

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Personal View On AUF

Now that school work has forced most of us back into the groove (some say rut but I prefer the former) attention has turned almost entirely from the summer vacation to school life. One part of this "school life" that has always bothered many students has been the annual money raising campaign by the All University Fund.

AUF is undoubtedly one of the most talked about, worked for, worked against, greatly loved or intensely disliked organizations in this University scene. Few if any activities here arouse as much feeling as does this organization. No other University student program (short of Saturday afternoon spectacles in the Stadium) affects so many of us. Last year, more than \$9000 was contributed by student and faculty to AUF. At the \$2 average student donation computed by the Fund, some 4000 students took part, directly or indirectly, in AUF collection drives.

All this is matter for and for the record. Actually, only a few students, those directly concerned with AUF, care too much about the total amount given to charity. The vast majority are more concerned with the manner in which such amounts of money are collected. We either submit to the propaganda and upturned hand treatment or fight for identity as a non-giver. As one of the latter category for the last two years, there are several things I should like to say about AUF as it has been in 1954.

The most important of the things I have to say is short: AUF has changed considerably from what it has been. During the last two years, years I imagine AUF workers have called the growing years, AUF has come of age. It has become a big business proposition (at least to those of us who think \$9000 is a large piece of change). More important, however, has been the change in the way AUF collects money. Few, if any, of the student population could fail to see the "play 'em against each other" spirit followed by the AUF policy makers during the growing years. Fewer still is that group of students who did not resent being played into giving money to charity.

I think AUF is an improved organization this year over what it has been in the past. Also, I think there is still room for improvement—not so much in the collection or contact methods but something of the spirit of the organization. While AUF was building, the spirit of "playing

'em" was necessary, but it is definitely out of place with the AUF of today. The last remnant of the "playing 'em" spirit remains in the Ugliest Man On the Campus competition sponsored by AUF.

This "honor" is ridiculous of and by itself, but when it is sponsored, aided, and much loved by an organization with the declared purpose of gathering money from students for charitable use, UMOG is silly, or more aptly, assinine. By giving organizations a chance to get one of their members elected to a "big deal" like UMOG, AUF is using one of the best money making angles ever, because the houses snap at the chance to get something their competitors do not have—in the name of charity.

In the AUF of two years ago, I can understand why the UMOG competition was held; it fit beautifully into the pattern of 100 per cent houses with red signs on their doors and other money making tricks.

This year, AUF seems to have taken stock in itself and come up with some good answers. There seems to be more of the spirit of working for charity for the sake of doing good, rather than making good publicity campaigns successful this year, yet UMOG elections are just around the corner.

Why then, does AUF keep on with a program such as electing that sterling character, the Ugliest Man? An organization which has markedly improved the results of good leadership, careful planning and great individual effort by its membership should take steps to remove a blot on an otherwise good performance record.

During the building years, AUF used radical methods of fund raising, for in those years, methods which had proved successful in bringing about great student interest in other activities were necessary in making the student body aware of giving to charities. The hustle and fire Rocky Yapp and others showed in dreaming up program to make students take part in AUF were both necessary and good then—not now.

AUF is an established part of the University and will continue to be so as long as its leaders keep an active, living organization. However, these leaders should concentrate on efficient management and good contact methods rather than promotional schemes.—T. W.

All Eyes On The Farmer

It's the man in the overalls, driving a tractor, milking the cows and loading the grain for market to whom the Congressional campaign of 1954 is geared. But then practically all campaigns are geared to solicit the votes of the farmer, which makes every campaign seem a repetition of the previous one.

This year, however, after twenty-one months of Republican government, the Democratic howl is echoing on the mid-western plains louder and longer than it has in the past twenty-two years. And the Republican spinal column seems to be reacting with shudders and shivers.

The President's farm program is generally under fire by the Democrats, especially the price support system which for the last two years has been mercilessly battered around in the two-party vocabulary as a "devil's program" and a "farmer's blessing."

The Democrats have consistently denounced the Eisenhower-Benson flexible price support system and now at campaign time are attributing the lowering farm prices are a carry over from the Democratic administration and that the flexible support program is the means to stabilize the farm-industry disparity.

