

For Clarification . . .

Role of Campus Newspaper

RECENT ATTACKS leveled against the University and, specifically, the Daily Nebraskan, have presented cause for the re-evaluation of the role of the college newspaper.

In the statement of purpose and policy which was printed in the first edition of the current semester, we stated:

"THE NEBRASKAN will stand for whatever it believes will benefit the University, its faculty and its students. This does not mean that we will accept any phrase, 'for the good of the University' as a final dictum on any matter, as not one of the three groups which compose our University body is always able to know what is best for the other groups.

"Our main goal is that of complete coverage of the University community. Any concentration on state, national and world events will be secondary to our purpose of existing as a college newspaper which serves as the printed voice of the campus . . . the Nebraskan will not create issues, as such, but this does not mean that controversy will be avoided. Rather we will report what we feel is important to the campus community, and if, because of some report we find that a further investigation needs to be made, we will, in a sense, be creating an issue."

HOWEVER, BECAUSE of the recent attacks and our statement of policy concerning controversy and the serving of the campus community, we find that comment on a non-campus issue is merited.

In a report submitted to the Republican Party Saturday, Ray Simmons commented:

"THE FOREGOING (examples) show a pattern which is clear and never-changing. Students at the University of Nebraska are being openly and deliberately indoctrinated with controversial and extreme political philosophies rejected by the overwhelming majority of Nebraskans of both political parties."

As a result of this statement, the following question arises: Is the campus newspaper a college paper which represents only the desired image of the college and private citizens, or is it a publication which reflects the views of the students in that institution?

IF FREEDOM of the press is not taught in the universities, where will it be taught? Are University students, who reflect some of the most current re-

freshing thoughts, to be suppressed to the point that they are afraid to present and support their own views? And, is the college newspaper supposed to convey student opinion through a stereotyped outline labeled, "The Specifics of Majority Opinion"?

The question of whether to print articles which do not contribute to a favorable impression of a college often arises. In answer to this question, it is accepted by all who live under a democratic form of government that nothing is gained by withholding information from the readers. And, in presenting this information to the readers, both sides to every question should be presented, with the principles of objectivity being the first consideration.

AS RECOGNITION must always be given to both sides of the question, and the fact that the conflicting viewpoints are based on truth, both ideas must be represented fairly and completely, and the readers must be left with the decision as to which viewpoints are right and just.

We have recently been asked to conform with a political philosophy. However, we ask: If non-conformity is synonymous with trouble-making, in the mind of society, and if trouble-making is the worst of all sins — if even non-conformity begins to follow a pattern of conformity — why then should not the students be expected to reflect the patterns of their society?

IF THE rotting cancer of silence producing fear and apathy has reached even into the campus — the last ground of idealists — then we can only conclude that the whole of society has been or is being caught in its fearful growth.

Perhaps some ask that the university students and the student newspaper become a mimeograph, faithfully reproducing the stencil of society.

Is our newspaper to serve as the voice of student opinion, or is it to serve as the carbon copy of an opinion which is favorable to a critic?

ARE WE the silent generation — or the silenced generation?

OUR ANSWER: There is no time for silence and conformity for the sake of conformity. Ours is a purpose and cause which serves the student community . . . our only path is that of objective journalism which combines individual viewpoints with the printing of the facts.

Stand on Controversy

WE OF the Daily Nebraskan editorial staff believe in free speech and fair comment. In our statement of purpose, we advocate that the Daily Nebraskan shall be an instrument of and for the University of Nebraska student body. In stating this purpose, we make complete coverage of campus news our prime consideration with necessary space given to members of the student body for their individual expressions.

We also believe that the opportunity of free speech and fair comment should be utilized by our readers, both for criticism and commendation.

CONSEQUENTLY, WE will not criticize Mr. Ray Simmons for his criticism of us.

That criticism, in essence, charged that over a five-semester period, the Daily Nebraskan has presented pre-

dominantly the liberal viewpoint. Outside of a few examples, Mr. Simmons wrote in his pamphlet, "one looks in vain for any political comment from the University which is conservative rather than liberal."

