could be considered.

The greatest motive which tried to kill the statehood bill, at least for the present, was the fear in the halls of Congress that the Senatorial balance of power might be disturbed. The Democrats, plus their Republican cohorts, have seen fit to block this administration-backed legislation so that their Senatorial power will not be challenged or disturbed.

In view of the arguments, just and timely, for bestowing the status of statehood upon the territory of Alaska, the 45 Senators who took advantage of a rule of debate to further their own selfish interests did so at the expense of Alaska and the nation.

Strategically and economically speaking, The Daily Nebraskan feels that Alaska is ready for statehood. The Senators that say the territory does not have the population or resources development to finance state government are not the people who have been most vitally interested in the development of Alaska.

The administration, the Democrat Senators backing the administration and some Republican Senators have declared that the statehood Bill has not been killed for this session of Congress. They have announced their intention to fight to bring the Bill back onto the Senate floor.

To do this would require a majority vote of the entire Senatorial membership provided the committee does not report out on the Bill within the specified time, under one month. The advocates of Alaskan statehood have pledged to bring the Bill back from its premature committee death. To accomplish this will mean applying pressure on Senators to reconsider their votes. It will also mean a scrambling for the votes of the seven Senators who were not included in the roll-call.

Sen. Hugh Butler of Nebraska voted to send the bill back to committee. Sen. Fred Seaton of Nebraska voted to keep the bill on the Senate

Daily Thought

A man without thought for the future must soon have present sorrow.—Confucius.

he is in a mood to keep in the red.) At 8:30 a.m., Saturday, March 29, Joe takes a few hours off to take the General Comprehensive Examination, a requirement for those seeking aid. From then on, Joe sits back and lets the general scholarship awards committee do the work. The group of faculty members considers Joe's average, his application and his grade on the examination. If he qualifies for more than one scholarship, he is given the more valuable one. He is notified of the results before August 1.

The pitiful thing about this simple procedure is that too many Joes do not go through it. According to Dr. Thompson, only about 500 students filed for awards last year. He said, "We always hear of a considerable number of capable students who never file applications, which is to us most regrettable." C. C. Wiggins, professor of horticulture, who served on the committee for many years, said "I would like to see everybody on the honors list apply for scholarships. We have a limited number of awards, but we would like to give them to the best students." He added that students wishing grants-in-aid do not need to be on the honor list as the grants are sometimes given to students with averages as low as 6.5.

Dr. Thompson attributes much of the failure to file to personal modesty and timidity. Wiggins believes that some students are afraid of the comprehensive test, which he calls "refreshing" and a "fine way to check one's general intelligence." He said one young married woman approached him after the test and said, "That was lots of fun."

A number of students seem to have the attitude that "others need it more than I do." These persons forget that Regents awards are not based on need, Dr. Thompson said.

Whether it is modesty, timidity or fear of the comprehensive test that keeps students from filing for scholarships, The Daily Nebraskan urges academically high-ranking students to remove their light from under the bushel basket long enough to seek the financial help which they most certainly deserve.—J.S.

Sound-Off

No Statehood For Alaska

It looks as if statehood for Alaska, and Hawaii too, has been killed again, for this session of congress. A bunch of die-hards, among them Nebraskan's Senator Butler, managed to end this "threat" to American security by a narrow 45-44 margin.

The Alaskan statehood bill was sent back to committee for further study. The Hawaiian bill will probably suffer to same fate if it comes up during the session. Indications now are that the backers of Hawaii will give up for this session.

It appears however that both Alaska and Hawaii will eventually become states. Some of the same objections to admitting these two territories were raised when most of the other states entered the Union. When Nebraska became a state, 85 years ago, people thought that there were not enough people here to form a stable economy. The same objections were raised concerning Alaska.

Much of the real opposition to the bill comes from southern senators, and the northern republicans—who play ball with them. The southerners seem to fear that four more senators would threaten their ability to maintain their filibustering. These votes, they feel, might be able to force closure upon the filibusters.

One senator remarked that as of now, he is 1/98 of the Senate whereas if the bill passed, he would be only 1/100. This is certainly sound reasoning and is a great argument against statehood.

One objection some senators may have to the entrance of Hawaii is its large Oriental population. Some of them perhaps fear that an Oriental-American might some day be elected to the senate or to the house, thus contaminating the existing membership. They seem to forget the old American reputation as the melting pot of nations.

