

## EDITORIAL OPINION

**Many Convocations Fine; Where are Democrats?**

Although the school year is barely a week old, already the wheels of progress are at work bringing outstanding personalities to this campus.

On the social side we have heard George Shearing and politically we will hear Representative Walter H. Judd this Friday and Senator Barry Goldwater next spring.

Others expected to visit the campus include, Colin Jackson, political science department; Prof. E. H. Gombrich of the University of London, art department; Dr. Jarime Benitez, chancellor of the University of Puerto Rico; Dr. Stephen de Borhegyi, anthropology department and Prof. R. F. Espenched of the University of Illinois, department of education to name the largest share of visitors.

The University convocations committee must receive most of the credit for these visitations with help from the Union talks and topics committee and the Young Republicans.

While we heartily endorse the invitations sent to these people in the varied fields of learning and we urge students to take full advantage of their appearance, we pause to consider the political visitations.

Realizing full well that both Messers Goldwater and Judd are adept speakers and would undoubtedly give us an educational insight to the American political scene, we suggest equal time for the other political party in our Democratic system of government.

According to Dr. A. B. Winter, chairman of the convocation committee, efforts were made last year to bring Richard Nixon and Republican National Committee Chairman Thurston Morton to campus—both leading Republicans. Total this up and you will find the score to be the following: Republicans—4, Democrats—0.

We admit that Judd will not appear as a guest of the convocations committee and that not all four Republicans have or will have spoke to the student body. However, why not follow a good old American tradition of inviting both sides and hear the full story? It would seem intelligent students could soon see that Republicanism is more than a name tacked to Nebraska politics.

If we think for one minute that Goldwater will speak on anything but conservatism or that Judd will bend over backwards to present the Democrat's views, we're crazy.

Here is hoping that the Young Democrats join in with other interested student groups and perhaps even the University convocations committee to bring us the whole story.

(N.B.)

**What Price for Freedom? Peace Corps is Cheap**

What will you give to prevent the growth of Communism in the world, our country, our state and up to the very door of your own home?

A million dollars? You haven't got it. Everything you own? Who wants it? Are you ready to approve a total war and give assent to the use of missiles, rockets and the deadly atomic and hydrogen bombs? Then will you take your chances of surviving for three months in an underground shelter while the radiation and fallout becomes harmless?

How about two years out of your lifetime? Your immediate reaction is probably that you cannot believe two years out of your lifetime can make an appreciable difference. How wrong you may be. These two years may be the ONLY way out. The only way we, as Americans, can preserve our freedom and still be around to enjoy it.

We are speaking of the Peace Corps. It is through this agency which we can positively win the minds of foreign peoples.

It is not enough to sit back and tell ourselves that we are the greatest peace-loving nation ever known on the face of this world. It is not enough to merely recognize the thousands of Hungarian refugees who fled the Russians and their oppressive rule and limped into our country. We must do more than stand by and watch the Communists and their doctrine infect and underdeveloped country and in a few short years take complete charge of their new "satellite." For each time another human being goes for Mr. K's line, we are another day away from peace and another step further from maintaining our way of life.

The Peace Corps is a way of winning these needy countries in a way so as to count them among our friends who will stand by us no matter the situation. And they will be there because they respect this country. As James Gibson, assistant director of Peace Corps public relations said last Friday in Lincoln "the Peace Corps is foreign aid in reverse." It is not pouring billions of dollars into these small countries where their standard of living is lower than their illiteracy rate. It is showing these people how to make the best use of what they have or what they can afford to purchase. It is teaching them how to read and write and how to care for a newly born baby.

The Peace Corpsmen are doers. They work side by side the Nigerian, the Filipino and the Indian. They give advise but more importantly, they show the natives how to do it so they may help themselves.

An American is an American no matter where he or she goes. The countries who will receive Peace Corps projects will soon learn that something else works—freedom, the Democratic society and the right of the individual to be an individual. Herein lies the greatest asset of the Peace Corps. How about it, is the price too high?

