

EDITORIAL OPINION

Campus Needs Democrats Too

As the campus is slowly settling down for the long final exam period, the general mood on all fronts seems to be one of serious intent. This is also true on the campus political scene.

Both the Young Republicans and Young Democrats have kept themselves busy preparing for the upcoming primary and general races since the Presidential election of over a year ago. Now the preparation seems to be somewhat complete with the release of the results of the Young Republican survey on campus political tastes and the subsequent statements from Young Democrat President Ted Muenster.

It does not seem too unlikely that the campus population will witness another mud-slinging campaign from the word go next semester. With the primaries only a few short months away both organizations have made their presence known.

Although the press has often been wary of accepting political statements as the complete truth, we might well see a point made by Muenster in today's issue. We are making reference to the availability of both points of view to students and faculty in a strong Republican state.

This University should be the grounds for the interchange of ideas, opinions and philosophies; even those pertaining to state and national politics. We feel this should be true in this particular case when one considers the important role politics play in forming national, state and local policy which in turn dictates the rules by which we live. This procedure is a part of the American way.

It would seem to us that the atmosphere is too easily filled with one party's views in a state where one party dominates year after year. We are not saying that what the leading party says is not good. Our concern is that it is often too easy for a party (such as the Republicans in Nebraska) to become complacent, and corrupt. There must always to the other side, the other party and the dissenting voice in our way of life. This is what the YD president is saying and we fully agree. It is therefore necessary that the Young Democrats be given the opportunity to present their cause to the public market for acceptance, and, in our environment where intellectual achievement is the ultimate, we must strive to listen even to the dissenting minority.

N. B.

Letterip

The Daily Nebraskan will publish only those letters which are signed. They may be submitted with a pen name or initials. However, letters will be printed under a pen name or initials only at the editor's discretion. Letters should not exceed 200 words. When letters exceed this limit the Nebraskan reserves the right to condense them, retaining the writers' views.

Foreign Students Have Answer

Sir,
We were surprised to read Mr. Baqai's opinions expressed about India which were full of inaccuracies and misleading contentions. Briefly the facts are:

1. After partition of India, Pakistan became an Islamic or religious state, whereas India became a secular state where Hindus, Muslims, Christians and people of other religions had equal rights and opportunities.

2. At the time of partition there were more than 500 states in India, the rulers of which had been given power to accede to India or Pakistan, provided such a decision satisfied following conditions:

1. The State had viability with the country it was acceding with.

2. The decision met with the wishes of people.

Two major problems arose as an aftermath of Partition, Hyderabad and Kashmir.

In Hyderabad, the population was 95% Hindus and not 85% Muslims as Mr. Baqai contends. Physically the state is surrounded by India very much as Nebraska is situated within U.S.A. The State had viability only with India. The ruler of the State was kept in virtual captivity by small minority of Muslim Soldiers. They were fanatics and were engaged in wide-spread acts of assault and arson. The ruler had no free choice. The Indian Police action only enabled the ruler and the people to decide for themselves which was inevitably the one to accede to India.

The question of Kashmir was different. The State has common border with both Pakistan and India. Even though the majority of people profess Muslim religion they were led by a party who were against the division of India on religious grounds and persistently opposed Mr. Jin-

nah's policy. They believed in the ideals set by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Nehru. Before the ruler of the State who was a Hindu had the chance to decide, Pakistan attacked Kashmir and sent tribesmen from North West Frontier who were so happy to go there to rob and murder people. Where ever they went they burned the houses, took away everything they could lay their hands on, assaulted and raped women, murdered people of every religion including majority of Muslims. This was all done in the name of bringing freedom to the people of Kashmir. To stop this carnage both the ruler of the state as well as the leaders of the National People's party appealed to India. India naturally could not sit quietly and watch this tragic drama. After a short war, India succeeded in repelling the attack and ejecting invaders, from 2/3 territory of Kashmir. India would have been able to possess control over the entire territory but it agreed to U.N.'s orders to cease fire.

Instead of vacating illegal territory occupied by Pakistan, the ruler of Pakistan who overthrew democracy and became Military dictator of Pakistan demands that India should have a plebiscite in Kashmir.

