

COLORADO STUDENTS:

Do Something

Two weeks ago Gov. John Love of Colorado proposed a tuition increase at state-supported universities in that state.

At the University of Colorado in Boulder the 40% increase would mean that in-state students would pay \$142 instead of the present \$104. Tuition for out-state students would be increased an even \$100.

Boulder reacted in its usual quick and valiant manner. Two thousand students boycotted classes Wednesday, Feb. 5, to attend a rally protesting the tuition hike. Student Body President Carlton Stoiber said the demonstration was to show the legislature that "the feeling is strong enough that it would require an event like this to demonstrate the concern."

The next day Stoiber and his counterparts from Colorado State University and Colorado State College presented a petition with 12,000 signatures representing the three state-supported schools to Gov. Love in protest of the proposal.

An editorial in the COLORADO DAILY at Boulder said, "... an increase in tuition of the magnitude proposed by Love is economically, socially, philosophically and politically dangerous. But, simply to identify the danger is not enough. It must forcefully be brought to the attention of the citizens of Colorado and of the state legislature."

An editorial in CSU's COLLEGIAN asked, "Who cares?"

It complained that less than 200 CSU students were sufficiently disturbed over the proposal to raise the tuition to demonstrate. It added, secondly, that students there have no concern over where their student fees go when they allow candidates for offices there to run unopposed. Apparently, it costs students at CSU about \$18 a year for these elections, organizations, etc. THE COLLEGIAN pointed out that that added up to only \$130,000 a year.

The editorial went on that it was easy to understand why Gov. Love thought he could get away with raising tuition. He need only to look at the record of CSU students to be assured that they, at least, will not miss a few more dollars per year. That strikes close to home, where it hurts.

Ever wonder why the University of Nebraska never gets the money it asks for? Ever wonder why tuition goes up here? Ever care? What if parents stopped sending money? Ever wonder about a breakdown showing where each student's \$132 goes? Ever organize as a student body to form some kind of a justified protest?

No, well then, just keep on paying, without even knowing. You'll be asked for more.

Spare Parts  
Two Decades Experience  
Backs Severeid Column

"I may occasionally annoy some readers, but I rarely bore anybody," claims Eric Severeid.

And few will deny either ability to the sophisticated, amusing and mildly cynical news analyst who has been newspaper reporter, author, radio, TV commentator, and now is syndicated col-



Eric Severeid columnist for The Hall Syndicate and the Daily Nebraskan.

His column on international, national, economic and military affairs—which he has been covering distinguishedly for about two dozen years—will appear Mondays on the editorial page of the DAILY NEBRASKAN.

Severeid began as a copyboy on the MINNEAPOLIS JOURNAL in 1931 before his A.B. degree at the University of Minnesota. Later he served as a reporter on the Journal, then on the MINNEAPOLIS STAR.

In 1938 he expanded his horizons, joining the Paris edition of the N.Y. HERALD TRIBUNE, first as a reporter, then as city editor. After a short trick as night editor of United Press in Paris, he joined the Columbia Broadcasting System in August of 1939 as a European correspondent.

His voice became familiar to listeners throughout the U.S. during the war. He was with the French Army and Air Force in France and Belgium, then broadcast news of the French capitulation from Tours and Bordeaux. His voice has since been heard from many parts of the world, including England, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Mexico, Brazil. So effective were his news analyses that many were collected and published as a book, "In One Ear." Recently he has been analyst and moderator on some of CBS' important domestic news and background programs.

Severeid claims no "expertise" except perhaps in the political and diplomatic areas," but he has gone from the small town of Velva, North Dakota, his birthplace, to the great capitals and news centers of the world, from a dirt farm to acquaintance with the world's great, from covering baby snatching and Minneapolis meetings to commenting on world war and world conferences.

In addition to "In One Ear," he wrote the juvenile "Canoeing with the Cree," the best selling "No So Wild a Dream" and, more recently, "Small Sounds in the Night." He has written for such magazines as the SATURDAY EVENING POST, LOOK, READER'S DIGEST, HARPERS, THE REPORTER, THE NEW REPUBLIC, THIS WEEK, AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE, BOYS' LIFE, ST. NICHOLAS and HARPER'S BAZAAR. He is president of the Radio Correspondents Association.

"I'm deeply interested in the whole current development of western society," he observes, "in all its manifestations from its preoccupation with gadgets to its philosophical phase of mind."