Another objection raised to the admission of these two territories is the fact that they are separated from the main body of American states—Alaska by Canada, Hawaii by the Pacific ocean. Some people seem to fear that lands would not be as defensible in case of attack.

Alaska and Hawaii will probably become states at about the same time, whenever they are admitted. Alaska is strongly democratic while Hawaii is just as strongly republican in elections. This sort of compromise would please both parties and would not throw the political alignment out of kilter.

Democrats and republicans split about evenly in their opposition to the bill. The vote was by no means along strict party lines. But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

What Am I Doing Here?

By Bob Reichenbach By Ken Philbrick Guest Columnist

At approximately 4:30 p.m. Monday, a sweet voiced female (your editor) telephoned, and told me a very sad story. According to her, Bob Reichenbach was pilled neck deep in studies and could not possibly carry out his duties as writer of this column (this is a column?) I replied this was certainly touching, but how did it concern me? Then the whole horrible, scandalous plot came out. She wanted me to do it.

I was told to write 24 double spaced lines and that it didn't make any difference what I wrote about (which shows the editor's concern about the readers). With this thought in mind I will proceed to comment on timely topics. There is a slight possibility I won't make my 24 lines. They will probably fill in the space with some interesting new slant on how little progress the committee is making on the parking problem.

I notice (somewhat regretfully) that the trend toward poodle cuts is still continuing. The only good thing about this hairdo is the fact it makes it easy to tell which girls have big ears (who looks at ears?)

Did you notice the article in Thursday's Daily Nebraskan listing all of those wonderfully easy ways to pick up lamps, chairs and other sundry pieces of furniture. Just walk into any salaried or fraternal house, the article said. I humbly thank The Daily Nebraskan (they made me capitalize it) for the lesson. It was the first instruction in breaking and entering that I had received since my apprenticeship with Viper Fagin. Thank Heavens, 24 lines.

Sound-Off No Statehood For Alaska

Tom Rische

It looks as if statehood for Alaska, and Hawaii too, has been killed again, for this session of congress. A bunch of die-hards, among them Nebraskan's Senator Butler, managed to end this "threat" to American security by a narrow 45-44 margin.

The Alaskan statehood bill was sent back to committee for further study. The Hawaiian bill will probably suffer to same fate if it comes up during the session. Indications now are that the backers of Hawaii will give up for this session.

It appears however that both Alaska and Hawaii will eventually become states. Some of the same objections to admitting these two territories were raised when most of the other states entered the Union. When Nebraska became a state, 85 years ago, people thought that there were not enough people here to form a stable economy. The same objections were raised concerning Alaska.

Much of the real opposition to the bill comes from southern senators, and the northern republicans—who play ball with them. The southerners seem to fear that four more senators would threaten their ability to maintain their filibustering. These votes, they feel, might be able to force closure upon the filibusters.

One senator remarked that as of now, he is 1/98 of the Senate whereas if the bill passed, he would be only 1/100. This is certainly sound reasoning and is a great argument against statehood.

One objection some senators may have to the entrance of Hawaii is its large Oriental population. Some of them perhaps fear that an Oriental-American might some day be elected to the senate or to the house, thus contaminating the existing membership. They seem to forget the old American reputation as the melting pot of nations.

Another objection raised to the admission of these two territories is the fact that they are separated from the main body of American states—Alaska by Canada, Hawaii by the Pacific ocean. Some people seem to fear that lands would not be as defensible in case of attack.

Alaska and Hawaii will probably become states at about the same time, whenever they are admitted. Alaska is strongly democratic while Hawaii is just as strongly republican in elections. This sort of compromise would please both parties and would not throw the political alignment out of kilter.

Democrats and republicans split about evenly in their opposition to the bill. The vote was by no means along strict party lines. But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

But the people of Alaska and Hawaii have been held in territorial status long enough. Most of their citizens seem to be loyal Americans—and as such, should enjoy the rights and privileges accorded to Americans.

Universal Military Training?

Yes... No

By EDGAR Z. PALMER By MAJ. JAMES R. STOCKMAN Associate Professor of Naval Science

The United States should not adopt any system of permanent peacetime military training such as U. M. T. because (1) it is thoroughly un-American, (2) it would endanger our security, and (3) it would substitute blind discipline for the American spirit of initiative. I am not discussing the present Selective Service Law, which has been adopted for a limited time and a given emergency, but rather the permanent system now being proposed.

