

Wednesday, Nov. 13, 1963

GOLDWATERITES:

Want Girls

University girls now have another activity which they can compete and oggle over.

The Nebraska Youth for Goldwater have announced that there will be interviews for "Goldwater Girls" next week.

According to the Goldwaterites, the girls, outfitted in special Goldwater costumes, will be used in election campaigns and fund raising dinners. You know, creators of spirit.

It seems rather unorthodox for a political group to implement girls in their campaigns to bolster spirit. Of course a political campaign is an exercise in public relations, and the more unusual the act, then the more publicity in the newspapers and other news media.

Then of course there is the adroit comment, made by one NU coed when she heard of the Goldwater Girls. "It would be hard to find ten good-looking girls on this campus who would be for Goldwater!"

Apathy...

At the "Campus Controversies" meeting Monday afternoon, Vice Chancellor G. Robert Ross and Student Council Vice President Dick Weill made some statements, that were on the surface, quite true.

When the subject of student apathy was brought up, one couldn't help but notice that the Union room 232 contained only about 75 students. When the subject of drinking laws was brought up, few could say that they had actually spoken to their congressman about the drinking "problem."

Weill stated, "We have a greater obligation than to mirror student opinion," and there was little disagreement.

Ross said, "I wonder if there is a clear (student) feeling," and no one in the room could or would tell him if there was.

Finally, Weill said, "To pass a resolution favoring 3.2 beer would cause the Legislature to think we are an irresponsible bunch of students," and this statement brought a ripple of dissent, but no one actually gave a solid reason why 3.2 beer could actually reflect student maturity.

Ross and Weill put University of Nebraska students in their place. We now know that the Student Council apparently doesn't need to actively seek out student opinion. We now know that student opinion or feeling is not clear, and indeed shouldn't be. We now know that student support of 3.2 beer would label them irresponsible in the Legislature's mind.

These are the hazy conclusions that one must reach after listening to the Vice Chancellor and the Vice President of Student Council.

Someone had to speak for the students if they couldn't present a picture of maturity and responsibility necessary to support the ideas they actually held.

MICK ROOD

Illinois Phi Delt's Prove:

Hazing Can Be Stopped!

By Bob Weaver
Pledge training, or rather pledge education, as it's coming to be called, is a proverbial campus problem in relation to the Greek system.

The fall semester brings its traditional line ups, fire drills, rack outs, fun and games, push ups, etc.

Assuming that "hazing" is undesirable to begin with, there are several ways of ridding the campus of this traditional activity.

The first is through administration or Interfraternity Council action. For the moment, this can be discounted.

The second, and more desirable, is through the fraternity active chapters themselves. Mr. Walter Draper in the Phi Delta Theta Scroll tells how it has been done:

The essence of this article comes from a discussion on fraternity hazing practices.

in a workshop at the Phi Delta Theta Biennial Convention, Bedford Springs, Pennsylvania, August 1962. I was privileged to monitor the discussion at that workshop and from it got a number of valuable suggestions which I feel should be passed on to a much wider audience. Inasmuch as hazing is one of the fraternity system's most vexatious and difficult problems, it becomes all the more important that we face it squarely and attack it frontally. We cannot hide the fact that hazing goes on in our fraternities. The public knows better. This we may as well recognize. Furthermore, we may as well recognize that the future of the fraternity on the college scene depends that we come to grips with the problem and successfully solve it.

What can interfraternity councils do to abolish hazing? What can general fraternities do at their respective national levels? What

can college administrators do? Unfortunately, the answer to these questions is—nothing more than they have already done. The general statutes, constitutions, and by-laws, bristle with regulations forbidding degrading and harmful hazing practices. Still these practices go on. Anyone who denies this is indeed foolish and irresponsible. The solution must come from the chapters themselves. It is axiomatic that no unwanted law can be enforced. Therefore, an honest desire to clean up our house before some one else cleans it up for us, throwing out all that is good along with the bad, must arrive within the chapters. Is this threat about someone else cleaning our house an understatement? Probably it is. For if one's house gets too dirty, sometimes burning it to the ground is more practical than trying to clean it out; that's just what our opponents are trying to do—burn us out of existence. How, then, can this de-

