

# Just Between Us . . .

By DON PIEPER  
Editor

You. What are you?  
You, the person reading this editorial, what are you?  
Are you the neurotic product of a shaken world?  
What do you want out of life?  
Do you think?  
Yes, I'm talking about you—a 20th century university student. Just what are you?

There have been a lot of words written to describe you and your contribution—or lack of contribution—to the world. Many men have attempted to evaluate you in the light of preceding generations.

For the most part, these evaluations are not favorable.

Your critics—both members of your generation and your elders—have described you as unimaginative blobs who are unwilling to face reality. These critics have said that you are interested only in security and are afraid to think.

In a word, you belong to the "lost generation." Consider the inflammatory words of an editorial writer for the Athenaeum, a student magazine at the University of Wisconsin:

"Today's students are a sterile assemblage of prisoners of orthodoxy. A group with little curiosity, content to munch chocolates and watch a television set while the rest of the world staggers blindly to destruction, a group hungry for a rut to cover in; a collection of youngsters already middle aged, lulled by life into a state of vegetative smugness."

Is that you?  
No question could be more basic now, especially for the seniors. Are you, the future citizens, merely frightened refugees of confusion? Do you ignore the difficult, preferring to bask in the false security of blind belief?

Don't laugh. There are a lot of people—intelligent, deep-thinking people—who believe that you are not even beginning to meet the challenge you must face.

Are these critics right?

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of truth in their indictments. In many cases, these critics have completely overemphasized the situation. But the modern student—you—cannot ignore their charges.

For instance, do you think? The Wisconsin editorial charges that students are content to accept without challenge the facts and opinions of their instructors. "We (have) refused to participate in the business of thinking, but preferred to watch the intricate process go on in the heads of others."

Oscar Handlin in the January, 1951, Atlantic Monthly says that "your generation has welcomed the shackles of orthodoxy—all those eager faces looking up at the platform, waiting to be told what to believe. There is a delight in dogma; know the authorities, accept the classics and wash your problems away."

Is that you?  
Things don't seem to be that bad. However, what did you get out of your lectures this morning? Did it occur to you that your instructors

might not know all the answers? Did you challenge anything?

The tendency seems to be for blind acceptance. Are you learning by absorption or do you sort through different views and come to logical conclusions?

The importance of thinking can never be minimized—but especially not now when a cruel and shrewd enemy stands ready to pounce on America's every weakness. You must know why you do not want to live under Communist domination. You must not be content to believe that free enterprise is best merely because others say so. Do you have an inquiring mind? There are those who say that you—as an aggregate—are afraid to think and that you welcome indoctrination.

In too many instances, these critics are right. There are exceptions but there is no need to discuss them. The student who needs discussing is you—if you are content to ride with the tide.

There are plenty of you who don't belong here.

Louis Bromfield, an author with whom this writer very seldom agrees, discussed you recently in an article for Esquire. And, in his analysis of the American system of higher education (which he thought was "merely messy"), Bromfield says that "there are too many young people in our institutions of higher education who are not there to acquire knowledge but to get a job somewhere, or to make a club, or to escape from their father's business or, most commonly, simply to please their parents."

Why are you here?

Don't back off from that question. Why are you here? If you are even partially awake intellectually, you know that the world faces a crisis. And it takes only a little more reasoning to conclude that solid, free-thinking leaders are needed. Are you here to prepare yourself to lead?

Bromfield said that you wanted a college education so that you could "get a job somewhere." In 1949, Fortune magazine wrote, after taking a nation-wide poll of the class of '49, that "security was its goal." Fortune went on to say that your generation "wants to work for somebody else—preferably somebody big."

Is this bad? Is there anything wrong with security? Of course not—as long as your search for security doesn't blind you to the importance of chance. You must not forget that progress comes only with adventure. If you do nothing but look for security you will become stagnant. Then all life will become stagnant. Do you recognize the pitfalls of a selfish search for security?

Are you really this bad off? Probably not. Probably your critics have been disillusioned by your performance in these critical times. And, probably, they have been justified. But every generation is disappointing—yours seems to be especially disappointing because your problems are especially great.

This does not excuse you.  
The Wisconsin condemnation concluded with these words:

"We hope that enough introspection will push us up the scale of evolution from sheepdom to something nearer the dignity of a Free American citizen."  
"Our world is not a safe place for sheep."

## NEBRASKAN EDITORIALS

# Constitution At Stake

The Student Council meets this afternoon.