(N.B.)

**Daily Nebraskan**

Member Associated Collegiate Press, International Press Representative: National Advertising Service, Incorporated Published at: Room 51, Student Union, Lincoln, Nebraska. SEVENTY-ONE YEARS OLD

Telephone HE 2-7631 ext. 4225, 4226, 4227

Subscription rates are \$5 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.

Copyright 1961 by the Daily Nebraskan, 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 direction of the Department of Journalism and Mass Communications. No financial or editorial control is exercised by the University. The members of the Daily Nebraskan staff are personally responsible for what they say, or do, or cause to be printed.

February 8, 1962

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor Gretchen Shelling News Editor Alvin W. Johnson, Jr. Copy Editor Cloyd Clark

Might News Editors Eleanor Billings, Louise Behrert, Jim Forrest

Staff Writers Mike McCloud, Jim Hovick

Staff Photographer Tom Kastner, Bob Nye, Mike McCloud, Jim Hovick

BUSINESS STAFF Paul Henley

Business Manager John Zellinger, Bill Gantner, Jim Trester

## The Daily Nebraskan

## Staff Views

**Outside Inlooking**

By Ann Moyer

At the risk of facing a mutiny staged by certain of my staff writers, I will venture to say that the news of Senator Barry Goldwater's visit to our campus pleased me extremely.

I became particularly interested in Mr. Goldwater when introduced to



Miss Moyer

Goldwaterism at the University of Wisconsin this summer. Wisconsin U. has a reputation for being a broadly versatile community as far as political thinking is concerned. In fact, I met very few persons from that part of the country who did not belong to a definite political group be it the Kennedys or, on the other end of the scale, the Goldwater Republican school.

Now the general application of the term conservative in Nebraska does not arouse much curiosity and is most often thought of in monetary terms, i.e., how much we spend. However,

even the dictionary (Webster's New Collegiate) defines the term as: pertaining to or characteristic of

a political party which favors the conservation of existing forms of government.

This definition and the political beliefs of true conservative Republican are not actually economically founded at all. A real conservative is concerned with maintaining the foundation upon which the freedom of our nation was founded, the Constitution.

Along these same lines he recognizes the doctrines of human behavior which have been acknowledged by psychologists and economists for years. The Conservative believes in

a competitive society in which each person should be allowed to develop his own talents and advance according to his own capabilities.

That is why Republican statesmen often do not favor government programs such as Social Security benefit increases because they feel people should be free to support their earnings as they please.

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

Take the men for example. There are no restrictions on them for hours. Then look at us. My, it seems hard to believe that during high school we were considered to be 2 years ahead of them in maturity. And by the by that is mental.

While we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions that you have placed on us. Do you consider us less discerning than they are?

We at the University of Nebraska still labor under the lethargic stigma of your Spanish Inquisitorial Board. You are the modern day counterparts of Don Quixote riding atop the buckle of a Victorian Bible Belt, lancing your crude weapons at the windmills of moral progress.

While, "in the room . . . (when you) women come and go talking of Michelangelo," does it ever occur to you that old "Mike" is dead? Time goes on girls and the world has made some moral progress since then. Did you know that? Didn't think so.

By your outmoded codes of extreme vigilance you insult our intelligence. How is it you presume yourselves less susceptible to falling prey to the pitfalls of life than we are?

You do insult us and apparently must consider us less capable than yourselves in making moral choices; otherwise, wouldn't you form a body of your living mothers to protect you with similar restrictions?

This of course gives you the benefit of the doubt—that you are logical. Perhaps I presume too much.

Maybe you don't think we have yet reached the age of reason. Some of

us are 21 and older—think we have reached any competent level of maturity yet? If not, then please explain why the girls we were graduated with from high school, who were not allowed to go to college, haven't the additions to society's restrictions