Just Between Us . . .

By DON PIEPER
Editor

When the members of the University Board of Regents met Saturday, they found themselves in the midst of a couple of red-hot arguments.

One concerned the proper methodology of selecting another chancellor and the other concerned the propriety of authorizing a doctorate of education.

The Regents found that the faculty wanted to be sure that it was consulted before any final move was made in the selection of a replacement for resigning Dr. Gustavson. The Graduate College wanted to make sure that this University did not offer a doctorate of education—especially under the plan which the Teachers College presented to the Regents.

★

The uproar was enough to make Dr. Gustavson wish that he was already in his office as president of Resources for the Future Inc.

When the smoke cleared, the faculty had been assured participation in the selection of a new chancellor. And, the Teachers College plan for offering a doctorate of education had been accepted—for good.

Both of these problems were donated a good many column inches on the front pages of the two Lincoln newspapers. They have received a great deal of coverage in The Nebraskan. But even so neither problem is entirely clear.

Let's look first at the problem of appointing a new chancellor. There is nothing which forces the Regents to consider faculty opinion when sifting through chancellor candidates. Nothing, that is, except precedent and a promise. The faculty was consulted when Dr. Gustavson was chosen in 1946. But there is no positive regulation which requires consultation with the faculty on such matters.

★

Even so it is only common sense that a man be chosen who has the support of the faculty. But, who said the faculty wouldn't be consulted? Certainly the Regents never mentioned ignoring the faculty. But an "informed source" did and the faculty didn't like the idea. The deans got together and drew up a petition which they circulated among other faculty members and presented to the Regents. They wanted to remind the Board that the faculty should have a voice in the selection. They indicated that they were positive that their "informed source" knew what he was talking about.

What did the informer let out? According to the best information The Nebraskan can gather from its "informed sources," there was an attempt on the part of certain Regents to push through a candidate without consulting the faculty. The deans acted upon this information.

In view of these circumstances, it is a very good thing that the Regents though twice before pushing through a Gustavson successor. Let's hope that there is an element on the Board which would have stopped any such attempts before they were made. But, because it is impossible to know just how the Regents would have reacted to this railroading, it is a good thing that the deans distributed their petition. Now, we know for sure.

★

Now, the matter of the doctorate of education is an even more confusing situation. I find it hard to understand why the dean of the Graduate College and the dean of Teachers College (Robert W. Goss and Frank Henzlik respectively) couldn't come to some mutual agreement on the subject. The doctorate has been under preparation for seven years — that should be plenty of time for reasonable men to work something out. Unless news reports are misleading, there doesn't seem to be any problem in the matter which is totally insoluble.

It is truly unfortunate that there must be disagreements such as this between different parts of the University. It is especially unfortunate that this disagreement had to show up at the same time the state Legislature is preparing to open floor debate on the University budget.

★

From this point, there seems to be a lot of questions still unanswered concerning the two problems. I would like to know just how the faculty's "informed source" happened to let the Regent's plan slip. I would like to know just how many Regents were involved in the plan to railroad a candidate into the chancellor's office. I would like to know just what would have happened in the Regents meeting if the faculty hadn't taken any action. I would like to know why an agreement couldn't have been worked out between Teachers College and the Graduate College. I would like to know if the reasons given to the press for the friction between the two schools are the real reasons.

I'll probably never know the answers to my questions but things would be a lot clearer if those answers were available.

NEBRASKAN EDITORIALS

Money Or Faith?

The re-converted Nebraskan should make money next year.

If it doesn't, the trouble won't lie with the Board of Student Publications.

For, according to the comments of several of the Board's members, the reduction to three days a week, together with the staff and salary cuts, was designed solely to place The Nebraskan on a sound financial basis.

The Board's efforts are assured of success.

★

Let's see just how much money the recent cuts in The Nebraskan will save the publications fund.