One of the great differences between continental Europe and the United States during the past century has been that the former has, in almost every nation, maintained permanent systems of military training, while the latter, our own country, has kept itself free of this burden except in times of war or threat of war. This system has neither prevented war in Europe nor has it insured success to the nations maintaining it. In fact, at the end of the century of military training, Europe is exhausted, disinclined to rearm in spite of our prodding, while we are in the most vigorous national health. There are persons who like this European system and wish to import it, just as there are those who like other European institutions and wish to bring them here. We do, of course, borrow ideas from all over the world, but when it is proposed to bring over the very authoritarian system which we came here to get away from, then I prefer the American plan, and intend to do all I can to keep it.

The nations which formerly were noted for their individualism and freedom of thought, such as Germany and Italy, were molded under the pressure of universal conscription into unified mental patterns which prepared the way for totalitarianism. Bismark, the builder of modern Germany, said contemptuously that where he found five Germans he found six opinions. He knew how to change this deep seated individualism, which had produced the Germany of fine literature, great music, and profound science, into the moronic national socialism of Hitler. The most potent weapon against the personal freedom which he despised was universal military training. A few generations sufficed. The same type of leader who thinks we need universal militarization of the youth is likely to think, in times of crisis, that we must extend totalitarian control over the rest of the population. This we have to look forward to, if we follow the European path.

With respect to military security, the Pentagon has given us no evidence that the kind of training which will be provided will have any appreciable effect in the event of war. The armed forces have never shown much respect for the national guard or the reserves, which, on a voluntary basis, have been trained in much the same manner as under a universal military training system. About the most that could be expected from the proposed system would be some habituation of city boys to camp life, and this could be done under better auspices by an extension of our civilian Y. M. C. A. and boy scout camps. Against any gain must be set the terrific loss in education in the usual sense, which is now a great source of national strength.

What are the real reasons back of the demand for U. M. T.? The first such reason is that the boys would be "indoctrinated." The object of this indoctrination is to insure that all men should believe in the glories of the history of the armed forces, in the wonders of the military system generally, and in the necessity for large appropriations for defense. The opportunity to preach military doctrine to every boy in the nation would be a priceless advantage for the Pentagon in its struggle for power in Washington.

America has held for over a hundred and fifty years a reputation as a peace-loving—yes, a pacifist nation. This reputation has been only partially sullied by our wars. The fundamentally pacifist heart of the nation has been recognized and respected by the world. It has been our greatest source of security in dealing with other nations. They have not felt it necessary to crush our growing power; rather they have been glad of it. Such a peace-loving disposition is not necessarily the invariable character of a people, however. It can be changed, given the proper indoctrination. Our beloved, peaceful, unaggressive America would become a world menace if the people became military minded. This could happen as the natural result of military training, without conscious purpose on the part of the Pentagon, simply through the installation in the minds of the trainees of a faith in military methods, and the neglect of alternative methods. Nor will the rest of the world stand idly by when this happens. They will join with Soviet Russia to crush us, as they joined with her to crush Germany, if our already preponderant military power becomes joined with a unified popular military spirit. It is impossible, of course, for the military mind to realize that our security lies in our pacifism. Bismark did not realize where his program would lead Germany. Changes such as this do not happen overnight, but in a generation or two.

The second real reason back of the demand for U. M. T., besides the desire for indoctrination, is the desire for discipline of the youth. There is some nostalgia for the old days when fathers are supposed to have beaten their sons often enough to break their spirits, and when all children meekly called their parents "Sir," and "Madame." Actually, there was never much of that sort of thing in America, or we would not have become the strong nation we are. The two ideals of child training are at opposite poles: the one toward discipline, the other toward individual initiative. The ideal of discipline is that of a man, or dog, who will instantly recognize the voice of his master, and obey that voice without question. The ideal of initiative is that of a man who is well educated, self reliant, and prepared to act on the basis of his own judgment. Up to now, we have preferred the latter. The military authorities like to claim that they can instill perfect discipline without damaging initiative, despite the fact that there are opposites. The most they can accomplish is some measure of discipline which crushes some of the initiative and turns some of it into an anti-social bitterness, which eventually may become communism as it has in Europe. The private son learns "never to volunteer." He learns that there are two ways of doing things, the right way and the army way, and that he must act the army way. He learns about Snafu. In short he learns to substitute the judgment of others for his own. I think the American boy is a better fighter when he is not too well disciplined. He is superior be-

Most of the arguments against Universal Military Training today stem from an almost inborn abhorrence of a free and democratic people toward things military. Deeply imbedded in the minds of most Americans is a horror of regimentation, compulsion and loss of civil liberties guaranteed by law.

