

# Daily Nebraskan Letterip

## Strictly Partisan

The Daily Nebraskan will publish these letters which are signed. Letters attacking individuals must carry the author's name. Others may use initials or a pen name. Letters should not exceed 300 words. When letters exceed this limit, the Nebraskan reserves the right to condense them, retaining the writer's views.

### Challenges Theory Of Economic Growth

To the Editor:

On October 18th the Daily Nebraskan reprinted from Think, an IBM publication, a short essay on economic growth in the United States by Henry Wallich, ordinarily professor of economics at Yale but presently a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisors. The Daily Nebraskan deserves applause for devoting space to discussions of matter that are, or should be, important to people everywhere. I take strong exception, however, to the soothing tone of Dr. Wallich's piece and to the conclusions reached in its terminal paragraphs. The article was originally directed, it is true, toward a non-professional readership; and in writing of this kind there is always conceded a certain amount of inaccuracy as a necessary corollary of brevity. I am sorry to say, however, that the article is remarkably consistent with the present posture of the Council, which in recent years has seemed to devote somewhat more energy to searching out post-facto justifications for administrative action—or inaction—than to pursuing scientific truth.

Professor Wallich—who should know better—begins by asserting a mutual exclusiveness between freedom and a high rate of economic growth. He implies that the Soviet Union's admittedly superior rate of growth has been attained at the expense of individual liberty (a dangerous over-simplification) and maintains that the United States cannot hope to match Russia's rate of gain without sacrificing a substantial part of our own values and liberties. But he omits mention of the fact that America's rate of economic growth is painfully below that which is being achieved in a great number of the other non-totalitarian industrial nations. I cite, for example, Sweden, France, and the United Kingdom, where a democracy purer than ours prevails (suffrage is truly universal and "loyalty oaths" would be furiously denounced as abridgments of liberty) at the same time spectacular progress is being made in enhancing material welfare. The oldest device of demagoguery is the "either-or" dichotomy, one variant being to offer auditors a choice only between a status quo and a totally unacceptable alternative.

Professor Wallich is in error when he maintains that it is harder for a nation already wealthy to make continued headway at a rate comparable to countries starting from a retarded position. His view is correct only in a formal, mathematical sense. It is self-evident that to increase a large number by ten (or some other) percent necessitates a larger absolute addition than would be required to increase a smaller number by an equal percentage. But mathematics merely records and in no way governs economic growth. And the plain fact is that the larger, more "advanced" economies are growing faster, despite their higher point of departure, than are the under-developed nations. The gap between rich and poor lands is widening, not diminishing. The reason, inexplicably over-

looked by Dr. Wallich, is the self-expanding nature of technological progress, which in the normal course of things tends to accelerate rather than slow down. Our own lagging rate of growth cannot rightly be attributed to our past successes. The author, himself, apparently neglected to note the trend exhibited by his own figures, which show a rate of gain that has increased substantially, although by "notches," from a relatively modest beginning eight generations ago. The truth is that the world is still in the dawn of scientific (and, we hope, social) progress, and every advance thus far has quickened rather than slackened the pace. It is simply not true that we, or any other "rich" nation, must resign ourselves to the prospect of reaching a point where further growth will become prohibitively costly in terms both of effort and freedom of choice.

It is thus grossly misleading to imply that the price of faster growth must be a surrender of liberty. In the first place, there is no such thing as unfettered liberty, now has there ever been in the past, whether in the United States or elsewhere. Government—meaning, in a democracy, society—has always inter-meddled in economic relationships and always will. Even an ostentatious quietism constitutes intervention in behalf of a status quo, and operates to bring about a redistribution of income as surely as would an increase or decrease in tax rates, minimum wages, or any other economic phenomenon. A "sound" policy of high interest rates redistributes incomes no less than would a policy of "low" rates. It is a wry commentary on our educational establishment that at the end of a century of free and compulsory schooling so many people can still be bewitched by words, and are persuaded so easily that torpid government is somehow benign.

As I indicated above, the normal expectation should be that economic growth in the United States would now be equal to or greater than that of any other nation. We have the resources. What we lack, although not entirely of course, is a sense of dissatisfaction with things as they are.