Last semester The Daily Nebraskan lost $3,155.24 (see the tabulated figures elsewhere on this page). Between semesters the Board cut the publishing schedule from five to four days a week, as well as reduced salaries—to save what was figured to be $2,938 a semester.

Despite this cut in expense, The Daily Nebraskan, largely through an expected reduction in advertising revenue, this semester will incur an estimated $2,200 less.

Saturday the Board slashed the publishing schedule and salaries again — a total of approximately $3,348 a semester.

Thus the reductions made in Daily Nebraskan finances during the last year totals $6,286 a semester.

If the income of the paper next semester approximates that of the paper during the first semester 1952-53, The Nebraskan can expect to profit more than $3,000 during the fall.

★

If the income for the second semester 1953-54 equals that of the present semester and the $3,348 savings is applied, The Nebraskan can expect to make more than $1,100 during the spring term.

Add the $3,000 to the $1,100, and you can estimate that the paper will earn $4,100 for the publications fund next year.

The Publications Board should be quite satisfied with the profits.

★

But The Nebraskan will be published only three days a week, its staff will have been reduced by two members on the news force and its salaries will have been sliced $540 a semester.

The University's newspaper will be but a skeleton of its former five-day-a-week self. And its service to University students will be reduced.

No one denies that the recent reductions will cut the effectiveness of The Nebraskan. No one seriously denies that a four-day-a-week or even a five-day-a-week paper is justified by the size of our University.

★

But the Publications Board (or at least 4/7ths of it does not believe that the University can afford a four-day-a-week, seven-column paper.

No doubt the Board is right if it figures that the paper would be produced on the basis of its 1952-53 income. Even if the $2,938 cuts made in January had applied to the entire year's operation, The Daily Nebraskan would have lost $217.24 the first semester and would have, of course, still lost $2,200 this semester, for a total loss of $2,417.24.

If these figures were projected into next year (assuming a stable income), continuing The Daily Nebraskan at its present frequency and the staff at its present salaries would have reduced the publications fund by nearly $2,500.

With this expected loss in mind, the Publications Board appointed a sub-committee to suggest what might be done to prevent the loss. The subcommittee recommended the now-official $3,348-a-semester reduction.

While one may argue that the sub-committee's proposed slash was too drastic, considering the expected $4,100 profit attached to it, there appeared to be no compromise between the four-and three-day-a-week paper. The jump was a natural one.

But the opportunity for a compromise did present itself.

★

The University administration rather suddenly offered to aid The Daily Nebraskan by an amount of $2,000 — if the salaries were cut 10 per cent, the advertising revenue were increased $600 the first semester and the paper remained a four-day-a-week enterprise.

As we have noted—without the subsidy, the increased advertising and the cuts in salary—The Daily Nebraskan would have lost $2,500 next year if published four days a week.

If, however, we add the administration's offer of $2,000 to the required revenue increase of $600 and the required salary reductions of $638 (two semesters at 10 per cent of the present salaries of $3,180), we find that the potential increase in income would amount to $3,236. This would mean more than a $700 profit next year.

These figures do not include the reductions in engraving costs which have occurred this semester (see the tabulated figures), or any increase in advertising revenue during the second semester of next year.

★

The Publications Board will immediately say that neither the $2,000 nor the $600 can be counted on next year. And, indeed, that is true.

But the administration's offer was not made to insure that The Daily Nebraskan would break even. The offer was made to aid the paper financially—only if staff members were willing and able to boost the paper.

In other words, the administration was challenging the members of The Nebraskan staff to demonstrate their concern for the paper. If the challenge were met, as shown through a $600 increase in advertising revenue, the administration was willing to donate $2,000 to the paper's income.

★

When the Publications Board refused the administration's challenge to the staff of The Daily Nebraskan, it demonstrated that it was more interested in insuring favorable financial results than it was in putting faith in the staff in hopes of saving the "Daily" in The Daily Nebraskan.