It is generally agreed that the world is threatened with a third world war. Such a war is not inevitable, but it is a matter of fact that the capability of making war inevitable is within the grasp of our chief antagonist. We know that the USSR is well acquainted with the possibilities of force as an instrument of national policy. Russia has used it at home and abroad.

"War," wrote that eminent military philosopher, Clausewitz, "is nothing but the continuation of state policy by different means."

In this age of improved communication, transportation and new weapons, war is no longer a contest between opposing armies or navies but a contest between peoples. It is the final, violent form resorted to when diplomacy and all other means fail. Modern war is total; it engulfs the nation as a whole, not just the armed forces. Any citizen of England or Germany of adult age during the last great war should be able to give a good definition of total war. We had a taste of it in our own country.

In simple terms, the next war will come as the result of applications of force. It is axiomatic that force respects force. The Russians may never respect us as a nation, but they must respect our capability for force, actual and potential. To give the Russians pause for reflection before they plunge us into war, we have undertaken to make our nation strong. The cost is staggering.

UMT focuses attention on this question with relation to our national defense: Are we operating on an efficient basis in our planning and preparations? From the standpoint of personnel procurement and training the answer must be an unequivocal no.

A glance at our military history reveals that the outstanding faults of United States military policy until very recently have been: dependence on volunteers for increase in the armed forces; short term enlistments; bounties; state control of militia; faulty replacement systems; faulty selection of officers; lack of a coordinating overall staff; and civilian interference.

Beginning with the organization of the general staff in the army and continuing through with new developments brought about by the national defense acts of 1916 and 1920, and finally the national security act of 1947 as amended by the Key West agreement, we find that much progress has been made toward eliminating many of the above-listed faults. We have achieved a sound structural organization. Whether this organization is to have any real meaning, as expressed in desired results achieved, remains to be shown in terms of efficient use of manpower, based on cost involved and minimum goals realized.

In the past two world wars we turned to selective service for manpower. Korea found us using the same antiquated method of procurement. Instead of having a ready force of trained men available for emergency call, ready to go into action with a minimum amount of refresher training—and this surely should be a requirement in this day of atomic warfare—we must rely on the slow, cumbersome machinery of selective service. In times of emergency we skim off the cream of the manpower crop, construct new camps or reconstruct old ones that were temporary in 1918, and saddle the regular establishment of the army, navy and air force with the responsibility of turning out a creditable citizen armed group in the shortest possible time. Instead of being ready to fight a war, the best we can hope for is to be ready to train an army, navy and air force.

The present process of building up our combatant manpower strength is wasteful, allows for little long-range planning (except for in the broadest possible sense), takes too much time, and contributes directly to inflation. Instead of it, we could very well have—through UMT—a steady source for an increasing accumulation of increments of trained personnel. Our regular armed force establishments would then be forces in readiness. Behind them and ready to augment their strength would be our reserve force—UMT graduates. With UMT we could have a hard core of combat-ready citizens on call, ready to go. What an imposing bulwark for freedom they would be!

It shouldn't take an efficiency expert to divine the advantages of UMT over the present horse-and-buggy selective service machinery when the two systems are evaluated in terms of national economy.

With regard to compulsion, regimentation, and loss of civil liberties, what about the status of the present draftee on his way to Korea? Ask him if he joined of his own volition, whether he lives apart from the rest of his platoon or company, and whose code of justice immediately affects him.

UMT may not prevent World War III but it should prove a powerful deterrent force to those aggressor nations capable of provoking war. To those men who served in World War II and were called back to serve in Korea it will mean that through the training of all generations it will not be the fate of one generation to bear an unproportionate load. This should be considered in our long view of national security. UMT will make it possible.

cause in a pinch he can take care of himself and his comrades in his own way.

I have not taken room here for all the arguments or questions which U. M. T. raises, but merely the most important, namely that we are threatened with a creeping totalitarianism. Whether we are headed for fascism or communism matters little. The main question is, shall we take the path of Germany and Russia, or shall we stay on the path which has made us what we are: the strongest, most prosperous nation in the world?

KNUS On The Air

- 3:00 Interlude" 3:15 "Guest Star" 3:20 "Your Stake in the Future" 3:45 "Shake Hands with the World" 4:00 "Memorable Music" 4:15 "Final Sports Ed" 4:30 "Road to Rhythm" 5:00 Sign Off