

RELIGIOUS PROBLEM:

Needs New View

The March 8 edition of THIS WEEK MAGAZINE asked in the headline to an article by James R. De Foe, "Is God Leaving The Campus?" Of course, that was not what the article meant to say.

The article said that college students are being neglected by their churches during the critical years when they are most in need of spiritual guidance in the form of a quote from a Roman Catholic chaplain.

A Protestant chaplain echoed that quote by saying that he was lucky if in the course of a term he shook hands with half the students he was responsible for.

Further, the article said that there has been a radical shift toward religious neutralism among academic leaders. And quoted an author as saying that the student of traditional faith may discover that his convictions are "ignored, dismissed in silence, or questioned by another standard of belief."

What it really fails to take a good look at is that the process of education is in operation. Students are wrapped up in that and it includes the search for so-called religious truth and a belief in God.

This country's student has been given the opportunity to find out for himself—a chance to find himself, to find God himself, a prime alternative to strict indoctrination.

But, if there is a problem it is not, "Is God Leaving The Campus?" but rather "Is The Campus Leaving God?"

The blame cannot be placed on campus chaplains and churches if the students of today are neogists. The religion of a person should come from within. It can be helped along, of course, by the clergy, but the clergy cannot lead faster than the person can go. The clergy should not blame itself because it thinks it is not doing a job, but should rather re-examine its methods of operation.

The article states that a new and profound religious conviction may emerge from the campus, but it will not emerge unless the churches act now to influence the "vast indifferent majority" who is being engulfed by the present religious vacuum in higher education.

There is religion on every campus. But, unless society stops criticizing the clergy it will never unfold. If the clergy can evaluate the position of the student, it can help religion become an important part in the life of a half-developed, growing person, the student.

CAMPUS OPINION

Council Action Backed

Dear Editor:

We disagree with Mr. Morris' contention, as expressed in last Friday's NEBRASKAN, that the student Council acted hastily in condemning the Skeete incident. He asserts that we should have tabled the motion so as to gather more information on the ramifications of the law and especially its exclusive clauses.

We believe that we acted on the basis of sufficient evidence. Official sources confirmed our action even before the motion was brought to the floor. They believed that the law had obviously been violated and that the action of the Barber Shop could not have been justified according to any clause within the law.

Therefore, because the incident involved a University student, because we wished to speak out in this student's behalf, and because we believed our action would focus attention on this regrettable incident and prevent its re-occurrence, we passed the motion.

Especially galling is the fact that we believe we acted with more information than Morris. Miss Strateman interviewed the County Attorney, the Editor of the LINCOLN JOURNAL, and Mr. Skeete, so as to validate our motion. On the other hand, Morris was not at the meeting, he received his information second-hand, and he made no attempt to con-

tact us concerning the facts.

Maureen Frolik
Mike Barton

EDITOR'S NOTE: The Editor did not assert that more information needed to be gathered to provide a better basis on which to introduce the resolution. It never questioned the basis on which the resolution was introduced. But the Editor knew, as a first-hand fact, that there was some question as to whether it would be introduced that day because its principal backer was in his office a short time before the meeting. In addition, staff members of the paper have been on top of the problem of discrimination on campus and in Lincoln for at least the past four months. In addition, the editorial said "apparently" some members did not even know what happened and that has not been denied. The letter questions the wrong thing. The Council should have waited so as to better evaluate the implications and results of its action. The Editor still believes that the Council knows not where its action will lead it or even what effect it will or was designed to have, other than the over-used "preventive" as stated in the above letter. Contrary to popular thought, speed of action is not always the best course. In these respects it was stated that Council had sacrificed too much to enter the resolution that day.

A Different Sales Tax

Dear Editor:

I did not hear the speech Thursday night by Lt. Gov. Dwight Burney. Nor could I have heard it since it was given to members of Delta Theta Phi honorary law fraternity. But there exists the opportunity to express my opinion.

Why doesn't our Lt. Gov. Burney take the time to examine the sales tax system which exists in Kansas. That state is trying to keep their northern residents from buying in Nebraska. They buy in Nebraska because there is no sales tax. I have been to Colorado

and Florida during the last three months. Yes, they have a sales tax too. This additional state revenue is an absurdity. The financial basis for a sales tax is sound, if used with discretion. Ask any resident of the aforesaid states if they like to pay those few pennies for small purchases.

My proposal is that if this tax system is better than a property tax, then it should not be applied toward aggregate necessities—food, clothing, sundries, etc., but rather that the purchase of any item in excess of N dol-

(Cont. on Page 3)



ERIC SEVAREID—

Dallas Like Other Cities, Reached Awkward Stage

By Eric Sevareid

The sense of civic pride, like the sense of nationality, becomes part of a man's personality in this life. When news came of the absurd county jail break, a friend in Dallas said to me with a groan, "They hated us last November, now they will laugh at us."

