

EDITORIAL PAGE

Baseless Claims

Since the Democrat party of Lancaster county has seen fit to indulge in what they call "Christian charity" in bringing an alleged statute violation to the attention of the Young GOPs, this writer would also like to take the opportunity to indulge in some of the same—and show Mrs. Dorothy Diaz, Demo chairman, and others of her party some convictions that are followed "as stringently as the bingo laws."

The Young GOPs are conducting—over this weekend—a telephoning campaign urging people to make that all-important trip to the polls next Tuesday. In the course of the conversation, the Young GOPs plan to ask people if they are able to get to the polls—and if they are sick or disabled, the young party members will then offer to provide such persons with transportation to the polls.

Which cannot be construed in any way—although the county Democrats are trying in every



ASSIGNMENT FOR TUESDAY

way they know—to be a violation of Section 32-1128 of the State Corrupt Practices Act—which reads as follows:

"Conveying voters to polls by candidates or committee forbidden; exception; penalty. It shall be unlawful for any candidate or committee to run or cause to be run any conveyance for the purpose of conveying voters to the polls, and any person violating the provisions of this section, shall, upon conviction, thereof, be fined in the sum of \$50, or imprisoned in the county jail for not less than 30 days; provided, nothing in this section shall be construed to interfere with conveying sick or disabled persons who are not able without assistance to attend the election."

An unintentional error in the news columns of The Daily Nebraskan indicated that all persons—regardless of physical condition—should be transported to the polls, if they so desire, by Young GOPs. From this unfortunate happening came the Democrats' virtuous attempt at Christian charity.

The Democrats have also brought out another Nebraska statute which defines the "committee" referred to in the section of the Corrupt Practices Act. This is defined as "every two or more persons . . . who shall be associated . . . to further or defeat the nomination . . . of any person or class of persons . . . shall be deemed a political committee . . ."

Even in view of an opinion from the State Attorney General's office, the Democrats are continuing their ridiculous attempt to bring some charge of smear or corruption against members of that party pledged to rid our government of the corruption of the past 20 years. Dean Kratz, Assistant Attorney General, advised this paper that Section 32-1128 of the State Corrupt Practices Act would have no application to volunteer groups who desire to aid in the drive to "Get Out the Vote" by providing transportation to the polls for aged or disabled voters.

The Democrats who rail against Sen. Joseph McCarthy's tactics are guilty—in this very practical instance—of the same smear, insinuation, statements taken out of context—one instance taken to represent the entire picture. In their last-minute panicked attempt to bring disrepute to that party that might bring a halt to their gravy-train, they are making a mountain out of a molehill, trying, vainly, to make state law point the finger of guilt at a situation completely void of illegality.

The Young GOPs have just as much right as anyone else to make a sincere attempt to help get out the vote on election day—and just because they are Young Republicans does not mean that they cannot have the same altruistic motives about urging everyone to use their sacred right to vote—as any other citizen of this country does.

The Democrats of this county and of this campus are making themselves look mighty silly in bringing charge after charge to the offices of local newspapers—in an attempt to make people swallow their baseless claims. In each instance, people of authority—and may we add just those of authority in the Republican party—have shown the claims of the Democrats to be fallacious.

This writer would like to suggest that the Lancaster County Democrats find more to do with their spare time than pouring through the statute books—trying to find some way to indict that very party that is capable of cleaning up the mess they started.—R.R.

On Their Own

Professor of Civil Engineering, G. C. Ernst, said, "We would rather get off, but there just isn't any place else to go."

Assistant Professor of Military Science and Tactics, Maj. John L. Tanner, said, "If the motion were to go through, it would definitely make it rough, especially to assemble our troops. We would have to have some place else."

Director of Athletics, George, "Potsy," Clark, said, "I don't see how we could let you count on using the practice field (north of the Coliseum)."

Director of the Division of Buildings and Grounds, Charles Fowler, said, "If they use concrete, it will probably cost not less than \$1 per square foot. With grading, that cost might go up."

Assistant Dean of the Division of Student Affairs, Frank Hallgren, said, "There is a limit to making the campus a completely utilitarian affair."

Chairman of the Student Council Parking Committee, Rockford Yapp, said, "We want to do what is best for the whole student body."

These persons were discussing the Student Council's proposal to make a concrete lot out of the mall south of the Coliseum.

Yapp moved and Eldon Park seconded a motion Wednesday that this area be converted into parking space. However, the Council decided to table the motion and let a committee look into the details. Council president Wayne White, appointed Yapp, Park and Dick Peterson.

