



Businesses Picketed

Marchers Protest Apartheid

Sixty marchers picketed four Lincoln businesses Saturday morning in orderly protest against the "apartheid", or racial separation policy of the South African government.

The march was sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Ad Hoc Committee Against Apartheid. They were protesting the four companies' business interests in South Africa.

The businesses that were picketed are Traveller's Insurance Co., Aetna Insurance Co., Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co. and International Harvester Co.

Aid To South Africa
The insurance firms, according to Carl Davidson, secretary-treasurer of SDS, hold stock in a consortium of banks that loan money to the South African government. International Harvester, he said, lends technical assistance and advice to the government.

A salesman at Connecticut Mutual commented that the march seemed like "an awful waste of time." He said that the "finance department pays no attention whatsoever to our suggestions. That's the

way it is in most major life insurance companies."

Davidson suggested at the afternoon teach-in on South Africa that if the employees of the Lincoln firm were to get together and protest their company's investment in the consortium banks, something might come of it.

The salesman from Connecticut Mutual said that even if this did happen in his office, the suggestion "would

be ignored. In fact," he said, "they'd probably tell us to mind our own business."

'No More Money'
A representative of another of the insurance firms expressed annoyance at the marchers' plans. "If this is the type of thing that University students do," he said, "I don't feel the Legislature needs to give the University any more money."

The Rev. Hudson Phillips,

a participant in the march said he felt the march "created an awareness on the part of the businessmen of Lincoln" in regard to the situation in South Africa. He is pastor of the United Campus Christian Fellowship.

Steve Abbott, another participant, assessed the value of the march as "bringing the problem (in South Africa) to the attention of the people in Lincoln."

'Disgrace'
Shoppers who viewed the picketing had varied reactions.

"They (the marchers) have the right to say what they think," one man commented.

One woman commented that the march was a "disgrace to the country. I think they should throw all of those students out of the University," she said. "They should be going there to be educated."

"They (the marchers) all look like Communists," another passerby said.

'General Unconcern'

Tom Mesner, a march participant, said he noted the four basic reactions from people viewing the march as "violent hatred, little old lady muttering and shaking her head, an overawed reaction and total unconcern."

"I expected the reactions we got," Mesner said, "general unconcern with a bit of amusement."

One ASUN student senator, Kelley Baker, took part in the march. "There should have been more student senators there," Baker said. "This isn't something that only SDS should support."



TEACH-IN . . . Saturday afternoon was concerned with United States and South African relations.

South African Holdings 'Like Stock Exchange'

By Julie Morris
Senior Staff Writer

The United States has "dragged its feet" in responding to the "immoral and illegal" apartheid policy of the South African government, according to one panelist at the South African teach-in Saturday.

"I would condemn American policy in South Africa more than any of you," Dr. David Trask told the audience which numbered about 120. Trask, associate professor of history, was one of eight panelists at the teach-in sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).

Trask said the reason the

United States has not spoken out openly against the apartheid, or separate development of the races, policy of the South African government is because "in the point of view of our government African questions are less important than European questions and than Latin American and Asian questions."

Business Interests

Carl Davidson, secretary-treasurer of SDS and coordinator of the South African Weekend program, said that the list of U.S. businesses with locations or interests in South Africa "reads like the New York Stock Exchange."

There is "a perceptible con-

nection between the comforts of this country and the slave labor of millions of black South Africans.

"I don't think this country is going to change its policy," Davidson said. "They can say a lot of nice things" but will take little or no action.

Sue Orrin, field representative for the World University Service, said that white South Africans "really deeply and intensely believe in the philosophy of separate development" of the white and Negro races.

Separate Schools

Whites and Negroes in South Africa, she said, attend separate schools which have different curriculums because "black South Africans are not suited to learn all the things the white Africans are," according to the whites, she said.

Esrom Maryogo, a student from Tanzania, stated, "Every condition for totalitarian government is present in South Africa today."

Godwin Dubay, a student from Rhodesia, discussed the effects that affluent, powerful South Africa has on other African nations. He said that, to white Rhodesians, South Africa is "where the white man in Africa has found a solution to the problem of the Negro."