People are just people. In no fundamental sense whatsoever are the people of Dallas, Tex., different from other Americans, though their professional boosters at times like to think they are. What happened to Dallas is that the principle of randomness in nature — including human nature — caught up with them. It is the principle that makes events come in clusters, from the grouping of the galaxies to the "run of luck" at poker.

The murder of President Kennedy led to the murder of Oswald, which led to the trial of Ruby which led to the jail break. "People will think," said my stricken friend, "that we just can't do anything right."

But Dallas has done many things right, and some things much better than some other American cities, including it may be argued, its handling of the most difficult civic problem extant — the process of racial integration. Racial hostility is certainly there, but it hardly compares with the massive, sullen hatred developing in New York and Chicago.

Dallas has more than enough of crime, but nothing like New York, where the nightly, non-fatal shootings and stabbings are so numerous they do not even make the papers. It has acquired more than its share of those bitter little political hate groups, and one reason they stand out so sharply is that they exist in the middle of a human climate that is breezy and openhanded in the best tradition of Western friendliness.

And this brings one to the specific practicalities why Dallas, or Dallas officialdom at least, has done some things wrong, at critical moments unfortunately, of her civic history. These mistakes were not due to corruption; they were not due to laziness or ignor-

ance. They were a direct result of this same western, casual, smalltown easiness of nature. The "Big D" is a metropolis in body, but not yet in spirit. It got too quickly for that. It doesn't want to part with the chummy, backslapping, first-naming spirit of its youthful Main Street days, and I can't say that I blame it. With sophistication goes formalities; Dallas wants the former but instinctively resists the latter.

By the book, a city hall or a county courthouse ought to be centers of formality, rules, and — if possible — dignity. In a medium-sized western city they become centers of informality. The nickname camaraderie around the Ruby courtroom both beguiles and astounds the European journalists covering the trial.

To go back to the beginning, when the law of randomness caught up with Dallas: when the first policeman to rush into the Book Depository building saw Oswald sitting in the refectory, of course the man in charge said, "He's okay, he works here." And of course, for the policeman, that was enough. When the press and cameramen wanted a look at Oswald during his transfer from the city jail, of course the chief of police wanted to be accommodated.

When Jack Ruby joined the throng, of course the officers let him stay; what was familiar was okay. The courthouse jailer who failed to lock the door behind him I can't fully explain; I suspect those desperadoes had become familiar, too; he probably called them "the boys."

Dallas wants the rewards of big city-ness but it doesn't want to pay the penalties. One of the certain penalties is the sacrifice of cozy good-fellowship in high places. The police chief who was in office last November 24th is still in office. Everybody likes him as a decent man. Everybody likes Sheriff Bill Decker, too. On the evening of the county jail break, while two or three of the criminals were still at large, Sheriff Bill took his wife out to dinner as he had promised.

The newspaper accounts next morning seemed to take this as a reassuring sign of steady calm.

Dallas has reached the awkward age. It's part boy, part adult; and at the awkward age, very awkward things happen.

JOHN MORRIS, editor; ARNIE GARDNER, managing editor; SUSAN SMITH-BERGER, news editor; FRANK FAIRBANK, MICK ROOD, senior staff writers; JERRY O'NEILL, MIKE KEEDY, AL BRANDT, KAY ROOD, junior staff writers; RICHARD HARBERT, DALE HAJEK, GAY LEITCHRUCK, copy editors; DENNIS O'BRIEN, photographer; CHUCK SALEM, sports editor; PEGGY SPEECE, assistant sports editor; PRENTON LOVE, circulation manager; JIM DICK, subscription manager; JOHN ZEILINGER, business manager; BILL GUNLAKS, BOB CUNNINGHAM, PETE LAGE, business assistants.

Subscription rates \$1 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 51, 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 Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.

Insight Elsewhere—
'Little Boy Blue, come blow your horn . . .'

by kenneth tabor

Nebraska Senator Roman Hruska sent the Johnson administration scurrying a couple of weeks ago. The cause of such hustle and bustle on the part of the executive branch was the amendment Hruska proposed to the Senate's wheat-and-cotton bill.

Our government has just recently made agreement with all the major cattle and sheep exporting countries allowing the import into our country of 920 million pounds of beef and veal a year. The Hruska amendment would have limited this amount to 540 million pounds annually.

In addition to throwing a shadow over those recent agreements, the amendment, if passed, would have had no little effect on U.S. representatives to the international tariff talks coming up soon.