To get a better picture of this disparity between farming and industry, one needs to go back to pre-depression days. Following World War I and the conversion back to a peacetime economy, the farmer began to feel a pinch in his buying power. Having produced to the fullest extent of his resources for the war-time demand, he found that during peacetime his products were not commanding as much money on the market as they had. The continuing full-capacity production brought about surpluses which resulted in pulling farm prices down and the farmer was fighting for survival against the higher prices which he had to pay for commodities produced by industry. This is the basis for disparity. For a simple example a farmer had to exchange two bushels of wheat for one sack of flour—a disparity ratio of 2-1. Because of this, the government, in the 1920s set up an investigating agency to form a federal aid program which would permit the farmer to survive amid the choking prices of industrial products. This movement resulted with the enactment by the Democrats in 1933 of an Agricultural program which in actuality sought to curtail production by the farmer and to eliminate disparity by a government price support system. Now for our simple example—the farmer can exchange his two bushels of wheat for two sacks of flour because by buying up the price of two bushels of what equal to two surplus of wheat, the government has kept the sacks of flour.

Preceding the 1930s many things happened in the world which set our economy back on its heels. The demand for farm products was reduced by the slowing up of international trade due to conflict in Europe. This was followed by the panic of the 1930s and the devaluation of the dollar. Unemployment resulted and the whole

economy was on a shaky foundation. Then came World War II and demand rose, for there were troops to be supported. Prices rose and the increase in production more than took care of the disparity problem. All the farmer could produce was bought by the government and sent abroad or put in storage until it was needed. Following the war prices slowly started to drop. Factories closed down. Demand for guns and ammunition no longer existed on the full-production basis.

The peace-time conversion was done smoothly on the industrial side of the market but as industrial prices began to drop so did the farm prices. The government found its store houses overflowing with surpluses from the full-production farms. There were no nations in the world who were financially able to buy the United States' farm products except those who were more or less self sufficient and there was no demand by them. This problem became more grave and farmers were being paid not to produce.

In 1952 the Republicans promised a solution to the farm problem in the form of a new Agricultural program. The 83rd Congress passed the Republican farm program, including the flexible support system which, because it did not give the farmers the 100 per cent of parity they had formerly had, met with much controversy. Of course the farmer is not getting all the immediate spending money from the flexible support system he got under the 100 per cent parity system, and this fact has been twisted by the Democrats into a statement of Republican abuse, without regard for the betterment of the entire economy. It is too early to tell if the flexible support system will accomplish what it sets out to do—gradually settle farm and industrial prices at a mid-point between parity and disparity but the long range Republican program is geared to handle this problem.

With the re-opening of foreign markets the demand will increase and take from the government some of the support burden. As a compensation to the farmers the new Agricultural program provides for social security benefits to farmers and farm workers. It provides for the deduction of up to 25 per cent of the farmers income each year for the costs of many soil conservation practices. In short—the government has more than made up for the loss of parity supports under the new 82 per cent parity system by giving the farmers these benefits which will reduce their tax bills and insure them an income upon retirement. If the farmers are so blind to this foresightedness then it is in vain that the Republican administration has worked.

Our nation has been running on a war-time economy for so long that its citizens have become ignorant of peaceful prosperity. There has been no depression as expected, there has been no serious drop in prices as was expected and still feared, there has been no great unemployment save that because of technical changes, but there has been proof that psychological changes have taken place—and the question yet to be answered is "will Americans support a peace-time economy?"—J. H.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS

by Dick Sibler



"Class—the odds are 40 to one that someone in here will flunk, unless of course, he decides to drop the course."

Future Leaders?

Potential Foreign Policy Groundwork Laid At NU

By JACK FRANSDEN

How many of us as students, and I use the term with its full meaning, are aware of the opportunity we have at our disposal to gain firsthand knowledge of potential foreign policy, not only of the U.S. but of various countries throughout the world?

I was recently made aware of this opportunity by a friend of mine, Jerry Ansari, an Iranian student at this University, who attended an Arab Student Convention at Estes Park, Colo. from Sept. 6 to 11. He brought back a story of an independent Arab student organization of which I am convinced will have an effect on the governments of the various Arab nations.