sire to do something be instilled in fraternity chapters from coast to coast? Educational programs? Lectures by visiting field secretaries? Stern admonitions from school administrators? Sorry! They've all been tried for years—and our "house" is still in sorry shape. I do not profess to propose a panacea to end our woes. But I do have some ideas to pass on—ideas that are certainly worth a try. Me conceded? Perhaps, but not on this account. Not quite. You see, these ideas are not mine. I learned them from other people—not faculty members—not school administrators—not general fraternity executives, but from good, healthy, fun-loving undergraduate fraternity men. To them goes the credit so richly deserved. I accept none of it. I can only consider myself privileged to carry their ideas to the printed page.

lose than if it had never been adopted at all. They said they would insist on adoption only by unanimous vote. There was still the inevitable immature minority that is found in every chapter, as well as the constant transiency of chapter membership to be reckoned with. Still, far be it from me to discourage anything as constructive and mature in intent as this Creed, especially when it springs from the chapter itself. So, with the risks well in mind the chapter went ahead and the Pledge Training Creed received unanimous passage in formal meeting.

The press reaction was wide but somewhat skeptical. "Keep your promise, Phi Delt's!" seemed to be the general tenor. But most important was that at long last the fraternity system was getting some favorable publicity in place of discouraging "smear stories." Indeed, the tone of student reaction and the wide newspaper, television, and radio coverage aroused the envy of many other chapters on the campus. But the same token, it put us on the spot. No one would forget the promise that had been made.

The first crucial test came the following year. When "informal initiation" time approached there was a cry by the vociferous and immature minority to "change the Creed!" Resisting pressures of this sort is not easy, but the Executive Council stood firm. The chapter president then took a step which I heartily recommend all chapter presidents to consider. It is a step that requires no chapter vote of any sort. It requires only the courage of one man's conviction.

The president went to the editor of the college newspaper (the very paper that had challenged us to keep our promise) and invited him to visit the chapter house during the informal initiation period at any hour of the day or night—and to bring a photographer with him. Of course there were outcries from the dissident minority, but once the invitation had been issued and prominently publicized on the editorial page, there was little the chapter could do about it.

The editor accepted the invitation and paid a visit to the house where he found all the freshmen—studying in their rooms! Asked to come again when "something would be happening," he and his cameraman reappeared. They found the men house cleaning and this resulted in more favorable "fraternity ink" in a paper that had previously been very tepid on the subject. I do not mean to contend that with this first crucial test safely passed the problem at Illinois has been finally "licked." No problem with a fraternity is ever solved once and for all. Every year when "that time" rolls around, all one can do is hope that there are those in the chapter mature

(Con't on page 3)



The Right Way

The Bountiful Reaping

By Steve Stastny

As the Thanksgiving season approaches, the Russian people should give special thanks to the generosity of the American people. Due to the benevolence of the New Frontier, 150 million bushels of the U.S. wheat will soon find its way into Nikita's waiting arms.

This sale of wheat to Russia shows the true courage of the New Frontier. It must take courage to ignore the Agriculture Act of 1961 which forbids the federal government from selling any subsidized commodity to Communist nations. It must take courage to bypass the Johnson Act of 1934 (amended in 1946) which prohibits U.S. citizens and federal agencies from making loans of any kind to any government or agency which owes money to the U.S.

Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, upon returning from his recent tour behind the Iron Curtain, said that Soviet farm production has risen "considerably" and added: "They have the ability to feed their people." In addition, other Agriculture Department officials echoed this opinion, saying that we would be "startled" at the crop yield of the East European countries.

The world was indeed startled to learn that Russia had suffered its fifth consecutive crop failure and that, as a result, food shortages behind the Iron Curtain were increasing.

Going even further, JFK has announced that Albania and East Germany, countries with which we do not have diplomatic relations, would be included in the wheat deal, thus giving

them recognition as official governments.

In this wheat deal, JFK has refused to recognize the bad faith and trickery that Russia has shown in her relations with the U.S. Thirty years of history say it can't be done on any but Soviet terms.