The administration, obviously displeased by these prospects, went into action. Members of the president's cabinet made a number of phone calls and visits to Senate colleagues. When this did not seem to be enough to stem the tide, Larry O'Brien, White House legislative aide, went to work pressuring and persuading members of that august body and informing them of the administration displeasure.

President Johnson's administration proved to be stronger than our senator in the final vote taken on the amendment two weeks ago. When all the votes were tallied, the Hruska amendment was voted down 46 to 44.

The amendment was just one of many which the Senate tried to tack onto the main bill. The only amendment which lasted through the debates and was made part of the law was the proposal made by Democratic Senator Allen Ellender to limit the scope of the bill to two years.

By far the most controversial proposal aside from the bill itself was the amendment to withdraw tobacco from federal subsidization. The motion was made in consideration of the Surgeon General's recent report on the harmful effects of smoking. The haste of the administration was little compared to a similar effort put forth by the Southern Senators. The fury and might roused by these oft-times troublesome Congressmen was sufficient to defeat the amendment by a vote of 63 to 26 with eleven abstentions.

Most all of the amendments were attempts to weaken the bill; and although some were surely of merit taken by themselves, proponents of the bill realized their weakening influence taken as a whole and reacted by soundly defeating either in committee or on the floor.

Such vote-power would normally indicate enormous enthusiasm for the bill, but such was not so in this case. Even the most vociferous supporters of the bill harbored no pie-in-the-sky dreams that this bill would solve the ever increasing farm problem in the U.S.

The bill itself was ample evidence that this is truly an election year. It represented a reversal on the part of administration which, under the late President, had washed its hands of the whole farm affair after the farmers vetoed compulsory controls in the last national referendum. Under President Johnson, however, much pressure was put on Democratic colleagues for passage of the measure. Included in this persuasion was the full support for the bill of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman who, though he has received little of the notoriety of his predecessor, has at least equal if not more force where such matters are concerned.

The main bill passed the senate by a straight party-line vote of 55 to 35 with some abstentions from both sides of the aisle. It will now go to the House of Representatives where Democratic leaders will no doubt put it into a conference committee. Normally this action is taken to adjust differences between House and Senate versions of a bill. This will be an extremely difficult task at this point since as yet the House has been unable to pass a wheat bill of its own. There will be difference, however, on those sections

of the bill which refer to cotton since the House has approved measures regarding this commodity.

What the bill boils down to is a \$1 billion subsidy of the various and sundry enterprises connected with production and processing of wheat and cotton.

The federal government will set a price support of \$2 a bushel for all wheat sold for domestic use by farmers who agree to restrict their acreage. This support price will be lessened to \$1.55 for wheat produced for export.

The bill includes provisions to pay bonuses to all cotton producers who cooperate with the government and reduce their plantings. The growers will receive a 30-cent a pound support price, while the mills will receive about six cents in subsidy on purchase of cotton grown in the U.S. which is sold at the world market price of 24 cents a pound.

The bill itself is a continuation of older policies and marks no new solution to the America farm situation. It is important as it marks a renewal of interest in agriculture by the administration. As long as there is this interest and as long as supporters do not consider this measure a cure-all, it is entirely possible that some sort of solution will be found in the environment of this attitude. The question in the minds of interested on-lookers should not concern this bill in particular. Rather, they should be concerned with how we can insure that this attitude will prevail after the bill is passed and numerous other affairs come into the immediate attention of both the Congress and the Administration.

Perhaps even more important: how to preserve the issues involved in the farm problem from the veil of esoteric confusion which usually settles over such matters during a political campaign.

Man, the stampede's on for

BRASS RINGER

SAVE IT BEFORE IT GETS AWAY . . .

... and there is no better way than a CML life insurance plan to help you save for the future.

Let us show you how you can build guaranteed future cash for retirement, for the education of your children, for the security of your family. And how CML's traditionally high dividends to policyholders make your savings grow even faster.

WALTER F. GARNER
SUITE 707
LINCOLN BLDG.
432-3289

Connecticut Mutual Life INSURANCE COMPANY

Hop to it, meet the new "Brass Ringer," it really gets around. It's clean and lean. With man-size brass eyelets and wraparound toe guard. Long on looks, strong on comfort, great on wear. Made of washable cotton duck in a new smoky white chino, also in white. Medium width, sizes 5 to 12, 13, 14. Stampede on down to your nearest store and let 'em rattle 'y up a pair. Ask for "Brass Ringer" Keds® today! It's a

Look for the blue label

United States Rubber
Rackletter Center, New York 20, New York

"BIRDIE IS COMING" MAR. 21