The United States has an enormous unexploited potential. For instance, there are in this country some 18 million non-white persons who are denied, by and large, any real opportunity to put themselves to their highest and best use. They constitute a tenth of the population. Our prejudices thus operate to ensure, among other things, that at no time can we fully utilize more than 90% of our human capacity. What liberties would be abridged if we were to avail ourselves of this opportunity to increase our rate of economic growth? Similarly, our unreasoning bias against the employment of women in anything other than "traditional" occupations under the close direction (needless to say) of a man, forecloses the possibility of some incalculable amount of economic growth. There are in the United States, in addition to the "under-employed" persons noted above, something like six million people who are actually and literally unemployed—in other words, contribution to growth is zero. Hundreds of thousands of these are concentrated in so-called distressed areas. But our fatuous attachment to the shibboleth of "states'

rights" effectively interdicts us from making any effort to relocate and retrain these experienced workers when, as is the case, state and local governments too are accused of being "dangerous" and "unsound" if they spend any money in pursuit of an objective which is not immediate and tangible. Similarly, we do not dare put the unemployed to work at any meaningful interim occupation, since this would constitute an "encroachment" by government. At the same time, of course, we profess dismay when our industrial establishment—steel being a conspicuous illustration—runs at only half of capacity.

We receive with great solemnity every admonition against "stifling individual incentives" despite the unmistakable evidence that every spectacular increase in investment—i.e., in productive capacity—has occurred precisely at a time when taxation and governmental spending have been at a high level rather than a low one. We are told that a government policy calculated to reduce interest rates would be an unwarranted interference with "supply and demand" and, hence an infringement of liberty. But we are not reminded that government's present policy of sustaining rates at a high level is also an infringement and one which tends to discour-

age investment in better equipment and untried ventures—both of which are necessary elements in economic growth. And in their absence, of course, liberties are really abridged—conspicuously, the liberty to choose from among a number of job opportunities on the one hand a greater variety of goods and services on the other.

I hold no brief for economic growth as the ultimate social value. It is entirely true that at some level an obsession with growth would necessitate sacrifices in respect of other important human aspirations. I think it is extremely important, however, to point out that the United States could probably double its present rate of growth without diminishing any way either our personal liberties or our personal standards of living. I share neither Professor Wallich's complacency with the existing situation nor his fear for our liberties should government—which after all means we, ourselves—face up to reality and begin to exert positive leadership.

Stuart Hall

The Daily Nebraskan appreciates the comments of Dr. Hall, chairman of the department of economics at the University. We welcome and encourage similar pieces from the members of the faculty. The Editor.

By Dick Shugrue  
Why did Sen. Carl Curtis refuse, at the beginning of September, to debate the issues with his Democratic opponent Robert Conrad, saying his schedule was full right up through election day and then, in the middle of October, agree to speak to a University legal fraternity, finding time for the date in his "heavy schedule?"

Perhaps the answer can be seen by examining his record in the years he has been in Congress.

The Lincoln Star, 1-1-59, said, "Nebraska's senior Senator . . . will throw his support behind ultra conservative Sen. Dirksen of Illinois for the G.O.P. floor leadership . . . One must assume from this that the senator is less responsive to the desires of his constituents than he is obedient to his own desires. "The state can also meditate on the fact that whatever further steps the senator may take toward liberalizing his position, the summation of them cannot equal nor offset his support of a senate leadership that would stifle progressive Republicanism . . ."

But, that's the way he's always been.  
On February 17, 1954, The Star quoted Curtis as saying social security is unjust and pointed out that he proposed to tax everyone and give everyone social security.

The Lincoln Journal in its 1948 voters guide, described Curtis as an "assiduous errand boy (who was) essentially an opportunist in politics. . ."

In August of 1954, the same paper said, "The record shows him as having voted for the flexible farm price support measure . . . Yet in his statement on filing for the Senate he said, 'I do not favor going to flexible supports.'"

In line with his social security record, why not pose this statement to your doctor, or your independent farmer, business leader or lawyer: "I believe that by requiring everyone to pay the social security tax and by letting the rate go to two per cent, we can pay the

bill." (U.S. News, Feb. 19, 1954).

This is the same guy who said "sound reason compels an abrupt and final end of American aid to India." (How does Ike like that?)

As long ago as September, 1950, Curtis was advocating the abolition of the U.N. as it now is and including only "freedom seeking" nations. He never told how the free world would ever be able to check the Communist menace outside of the world tribunal, though. But, the Curtis position is at least consistent, as he advocated the same thing just the other day.

