

EDITORIAL OPINION

Schlesinger Misses Severeid's Point

Eric Severeid fans will recall a column which appeared on this page sometime back in which he criticized Nixon and Kennedy as "tailor-made candidates" and packaged products of the "managerial revolution."

The brilliant Harvard University historian, Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., has written a book as his answer to the column, which he calls "brilliantly written by wrong-headed" Severeid. (Schlesinger, by the way, is backing Senator John F. Kennedy 100 per cent.)

Schlesinger describes his effort as a "pamphlet in the best tradition of political discourse." The "pamphlet," which is hard cover book, published by Macmillan, is entitled "Kennedy or Nixon: Does It Make Any Difference?"

Schlesinger, in a press conference took sharp exception to the notion that the candidates are "machine twins." He argues, "They are very different in crucial ways." One of these differences, he claims, is Nixon's "lack of acquaintance with American history." "Anyone acquainted with the American historical tradition would not" indicate that a man who disagrees with him is "disloyal."

The author of the "Age of Roosevelt" pinned sociologist David Reisman's label "other directed man" on Nixon. "In place of a sense of history," he said, "Nixon, because of his own relationships to the world, is at once passive and manipulative . . . he tends to believe instinctively in fatalism and in conspiracy."

"If Nixon is elected," he told the press conference, "it would be a catastrophe. I really feel," he said, "that four more years of the kind of moral, intellectual and political slowdown we have now is more than we can afford."

Schlesinger is typical of the group of ultra liberals who side with Kennedy and who contrast with the reactionary Republicans, such as Senator Barry Goldwater, who are fighting Kennedy tooth and nail.

These two groups are of the opinion that the country will fall part overnight if the candidate whom they so vehemently oppose is elected. We don't go quite this far, although we do prefer one above the other and we will shortly state our preference. However, if our candidate is defeated, we will stand wholeheartedly behind the President-elect. Both Nixon and Kennedy are qualified for the Presidency, although we feel one is more qualified than the other. They would not be running if they were not qualified.

We do, however, support Severeid's criticism of the candidates. Neither candidate bears the mark of a statesman. "They represent a clean break with the past," as Severeid puts it.

Schlesinger missed the point of Severeid's column. He was not attempting to show that there were no philosophical differences between the two men as Schlesinger seems to interpret it. He was quite legitimately pointing out that Kennedy and Nixon are packaged politicians and we agree with him 100 per cent.

Cartoonist Pokes Fun At Nixon's Prose

The presidential candidates this year lend themselves quite well to political satire and writers and cartoonists alike have not missed a trick, although Vice President Nixon seems to attract more than his share of attention along this line.

Cartoonist Jules Feiffer, a rather cynical observer of the times, has poked fun at Nixon's prose style in a panel strip showing the Vice President in several speaking poses with the following captions:

"I believe Senator Kennedy believes what he believes sincerely as I believe that I believe what I believe sincerely."

"What do I mean by 'sincerely'?" This is what I mean by 'sincerely.' I mean that both of us are honest in our feelings about our differences in approach to what is best for our nation's future."

"What do I mean by 'approach to'?" This is what I mean by 'approach to.' I mean that in the words of Jefferson, 'That government is best which governs least.' Now what did Jefferson mean by 'least'?" This is what I believe Jefferson meant by 'least.'"

"Senator Kennedy may disagree with me in my interpretation. I have no doubt he will be sincere in his disagreement with my interpretation as I am sincere in my agreement with my interpretation. More about that later! What do I mean by 'later'?"

"I mean that while Mr. Khrushchev is in this country it is not in the best interests of the American people to show our dissension or lack of faith in our system, although I feel that Mr. Khrushchev (and I have told him this point blank) is sincere in his lack of faith in our system."

"What do I mean by 'sincere,' 'faith,' 'our' and 'system'?" This is what I mean by . . ."

Somewhat exaggerated, but also somewhat typical of a Nixon speech prior to last Friday night when he altered his strategy. Perhaps he read the cartoon after the first debate.

Daily Nebraskan

SEVENTY-ONE YEARS OLD

Member Associated Collegiate Press, International Press Representative, National Advertising Service, Incorporated. Published at: Room 20, Student Union, Lincoln, Nebraska, 16th & R.

