Frank B. Morrison

At one minute before the March 13 deadline, ex-Gov. Frank B. Morrison filed for the Democratic nomination to the U.S. Senate. Morrison joins University of Nebraska economics professor Wallace Peterson and David J. Thomas, Doane College business professor in the primary race. A primary campaign that might otherwise have been colorless and even unimportant is now highly significant.

FOR MORRISON, a big win in the primary is needed to make him well-known to Nebraska voters once more and regain his image of a winning Democratic candidate based on three gubenatorial victories. Morrison lost some of that image in 1966 when he was defeated by Carl Curtis in the senatorial race. Morrison's problem then, and maybe now, was a close identification with an unpopular Lyndon Johnson and his policies.

For Peterson, the primary race must be viewed in a completely new perspective. What might have been a victory for one little-known professor over another little-known professor in a low-keyed and inexpensive campaign now must be a hard-fought and expensive one.

The one man who can benefit most from such a campaign is Wally Peterson. If Peterson defeats Morrison, he will no longer be just another University professor, but a viable candidate in a position to win the senate seat from Roman Hruska. Just as Norbert Tiemann strengthened his candidacy in 1966 by defeating Val Peterson, so could Wallace Peterson strengthen his candidacy by defeating ex-Gov. Morrison.

BUT WHY did Morrison enter the race? How does he stand on issues now? What is his record? According to the former governor, he is running because of a speech by Hruska in which the senator blamed all the nation's problems on the Democratic Party. Sure. Morrison is running partially out of personal vanity, egotism and ambition, and partially because no well-known or well-financed candidate emerged during the early days of filing.

Morrison's stand on the Vietnam war now and his refutation Hruska's record and statements are commendable. But his own past support for the Vietnam War and President Johnson leaves him slightly tarnished. In announcing his candidacy, Morrison said he was in Asia two years ago and came away "with the conviction the war in Vietnam was a mistake and much of our South Asia policy was wrong." What did Morrison say about this "conviction" then? Did he join the increasing number of important citizens who were criticizing the war?

THE EX-GOVERNOR has run in Nebraska campaigns every two years since 1958 except in 1968. As long as there are races to run and offices to covet, Frank Morrison will be there. But voters should remember that he lost to Hruska in 1958 and Curtis in 1966. Unless Nebraska Democrats want "leaders" in the Senate who are proud to support mediocrity (it does have its place, right Roman?), they should give Wally Peterson an opportunity to be a Nebraska senator.

Jim Pedersen

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoth, Neb.
Telephones: Editor 472-2588, Business 472-2589, News 472-2590,
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 per year.
Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during
the school year except during vacations and exam periods.
Member of Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
The Daily Nobraskan is a student publication, independent of

34 Nebraska Union University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 58500 Sorel's News Service



Gall in the Saddle

SACRAMENTO—Maureen Reagan, daughter of California Governor Ronald Reagan, recently returned from a USO tour of Vietnam. An advocate of military victory before her visit, she told newsmen that she now favors a negotiated settlement. Reacted her father the Governor: "While I'm partial to my daughter and love her very much, I don't think foreign policy should be decided by USO entertainers."

our man hoppe

by ARTHUR HOPPE

Vice President *Agnew devoted most of an hour-long interview with the New York Times the other day to criticizing, if you would believe it, us ace newsmen.

His main criticism of us was that we criticized our Government too much. Why, he asked, didn't we criticize the governments of Russia, China and North Vietnam instead?

Their ace newsmen don't criticise their governments, he pointed out. They critize ours. And why can't we be more like them?

Mr. Agnew ended the interview by saying he didn't want to be President. "The thing that's become increasingly attractive to me," he said, "is a syndicated column."

It should be a great column

— bold, fearless and daring
political analysis. He could call
it, "Out of My Head." You can
envision its tremendous
possibilities.

WASHINGTON — The Silent Proletariat stands unanimously behind our beloved President and genius military Commander in Chief, R. Nixon, in his glorious determination to thwart the power-mad North

Vietnamese imperialists in their insane ambition to seize the freedom-loving, democratic Kingdom of Laos.

The rafters rang with thunderous cheers as R. Nixon told the Republican Party Congress that North Korea, China and Russia were all paper tigers. "Capitalism is the wave of the future," he said. "We will bury them."

It is widely known that millions of exploited peasants are starving in China, while millions of exploited Kulaks are drunk in Russia, he said.

Revolution, led by the freedom - loving, democratic bourgeoisie, is expected to break out in these oppressed countries at any minute.

PARTY MEMBERS at the Congress pledged once again their allegiance to the Revolution of 1776 and vowed to double their work quotas in order to achieve R. Nixon's Eight-Year Plan.

The only foolish criticism of R. Nixon's brilliant address came from W. Fulbright, the infamous revisionist who has publicly suggested revising the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

In the interest of unity and

harmony among The Silent.

Proletariat, this foolish criticism will not be printed. But the Party members unanimously resolved that W. Fulbright should be forced to parade down Pennsylvania Avenue with a dunce cap on his head.

Turning to the East German revanchists and the Cuban adventurists, it is high timethese power-mad, imperialist lackeys and their runing dogs...

NO, it just won't do. The American public simply isn't ready for Communist-style journalism. Nor is it going to help world affairs much, if we ace American newsmen devote ourselves to criticisizing the misdeeds of Russia, China and North Vietnam.

The basic problem, which Mr. Agnew has overlooked, is that Moscow, Peking and Hanoi are outside our criculation zones.

So Mr. Agnew is making a terrible mistake. If he wants to get anywhere by criticizing Communist governments, he shouldn't become a syndicated columnist.

He should run for President instead.