OVER THE past weekend, evidence that the Nebraskan has publicized the conservative viewpoint has appeared in the daily newspapers. Yet, further evidence is available in the Daily Nebraskan office.

Despite this, as a result of our policy of statement, it follows that we respect the right of Mr. Simmons to express his opinions concerning the Daily Nebraskan, its editorial policies and its editorial and news content.

WE ONLY wish that we were more certain that Mr. Simmons similarly respected our rights.

The Time For Unity

OPEN LETTER TO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS, FACULTY MEMBERS AND THE CITIZENS OF NEBRASKA:

WE ARE sure that between our critics and us there is no difference of opinion on the urgent need to fight Communism and Communists at every turn.

But some of our critics disagree with us on method.

IT IS our position that in America we often agree to disagree, to let our assorted beliefs compete for public acceptance in the free market-place of ideas. This right to freedom of expression is guaranteed by the Constitution. It is likewise limited by the Constitution, all rights being qualified.

In this country, we have legal machinery with which to fight sedition. Thus, if any citizen knows of students who are Communists, it is his public-spirited duty to set the machinery of the law in motion, to see that indictments are brought and trials held, so that the guilty will be punished and — we hope — the innocent exonerated. That is the American way.

BUT IT is not the American way to point the finger of guilt by association, guilt by distortion, guilt by mere assertion — particularly when that craven finger is pointed at young people.

To charge, without firm factual substantiation, that today's students are Communists or the dupes of Communists is to play the deplorable ape to a 17th-century scoundrel.

MOREOVER, IT is grossly unfair to the 99.99% of our students who are loyal and dedicated Americans and who are undoubtedly better informed on Commun-

ism and Communist objectives than most of their predecessors were.

These students are steeped in the American values that assure freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion, the importance of enlightened discontent as an instrument of progress, the importance of sifting out half truths, inconsistencies, inaccuracies and ambiguities.

LET'S ATTACK this problem with reason; this is not the first great stress placed on the nation. When we call someone a Communist, let's be ready to prove it. We'll lick ourselves if we let the term be loosely applied to anyone who disagrees with us. If we set friend against friend, implant seeds of distrust in our institutions of learning, forget that the "battle of ideas" is what made this country what it is today, then we have done for the Communists what they can do for themselves.

What do we win if, out of fear of Communism, we destroy the American heritage of freedom? Fight Communism to the bitter end, but in a manner that protects the lives and reputations of the innocent.

THE STUDENTS at the University of Nebraska are as fine a group of young adults as we could find any place in the world. We should have faith in the students just as the students have faith in their fellow citizens of Nebraska and in the American system.

Now is the time for unity, not division; for courage, not hysteria; for reason, not irrationality.

SEVENTY-SECOND YEAR OF PUBLICATION
Telephone 477-8711, ext. 2588, 2589, 2590
Member Associated Collegiate Press, International Press Representative, National Advertising Service, Incorporated.
Published at: Room 51, Student Union, Lincoln 8, Nebraska.
14th & R

Editor: Linda Jensen
Managing Editor: Gary Lorenz
News Editor: John Morris

Entered as second class matter, postage paid, at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska.
The Daily Nebraskan is published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, and once during August, by students of the University of Nebraska under the supervision 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 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, do, or cause to be printed.
February 4, 1963.

At Meeting in 1961 . . .

Anti-Red Policy Stated by Regents

(This public statement of policy was issued by the University of Nebraska Board of Regents at a meeting in Lincoln, July 18, 1961.)

The purpose of this statement is to officially inform Nebraska parents, students and all others interested in the university's determination to preserve the value, the integrity and the propriety of its programs and to state publicly its opposition to communism.

"We regret exceedingly the developments which have made it seem necessary to us to:

—Attempt to reinforce in this manner that the University of Nebraska is an American public institution of higher education, committed by belief, heritage and law to American principles, and

—Attempt to reinforce in this manner the faith of the people of Nebraska in their own university, and in those they elect and employ to operate it, and in its student body which, for the most part, is composed of their own sons and daughters.