Being independent, Arab students can express their views freely and being in this country they are undoubtedly the cream of the Arab crop and possibly the future policy makers of their respective countries. Their voice will be heard and certainly respected by the present Arab governments.

Jerry informed me that the common objective and purpose of the organization is the unanimous and determined desire for unity of the Arab Nationalist movement.

Our instructors inform us that nationalism is one foremost consideration in the making of foreign policy. Nationalism is one reason for the defeat of EDC by France. Nationalism is a prime reason for the discontent of the "adopted" countries behind the Iron Curtain. And the reason for the desire for the unification of the Arab states is nationalism. Here is sort of feeling most of the readers are unaware of and perhaps unconcerned with.

A United Arabia such as the one greatly desired by the Arabic students in this country, would present a formidable bulwark to any southwest expansion by Russia.

With this, and the fact that the Middle Eastern countries appreciate the value of an American dollar, in mind it would seem logical to assume that U.S. aid would be increased to any so proposed United Arabia.

This is just an example of how we, as students, have the before mentioned opportunity the knowledge of potential foreign policy.

The word student, returning to its full meaning, is derived from the Latin word "studens" which means "being eager." As students how many of us are eager to gain the knowledge of potential foreign policy? We, as the so called "younger generation" are the future policy makers for the U. S.

If not as leaders then as voters. As "students" I believe that we owe it to ourselves and to our country to gain as much advance information as possible.

In this respect we are fortunate to have as fellow students at the representing 46 countries. They are intelligently informed on their country in relation to the rest of the world and have definite views of their own on policy. They, and those like them, are the future policy makers of their respective countries. They are the representatives with whom we are fortunate to have contact. They are the ones with whom we can talk and formulate our opinions on future foreign policy.

I doubt if there is anyone on campus who doesn't have some contact with these foreign Cornhuskers. Their acquaintance is made via the class room, through the various student living accommodations through several student organizations such as, to mention the main contact, Cosmopolitan Club.

We are given the chance to travel the world of languages, philosophies, cultures, opinions and ideas. How many of us are "being eager" enough to take advantage of it?

Copped Copy

Evaluations Of College Include Sports, Fun,?

Editor's Note: This article was reprinted from the South Sioux (City) News who in turn reprinted it from Texas Siftings.

Somehow or other the idea has gained ground that the students at the average American college pay more attention to athletic sports, including cigarette-smoking, than is really good for them. It is also alleged that the expense is very heavy, inasmuch as it costs as much to be a Congressman as it does to be a student at Harvard. College students are very extravagant in everything except at prayers.

It is not very often that common "sense" is taught at universities, but we infer that such is the case at a Georgia college which is named Polcat College.

There are some colleges that would never be heard of if it were not for base-ball clubs. The reason the Harvard men had it laid on them so thick last year was because the latter foolishly devoted some of their time to study, thus neglecting their regular business. What does a young man go to college for except to play baseball? A college is very often a place

where a young man, if he studies hard, can in two years, learn as much Latin as he can forget in six months after he goes to work for a living. It is a solemn and instructive fact that one of the best Latin and Greek scholars in Athens, Ga., is sodding grass at 70 cents an hour. He intended to become a great lawyer, or an influential journalist, but he found out that he could make more money in his present employment.

To succeed in this world a college education is not at all requisite. There is a county treasurer in Texas who can neither read nor write, and yet he has put fifteen dollars where nobody but himself can find it.

A gentleman who has been there says that the festive college youth spends most of his time courting the girls, and doctoring up his monthly statements to his father. He will study between times, providing smoking cigarettes, playing baseball, football, tennis, and poker, taking in hops and banquets, and getting full, will leave any time.

Givin' 'Em Ell

NU Friendly? You Said It!



By ELLIE ELLIOTT

Let's make this the friendliest campus in the country. But why be modest; let's make this the friendliest campus in the world! But this is the friendliest campus. Midwesterners are noted for their friendliness; they are second only to Texans (so say the Texans).

When I arrived, the first thing I noticed (except for the hay-fever) was the way that Nebraskans are willing to go out of their way to help a stranger. Yes, I found everyone most friendly . . .