The Soviet Union has refused to pay her \$2.5 billion Lend-Lease debt to the U.S. even after 1951 when we scaled down the original debt to \$800 million. The Russians declined to pay more than \$300 million of this debt.

On top of this, repudiated Russian obligations held by the U.S. government total over \$190 million; repudiated Russian obligations held by American citizens amount to over \$100 million; and confiscated property rights and interest of American citizens in Russia total over \$300 million.

These staggering amounts when combined with the Russian suspension of interest payments bring her total debt to the U.S. to well over \$3 billion.

How can any supposedly sane person imagine that a trade with the Soviet Union can be established on these past performances?

U.S. trade with Communist nations helps strengthen the government's control over the enslaved people. There should be no trade with the Soviet Union, whatsoever, as long as the Communists are dedicated to world conquest. Without a complete change in Soviet morality, the price of more trade with the Soviet Union would come too high.

CAMPUS OPINION

Stastny Under Fire

Dear Editor:

Steve Stastny's "Trojan Horse" column of November 7th seems to me quite lacking in logic as well as containing a major piece of anti-United Nations misinformation.

I believe Stastny's statement that "Russia has used the veto power over 100 times," but how does this fact contribute to the conclusion that the U.N. is a "Trojan Horse" and a tool of the Russians? It seems more reasonable to conclude that Russia's veto was used because of the dissimilarity between U.N. resolutions and Communist policies.

The activities of Communist spies in the United States under the cloak of U.N. immunity are certainly valid subjects for attack, but having the U.N. located in the United States can be defended on many grounds, particularly those of public relations and propaganda. U.N. delegates are a "captive audience" to American democratic institutions and our general way of life, which almost all Americans, including the Radical Right, consider worthy of observation and emulation by foreign nations.

In spite of the Russians' failure to dominate the U.N., as demonstrated by their frequent use of the veto and the consistent and growing rejection of Communist China's admission, Russia has indicated no desire to withdraw from U.N. membership. The Korean War was

the largest armed conflict since World War II, and the U.N. was on our side.

If Russia can put up with failure, why should the United States be so politically spoiled that she should demand ever greater success as a condition of continued U.N. membership? Herbert Hoover, the John Birch Society, and Stastny seem to suggest this, though I think the cause of world peace would be served best if the U.N. were neither a tool of the Communist nations nor the Western powers, but rather a common ground on which all nations and ideologies could meet and seek common solutions to the world's problems.

Communist mistreatment of Cardinals Stepinac and Mindzenty involved internal politics rather than international law; and consequently, was outside U.N. jurisdiction; but our Bay of Pigs (Cuba) fiasco did violate international law, as did Russia's suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1956.

Contrary to Stastny (Information Please Almanac 1963, p. 771,) the U.N. General Assembly did vote a condemnation of Russia's action and passed not one, but five, resolutions on the subject. There has been no U.N. condemnation of the United States' role at the Bag of Pigs, which was not even justified exactly by the Monroe Doctrine, a document hardly synonymous with international law.

Sincerely,
F.S.L.

The Daily Nebraskan
JOHN MORRIS, managing editor; SUE HOVDE, news editor; FRANK PARTSCH, SUSAN SMYTHRENGER, GRANT PETERSON, senior staff writers; LARRY ASMAN, SHARI JOHNSON, junior staff writers; PATTY KNAPP, ARNIE GARDSON, copy editor; HAL FOSTER, photographer; MICK ROOD, sports editor; MIKE JEFFREY, circulation manager; JIM DICK, subscription manager; BILL GUNLICKS, BOB CUNNINGHAM, PETE LAGE, business managers.
Subscriptions rates \$2 per semester or \$3 per year.
Entered as second class matter at the post office in Lincoln, Nebraska, under the act of August 4, 1912.
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 censorship by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

DAILY NEBRASKAN NEEDS REPORTERS
Drop in at room 51, Student Union

Orange Blossom
ENGAGEMENT AND WEDDING RINGS

NO. 599

\$225

Sartor Jewelry
1200 "O" STREET 432-3616
REGISTERED JEWELER AMERICAN GEM SOCIETY