Telephone HE 2-7831, ext. 4225, 4226, 4227

The Daily Nebraskan is published Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, by students of the University of Nebraska under authorization of the Committee on Student Publications as an expression of student opinion. Publication under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Student Publications shall be free from editorial censorship on the part of the Subcommittee or on the part of any person outside the University. The members of the Daily Nebraskan staff are personally responsible for what they say, or do, or cause to be printed, February 9, 1960.

Subscription rates are \$3 per semester or \$5 for the academic year. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1912.

EDITORIAL STAFF
Editor: Herb Probasco
Managing Editor: Dave Carlson
News Editor: Karen Lane
Sports Editor: Hal Brown
Ad. Editor: Gerald Lamberson
Copy Editors: Pat Davis, Ann Meyer, Gretchen Shelton
Staff Writers: Norm Reilly, Dave Wolfarth
Junior Staff Writers: Nancy Brown, Jim Forrest, Nancy Whitford, Chip Wood
Night News Editor: Jim Forrest

BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager: Eric Reisman
Assistant Business Manager: Don Ferguson, Chip Kohler, John Schroeder
Circulation Manager: Bob Huff
Classified Manager: Jeri Johnson



England's Great Debate-- Shall Britain Be Weaker?

By Eric Severeid

In the United States the great debate centers on how to make America stronger against the riptides of Communism. In England this week the great debate has been whether to make Great Britain weaker and, if so, what steps should be taken to begin the surrender to Russian power.



Severeid

There is really no other way to describe the ferocious fight in the dank Yorkshire city of Scarborough, where the British Labor Party, technically representing very nearly one-half of United Kingdom voters, has been eagerly destroying itself in its show-down argument over defense. By the time these words appear the party conference will have decided — whether Britain should stay in NATO and keep American nuclear weapons in Britain while ceasing the costly effort for an independent British nuclear arsenal, or get out of NATO, get American bases out of Britain and throw away Britain's own nuclear weapons, or a variation of either theme. But, however, the vote goes, the issue itself will not be decided in the ranks of Labor. If the vote goes for unilateral British disarmament, the Labor Party stands officially self-branded as a neutralist — indeed, a pacifist — party, the leadership will probably quit, its members of Parliament would be technically bound to follow this line, and for more months to come our strongest ally would continue to be convulsed by a nationwide argument as to whether it is to quit the alliance in an illusory run for safety — an action the government and a majority of the people, including labor votes, are now against.

If the vote is for Britain's remaining a nuclear power within the alliance, the argument will be muted, but only for a time. For the heart muscles of the Labor Party are driven by doctrine, not pragmatism. This matter is a matter of faith with its left-wing, as is the matter of nationalization of industry, and dreams are unadjustable. Either way, Britain will continue to be distracted by this corroding argument over her proper role in the nuclear age.

Unless some magical progress is made toward East-West disarmament, this incessant controversy is fairly sure to weaken Britain's will to remain dug in at the front line of the Western alliance. The befuddled, inchoate yearning for island safety, rid of the dreadful bomb, is bound to eat into the souls

of more and more Britons who know that their tiny parcel of this earth could be carbonized in an hour.

I fail to see how it could go otherwise, and with it will go a spreading anti-Americanism, already more prevalent than most Americans comprehend. The East-West stalemate is hardening, not thawing, and as long as this continues, the spirit of British neutralism — "A plague on both your houses!" — will grow. It grows perceptibly every time Washington makes a blunder or an apparent blunder. These days America is getting the benefit of the doubt scarcely any more often than is Russia. America's tawdry welcome of Khrushchev at the East River dock seemed to annoy Britons just about as much as Khrushchev's naked grab to make the Congo a Communist base. The image being created in Britain of Eisenhower and Khrushchev is that of two men equally stubborn and wrong headed.

All that the present world, naked of trust, possesses to hold the peace is the mutual deterrent, ghastly makeshift though it be. The Western deterrent in the present technological stage, could be gravely weakened without Europe, that is, without nuclear bases in Britain. The time is coming when this would not be necessarily so, when quasi-indestructible hard fuel intercontinental missiles will nest under American and Russian soil and when quasi-inviolable missile-equipped submarines will roam the seas. At that point, a decisive surprise attack by either side would be impossible. Then deterrence will be complete unless man goes mad, and then small nations like Britain can begin to . . . about unilateral nuclear disarmament, doubtful though it is that this would save them if the madness broke out.