Now, there is nothing really unusual about a motion being made in University Student Council meetings. Nevertheless, this is an unusual motion, because it has a little rebellion in it. Its author and several of his friends on the Council had been worried about the fact that everything that their governmental body did was subject to faculty approval.

When Yapp got the idea to look into the possibilities of turning the mall area into a parking

spot his first inclination was to go to the faculty and see if it would be all right. But, after a little thought, he decided that the Student Council was an autonomous body and capable of making a mature decision on this subject and he would take it to them first.

Therefore, in his regular parking committee report, Yapp made his suggestion into a motion. The Daily Nebraskan wishes to congratulate both he and Park for their healthy view of the place of a council of students. However, we are not so sure that their idea for more parking space is practical.

The special committee is doing a great deal of research to find the possibilities of the new lot. Yapp has talked with Charles Fowler of Buildings and Grounds and Sgt. John Furrow, head of the University Police. Peterson is getting tentative plans and estimates cost for the lot surfaced in gravel, crushed rock, asphalt or concrete from professional contractors. Park is working to find student and faculty opinion on the idea. They will meet before the Council meeting next Wednesday and prepare a comprehensive report for presentation then.

Meanwhile, your Daily Nebraskan has been doing some research too. We have found that there are three primary objections to converting the mall into a parking lot:

- 1) The military courses need to use the area for drill practice.
2) Civil Engineering students studying surveying need to use the area for lab work.
3) The cost is prohibitive.—D.P.

The Daily Nebraskan

FIFTY-FIRST YEAR Member Associated Collegiate Press Intercolllegiate Press EDITORIAL STAFF

The Daily Nebraskan is published by the students of the University of Nebraska in cooperation of student news and a feature only. According to Article II of the By-Laws governing student publication and administered by the Board of Publications, "It is the declared policy of the Board that publication, 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 Daily Nebraskan are personally responsible for what they say or do or cause to be printed."

Subscription rates are \$2.50 a semester, \$2.50 mailed or \$3.00 for the college year, \$4.00 mailed. Single copy 5c. Published daily during the school year except Saturdays and Sundays, vacations and examination periods. One issue published during the month of August by the University of Nebraska under the supervision of the Committee on Student Publications. Entered as Second Class Matter of the Post Office at Lincoln, Nebraska, under Act of Congress, March 3, 1879, and at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of Congress of October 3, 1917, authorized September 10, 1922.

Editor: Dick Halverson, Sam Stephenson, Pat Hall
Associate Editor: Don Piper
Managing Editor: Roy Gorham, Ken Rystrom
Business Editor: Dick Halverson, Sam Stephenson, Pat Hall
Sports Editor: Glenn Nelson
Asst. Sports Editor: Charles Kincaid
Faculty Editor: Ed Fink
Book Editor: Jan Hoffman
Reporter: Tom Woodward, Jan Harrison, Paul Neuss, Marjorie Kline, Marjorie Kline, Lyra, Connie Good, John Younes, Chuck Decker, Ed DeMar, Cal Kuska, Gary Sherman, Del Harding, Darwin McAffee, Del Swenson, Charles Deane, Don Jackson, Faddy Wright, Mary Ann Hansen, Grace Harvey, Jerry Dingman, Marilyn Hutton, Ruth Kleiner, Nancy Carson, Bart Brown, Tom Becker, Howard Yapp, Bob Herr, Gary Franzen.

BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager: Arnold Stern
Asst. Business Manager: Gene Gipple, Pete Bengtson
Circulation Manager: Ed Bang
Night News Editor: Pat Park

Letterip

U.S. Behavior . . .

Dear Editor,

As a foreign student it is possible that my question is decidedly out of place. According to all the best handbooks on "How to behave in the USA" mention of, let alone active interest in American politics is definitely beyond the pale. Therefore in fear of the imminent revival of tiring and feathering or the receipt of an invitation from McCarran to step off these shores, I step in, apologetically, where the British and French delegations to the UN fail to tread, and crave your indulgence as a fellow student.

I am wondering why the Daily Nebraskan "fervently hopes for the election of Dwight Eisenhower to the highest office," according to your issue of Tuesday. By what process of reasoning has this official organ of (is it 7,000 or 8,000?) students arrived at this state of intoxicated excitement which leads to the employment of such an adverb in behalf of one candidate. Is it that he is but one state removed from being a native son? Does the corn grow so huskily and irresistibly around him? Is it that flashing smile arguing so conclusively the superiority of unsocialized dentistry? Or could it be that super-confidence in Eisenhower that convinces you with him that at his appearance in Korea the difficulties of the Reds will disappear with the gunfire? Perhaps you follow on the other hand the philosophy—"in Republicanism do as the Republicans do."

