

Monday, November 11, 1963

A GUIDELINE FOR:

College Nights

The maddening dilemma of College Nights has been solved; and the ironic part was that it wasn't a dilemma at all. There is, however, a guideline to follow.

Sunday G. Robert Ross, vice chancellor of Student Affairs, gave the Daily Nebraskan the administrative policy concerning college nights.

A college night dance is subject to University disciplinary action only if the event is sponsored by or exclusively for University Students.

Friday night there was a College Night dance at the Playmor Ballroom. Two characteristics made it different from previous College Night dances. First it was not directly sponsored by a University student or group, and second it was advertised by poster as "open to the public."

These seem to be the criteria for staging a dance and keeping the University calm.

As is pointed out in today's story, however, there were minors drinking at the dance. They should realize that they are doing this at their own risk, and if caught are subject to University disciplinary measures. It is usually the University's policy to place students convicted of "minor in possession of an alcoholic beverage" on conduct probation.

Second offenses usually result in expulsion from the University.

GARY LACEY



G. L. MAUDLIN  
A CHICAGO SUN-TIMES

TIME & PLACE:  
Con JFK Articles:  
Fact Or Fiction?

By Murry Shaeffer

In recent weeks we have been informed that Barry Goldwater, the golden boy from Arizona, is a shoe-in for the presidency (even though he is not assured of the Republican nomination yet) and that JFK has in a short period of three years fulfilled not one of his campaign promises, has given the whole world to the communists, and at the same time has lost all his national support and popularity.

If this was the case, or if the accusations had the slightest tinge of validity, there certainly would be cause for concern. But no, these articles were not of fact, rather they were lifted from two campaign propaganda leaflets. "How Goldwater Will Win the Presidency" and "Barry Goldwater Talks about Labor and Farm Problems," which are being distributed by the "Youth for Goldwater".

Just to refresh the readers' memory, the column being referred to stated, that right now—meaning if the election were held today: Mr. Goldwater would receive 301 electoral votes as opposed to 197 for President Kennedy. Two hundred and seventy electoral college votes are needed to win.

A breakdown of voting strength by regions shows Mr. G. trailing in only the North, East and "Border States" (meaning heaven knows what?) This pamphlet shows that this Republican will receive all the votes from the South and nearly all electoral votes from the Midwest, Mountain, and Pacific States. The only note of pessimism is California, whose forty electoral college votes, are classified as "doubtful." In other words Goldwater has already won the 1964 presidential election, why sweat it?

This is a "great" poll, and should work wonders with the emotional segment of our population, but what about the rational members of our nation?

The first thing that enters the mind of a thinking person is the definition of "poll." A "poll" in present day terminology is a study of public opinion obtained from a specific group (ideally a representative group and then generalized to the whole population.)

Polling comes in two different varieties, area polling is the interviewing of every person within a predetermined area, e.g., an

area two miles square, while quota polling is the interviewing of a representative portion of the total population. If the total population of a country is composed of 10% Negroes and 90% whites, your quota of ten people will have to include 1 Negro and 9 whites with the appropriate number of Catholics, Protestants, etc. — a miniature population.

Now if you come out with a fairly accurate quota, the results as generalized to total population, should be within 20 per cent one way or the other, of the actual vote.

Well then, after a brief lesson in polling procedure, the question arises—what group was polled for the results found in the "Goldwater Will Win . . ." pamphlet? The executive board of the "Draft Goldwater Committee", Maybe?

Mr. George Gallup in his latest poll, published last Sunday, obtained the following results. Using the question, "Suppose the choice for President in the Republican convention in 1964 narrows down to Barry Goldwater and Richard Nixon, which one would you prefer to have the Republican convention select?" people who identified themselves as Republicans showed the following opinion:

Table with 2 columns: Candidate, Percentage. Includes entries for Goldwater, Nixon, and Undecided.

Con't. on Page 3

—Yankee In Mexico—  
Student Shamefully Makes Excuses  
For U.S. Policies In Latin America

By Susie Rutter

Democracy versus Communism, Kennedy versus Khrushchev, Red Propaganda versus United States Foreign Aid. New Alliance for Progress versus years of anti-Imperialism. Yankee money yes, intervention no. Anti-Americanism. It is truly a unique feeling for an American, a citizen of the perfect model of successful democracy and without a doubt one of the most scientifically and technically advanced nations in the world, to shamefully be making excuses for his country's foreign policy. This is the case in Latin America.

Twenty countries with more than 200 million people are emerging under the impact of the twentieth century and breaking the bonds of traditional society and social institutions. Latin America: a country in revolution.

In spite of the magnitude of the changes that have been taking place in recent years and the military coups in the past month, the United States has failed to sense the significance or take firm action. Too often it has been assumed that the neglect of Latin America could be corrected with additional loans and grants, more generous economic assistance.

The real problem that exists in inter-American relations is the lack of understanding and sympathy for those south of the border—a lack of knowledge of the actual situation and thoughts in the minds and hearts of the people.

In the 1950's when the Communists managed to acquire a dominating position in the government of Guatemala, U.S. policy makers were momentarily shocked out of indifference. But under a successful counter-revolution backed by U.S. aid, the Americans of the north once more settled back into an aura of security.

Then came the expression

of "popular acclaim" accorded Vice-President Nixon in Caracas and Lima.

And then came the Cuban Revolution: a fight led by patriot Fidel Castro to rid his country of tyranny and establish national independence.

Early in the history of the United States it was realized that the security of the hemisphere depended greatly on the independence of the countries under the Spanish and Portuguese empires. The Monroe Doctrine and the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro are manifestations of this concern.

Economic interests and trade are also an important link with Latin America and evidence of the influence of U.S. investments and regional interdependence has been shown in the Cuban sugar fiasco.