But left-wing British Socialists cannot tolerate delay in this any more than they can tolerate a working class prosperity that did not happen to come about by their methods and under their aegis. The old strain of British Puritanism survives in them: they thus believe that Spartan, that is shabby, living is good for the soul and that by their moral example they can persuade the Communist lion to lie down with the lambs.

After all, they were the people who voted against heavier armaments for Britain almost on the eve of World War II. Marxism is dead in West Europe, and because European socialist parties are semi-Marxists, still yearning to give the Kremlin the benefit of many doubts, they are dying as true opposition parties. Like the dinosaurs of the Jurassic Age they can no longer cope with their environ-

ment. But give the dedicated left-wing British Socialists their due — they are ending not with a whimper but a bang.

Let this also be the end of the patronizing European complaint that the two American political parties are too drearily alike and provide no true philosophical (i.e., class-based) alternatives.

European peoples, too, are being forced into a basic consensus on prosperity through regulated capitalism based on the scientific revolution.

In popular politics as in popular culture, the much derided "American way of life" remorselessly spreads. Dist. 1960, by the Hall Synd. Inc.

Staff Views BOVINE VIEWS

by Jerry Lamberson

Curriculum reviews seem to be the latest subject on the Ag campus as a committee has undertaken a project to study that program.

The curriculum committee reported to the Ag teaching forum Friday afternoon that it should develop principles not techniques in Ag courses and that curriculums should follow these principles.

Establishing the principles in the Ag programs would allow the students to know the reason behind the techniques. It is not so valuable today to know how to milk a cow or to plow a field. For only a fraction of the educated students will ever return to the farm to use this technique.

Students that go into research, business and education jobs related to agriculture will not need to know just the techniques but the principles behind the techniques so that they might know the answers.

At present, Ag students are required to take an introductory course in five departments. Introductory courses are basically technique courses which many of the students, especially those from the farm, already know the techniques. Therefore the introductory courses seem to fulfill no purpose but to load the student's curriculum.

Introductory courses in five departments would only serve as a broader background for the student. Today our education is looking away from diversification toward specialization. Five introductory courses is in itself contradictory to any such theory. If the student is going to specialize in his vocation, let him take more subjects pertaining to his vocation.

Specialized study programs will add breadth and depth to the student's curriculum and will develop the physical, biological and social perspective. With the shift to the teaching of principles, the Ag campus is taking a big step forward and may soon achieve the level attained by most of the other Ag Colleges in the Midwest area. The modern trend is to educate the student with something he can use in

strengthening his specialized field.

For example, one Ag College has dropped all introductory courses. The freshman year is filled with scientific and basic requirements. Courses pertaining to agriculture may be only seminars explaining the principles of each field and the values contained in each. Then in the sophomore year the student is ready to begin specializing.

Five introductory courses take practically a whole year and the student still has not filled many of the scientific and basic requirements. After the student has taken these courses he still is unaware of many of the principles in each of the fields. Introductory courses have failed their purpose.

The same Ag College has also said that a good specialized education takes more than 128 semester hours. So they have increased the semester hours to 138 excluding ROTC.

The Ag College has taken a big step forward in trying to evaluate the program which has been termed the favorite indoor sport — curriculum review.

Band Honorary Names Pledges

New pledges have been selected to Gamma Lambda, honorary band fraternity on the basis of their musical ability and interest in the University band.

They are: Leonard Lamberty, Harrison Warren, Richard Slepicka, Don Morgan, Peter Salter, Joe Edwards, Jim Herbert, Gene Schellpeper, Robert Nelson and Duane Stehlik.



MAGEE'S

Pants . . . Pants . . . : Pants

Jack Winter pants . . . the pants that really fit in the fabrics that flatter. Rich, unusual colors, typically Jack Winter.

Pants designed to make the most of what you have and minimize what you have too much of. Jack Winter goes to all lengths to please you.

All Styles 10.98

(a) The front zip style. Perfect for the slender figure. Available in Talls.

(b) Washable wool and orlon basic pants in solid colors. Available in Talls.

(c) Side zip style for an easier fit for the fuller figure. Short, medium or tall.

Jack Winter jersey blouses and cotton shirts in colors toned to match.

Women's Sportwear MAGEE'S First Floor