Dubay said the "common thing" today is "to talk about Rhodesia as if it were very different" from South Africa. In reality, he explained, Rhodesia is "very similar" to South Africa.

'White, Negro Towns'

Townships in Rhodesia, he said, are separated into white towns and Negro towns. He said Negroes are not allowed to go into the white towns. Dubay said that the "separate, but equal" education policies for whites and non-whites in Africa is a "very big fallacy."

"What are you going to do as an American?" Dubay asked his audience. "Are you going to raise your voice?"

The teach-in was the climax of a weekend of activity aimed at explaining the situation of South Africa to the campus, according to Davidson.

SDS contends that the Negroes of South Africa have little or no freedom because of the oppressive apartheid policy. According to a pamphlet distributed by the group the "official policy of the United States toward the government of South Africa is opposition," but the "actual policy toward the government of South Africa is cooperation."

Other speakers at the teach-in included the Rev. Hudson Phillips of the United Campus Christian Fellowship. Rev. Phillips said that the church in South Africa "has become a tool of the government and that the church assists in 'prolonging apartheid' because it cannot speak out now "without radically affecting" its position.

To sidestep the issue all together, the church in South Africa maintains that apartheid does not fall into the category of spiritual matters and therefore it is not the church's business to become involved in opposing it.



DEMONSTRATION . . . in downtown Lincoln Saturday morning included sixty students carrying protest signs against the United States' dealings with South Africa.

Viet Nam Question Discussed

By Nancy Henriksen
Junior Staff Writer

The question of whether or not the United States should stay in Viet Nam was debated at the Delian Union Literary Society meeting in the Nebraska Union Saturday evening.

Support for the United States' role in Viet Nam was presented by Bashir Ahmad and Kenneth Keath. Opposing them were Carl Davidson and Miss Jane Adams.

Ahmad said that the U.S. did not go into Viet Nam as an aggressor, but by invitation of the elected government and because of commitments already made by the Geneva Conference.

He said that the United States holds two commitments in Viet Nam—moral and treaty.

"The United States gave its word, and it must be honored," Ahmad said. "Prestige and work are involved, and an honorable settlement is very important."

Rejecting his theory, Davidson said that the United States' commitment is phony; that it is committed not to the Vietnamese people but to the United States itself.

Stressing that Viet Nam is one country, he said, "There is no such thing as two individual nations in Viet Nam." Davidson stated a belief that the United States should negotiate out of Viet Nam, and any solution has to view the National Liberation Front.

Preconditions for a settlement are withdrawal, and possibly an electoral provision, he said.

Affirming the United States' role, Keath said, and has not introduced arms. Drawing analogies with World War II, she charged that the United States is violating many laws. Keath said that if victory is given to the Communists, the United States will be allowing a slow degeneration in Southeast Asia.

Davidson cited two alternatives for settlement. One was to have the same people negotiate as at the 1954 Geneva agreement. Another suggestion, which he said is not possible, is to have only the army generals negotiate, and not governments or political parties.

Chatravarty: 'India Hemispheric Link'

A speech on the political aspects of Indo-American relations given by Dr. Amiya Chatravarty highlighted the annual India Night Saturday.

Chatravarty is currently a professor of Oriental religions at the University of Boston. In 1950-51, he served as official advisor to the United Nations Indian delegation. He was a companion of Gandhi from 1946-48.

In his speech Saturday night, Chatravarty compared India to the United States, explaining that the two countries were alike in that both are founded on a multi-lingual, multi-racial and multi-religious basis.

India and the United States, he explained, have never contemplated getting rid of other cultures by excluding them.

He said, "Our nation (India) is a meeting place for cultures. India has historically been the hemispheric link between the two great hemispheres of culture."

In relation to this, Chatravarty advised that if India forgets the large variety of factors in the nation, it will be committing suicide.

"The very existence of India depends on the delicate balance of all cultural factors," said Chatravarty.

He said that the more composite a nation is, the more staying power it has. However, he warned, if a nation is engaged in civil war, it cannot have international security today.