Curtis has gone down the road with the isolationists. In Sept. of 1950 he was reported blocking aid to South Korea three times. He was reported supporting the infamous Tidelands oil and gas legislation which doled out the mineral rights to states bordering the deposits, although the s.o.p. has been to limit state boundaries to three miles.

Here are some gems from Carl's record:

- 1939: Voted against the National Defense Bill;
- 1940: Voted against National Selective Service;
- 1945: Voted to exempt insurance companies from anti-trust prosecution; Voted to draft unmarried nurses;
- 1947: Voted against the Greek-Turkish aid bill; Voted against the Voice of America;
- Voted to slash foreign relief;
- 1948: Voted against trade extension agreements; voted against Marshall Plan extension; voted to cripple European arms aid;
- 1950: Voted against Korea-Formosa economic aid

bill; voted against voluntary Fair Employment Practices Act;

1951: Voted to slice by \$10 million reclamation works; voted against unemployment insurance for federal employes.

This could be continued right down to 1960, but space forbids the fun. The point is that Curtis has been putting his foot in his mouth for 22 years. He cheers reclamation at home, and votes against it in Washington; he supports foreign trade expansion at home, and votes against it in Washington; he claims to support the laboring man, but voted for Taft-Hartley and against FEPC, etc. etc.

The record alone is good enough reason for Curtis to squirm out of debate with Conrad.

The record alone is reason enough to send Curtis back to Minden.

### Soil Scientist Speaks Tonight

An internationally known soil scientist from Holland, Dr. D. J. Doeglas, will present a lecture at Morrill Hall tonight at 8 p.m.

Dr. Doeglas, professor of geology and mineralogy at the University of Agriculture at Wageningen, Holland, served as a visiting professor at Louisiana State University in 1949.

His current U. S. tour is sponsored by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. His visit to the University is jointly sponsored by the University Research Council and the department of geology.

### Or Else

By John Else

It seems unfortunate that in an academic community, such as this one of which we are a part, there cannot be mutual respect and trust in one another's intellectual integrity. This appears to be the case, however, in the "feud" which is going on between the Student Council and The Daily Nebraskan. Or perhaps one might say that this feud has now been reduced to a personal one between the editor and the leaders of the Student Council.

It has almost reached the point of tradition, where anyone who is elected to our student government is automatically an enemy of the Daily Nebraskan. This is an extremely unfortunate situation, by its very nature. Now the Council shuts its doors as much to aggravate the Rag editor as for anything else, and, on the other hand, whenever there is any dubiousness, the editor finds it much more satisfying to take the negative on a Council issue or event. And so the vicious circle continues endlessly.

It is comical that any kind of feud should arise over the insignificant proceedings of the Student Council. Students cannot really be taking the situation of the world seriously if which they deal is the closing hours for girls' residences; this is like a couple housewives discussing the color they should paint the fence on which they are leaning while both their homes are burning down.

It does seem, however, that the Council has begun some sort of an awakening—but why couldn't the students be informed of it? Just because the material was not in constitutional form does not mean that the rough draft could not be presented to the student body as such (i.e., a rough draft). It would be encouraging to know that the Council was beginning to move in some sort of significant direction. But perhaps the Council feels that it is better to keep their proceedings away from the "masses" so that they will not receive undue criticism from the ignorant few who might misunderstand. However, if this is the case, the Council doors should never be open.

What about the Rag? I think the general consensus is that it has reached a high point in quality. The reporting of the Student Council proceedings seems to be its only major weak point—evidently because of the prejudice formed by the aforementioned feud. Legitimate gripes from the Council include the fact that the paper's negative attitude does not give adequate credit to the Council for its victories in behalf of the students.

So the private little strug-

gles go on with no attempts at reconciliation while the students suffer lack of information because of closed doors or inadequate coverage. Perhaps Ben Franklin had something to say to both sides: "The proud hate pride—in others." Both are supposed to be working for the student body, something much greater than their own pride; but Voltaire made a good identification when he wrote, "The infinitely little have a pride infinitely great."

Perhaps neither side will recognize themselves in these quotes, but this is just a view . . . from the outside.

### A FRAT TO REMEMBER

Every year, as we all know, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Collegiate Fraternities awards a highly coveted prize to the fraternity house which, in its judgment, has done the most to promote and enhance the fraternity way of life. The prize this year—eight hundred pounds of white putty—goes to the Signa Phi Nothing chapter of the South Dakota College of Dentistry and Renaissance Art.