But I write not to ask you to change candidates (for that would indeed be out of place) but methods. It would seem fairer to the level of political intelligence and interest of what must be an almost exclusively academic clientele to reflect the "I like Ike" or "gladly Adlai" bright-button-wearing method which is almost innocent in its frivolity. When we consider the seriousness and complexity of the problems confronting the American Executive.

An impartial discussion of the proposed programs and their feasibility in relation to the realities of the situations at home and abroad, the political and administrative experience of the two major candidates a propos of the office of President might be worthier objectives for the editorial column of a campus newspaper in this "time for greatness."

This should release student votes from the emotional mob approach which is apt to get the better of any of us, being so much easier than going through the uncomfortable process of breaking down our prejudices and thinking clearly and independently. Sincerely, JOSEPEYNE SLADE

Free Men . . .

Editor's note—Since limitations made it necessary to delete small sections of the following letter:

Dear Editor:

The spirit of free men is indispensable to the survival of our society. Transcending the boundary of party politics, the concept of "free men" implies the right of all Americans to independent thought and freedom of inquiry and, above all, to rise above the muddle of conformity and express, freely, fresh and liberal conclusions. We must guard this sacred trust jealously and scrupulously or take our place in history's chamber of fallen democracies in company at Athens and the Roman Republic.

Herein lies the danger and reason for our serious concern over the tactics bared in the "rabbit punches" of the mental lightweight from Wisconsin. With the "old guard" cronies in his corner, his lack of concern for rules of fair play and respect for justice would seem as well the result of his environment as of his own stardom. His victims have to date come from the ranks of liberals, especially those who dared chest the garrote of the China Lobby and went on to spit out the truth regarding post-war policies in the Far East. In blatant disregard of the inherent right of every American to disagree, McCarthy has lowered his iron glove on these loyal Americans, and today they stand as grim testimony of a tragic betrayal of our treasured constitutional rights—the brand of "Communist" smeared across their souls.

It was a genuine optimism that drove liberal minds to view General Eisenhower, especially in light of McCarthy's slander of General Marshall, as the glorious figure who would suppress this lunatic fringe of his party. In this moment the refreshing words of Adlai Stevenson that "liberals are not Communists, and that socialists are not Communists, and the radicals in the American tradition are not Communists" make their deepest impact.

Finally, we gasp in awe at those of both parties who view McCarthy as a great leader of the anti-Communist religion. Admittedly, his concern over sacrificing the basic principles of American justice and his avowed feeling that it is "important to keep alive in the world the principle of dignity of man" do express a deep, divine-like reverence. However, these words were echoed in defense of the Nazi murderers of defenseless American soldiers and many civilians in the Malmédy massacre. Now when the Senator from Malmédy mounts his "anti-Communist" pulpit, he abandons notions of justice and fairness and issues forth, in the name of the holy desire to suppress the Democrats, the summons to stamp all liberals and free thinkers as Communists or Russian espionage agents.

While his proclamation of Inquisition runs over with GOP joy, nary a single Communist has been put behind bars by its lack of goodness and loving-kindness. I submit then that we repudiate the bull of this self-anointed pope of the faith of smear politricks and look forward to the great day when we can, out of sympathy, grant the GOP brainchild—McCarthyism—an undeserved interment with other creatures of folly. Sincerely yours, RONALD RAY RADER

A Student Views The News

War Is Biggest Issue In Last Minute Campaign

Ann Griffiths

In the closing hours of the campaign, the Korean war has been revived as the top election issue while charges and countercharges fly thick and fast.

Eisenhower returned the issue to prominence by charging that the Democrats want the war forgotten. He maintained that American forces can be brought home if the full potential of South Korean manpower is utilized.

Stevenson countered by accusing the Republican nominee of promising a quick and easy peace that he will not be able to deliver. He suggested that Eisenhower was "playing politics" and that the GOP stand may actually have delayed an armistice.

Earlier in the campaign, Democrats brought up Gen. Eisenhower's 1947 statement Griffiths



Griffiths

that "the military occupation of South Korea is not essential to the military security of the United States." Eisenhower replied in turn that

the administration had "abdicated" its civilian authority if a secret military estimate was the only basis upon which policy had been determined.

Then came the most publicized development on the subject. Eisenhower promised to visit Korea personally upon his election in order to arrange the transfer of responsibility from U.S. and UN forces to South Korean troops. Stevenson called the offer a "desperate bid" for support and Truman charged that as top military advisor to the administration, the General should have turned over any plans for shortening the Korean war to proper agencies.