We wish to direct attention to the following points:

GOVERNMENT
The responsibility for the government of the university under constitutional authority and under direction of the Legislature has been placed with the Board of Regents whose members are elected and who are not only unalterably opposed to communism but who have, in addition, given solemn oath to support and defend the Governments of the United States and the State of Nebraska. We clearly understand that our responsibility includes the duty of protecting the university and its students from all influences detrimental to the fundamental processes of American democracy and to the American freedoms of inquiry, responsible expression and the unhampered pursuit of learning. We are fulfilling this duty and we stand

ready at any time to discuss and consider any proposals, presented properly and in good faith, which could further enhance the fulfillment of the total responsibility of our office.

The university is a product of human endeavor and therefore, is not immune to error. Since it is governed by a public board and composed of public property, people employed by the public and students availing themselves of educational opportunity, provided in substantial part by public fund, it expects its actions to be scrutinized, debated and even subjected to open criticism. We believe, however, that all such participations can and should be accomplished with the utmost consideration for the welfare of Nebraska and its people so that damage to the reputation of the institution, in which Nebraska has invested so heavily, can be held to a minimum.

STAFF
The administrative officers, faculty and employees of the university are under oath to support the Government of the United States and to oppose any forces which would destroy it. We believe that the staff members of the University fully understand the obligations they have accepted and are aware that the Board of Regents will not hesitate to fulfill its duty to take prompt remedial action whenever proof is made that such oaths are being violated.

On the other hand, however, we intend to resist vigorously the spread of unsupported hearsay charges, speculations, or innuendos which would foster doubts concerning the loyalty and patriotism of the university, its staff and the student body it serves.

STUDENTS
The doors of the university are open to all students who have demonstrated scholastic ability and the desire to participate in higher education. It must be expected that some of those who enter will demonstrate the usual manifestations of immaturity and inexperience, as did their forebears at similar points of personal development. This, inevitably, involved outcroppings of the natural impatience most young people have to correct immediately the inequities and ills of the world as they see them. It also occasionally involves an exercise of the inclination some young people have to disturb the status quo and the minds of those who would prescribe their thoughts and utterances.

DETERMINATION
Consistent with the policy it enunciated November 21, 1953, when the Board of

Regents noted, "The rights to uphold, to discuss and dissent are the moral fiber of America's greatness." The university now intends to continue to conduct its programs of teaching and experience for students according to the traditional American belief in freedom of inquiry and democratic decision.

In the pursuit of this course, the university, responsive to its fundamental responsibility as a teacher, will provide a wholesome, stimulating and effective atmosphere for the encouragement of learning.

We recognize that the accomplishment of this objective requires, among many other things, an alertness to the possibility of subversive activities. The university, as always, will continue to cooperate wholeheartedly with all the official agencies of inquiry, including the Bureau of Investigation, and will, should the need arise, act on its own volition to keep from its campuses influences of any kind which are damaging to the operation of American freedom of threatening to the American form of government.

POINTS
By way of summary, the Board of Regents wishes to state clearly and emphatically:

—Communism is not present at the University of Nebraska. If it, or any other subversive activity, should ever be found at the university, the Board of Regents would act promptly and effectively to eradicate it.

—The general climate at the university in which students are encouraged to learn is wholesome and stimulating, and the Board of Regents intends to keep it so.

—The Board of Regents continues to uphold the American right of students to express themselves and their views in student publications in keeping with the usual accepted journalistic requirements for accuracy, responsibility, good taste and fairness. Responsibility for any change in this attitude rests with the Board of Regents.

—The Board of Regents has the utmost confidence in the patriotism and loyalty of the University of Nebraska staff and in the determination and ability of its administrative officers to help keep the university a loyal, American public institution of higher education especially devoted to the service of Nebraska and its people.