Today's meeting may provide the only opportunity for open debate on the matter of election filings. No changes can be made in this year's elections, it is true, but next week the 1953 election will be a matter of record and nothing is quite so uninteresting as an election which has passed.

Should the Council feel obligated to recommend election changes to next year's Council, the first matter it should consider is a re-definition of the eligibility requirements for applicants for class and Council positions, for grave injustices have resulted this year from the arbitrary divisions between junior and senior standing.

The first question undoubtedly is, "What does the constitution say concerning eligibility?" It says two things.

Art. IV, Sec. 1 a (5) states: "Filings for college representation are open to students who will be eligible to serve during their sophomore or junior years." (The by-laws say: "Filing procedures shall be the same for class officers and representatives to the Student Council . . .")

Art. V, Sec. 1 b states: "Regular University rules shall govern in determining a candidate's eligibility."

The first provision says nothing about the standing students must have at the time they file. The by-law provision implies that the same is true of class officer applicants. Applicants for senior class officers shall be eligible to serve during their senior year and those for junior positions to serve during their junior year, is the obvious intention.

If this is true, it is unconstitutional to base eligibility for filing on the applicant's standing this year. In the two cases in which applicants for senior positions were disqualified this spring,

it is clear that both of them will be seniors next fall.

The other constitutional provision appears at first glance to cloud the issue. If "regular University rules" include class standings, the rules must be applied in accordance with Art. IV, Sec. 1 a (5). In other words, the University's eligibility system must be employed to determine the class standing a student will have next fall.

The only practical manner to determine this number is to add the number of hours the student has earned through the first semester of this year (the number now employed in determining eligibility) and the number of hours he is now carrying.

Two problems immediately arise: The student may not pass all of his present courses and he may pick up additional hours by attending summer school. The first problem is unlikely since the chances are that any applicant who meets the grade average requirement will not flunk courses this semester—particularly since he obviously feels he had enough time to engage in an activity next fall.

The addition of summer school hours is a possibility, but it is just as great a possibility under the system now employed. No one has raised an objection.

If the constitution were to be followed strictly, the Council this afternoon would have little choice in devising an eligibility system.

But because the Council has shown that it frequently finds it easy to avoid the constitution on the matter of elections, perhaps this afternoon's debate should concern itself with the advisability of a constitution.

The constitution is specific. Will the Council members respect it or is the constitution just a piece of paper?—K. R.

# WORLD REPORT

By PAUL MEANS  
Staff Writer

**TODAY'S HEADLINES . . .** At Panmunjom today, Armistice negotiators are to meet at 11 a.m. . . . The negotiators appear ready to compromise on small issues but are still far apart on the basic problem blocking a cease-fire in Korea. . . .

The White House announced Wednesday that President Eisenhower will present his administration's defense program, complete with military and foreign aid

costs, at his news conference today at 2 p.m. (CST).

Thirty GIs and five Marines came home to American soil Wednesday from long captivity in Red prison camps in North Korea. . . .

**SHADES OF JESSE JAMES.** Two "tough talking" bandits held up the Citizens State Bank at Decatur, Neb., in broad daylight Wednesday and escaped with around \$14,000 after locking three women employees in the vault.

# Bricker Amendment Might Limit Atomic Control Pacts

**(EDITOR'S NOTE: A proposed amendment submitted by Sen. Bricker (R-O) would limit the treaty-making powers of the President. Although neither house of Congress has begun action on the proposal, "this question of amending the Constitution" according to Neal Stanford in the Christian Science Monitor, "can well become one of the most heated and controversial issues of the coming months." The following editorials, two in a series of four, were published recently in the Washington Star. The Nebraska reprints them from the Congressional Record. The third and fourth editorials will be published in the near future.)**

President Eisenhower yesterday gave the best definition we have heard of the Bricker resolution to limit the treaty-making power. The people who are arguing for this proposed amendment, he said, are saying that the Constitution should be changed so as to keep it the same as it now is. Many agree with the President that this is a bit of an anomaly, for the Bricker amendment would add nothing to the safeguards already in the Constitution.

It must be remembered, however, that the President is talking about only one segment of the four-point resolution. The other three points are all concerned with crippling the treaty-making process through which our foreign relations are controlled. These would effect changes of a most dangerous character.

For example, section 2 of the proposed amendment would forbid the United States to negotiate any treaty permitting an international organization to supervise or control any matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

Witnesses at the recent hearings naturally supposed that this would prevent the United States from agreeing to international control over atomic power.

Bricker takes a different view, but his interpretation of section 2 seems to fly into the face of its precise language.