Since the cease fire Kashmir has already had two free general elections and the elected representatives have irrevocably decided to accede to India. Thus the accession of Kashmir is Complete on all counts i.e.

1. The ruler of the State has decided to accede to India.

2. The State has viability with India.

3. People of Kashmir through their elected representatives decided to accede to India.

Therefore Mr. Baqai's arguments are not valid.

Truly yours,
Sahib Malkani
Haryashp Gugnani



"FINE CHARACTERS, CONVINCING MOTIVATION---BUT YOUR PLOT SAGS."

The University

Campus Split Fades

BY TOM EASON



Beginning with the problems of Lincoln students, this column has touched many phases of the life of the University these past four months. It seems appropriate for me to close the semester with an optimistic analysis of a disappearing campus phenomenon — the damaging and phony issue of Greek-independent conflict.

DAMAGE

The Greek-independent conflict or split has impeded the progress of the University. Not many years ago, callous invectives and more solid missiles were hurled in the courts of Selleck. Biting criticisms of both systems have been used as arguments in the competition for promising young men.

Fairness has suffered at the hands of ignorance and intolerance. The split developed antagonistic attitudes and false distinctions. It replaced healthy competition with prejudiced separation.

CHANGE

Time strides ahead and brings significant changes in its bold steps. Independents have assumed positions of leadership and honor. Dormitory construction plans create staggering implications for the future orientation of life on the campus.

As recently as last spring, I was greatly afraid that fraternities would not recognize the importance of these changes and would waste valuable effort in a

weird sort of defensive activity instead of constructive planning. This has not happened.

PROGRESS

Norm Beatty (with whom I have not always agreed) expressed the matter well in his editorial last Monday. "Ferguson and Co. have done much in the last year to better Greek-Independent relations," he wrote. "It is interesting to note that the IFC and Residence Association for Men (RAM) no longer stand opposed to each other. Leaders in both organizations have rightfully arrived at the conclusion that they are seeking the same goals. Their combined interest in all phases of campus life including the Student Council is heartening."

For another view of the subject, the article "The Majority Speaks" written regularly for the Nebraska alumnus by Steve Gage revealed his clear insight on the subject as early as November of last year.

John Nolon, who is slated for the IFC presidency and the likely candidates for president of RAM have been raised in an atmosphere of cooperation between the systems. May the good sense of these and other student leaders succeed in blotting out permanently this ridiculous "split." Right now it is vanishing, and all of us who have witnessed its ugly consequences in the thought and actions of our friends will be glad to see it gone.

A Student Speaks Out . . .

Young Democrat Aims at GOP; Says Students Get Unfair Picture

(Ed. Note: The following is a story based on an exclusive interview with Ted Muenster, president of the University Young Democrats, printed in light of the upcoming state and national primary and general elections.)

University students are not getting a clear picture of politics and government on both the state and national levels at a time when it is most important that they do because of a "predominance of a decadent Republican Party in this state," according to Ted Muenster, president of the campus Young Democrats.

"This dominance has led to the degeneration of the once vital Republican Party of George Norris to a position of blind, ludicrous obstruction as exemplified by Carl Curtis, Phil Weaver, Congressman Cunningham and Co.," Muenster noted.

The YD president said due to this situation he, as the top spokesman for the campus Democrats, plans to institute a program to offset the muddled picture students are getting. "Now that Congress is back in session we want to take the leading issues including the medical aid to the aged, federal aid to schools, tariff adjustments among others and present them to the campus so as to

inform students on these vital issues in our Republican state," he added.

Muenster explained that Governor Frank Morrison's positive program for state development and "realistic talks with all Democratic candidates who have filed for state or national office" will be included in the new YD program.

"In the fall before the general elections we hope to be in a financial and organizational position to maintain a leading role in the Democratic campaign in Lincoln.

"It is not our aim to create a similar dominance within the state but instead a two-party system where both sides might have the points of view presented and discussed," Muenster said.

The Young Democrat program is just a part of a national movement of the Young Democratic Clubs of America to increase in size to take on the role of informing students on state and national issues, Muenster explained.

"Our real difficulty lies in the fact that we are working in the heartland of the Republican party and in a state dominated by Republican conservative newspapers. It is actually difficult to get our point of view out to the students," he said.