We feel certain that the Board will see its expected results — more money. But we feel equally certain that, had the Board given the staff of the paper a chance to save The Daily Nebraskan, its faith would have been justified.—K.R.

The Daily Nebraskan

FIFTY-FIRST YEAR
Member: Associated Collegiate Press—Intercollegiate Press
Advertising Representative: National Advertising Service, Inc.
420 Madison Ave., New York 17, New York

The Daily Nebraskan is published by the students of the University of Nebraska as expression of students' news and opinions only. According to Article II of the By-Laws governing student publications and adopted by the Board of Publications, "It is the declared policy of the Board that publications 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."

Subscriptions also are $2 a semester, $3.50 mailed or $5 for the college year. $4 mailed. Single copy 5c. Published daily except Saturday, Sunday, Monday, vacations 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 at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of Congress of October 3, 1917, authorized September 10, 1922.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor ..... Don Pieper
News Editor ..... Bill De Hart
Editorial Page Editor ..... Ken Bretzer
Managing Editor ..... Sally Hall
Copy Editors ..... Tom Woodward, Jan Harrison, Marilyn Tyson, Nancy Gardiner
Sports Editor ..... Glenn Nelson
Ass't Sports Editor ..... Howard Vogel
Feature Editor ..... Phil Cutler
Ag Editor ..... Chuck Bauer

REPORTERS

Marianne Hanson, Kay Neely, Cynthia Henderson, Marilyn Hilton, Willie Beck, Marilyn Mitchell, Beth Rubner, Grace Harvey, Dan Blikemeier, Nancy Odum, Marcia Nicholson, Natalie Katt, Elaine Guttitberger, Phyllis Herzlberger, Doris Abbiatecis, Henry Baum, Ernie Fake, Frank Svoboda, Dee Jackson, Don Shafton, Roger Wait, Dick Eadlecek, Jim Parrish and Martin Ross.

BUSINESS STAFF

Business Manager ..... Arnold Stern
Ass't Business Manager ..... Ed Berg
Circulation Manager ..... Pete Bergthim, Stan Slepka
Night News Editor ..... Chuck Bauer

WORLD REPORT

By PAUL MEANS
Staff Writer

TODAY'S HEADLINES...

President Eisenhower disclosed Tuesday his new tax program... It included the extension of the excess profits levy on business until Jan. 1 and the maintenance of the individual income taxes at present rates until that date...

The Army disclosed Tuesday that South Korean troops may be able to man the entire battle front in Korea next year...It was stressed, however, that Allied troops will be needed in reserve..

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey has recommended tightening college draft deferments, especially for freshman, sophomores and graduate students...

Pro-American Premier Shigeru Yoshida was re-elected by the Japanese House of Representatives Tuesday and won the right to form his fifth postwar Cabinet and his fourth in a row...

• • •

Press Freedom Or Mr. McCarthy

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following article was published in the May 12th edition of the Christian Science Monitor.)

Does the Senator McCarthy-Editor Wechsler affair constitute attempted intimidation of the press? The American Society of Newspaper Editors proposes to find out.

The copious quotations and commentaries which have followed release of the transcript of the closed hearings before the Senate Investigating Subcommittee have pretty well established the salient facts:

That James A. Wechsler, editor of the New York Evening Post, was for three years, while a college student, a member of the Young Communist League; that he then resigned in disillusionment and for the past 18 years has been an active and effective exposer and opponent of communism; and that he has never made any secret of his early ted connections.

• • •

That the Senate committee, under Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's chairmanship, called Mr. Wechsler to testify ostensibly concerning his books said to be in government information libraries in a number of countries; that it developed neither the chairman nor the committee staff knew whether the books the libraries possess are the two Mr. Wechsler wrote while a sympathizer or the two he wrote later attacking communism, nor did they know which libraries had copies or how many.

• • •

That after five minutes spent on the books, Senator McCarthy and the committee counsel spent the remaining five hours chiefly on the subject of whether the Evening Post had praised or criticized Messrs. Jenner, Velde, and McCarthy in their several investigative activities.