In this respect, Chatravarty noted the caste system problem in India that runs parallel to the racial problem in the United States.

He explained that the new constitution in India does not allow the caste system. Chatravarty said he is in favor of the principle of integration in the United States.

In the field of international

relations, Chatravarty said, "Who has ever heard of India playing the role of the aggressor."

"India has to act as a bridge between nations," said Chatravarty.

He stated that this principle has been followed in India's positions as a mediator in Cyprus, Indonesia, Korea and between the Arabs and the Israeli on the Gaza Strip.

He noted that it is the United States that most wants European unity, though not out of selfish motives. The power of the United States is exerted towards being a good neighbor, said Chatravarty.

Chatravarty received scattered applause when he stated that in his opinion, the United States' military policy in Viet Nam is not in accordance with the general wishes of the populace, nor is it in the nature of the United States.

The differences of opinions in this country on the Viet Nam issue, said Chatravarty, "spells out a central split in the conscious of this nation."

Chatravarty was questioned about the wisdom of military aid from the United States to India if the latter country was attacked by China.

"It would be an impossible military position for the United States," replied Chatravarty. He explained that such an action would open the United States to direct attack at every point in the East.

He stated further, "We cannot afford the luxury of a nuclear war."

Chatravarty is being sponsored by the Unitarian Universalist Association, the University Council on Religion and the Unitarian Church of Lincoln. He is presently traveling across the country under Unitarian Church sponsorship.



REGISTRAR . . . Hoover ponders the University's future enrollment.

Administrators Praise Registrar's Predictions

By Bruce Giles
Senior Staff Writer

Despite criticism regarding enrollment figures and registration, Dr. Floyd Hoover has received praise from his fellow University administrators.

Hoover's enrollment projections, according to Lee W. Chatfield, associate dean of student affairs and director of the Junior Division and Counseling Service, have contained "an error that is generally about two per cent or less."

He emphasized that Hoover is "working with variables that can't always be identified and when they can be identified, can't always be evaluated."

"Any time you come within two per cent, you are doing about as well as you can do," Chatfield said.

Many Variables
As an example of the variables involved, Chatfield pointed to the GI Bill and its effect on next fall's enrollment.

"All we can be sure of is that it isn't going to reduce enrollment," Chatfield said. A. C. Breckenridge, vice chancellor and dean of faculties, commented that Hoover has, on the whole, done a good job of dealing with a great problem.

He said that in making enrollment projections, the registrar "has to use some hindsight and must work with a whole host of factors over which he has no control."

He said the problem exists in many other colleges, too.

"It gets irritating to us, students are annoyed, parents are annoyed, and the registrar is helpless," Chatfield said. "He has to deal the cards as they are given to him to deal."

Limitations Unknown

Breckenridge also noted that many times the University does not know the limitations that may be placed on students at other colleges, thus encouraging more students to attend the University.

Hoover, who has been registrar since 1956 and worked in the registrar's office previously to that, described his part in the enrollment projections as "five-finger exercises." That is, his projections are the fundamental beginning attempts, but not the completed product presented to the Nebraska Legislature.

However, Hoover said he does not claim to be infallible and is in fact, the first to admit it when he is wrong.

Hoover called his estimates

of the 1957 enrollment—"the fiasco of 1957."

"I was off 10 per cent and that is an absolutely intolerable margin," he said.

He cited five specific reasons why his projections for 1957 were off. They included a rise in tuition, four days of hot stifling wind across the state that killed many of the crops, unemployment as low as in the late 1930's, and over 400 students more than usual being suspended on poor scholastic performance.

"These and a thousand other imponderables cancel out the best of efforts to make predictions," he said.

Factors Involved

Hoover pointed out that Nebraska economy is, to a great extent, tied to agriculture, but he had no way of knowing about the four days of killing wind, nor did he have any idea that the University would tighten their scholastic requirements.

"I haven't felt at all comfortable since," Hoover added. "I shouldn't be off more than two per cent. I have been coming close to it, but none of these disasters has occurred since."

"All you can hope to do is

Cont. on Page 3, Col. 3