Not to mention the powerful blocs of support the Latin American countries provide or provided against the Soviet Union and Communism.

Yes, Latin America is important to the United States. Latin America is important as long as we continue to benefit from the economic exploitation and imperialism that we are known for.

Obviously there is something wrong with our Latin American policy; they don't like us. Hostile opinions are voiced loudly, restating antagonisms of half a century ago. Latin American young intellectuals consider us as the embodiment of nasty capitalist imperialism.

We are charged with supporting dictatorships, of economic discrimination, of disregard of human rights, of putting our interests over those of Latin America and of in general manipulating the political, economic and social situations for our benefit.

The lack of respect which the United States has suffered in Latin America now appears as a threat to our national interests and security.

The influence of Communism and the Soviet Union threatens to extend itself to other countries with the appeal of revolutionary independence and power. This

appeal of Fidelismo and sympathy for the Cuban cause has been evidenced many times by the actions of the people and their representatives in the Organization of American States.

Latin American support in world affairs has also shown signs of weakening. In the United Nations, Cuba is a voting member of the Communist bloc and former allies have assumed neutral positions.

Communist infiltration in the Western hemisphere is a threat to all democratic institutions; Cuba is the spearhead which has brought the cold war ninety short miles from our shores.

Why are we the "Ugly Americans"?

Fear of intervention stemming from U.S. policies of the past such as Roosevelt's action in Panama plays an important part in our losing popularity contest.

The Organization of American States, a regional unity created to solve the ills of our hemisphere and promote our security and peace, was relatively ineffective when faced with the Communist triumph in Cuba. At Punta del Este in 1962 the action of six Latin American countries and their refusal to agree with the exclusion of Cuba from the inter-American system reflect the growing difference in viewpoints that has developed.

Cuba is representative of the widespread social and political unrest that exists in the republics today as evidence the recent military takeovers in Honduras and the Guatemala. Social and political unrest which has made them more susceptible to Communist penetration and aggression.

To meet the threat of the Soviet Union and gain another victory for our side in the cold war, we propose a phenomenal foreign aid program. Twenty billion dollars minimum to Latin America in the next ten years. We hopefully call the plan the Alliance for Progress.

Result: No Alliance and Little Progress.

After an initial enthusiasm on the part of both sides the Latin American countries failed to come through with the required development plans and the United States (according to Latin America) failed to distribute the promised funds. Latins seemed to interpret the program as another form of magic that would transform them overnight into prosperous and progressive nations of the world.

It is true that it must be

remembered that it is unfair to judge the results of such a long term program now; much money has been spent and some of it usefully—the Latin American governments are beginning to understand that the program involves a two way partnership and mutual cooperation.

However, at present and with a skeptical viewpoint the Alliance for Progress cannot be considered to have accomplished its purpose to re-establish a firm basis for continued inter-American cooperation and understanding.

One reason may be the built-in resistance all Latins have to any pressure from the North; the resentment of "interference" is strongest in countries that believe themselves capable of making and carrying out their own economic decisions. They seem to be saying in all their complaints: "Give us the money or make it possible for us to earn it and then leave us alone."

One Latin American student here offered the following choice opinion when questioned about the Alliance. "You have to give us the money because you are afraid of communism. We need the money for our development and if you don't give it to us then we can get it from them."

Thus the latest brainstorm of our government has as of now failed to better relations with Latin America and possibly for the reason that again we tried only to "buy" the southern republics and there still exists little real understanding of the actual conditions in the different countries and little real understanding of the people and their motivations.

Whose move is next?

CAMPUS OPINION

Gridder Ambassadors

Dear Editor: I had the privilege of accompanying the football team to the University of Missouri game two weeks ago. Football fans have been justifiably proud of the team's recent accomplishments on the field. But, I am certain the citizens of Nebraska would have been especially proud of the team's conduct during the entire trip. They served as fine ambassadors for this state.

Sincerely yours, Prof. Ray H. Steiner College of Dentistry

Floatin' In The Breeze

How many cakes must an old lady bake, Before she is called a cook; Oh how much wood must a woodchuck chuck Before he learns to chuck wood; And how many projects must a boy scout do Before he earns his merit badge;

The answer my friend is floatin' in the breeze The answer is floatin' in the breeze.

How many roads must a folk singer walk Before he can write his first song; Oh how much labor must a laborin' man do Before he can retire to his farm; And how many answers must you find in the wind Before a folk song makes sense;

The answer my friend is floatin' in the breeze The answer is floatin' in the breeze.

WE NEVER CLOSE

Advertisement for O.K. Rubber Waders tires. Features a large graphic of a tire and text: 'SAVE 2¢ ON EVERY GAL.' 'CIGARETTES 25¢' 'DIVIDEND BONDED GAS' '16th & P Sts. Downtown Lincoln'

Advertisement for O.K. Rubber Waders tires. Text: 'OK NEW TIRES Lifetime Guarantee AS LOW \$10.95' '7.50-14 Nylon Tubeless Plus Tax and Recappable Tire' 'BRAKE RELINE \$12.95' 'Front End Alignment \$6.95' 'Chain Bar \$8.95' '6.70x15, 7.50x14 Tubeless Black Other Sizes Proportionately Low. Film Tax and Recappable Tire. WE ALSO CAP ALL COMPACT SIZE TIRES - 4-HOUR CUSTOM CAPPING NO MONEY DOWN PAY AS YOU RIDE' 'T. O. HASS 500 West "O" 435-3211'

Advertisement for The Daily Nebraskan. Text: 'The Daily Nebraskan is published at Room 51, Nebraska Union, on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday by University of Nebraska students under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from any credit by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraskan are responsible for what they come to be printed.'