But in the meantime a letter from Gen. James Van Fleet which concurs with Eisenhower's views on the use and intensive training of ROK replacements has been made public, and the Democrats have even more to deal with than threats and promises.

Wednesday, Foreign Soviet Minister Andrei Vishinsky rejected the recent US proposal for a UN truce plan as "utterly unsatisfactory." Thus the wars go on—in political circles, in Korea, and in the campaign. Election Day is Nov. 4.

A Student Looks Toward Politics

Communism Threat Or Politics?

By KEN RYSTROM Managing Editor

The most powerful and dangerous word in America today is undoubtedly "Communism." To have the word linked directly or by implication, to one's name is a virtual kiss of death. It means automatic and complete ostracism from the worlds of business, society, teaching and writing.

The threat of Communism to the American way of life without doubt justifies the concern of our citizens and their efforts to check it both within and without the country. The presence of a Communist or Communist propagandist is a threat to the continuance of our liberties, we all know.

Both Democrats and Republicans agree to this. Both declare war on Communism and pledge ourselves to a wholehearted effort to clear the government from Communists and Communist sympathizers.

But they do not all agree on the methods of fighting the Red threat.

On one extreme are those who exact loyalty oaths from college professors, government employees and laborers, who set up loyalty boards to check the record of thousands and thousands of Americans, who invade public libraries, burn books and label and censor literature as being "subversive."

Politically, their effort, according to Columnist Dorothy Thompson, "is described as an attempt to 'control thought' by character assassination and organized pressures to remove from public influence persons with opinions differing from one's own, using for that purpose smear and slander; it stifles honest opinions; it threatens civil liberties."

It is known as McCarthyism. Designed to meet the threat of Communism within our government, it has employed efforts to establish guilt by association and accusation.

Senator McCarthy, its chief exponent, has continually attacked the Democrats and their record and advisers for being, if not pro-Communist, at least a knowing aid to Communism within the government. Last week he directed his barrage of charges against the Democratic candidate for the presidency.

On the Republican side, General Eisenhower has been forced, by whom no one seems to know, to reconcile himself at least partially to the junior Senator from Wisconsin. His reason, undoubtedly to unite the Republican party both in the campaign and in his hoped-for Republican Congress, was justified. Eisenhower said, because he agreed with the purposes of McCarthy—if differing with the Senator's methods.

The statement has since been a source of frequent Democratic charges that Eisenhower has surrendered his principles for political expediency and that, if he has not become an advocate of McCarthyism, he has at least given it room for existence in his crusade.

Democratic press and politicians have attacked Ike's reference to "methods" as indicating the surrender of the candidate to the Communist and fascist principle of "the end justifies the means."

Methods "also exactly described the differences between Joe McCarthy and Adlai Stevenson in the matter of Communism," the Arkansas Gazette said. "The Democrats do not feel that a man who is irresponsible enough to attack the patriotism of, to cite only the most spectacular example, George C. Marshall . . . should be

sitting in the U.S. Senate. General Eisenhower, on the other hand, is willing to support the candidacy of Joe McCarthy—even while disagreeing with his method. Thus he says, in effect, that Joe's end justifies his means—and that, we believe, is as dangerous a doctrine as any the Communists espouse."

The Republican press, however, has taken a different view of the Eisenhower statement. The Washington Post, has said: "General Eisenhower met one of the severest tests of his candidacy in Wisconsin, and he handled it in a typically Eisenhower fashion. While continuing to support Senator McCarthy, because he is the candidate of the Republicans in Wisconsin and because the general naturally wants the backing of a Republican Congress, he nevertheless opened a wide gulf between himself and the notorious mudslinger . . . We think that Ike has left Wisconsin without any taint of McCarthyism on his shoes."

Whether Eisenhower did or did not surrender to the "ends justify the means" theory, if the Senator and the general both receive tickets to Washington, what can we expect? The Chicago Sun-Times, an avid Ike supporter, has expressed its desire for McCarthy's defeat, but has added: "If (McCarthy returns to the Senate), it seems to us that the last best hope for extracting his fangs lies in the election of a president of McCarthy's party. That is on the theory which Ike himself has expressed that a GOP victory naturally would build up almost irresistible pressures for party regularity among congressional Republicans—regardless of their past records. On the other hand, if McCarthy wins in Wisconsin and Adlai Stevenson wins nationally, we could expect, with almost dread certainty, six more years of uninterrupted and irresponsible ranting by the Wisconsin wild man."