This alone might not constitute attempted intimidation of the press. But, to borrow one of Senator McCarthy's pharses, there seems to be at pattern:

On December 15, 1950, Mr. McCarthy on the Senate floor urged the public to tell the Adam Hat Company "what they think of sponsoring this man (Drew Pearson on the radio, a McCarthy critic)."

On June 16, 1952, Time magazine revealed that 11 of its national advertisers had reported receiving letters from the senator asking them to withdraw their advertising because of an article critical of his record.

• • •

On April 28 and 29, 1953, Senator McCarthy sent and made public two wires to Mr. Wechsler addressed to "Arthur Lawson, editor, New York Evening Post," and explained he deemed the use of Mr. Wechsler's Young Communist pseudonym of 18 years ago, "appropriate."

And now comes the record of the committee hearing, which so far as the chairman's utterlike an indictment by denunciances are concerned, reads more tion and innuendo than a search for facts.

Are publications and their editors who thoroughly oppose communism but who happen to see dangers in the methods by which Senator McCarthy attacks it thus to be "punished" and equated with "the Daily Worker and every other Communist-line paper?"

Korea: Help . . .

The World Student Service Fund is setting up a program for aiding 30,000 Korean students. Food, medical supplies and clothes will be sent to Korea as immediate help.

Later, aid will be given in the form of books and students supplies. WSSF was asked to help Korean students by President Eisenhower last December.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS . . . . By Bibler

"Well, now, I suppose you guys have never borrowed any of my clothes."

From The Glass Box

Rival Paper Not Likely To Appear; Costs Heavy

Hal Hasselbalch

Since the decision of the Board of Student Publications to limit publication of The Daily Nebraskan to three issues a week next semester several students have entertained the idea of publishing a "rival newspaper" on the off-days at least.

It would be fine were some entrepenteur to succeed with a new paper but there is little chance of that happening. Competition, especially in the newspaper fields, is one of the most healthy developments that can happen to a community.

First investigation would probably discourage any ambitions enterprising journalists or daring businessmen would have. To publish a paper with all the features of the present Nebraskan would run about $1,800 a month.

About $150 is a safe basic cost for a single issue. All engravings are extra. They run from 50 cents or a dollar for small half column size to $5 or $10 for large ones. That isn't too large a one at that.

If the paper is to contain headlines set in certain faces that must be set by hand, there is an extra charge. Any body type that is not regular eight point one column type costs extra.

Now, where does one get the money to finance such an undertaking? The Nebraskan has enjoyed a net paid circulation equal to the enrollment of the University. Each subscriber pays for his paper when he registers. Two dollars of the registration fee goes to the Nebraskan.

Where would a rival paper get its subscriptions? It is not likely that one hundred per cent of the University students would be interested in buying a paper comparable to the Nebraskan for $2. Even if another business manager could get $12,000 in subscriptions that would only begin to cover costs.

Of course, there are lots of businesses in Lincoln that advertise. Many business places do not use The Nebraskan. Possibly a new paper could interest a few of the potential advertisers missed by The Nebraskan but the large accounts are all contracted by The Nebraskan and have been buying Nebraskan space for years. Besides the newspaper, the yearbook and several other publications are financed by Lincoln advertisers.

A new paper would have to run on red ink for some time before it could begin to cut into Nebraskan advertising fields. Advertisers have to be sure that their displays will be seen.

The prices above cover printing costs only and do not include any salary for the staff. Approximately $800 per month is paid to Nebraskan staff members. That does not include reporters, columnists or workers in the business office.

Thus, it is seen that publication of a newspaper to rival the Nebraskan, although a top notch dream, will likely remain a dream for some time to come.

NUBB

WEDNESDAY

AIEE meeting at 7:30 p.m., Room 217, Ferguson Hall.

Chancellor's Dinner at 6 p.m. in the Main Dining Room, Union.