Staff Views

Out Of The Woods

By Jim Forrest

The "take cover alert" has sounded. The first "bomb" has already exploded with a direct hit on campus and if I were you, I would head for your nearest "political bomb shelter."

The initial attack has sent the leaders of the Young Democratic group, who are the home guards for the forces of national liberalism, to the front in an attempt to regroup their vast forces used so effectively in the 1960 presidential and gubernatorial campaigns in which the forces of liberalism won a sounding victory against the political armies of conservatism who until that time had managed to retain political dominance in the country. For eight years the Republican party held sway under the leadership of an ex-war hero and against markedly diminished strength of their forces in Congress in the last years.

After the victory of Democratic leader John Kennedy (another war hero), the forces of the home guard (the Young Democrats), were disarmed and dismissed. However, the campus Young Republicans have taken the initiative and have pulled the rug out from under the Y.D.'s favored position in the reflections of the national political spotlight on Washington, D.C. Forces headed by Y. R. chairman Larry Roos planned and executed a well taken campus political poll. This poll was taken before Christmas vacation in view of the Y. D. forces (and I have an idea many of the Y. D.'s and their supporters took part in the poll) but the liberal home guard did nothing to prepare for the possible results of the poll . . . that's confidence.

And so, in yesterday's Daily Nebraskan, a campus newspaper that favors the liberal camp, printed the results of the poll which exploded on campus as loudly as any multi-megaton nuclear device from the stand point of campus Republican-Democratic relations. However, the poll "bomb" was clean. Fallout was limited to the voicing of comments, the breaking out of arguments and maybe a few friendships.

The poll was accurately taken and tabulated and reported in the Rag. A few of the statements made by Roos are disputable and perhaps ill founded, but very little valid criticism of the poll itself can be voiced. In fact, the leader of the YD forces, after the initial shock of the article, commented: "I am grateful



to the Young Republicans for publishing the results of their poll, which I believe to be reasonably accurate."

This "reasonably accurate" is very generous of Ted Muenster, president and "top spokesman for the campus Democrats, but then his hero-leader, JFK, came out with over twice the plurality of votes over any Republican candidate for 1964. As leader of the Democratic forces on this campus (do the campus Democrats really consider Muenster as "top spokesman?"), he planned a counter-attack. I mean attack in all this worthy and vicious context.

In today's Daily Nebraskan under the feature title of "Students Speak Out . . ." (which gives the "attacks" of the Young Democrat leader an undeserved air or respectability) President Muenster set off his counter-balancing bomb in an out right and overt slam against the Republican Party. This bomb, unlike that of the Young Republican's, is not clean. The fallout is thick with mud-slinging, name calling tactics and slanted glorifying all's-right-in-the-Democratic-camp propaganda. I encourage all subscribers and readers of the Rag to read this article. History majors and students of American politics will recall, upon reading it, the horrid, unjustified days of smut politics of by-gone days.

This leader of the liberal forces on campus says without even a hint of supporting evidence except for his own pedantic party allegiance that the "predominance of a decadent Republican party lead to degeneration of the once vital Republican party of George Norris to a position of blind, ludicrous obstruction as exemplified by Carl Curtis, Phil Weaver, Congressman Cunningham and company."

He attempts to hide the dirty "fallout" of this harsh statement by saying, "It is not our aim to create a similar dominance within the state but instead a two party system where both sides might have their points of view presented and discussed." Fine, Muenster and apparently the campus Democrats got their points of view presented in today's editorial columns.

In addition, comments were made to a Rag reporter in which Muenster said in relation to the poll's revealing result that Fred Seaton is the popular gubernatorial candidate for 1962, "The gap between Gov. Frank B. Morrison and Fred Seaton should greatly diminish as the people of Nebraska realize that Seaton has no understanding of state problems."

(Continued on page five)

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
14th & R
Telephone HE 2-7631 ext. 4225, 4226, 4227
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, 1911.
BUSINESS STAFF
Assistant Manager Don Ferguson
Assistant Business Managers John Zeitinger, Bill Gustafson,
Bob Cunningham
Circulation Manager Jim Tractor