Mr. BRICKER told the Senate the other day that this claim that his amendment would stand in the way of an effective atomic-control program was the most absurd charge leveled against it. He arrived at a contrary interpretation by saying that control of the atom is not within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. "at, then, is within the country's domestic jurisdiction? No one knows."

In trying to escape from one horn of his dilemma, Senator BRICKER has made section 2 meaningless. Perhaps there is some gain in that, but it seems inconceivable that Congress will approve a resolution which meant one thing to its author and the opposite to nearly everyone else.

This is the second time that Mr. Bricker has come forth with a muddled and mischievous proposal affecting the treaty power. His 1952 resolution was abandoned after its defects had been exposed.

Since January he has been pressing his new version on the apparent assumption that it had the support of the President and the Secretary of State. Now it is obvious that no such support will be forthcoming despite Senator BRICKER'S missionary work at the White House.

It is a pity that the Senator did not also sit down with some of the experts who have been studying this problem for the administration, for his resolution, as a whole, is the gravest sort of threat to the standing of the United States as a world power. He is in the ridiculous position of a Republican senator trying to undercut the powers of a Republican President to deal with a world crisis.

Last year his reckless course seemed to be explained as partisan politics. But what can explain it now? The Senator has the alternative of withdrawing his foolish resolution or of risking stultification of the administration he helped to bring to power.

# Amendment Would Steal Ike's Power

Any move to narrow the treaty-making power must be closely examined these days because of the vast responsibilities that the United States has acquired. The power to make treaties is the power to regulate our relations with other nations, including our closest allies.

When the Constitution was being drafted in 1787, there were demands that the treaty power be limited in various ways so as to avoid possible abuses. The United States was then only an isolated strip along the Atlantic seaboard with fewer than four million people.

But the Founding Fathers insisted that the door be kept open to any kind of agreement deemed appropriate to the national welfare—within the powers granted by the Constitution.

Now that the United States is the most powerful nation in the world, however, Senator BRICKER and his colleagues want to take away part of what the Founding Fathers deemed essential.

Section 2 of Senator BRICKER'S proposed constitutional amendment reads as follows: "No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

Some students of international law say that if this provision

## LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS . . . . . By Bibler



# It Seems To Me Octogenarian Tagged To Win Class Election

Glenn Rosenquist

Dorothy, 81-years-old, has applied for junior class president. Though her hair is scraggly and white and her shoulders sag, she is eligible.

Dorothy is no ordinary student. Because of her age, people assume she is a mature personality. She is respected on the campus because she is older than most.

When she blinked her baggy eyes and announced her intentions to run for class officer—no one batted theirs.

And everybody wanted her to win. That is, until they found out her platform from The Daily Nebraskan. Dorothy is campaigning for a junior-senior class council of fifty members, a lavish junior-senior prom, class dues, class picnics, class beer busts and many other friendly and heartwarming get-togethers.

Old Dotty will probably be elected junior class president in a landslide. Because of her maturity and popularity on campus, how could she miss? Maybe she'll even be a Mortar Board.

But though Dorothy is 81 years old, she's got a lot to learn. She must learn the deep-down facts of so-called "class spirit" on the campus.

She'll learn that it's there all right. But Nebraska's class spirit is a passive thing, which disappears when it's riled up.

Nothing seems to be worrying sophomore more than: "Will I get into advanced ROTC?" At least the Air Force has initiated a new policy. Their quota system has been drastically changed. Sophomores wishing to be accepted for advanced are sweating it out.

More emphasis has been placed on flight training. Cadets interested in flight training and physically fit for this training have a much better chance of making advanced.

Rigorous physical examinations are in progress to determine those physically fit to fly the airplanes in tomorrow's air force. The other exams are getting tougher too, as any sophomore can testify.

While the Air Force is changing its quotas, Max I. Dog is enjoying the benefits of college association. Max, I understand, attends Professor Curtis Elliott's class regularly. Does Max pay tuition?

While Max I. Dog is paying his tuition, let's pay some attention to the ticket-sellers. Ticket sellers sell tickets and right now they are selling Kosmet Klub tickets. "Is said that a Kosmet Klub official at the last Kosmet Klub worker meeting asked the workers to raise their hands if they hadn't sold more than 300 tickets. It's ridiculous, but those who raised their hands probably won't make the club.

WORDS OF WISDOM . . .  
The steam that blows the whistle doesn't move any machinery.

It was the first trip to sea, and one young sailor was draped weakly over the rail. The captain came along the deck, and with one look at the sailor, said, "You can't be sick here."