One gentleman who sat next to me in a class, was so friendly that he copied all my notes, and was most upset when I did not care to make the examination a co-operative effort. He flunked. The girls down the row are so friendly that they write each other's themes. Their instructors are a little perturbed at the lack of originality that results from this joint effort, but after all, we must keep our friends.

The boys here are so friendly that last spring they decided to give the dorm girls a housewarming. Fortunately, we are equipped with fire extinguishers. Speaking of dorms, the Men's Dorm is doing its own share in the "Friendly Campaign" by advertising for female occupants. That is what I call getting in the spirit of things.

This weekend we are sending our students down a little friendly competition at Colorado. We are sending our first drinking team, our second drinking team, and all the substitute drinking teams (plus a few football players), to see if we can't drink our Colorado friends under the table at Tulagi's. There's supposed to be some sort of a football game, too, in which the friendly Nebraska team hopes to put the friendly Colorado team in the hospital.

If we are going to ape on this friendly business, there will have to be some changes made around here. I don't think the administration is co-operating fully. We still

have examinations, downs, lecture classes, and AWS rules. These certainly hamper friendship. And how can a fraternity be its little old self when it is on social probation? Let's move all the classes out to the Delt woods; I hear that they're "right friendly" out there.

Seriously, though, before somebody gets the idea that I'm a subversive (or whatever they're calling them these days), we are pretty friendly people . . . and we are also most inconsiderate. Boys open doors, but girls never say "Thank you," so boys don't open doors any more. We generously pile all our friends into the car, but we drive as though the streets were private property. We are proud that we get to class, but we sleep through the lecture. If you want to be man's best friend, O. K., but stop kicking him under the table.

Advertisement for Sittling Bull Varsity featuring a bull illustration and text: "Sittling Bull Varsity" and "ROBERTSON-MURPHY-WATSON NOW".

Advertisement for Classified Ads: "CLASSIFIED ADS CALL 2-7631 EXT. 4226 FOR CLASSIFIED SERVICE".



CAMPUS BEAU BRUMMEL enthuses over Jockey brand underwear

Impeccably groomed Chisley J. Chisley ("Chi-chi" to his friends) says, "I like new-fashion and old-fashion comfort. For instance, this week I give the nod to tartan cummerbunds and ascots of shocking pink—but every week I go for the at-ease feeling of Jockey shorts! Take it from a clothes-horse . . . never say Neigh to Jockey comfort!"

Whether you share Chisley's taste for sartorial splendor or not, you'll enjoy the casual, at-ease appearance that comes from wearing Jockey shorts. Better drop into your dealer's soon . . . buy a supply of Jockey shorts and T-shirts . . . and feel as good as you look!

Jockey underwear advertisement with logo and text: "it's in style to be comfortable . . . in Jockey underwear".

The Nebraskan

FIFTY-SECOND YEAR Member: Associated Collegiate Press Interscholastic Press Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated. The Nebraskan is published by students of the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. It is the oldest and largest student publication in Nebraska. It is published weekly during the school year except during vacation periods. One issue is published during August 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 16, 1953.

EDITORIAL STAFF Tom Woodward, Editor; Jan Harrison, Managing Editor; Kay Naska, News Editor; Marjorie Hanson, Copy Editor; Bruce Bruzmann, Dick Pellmann, Sam Jensen, Harriett Ross, Howard Vann, Sports Editor; Grace Harvey, Reporter; Beverly Deane, Fred Daley, Phil Herzhberger, Joanne Junge, Babs Jergenhuis, Roger Henkle, Marcell Mickelson, Connie Platt, Mary Sholladay, Lucrèce Switzer, Tom Tabot, John Terrill, Steve Winbrenner. BUSINESS STAFF Chet Stepp, Business Manager; Ben Belmont, Barbara Elcker, George Madison, Andy Hove, Asst. Business Managers; Nell Miller, Circulation Manager; Sam Jensen, Night News Editor.

Comic strip titled 'FEARLESS FOSDICK' by AL CARP. Panels show characters talking about 'WILDROOT CREAM-OIL, CHARLIE' and 'HAIR WON'T STAY COMBED? GET WILDROOT CREAM-OIL, CHARLIE, AMERICA'S FAVORITE'.