ERIC SEVAREID—

U.S. Must Keep Its Head,  
Nice Guys Can Finish First

This country is now in a period of its international life that was always inevitable and repeatedly predicted by the politically weather-beaten.



Our policies, presence and our simple existence are being attacked in Europe, the Far East, the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Africa, the Caribbean and in Central and South America. The attacks are serious and specifically motivated, as in Panama or Indonesia, or temporary—we hope—and without reasonable cause, as in Ghana and Cyprus.

They are not coming to an end any time soon. Indeed, the next wave of anti-Americans called "student," though they do precious little judging, in several southern capitals that are now quiescent. They will make Panama and Guantanamo the nominal excuses for their organized prancing and prattle, and the local Communists will, of course, be at the heart of it.

Riots make better news than quiet construction, and any number of well meaning but innocent Americans will feel sick at heart under the impression that the whole world loathes the United States, and that our foreign policies must be fundamentally misconceived and everyone failing. We have some tears of remorse to shed, but not that many.

For most of these difficulties there was never any practical preventative. It was not possible to set dozens of tribal clusters free under the guise of nationhood and not expect them to behave like tribal clusters for a long time, until they sort themselves out. It was not possible to leave vacuums of power lying around, as in much of Southeast Asia, and not expect yellow imperialism, in the mode of Mao or of Sukarno, to replace white imperialism. The Communist

revolutionary movement is a fundamental fact of the century. It has preceded, on two levels, direct power confrontation between the great Communist powers and the United States, and subversion in smaller, undecided countries.

We could hardly expect to calm down the direct confrontations as we have pretty successfully done by strength and firmness, and not expect an increase in subversion in many places with the aim of eliminating our local influence, blackguarding us and rattling us. If we allow ourselves to be rattled and behave rashly, we are fools and will properly deserve the results.

Our trouble is not that we have behaved unwisely in all these trouble spots. Our fundamental trouble is that we have taken on too much, too soon. We have overextended ourselves, not necessarily in money resources but in our resources of personnel, expertise, emotions and attention span. An American secretary of state today is a man trying to play a hundred chess games at once, often against opponents who play by different rules or no rules, and no man can discharge this task with a high winning average.

We took it all on too soon in the sense that we hadn't yet got rid of impedimenta carried over from the nineteenth century, when we had no foreign policy to speak of but many concepts

that made us feel good. Perhaps the basic one was of a messianic nature, the idea that because we had built something new here, in contrast to blood-stained Old Europe, this new thing could be built, and quickly, anywhere, including dimmed Africa and overcrowded Asia. To this concept we added unworkable working rules of procedure, including the self-deceptions that all sovereignties are equal whatever their power, and that we don't intervene in the internal affairs of other nations. Since we are frequently obliged to ignore both propositions, we suffer the pangs of moral conflict within ourselves.

This is what amuses De Gaulle, who has no intention of sitting on his hands for a generation until we get our practical and moral ducks lined up. The fascinating thing about the old cynic in the Elysees Palace is that he upsets the powerful by using the weapons of weakness. France is only strong enough to disorganize; it is not strong enough to re-organize. Put another way, he uses the tactics of Judo—he causes the powerful to flounder in the direction he wishes by sudden disengagements.

Still, nice, lumbering guys don't have to finish last. Not if they learn to keep their feet and their heads, select their targets carefully and pay no attention to the claqueurs in the gallery who are trying to rattle them.

CAMPUS OPINION

Profits Spur Integration

Dear Editor: I found an article which may interest the students on the NU campus. It appeared in the November issue of THE PROGRESSIVE. article is quite lengthy so I will only take excerpts from the article to convey its meaning: "Proprietors of places of public accommodation in Dixie have long feared that if they admitted Negroes, Southern whites would boycott them and ruin their business. Their fear not only turns out to be largely unfounded, but it appears, at least on the basis of one study, that integration brings more patronage than before."

Among hotels, motels, restaurants, taverns, night clubs, and other establishments serving or hiring Negroes, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL reported a fter canvassing Southern cities: "Only a few report suffering any lasting economic consequences" and "a sizeable number, in fact, declare that business has been better than ever."

(about one-fiftieth of one per cent difficulty) was felt by Harvey's Department Store in Nashville. Out of 60,000 customers with charge accounts, only 13 have closed their accounts because the Tennessee store desegregated its lunch counter in 1960. The store president, Fred Harvey, states, "We're getting plenty of customers to replace the hard-headed ones." In Atlanta, 14 hotels recently announced they would begin accepting Negro guests attending conventions. Within a day they had received bookings for conventions with 3,000 delegates.