The sailor looked the captain up and down, then with all the dignity at his command, said, "Watch."

# Wrestlers Approve Paper-Mate Pen

# Engineers Week Aimed At High School Students

As you read this article, the engineers are feverishly performing miracles they never thought were possible on displays that were supposedly fool-proof. Yes, the nail chewing is finally over with, and Open House is here; most engineers will be involved in one way or another to present an other successful and educational display of what they consider to be valid applications of engineering principles.

I need not describe the displays here because they have been published elsewhere in the paper. But the students in the College of Engineering and Architecture are ready and willing to explain as much as they know about their displays from 2 until 10 this evening.

Any and all students are urged to attend the Open House when they can, for it is as much a part of the University activity as any other function involving as many students.

You can be assured that you will carry away something to

think about from one or several displays. Then, perhaps, you will realize the very real purpose of E-Week: e.g., to engender in the minds of visiting high school students an interest in the field of engineering, or at least an interest in the possibility of securing a college education of some sort.

Yes, E-Week is here to inform the public of the opportunities offered at the University for their children, and to acquaint the children with an atmosphere and a way of life that might otherwise be completely foreign to them.

This year's Open House promises to be as complete and diversified as the 83 previous events of this sort. Many of the old displays that are practically demanded by the people will reappear, but the others will be new and interesting in keeping with technological progress being made in all fields of engineering.

So plan to attend, even though you may have seen it before. You'll be glad you did!

# Letterip

Immoral . . .

Dear Editor:  
Your editorial of Wednesday, "Bargain Basement," was well taken. A satirical approach is undoubtedly the only sensible one to be taken toward such a preposterous suggestion as that advanced by Gen. Clark.

I would like to point out, in addition, that the offer of money to Red pilots is highly immoral, since we are bribing them to commit treason against their country. The Russians may have a legitimate reason for protesting Clark's offer as being contrary to the purposes of the United Nations.

FRANK PIERSON

# NUBB

**THURSDAY**  
Home Ec Club at 4:30 p.m., Home Ec Building parlors.  
Robert Ripley's "Believe It or Not" display starts at City Hall.  
Ag Students Bull Session at 7:30 p.m., Ag College Activities Building.  
Physics Colloquium at 4:15 p.m., Room 211, Brace Lab.  
Engineer Open House starts from 2 to 5:30 p.m. and 7 to 10 p.m.  
Kosmet Klub Spring Show, "Anything Goes" at 8 p.m., Nebraska Theater.  
AUF at 7 p.m. in the Student Union.  
Song Directors for the Ivy Day Sing at 5 p.m., Room 315, Student Union.

# The Daily Nebraskan

FIFTY-FIRST YEAR  
Member: Associated Collegiate Press—Intercollegiate Press  
Advertising Representative: National Advertising Service, Inc.

429 Madison Ave., New York 17, New York

The Daily Nebraskan is published by the students of the University of Nebraska as a representative of student opinion and expression of student news and opinions. According to Article II 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 control on the part of the Board, or 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 on campus or in the school."

Subscription rates are \$3 a semester, \$2.50 a year for students and \$4 for non-students. Single copy 5¢. Published daily except Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, vacation and examination periods. One issue published during August each year by the University of Nebraska under the supervision of the Committee on Student Publications. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under act of Congress, March 3, 1879, and is mailed at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized September 10, 1952.

**EDITORIAL STAFF**  
Editor: Don Pieper  
News Editor: Ed De Mar

**MANAGING EDITOR**: Ed De Mar  
**EDITORIAL STAFF**:  
Editorial Page Editor: Ed De Mar  
Managing Editor: Ed De Mar  
Copy Editor: Ed De Mar  
Sports Editor: Ed De Mar  
Art Editor: Ed De Mar  
As Editor: Ed De Mar

**REPORTERS**:  
Marianne Hanson, Marilyn Huston, Natalie Katt, Cynthia Henderson, Willie Dech, Kay Neely, Dora Ahlschroed, Marilyn Mitchell, Nancy Odum, Phyllis Herbstroter, Beth Gowder, Elaine Smithberger, Jan Carlsen, Don Jackson, Grace Harvey, Marcia Mitchell, Roger Wall, Francis Svoboda, Henry Baum, Jim Farish, Dick Kadavick, Don Shaften, Don Wilkmer, and Martha Bree.

**BUSINESS STAFF**:  
Business Manager: Ed De Mar  
Advertising Manager: Ed De Mar  
Circulation Manager: Ed De Mar  
Night News Editor: Nancy Gardner