American Society of Mechanical Engineer's Dinner at 6:30 p.m. in parlor X, Union.

College of Dentistry Dinner at 5:30 p.m. in parlor Z, Union.

Inter-Varsity meeting at 12:30 p.m. in room 313, Union.

Phi Chi Theta meeting at 7 p.m. in room 313, Union.

Kosmet Klub meeting at 7:30 p.m. in room 316, Union.

Dr. Werkmeister's Seminar at 4 p.m. in room 315, Union.

Delta Sigma Delta meeting at 7:30 p.m. in room 315, Union.

Student Faculty Coffee Hour at 4 p.m. in the Faculty Lounge, Union.

TWO ON THE AISLE

Reaction To New Movie: 'So What?'

By BOB SPEARMAN
Staff Writer

"House of Wax," filmdom's first full-scale plunge into the dramatic with 3-D, has come and gone. Hollywood dipped back into its bloody reservoir of old tricks to dream up the plot for this one. Elements of Dracula, Frankenstein, Pearl White (remember the Perils of Pauline?), and also a few new horror angles were in this ghastly,, gory, gripping, gas-light murder story.

I didn't like "House of Wax." I go to movies to be entertained. Entertainment is a broad term. But it's stretching the point to strangulation when you show all of the finer details of life in a morgue. Also, I don't think it is absolutely necessary to have the story line in a movie so completely wrapped up in horror that there is no room for humor. Almost any horror show has a comic relief character, and House of Wax was noticeably devoid of any such person.

The movie is about a sensitive sculptor-in-wax who has created a display of life-like statutes. The artist's partner set the exhibit on fire to collect the insurance. The sculptor, burned beyond recognition in the fire, is driven mad by the incident and sets out to recreate his exhibit using human subjects. If he can's find what he wants in the local morgue he looks over the living populace with a fiendish leer. So the story goes. Eventually the demented sculptor falls to his death in a vat of his own paraffin.

There was a certain amount of artistry in the movie, but it became hopelessly lost in a pageantry of panic. Maybe I'm getting senile but I'd like to see a 3-D movie similar to "The Greatest Show on Earth. This type of movie would lend itself well to the 3rd dimension.

Speaking of 3-D, "House of Wax" obviously was a challenge for the directors. The 3-D effect was a sort of sidelight to the action. It was inserted here and there when the story started to resemble something just a little less terrifying than the rest of the movie.

North Carolina, Michigan Consider Velde, Voting

Witch Hunts . . .

From a letter to The Michigan Daily, University of Michigan:

I have been following very closely the actions of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It seems that this committee, headed by Rep. Velde, and congressional investigating groups in general, have been picking up momentum.

It was my belief and hope that as soon as the Republican Administration took office, these hysterical witch-hunts would die off for lack of victims. It seems, however, that just the opposite has happened. Mr. Velde, McCarthy, Jenner, and Co., have turned on their own party's administration.

The most shocking and disquieting aspect of the situation now facing us is the intrusion of these power-and inquistors into the field of education. Academic freedom is the very foundation of our democratic concepts. It must be separately defined.

The odious congressional investigations into the "Voice of America" and the State Department were bad enough. But when McCarthy and Gang assume the power to dictate their idea of conformity to our educators, the line must be drawn by a strong and determined opposition.

Professors and teachers should not be made to testify publicly before a congressional committee. And when they refuse to answer questions put to them by these committees, they are clearly with in their constitutional rights. A statement issued by a group of prominent college presidents sustaining professors who refuse to co-operate with the investigators would be very influential. The presidents, who are of unquestionable loyalty, are in an unassailable position, and are the logical choice to lead the fight.

Of course subversive elements should be removed from our institutions of learning. But this should be done by a more effective and less noisy organization, such as the FBI. We should not allow reckless and hysteria-inspiring tactics to defeat our purpose. Let's not burn down the house to get the rats.

How Old? . . .