These findings by the conservative JOURNAL should be pondered by conservative Congressmen who fear that the Administration proposal to end discrimination in places serving the public will cause the owners financial loss. The reverse may well be true. Now, not only morality and the Constitution call for integration but the profit motive may join in the chorus."

Douglas Paine

Insight Elsewhere—  
'Charlie my boy, oh...'

by kenneth tabor

For many years government officials have been talking about the probable future of the French, telling us to watch out, because De Gaulle would not be content to be a second rate power.

It is, then, a little amusing to see the shocked look on these same faces when the French opened relations with the Communist Chinese. Why they moved as they did is a moot point. Several reasons have been offered.

The open rift between the Soviets and the Red Chinese has seemed to form a gap in the foreign policy of the West. French Ambassador Herve Alphand has told our state department that France hopes to fill that gap.

The announcement of their position assures all that they are not forming a "two-China" policy; that rather they view that portion of the world as under two governments, Formosa and the government of China. The agreement was in no way to imply approval of the political expressions of Peking.

The French announcement fell on the eve of the anniversary of the French-German reunion. That union called for consultation before making any major diplomatic moves. There was none in this case so the anniversary "was met with little jubilation."

The French colonies also reacted quickly. Madagascar's reaction seems to typify colonists' feelings. Madagascar has announced its inability to go along with De Gaulle.

Most important was the reaction of the 7,000 French in Viet Nam. Violently anti-Communist and in the midst of a pitched battle with the Red forces, these French patriots felt sadly disillusioned. It seems strange to these thousands to fight the Reds on the one hand, and make agreements with them on the other.

Pressed the hardest by

the issue were the Nationalists on Formosa. Their first reaction was to break all ties with the French. Our government has urged that they wait. It seems to be our hope that by waiting the Nationalists can come out of this fray victorious.

The Nationalist government doesn't seem very pleased with our advice. They still consider the populous of the mainland their patriots, separated from their true government by the Communist tyranny.

No one is forgetting, however, that if this is to be considered a crisis of major proportion, the battle will be fought on the diplomatic level. It is to the advantage of the French that it be so.

Our biggest fear seems now to be that this will open the way for recognition of Red China in the UN. Such a recognition would put us in a difficult position as we still maintain troops in South Korea and are still committed to protecting the island nation of Formosa. The French may regard, however, our failure to respond to Chiang Kai-shek's pleas after World War II as a tacit approval of the existing situation.

More important than the UN is our own position as a nation. We have long been urging Europe to take a more active part in world affairs. France has now done so. The situation has called forth America's diplomatic disapproval, but now our state department has to decide how to treat De Gaulle. Washington will be busy for some time deciding whether to treat De Gaulle's nation as that country which openly diverged from our foreign policy regarding the East or as that country which came to our aid in the recent Cuban crisis. That De Gaulle still feels he has been shunned by the United States will not make our task any easier.

**Help Wanted  
Nebraska Union**

Cashier: M-F 5:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m.  
M-F 9:00 a.m.-12 Noon  
Sat. 12 Noon-3:00 p.m.  
M-F 3:00 p.m.-1:00 a.m.  
Alt Fri 6:00 p.m.-1:00 a.m.

Busser: W 3:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m.  
F 3:00 p.m.-1:00 a.m.

Apply Mr. Barnes  
Nebraska Union

**WE NEVER CLOSE**

**HARVEY'S**

**2¢**

**ON EVERY GAL.**

**BALL POINT PENS**

**15¢ WITH GAS PURCHASE**

**DIVIDEND BONDED GAS**

**16th & P Sts.**

**Downtown Lincoln**

JOHN MORRIS, editor; ARNIE GABROW, managing editor; SUSAN SMITH-BECK, news editor; FRANK PARTSCH, MICK BOOD, senior staff writers; JERRI O'NEIL, MIKE KEENE, AL BRANDT, RAY BOOD, junior staff writers; RICHARD HALBERT, DALE RAJER, CAY LEITCHICK, copy editors; DENNIS DEFEAIN, photographer; CHUCK BAUM, sports editor; PEGGY NEFCE, assistant sports editor; PRESTON LOVE, circulation manager; JIM DICK, subscription manager; JOHN ZEILINGER, business manager; BILL GUNLICKS, BOB CUNNINGHAM, PETE LAGE, business assistants.

Subscription rates \$3 per semester or \$5 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 11, Student 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 Nebraska are responsible for what they cause to be printed.