The Democrats counter with the fact that McCarthy will not only have access to government files and information concerning employees, but he will also be chairman of the expenditures committee, which must approve the budgets of all departments of government. Both positions would boost his fascist campaign, they say.

Efforts have been made during the campaign to avoid unneeded discussion of McCarthy—particularly on the Republican side. But the efforts have been in vain, for frequently, when Democrats attack McCarthy, Republicans, many of whom do not approve of the Senator's methods, immediately jump to his defense. Or, on the other hand, even though certain Republicans have attempted to remove themselves from any connection with McCarthy, Democrats continually speak of McCarthyism as a plank in the GOP platform.

If McCarthyism is not the answer to internal Communism, what can we do to protect our liberties? The Democrats point to the record of the Administration: 1. "As a result of patient investigation and aggressive and skillful prosecution by the Department of Justice, the top leadership of the Communist Party has been tried, convicted and jailed, and the secondary leadership has been indicted. Conspiracy directed by a foreign power has been suppressed but political freedom has remained intact."

2. "Prompt prosecutions have supported Congressional investigations of Communist activities. The citizenship of Harry Bridges was revoked. Large numbers of alien Communists have been deported."

3. "Where Communist agents have infiltrated into key positions in industry and government, they have been ferreted out . . . The Loyalty Program for Federal Employees, set up by President Truman, utilized the FBI to screen each and every person on the payroll of the Federal government."

4. "The Democratic success in fighting poverty and repression has aided immeasurably in the fight against Communism and its efforts to control men's minds."

Republicans, however, point to a "shameful" Democratic record in resisting Communism. They charge that the Democratic Party has "coddled" top Communists, that Communists have influenced decisions—particularly in foreign policy—of the government and that the Democratic Party has persisted in calling "red herring" any attempts by the Republicans to fight Communists in the government.

"So much remains to be done in the way of recovering the ground lost by the Democratic Party's failure to understand and to check the Communist menace, that only a completely new administration with no ties to the old—will be able to restore stability and peace," goes the Republican argument.

In regard to their candidates, the Republicans say, "The record proves that Richard Nixon is an experienced and relentless foe of Communism, a scourge of the souldrels . . . that Dwight D. Eisenhower has the experience in making the right decisions in a world contest and the stature and unexcelled organizing ability to enforce the right decisions."

In recent speeches the candidates placed different emphasis on the real threat of Communism. Ike declared that its penetration "contaminated in some degree . . . virtually every department, every agency, every bureau, every section of our government. Stevenson, on the other hand, emphasized the broader aspects of Communism's appeal to the mass mind, embittered and frustrated by unemployment and want. Eisenhower has declared: "Let every person distributing political literature through the mails be made to disclose its source of funds and its membership. Let every organization affecting our political life be compelled to make public its finances, membership and affiliations. In short let us use every legal resource to insure that all groups which enjoy the right to free speech extend that right to talking about themselves—plainly and publicly." Stevenson has said similarly that he would "use all power of the federal government to expose and identify Communist activity, to remove Communists and their tools from places of position and prestige in our society and to protect our free institutions from Communist espionage, sabotage and subversion."

Both candidates appear to have the same goal. The questions then are two: "Who will more closely follow the principles of our democracy in fighting the threat of Communism?" "Who can do the better job?" Let us hope that the voters currently answer these questions come Nov. 4. All of us have a stake in the outcome.

KNUS

- 3:00-3:15 Jay's Jambies
3:15-3:30 Treasury Show
3:30-4:00 Authors of the Ages
4:00-4:15 Spins and Needles
4:15-4:25 Garretson's Wax Works
4:30-4:35 This I Believe
4:35-4:50 Robin's Nest
4:50-5:00 News

NUBB

- Monday
YW Camp Counseling—Ellen Smith Dining Room, 4 p.m.
YW Commission Christian Beliefs—Ellen Smith Dining Room, 5 p.m.
Cornhusker pictures—West Stadium photo lab.
Varsity Dairy Club—5 p.m.
Tuesday
Cornhusker pictures—West Stadium photo lab.
Block and Bridle—4:45 p.m.
Cora Cols—5 p.m.
Cosmet Club Activities meeting—Room 309 Union, 7:30 p.m.

Margin Notes

The Beautiful Season

Despite early warnings that the dry spell would prevent a colorful fall, Lincoln's trees are now dressed in magnificent shades of red, yellow, orange and a still-persisting green. One campus personality, from New England where the falls are perhaps the most beautiful in the nation, said the other day that Nebraska's autumn has been much more colorful than she had ever imagined it could be.

Daily Thought

It is worth a thousand pounds a year to have the habit of looking on the bright side of things.—Johnson.