(By Jim Wilkerson of the Daily Tar Heel, University of North Carolina):

From time to time the question of lowering the voting age to 18 comes up for discussion . . . So far only one of the 48 states —Georgia—has taken this step, which places several thousand new voters on the books.

. . . The idea has wide superficial appeal. The most popular argument in its favor is that anyone old enough to fight for his country is old enough to vote—a high sounding, though not necessarily logical deduction.

If we were forced by a manpower shortage to start drafting 16 and 17-year-olds, as some countries did in World War II, would that argument still hold true?

. . . What about the girls? They dren't drafted at 18. Shall we tell them to come back in three years or just throw them in as a bonus?

. . . The eligibility to vote boils itself down to the question of whether or not a person is able to exercise this right in a wise and intelligent manner. The average 18-year-old is still in high school, usually his last year. He is about to graduate from America's greatest training ground in democracy—the public school.

. . . Many of these youngsters are serious-minded and mature beyond their years, but the majority, as we all know, are rather carefree and limit their profound thoughts and observations for the class room.

. . . Since their teachers' interpretations exert a great deal of influence on their thinking, most of their ideas are formulated in tn the class room. But again, the class room should be a training ground for citizenship, not a final test.

There should be a period when these academic ideas have time to fall into their proper relation to actual conditions, a period of crystallization, of adjustment to reality as opposed to theory.

We all see big changes in our attitudes and our beliefs since we left high school. Some of them we recognize as juvenile . . . Leaving the protection of home and class room, we find ourselves reassessing, taking a new account.

. . . I'm sure that the people advocating the 18-year-old vote are guided largely by their conscience and their intentions are the very best.

But issues are easily confused when viewed in the light and the shadow of war, valor and death. It is there fore doubly important that the issues be lifted out, carefully scrutinized and evaluated on their own merits.

DN Profit, Loss Statement

Account	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Total	Febr.	March	April	May (est.)	Total (est.)
Expenses:											
Printing & Eng.	1,866.00	3,433.29	3,428.20	2,455.34	1,494.06	12,676.89	2,200.46	3,177.10	2,191.58	2,600.00	10,169.14
Salaries	85.00	957.50	957.50	957.50	957.50	3,915.00	795.00	795.00	795.00	795.00	3,180.00
Photography	22.00		182.88					2.50			
Telephone	31.83	26.52	25.83	25.83	28.63		29.24	25.83	27.03	25.83	
Stationery & Supplies	103.36	24.99	4.68	37.26			21.10		5.51		
Advertising	16.00	40.00	24.00					41.33			
Sundry & Misc.		117.34	30.78	12.93	4.38		4.79	8.20			
Postage		20.00		15.00			36.52				
Art		7.00	10.00					19.79			
Equipment							55.25	52.50			
Subscriptions		15.60						5.40			
Total Expenses	2,124.19	4,642.24	4,663.87	3,501.86	2,484.57		3,142.28	4,127.65	3,019.12		
Semester Expenses					17,416.73				10,289.05		
Income:											
Local Display	976.98	1,797.37	1,568.87	894.61	779.64		896.98	863.77	767.21		
Nat'l Display	321.20	644.35	365.54	343.35	374.65		893.25	809.18	569.00		
Classified	23.00	30.65	35.95	15.45	13.20	8,180.31	18.90	23.40	18.45	1,000.00	
Student Fees	910.08	1,744.32	1,289.28	1,061.76	682.56	5,688.00	1,368.80	1,454.35	1,283.25	1,111.60	5,218.00
Foreign Subscriptions	109.00	53.70	9.95	7.50	10.50		15.00				
Misc. Income	44.91	60.09			94.53						
Total Income	2,385.67	4,330.48	3,269.59	2,322.67	1,953.08		3,192.93	3,150.70	2,638.01		
Semester Income					14,261.49				8,981.64		
Semester Loss					3,155.24			(to May 1)	1,307.41	800.00	2,200.00