The award this year is exceptionally richly deserved, for the Signa Phi Nothing house is the very model of all a fraternity should be. It is, first of all, a most attractive house physically. The outside walls are tastefully covered with sequins. Running along the upper story is a widow's walk, with a widow stationed every three feet. Moored to the chimney pot is the Graf Zeppelin.

Indoors, the house gives an impression of simple, casual charm. The chapter room is furnished in honey maple and oaks, with a dash of verve provided by a carp pool three hundred feet in diameter. A waterspout rises from the center of the pool with the housemother bouncing on the top.

Members' rooms are gracious and airy and are provided with beds which disappear into the wall—permanently. Each room also has a desk, a comfortable chair, a good reading lamp, and a catapult for skeetshooting. Kidney-shaped desks are available for kidney-shaped members.

Perhaps the most fetching feature of the house are the packs of Marlboros stacked in heaps wherever one goes. If one wishes to settle back and enjoy a full-flavored smoke, one needs only to reach out one's hand in any direction and pick a pack of Marlboros—soft pack or flip-top box—and make one's self comfortable with a filtered cigarette with an unfiltered taste—that triumph of the tobaccoconist's art, that paragon of smokes, that some of cigarettes, that employer of mine—Marlboro!



The decor, the grace, the Marlboros, all combine to make Signa Phi Nothing a real gas of a fraternity. But a fraternity is more than things; it is also people. And it is in the people department that Signa Phi Nothing really shines.

Signa Phi Nothing has among its members the biggest BMOCs on the entire campus of the South Dakota College of Dentistry and Renaissance Art. There is, for instance, William Makepeace Signafoos, charcoal and bun chairman of the annual Stamp Club outing. Then there is Dun Rovin, winner of last year's All-South Dakota State Monopoly Championship, 135 Pound Class. Then there is Rock Schwartz, who can sleep standing up. Then there is Tremblant Placebo, who can crack pecans in his armpits. Then there is Ralph Tungsten, who went bald at eight.

But why go on? You can see what a splendid bunch of chaps there is in Signa Phi Nothing, and when one sees them at the house in the cool of the evening, all busy with their tasks—some picking locks, some playing Jacks-or-Better, some clipping Playboy—one's heart fills-up and one's eyes grow misty, and one cannot but give three cheers and a tiger for Signa Phi Nothing, fraternity of the year!

And while you're cheering, how about a huzzah for the newest member of the Marlboro family of fine cigarettes—unfiltered, mild, delightful Phillip Morris king-size Commander! Have a Commander—welcome aboard!

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, 14th & E Telephone HE 2-7651, ext. 4225, 4226, 4227. Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$10 for the academic year. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1913. 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 Affairs as an expression of student opinion. Publication under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Student Publications shall be free from official 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 choose to be printed. February 5, 1960. EDITORIAL STAFF Editor: Bob Froese Managing Editor: Dave Callahan News Editor: Karen Long Sports Editor: Hal Brown Ag News Editor: Gerald Lamberson Copy Editor: Ed Beck, Ann Meyer, Gretchen Shulberg Staff Writers: Norm Beatty, Dave Wohlforth Junior Staff Writers: Nancy Brown, Jim Forast, Nancy Whitford, Chip Wood Night News Editor: Nancy Whitford BUSINESS STAFF Business Manager: Stan Kaiman Assistant Business Managers: Don Ferguson, Chip Kellie, John Schroeder Circulation Manager: Ben Saff Classified Manager: Bert Johnson



### ELECTED!

By a landslide... the new Esterbrook "101" Now—a different type of cartridge pen! It carries 2 cartridges in the barrel—one is a spare—so there's no need to run out of ink.

32 points in its favor! Every point custom-fitted to a different handwriting personality. Choose your personality... choose your pen point... 32 in all!

\$1.95 is the low, low price of the Esterbrook "101" Renew Point Fountain Pen... so there's no opposition to the fountain pen budget this year! Get on the Esterbrook bandwagon... pick your pen and pen point now! 5 colors. Squeeze-fill available, too!

Esterbrook Pens \$1.95 Other Esterbrook pens slightly higher. 97.32 The Esterbrook Pen Co.

THERE'S A POINT CHOICE OF 32—ONE IS CUSTOM-FITTED FOR YOU! student italic broad medium