Signed:
CLARENCE SWANSON, President
RICHARD E. ADKINS
J. G. ELLIOTT
FRANK FOOTE
B. N. GREENBERG
J. LEROY WELSH



Protest to Demolition

TO THE EDITOR:

I protest the demolition of the old Administration Building. I protest because of its exterior beauty, its representation of a period of architecture, its past tradition as a focal point of the old campus.

I protest because the new structure will be of concrete—appearing marble and steel, marvelous in its simplicity, a model of the best of the new architecture, extremely utilitarian, and destructive of that part of the old campus, which reminded us of our past. All that will remain architectural-ly to call up the days

when buildings were constructed with towers and turrets and cupolas and ornate columns to imitate older universities and to symbolize our hopes that we might someday have a great University will be Grant Memorial and Architectural Hall.

Once we had Pharmacy and Old University Hall, frivolous and weak at the joints, but elegant and a thing of wonder to our students from sod and wind-blown frame houses.

I protest that the people of the state did not see fit to supply the money to rebuild and maintain the old buildings, and I protest that the University administration aided and abetted this neglect by not making known to the people the intangible val-

ues of these old structures. Not that I think the people would have listened at this point of time when our old buildings are like junk in the attic — not quite old enough to be valued as antiques.

But I protest because the administration could have stilled the demolition of the old and placed the new buildings elsewhere. The administration could have waited for another generation which might as a whole find some value in the buildings — as a tourist attraction perhaps. The administration could have protected this link with our past as a reminder for our students that no education is complete without a heightened awareness of the past and that no true progress is made except that built upon the efforts and hopes of those who went before us.

I realize that this protest is too little and too late, and that there remain now only a few more things to do in the name of "progress."

Let us tear down the remaining old buildings, dig up the trees, the grass, and the lilac bushes, and build a parking lot. Then we might — we just might in a burst of ostentation — dye the gravel green.
MRS. ELLEN SIM DEWEY
Class of 1944

Moore: Nebraskan Sounds Too Liberally Prejudiced

Continued From Page 1

ka said, "In order to make a judgment, I'd have to do an extensive study of back issues of the Daily Nebraskan. I wish I could comment, but it would not be fair either to you or to Mr. Simmons."

U.S. Senator Carl Curtis could not be reached for comment.

Fred Seaton, former Republican gubernatorial candidate, explained that he had not received a copy of Simmons' report, and that he would release a statement today after having seen a copy of the charges.

Bill Moore, chairman of the Grand Island "Think and Act" Committee, said "I have read the material Senator Simmons has put out. If this is true, I feel the Daily Nebraskan is overwhelmingly one sided and is leaning too far in one direction in its presentations."

"It seems to me, there is

too much prejudice involved — in fact, the Nebraskan sounds highly prejudiced (toward the liberal philosophy)," Moore said.

Charles Thone, past state chairman of the Republican Party, said he had no comment.

The editor of the Fremont Guide and Tribune, Russell Weber said there hasn't been enough time for any general reaction in the Fremont area, since news of the report did not reach there until late Saturday afternoon.

Weber commented, however, that "there is an extreme attitude that presents strongly one side of the issue," and that this is an attitude not presented in a manner that would encourage open discussion of the situation.

Don Ferguson, editor of the Nebraskan in the spring of 1962, said, "I was disappointed in his unobjectivity. Anybody can take statements out of context and can make a case one way or another."

NU Professor Says 'Nebraskans Proud'

Continued From Page 1

would not want to do anything to limit this right.
"I would like to add that I honestly believe most Nebraskans are very proud of these students since they are among those journalism students who, within the past two years, have brought many national awards to the University and subsequently to the people of Nebraska. It seems strange to me that Mr. Simmons has chosen to attack young people who are among those busily proving that they are second to none in the entire country."

DID YOU KNOW?

College students can have \$10,000 of insurance protection for less than 12¢ a day through Lutheran Brotherhood.

LIFE AND HEALTH INSURANCE FOR LUTHERANS
701 Second Avenue South • Minneapolis 2, Minn.

*Premium increases at a later age when policy automatically converts to permanent insurance.