

Due process—nonexistent

No due process in disciplinary proceedings exist at the University—not a startling revelation to most students, considering that 99 per cent of the campus is not even aware there is a system for disciplinary proceedings at Nebraska.

But for the student who has been called before the Student Tribunal or summoned to the Office of Student Affairs for a "conference" it means that their cases have been handled without the proper legal guidelines.

Finally a Student Senate committee has presented a lengthy report pointing out the failings of present procedures for disciplinary cases and also submits recommendations for completely revising the system.

The report shows appalling deficiencies in almost every phase of disciplinary proceedings including a court system which lacks cohesion and consistency.

For example one of the main problems is that the guidelines for disciplinary proceedings are not only vague and incomplete but they are scattered randomly throughout approximately four different handbooks.

When a disobedient student makes an appearance in the Student Affairs office there is no written ruling which insures he has been informed as to the rule he has broken, how his actions were discovered or which states he was given enough time to prepare a defense or enlist legal counsel.

The Senate committee's report also shows that legal safeguards during student hearings are lacking in the following areas: the right to an open and unbiased hearing; right of student to confront witnesses against him; exclusion of illegally obtained evidence . . . and so the list continues.

Another failing in the court structure is the system for appeal, which is ill-defined and in some instances non-existent. No single court has the power to handle all appeal cases and so for all practical purposes the Office of Student Affairs has the loudest voice in deciding disciplinary cases.

The days of the therapeutic Student Affairs office complete with an administrator acting as friendly adviser, psychiatrist and judge are over, as anyone who read the Senate committee's findings will agree.

This committee has proposed a legalistic and workable system for disciplinary proceedings and a court structure which would assume the legal guidelines so miserably lacking in the present courts.

The University must adopt these proposals as its official policy on disciplinary procedures.

Cheryl Tritt

John Reiser . . .

Who else but Nelse?

When Republicans meet in Miami this summer to pick the party's nominees for national office, three considerations should dominate all others.

First is the selection of a candidate who can whip Lyndon Johnson.

Second is selection of the man who would do the best job as President.

Third is the return of the GOP to the mainstream of American political opinion, after the disastrous detour of four years ago.

On all three considerations, their choice should be Nelson Rockefeller.

Rockefeller has clearly demonstrated his ability to attract the votes of Democrats and Independents, which are so essential to Republican hopes of regaining the White House, and his equally important ability to garner a significant number of votes in the large urban areas.

Moreover, his status as a "non-candidate" has permitted him a certain amount of flexibility on the issues which will dominate the campaign. This flexibility could become increasingly important if circumstances change materially between now and August.

His record as Governor of New York is nothing short of terrific — a solid example of dynamic achievement at the state level.

No candidate can match Rockefeller's grasp of and experience with our major domestic problems — urban crisis, civil disorder, educational demands, air and water pollution and the struggle for equal rights by racial minorities.

Foreign policy is a Rockefeller strong point, too. He has served three Presidents in this area, handling a number of special assignments. It is widely conceded that he is more respected among Latin American leaders than any other American politician.

As a leader of our effort to obtain ratification of the UN Charter, he understands how we can cooperate in the effective use of that organization to obtain world peace.

Finally, there is the Rockefeller record as a Republican. Nelson Rockefeller is identified, as is no other Republican, with the fight to deny extremists control of the GOP.

His nomination would serve as a signal that the Republican party is not the vehicle of a small band of dedicated reactionaries who want to wind the clock back a hundred years or so.

It would notify this nation that the GOP would again be actively seeking solutions to national problems and not contenting itself with denying their existence.

A restless and discontented country seeks a viable alternative to keeping Lyndon Johnson on the job. The nomination of Rockefeller will give them such a choice.

If nominated in Miami, Nelson Rockefeller will crush Lyndon Johnson this November.



CURRAN

FELLOW AMERICANS WE SHOULD ALL TAKE PRIDE IN THE DRAFTING OF GRAD. STUDENTS. Now THIS NATION CAN SUPPLY THE MOST INTELLIGENT, MOST TALENTED, BEST EDUCATED CORPSES THIS WORLD HAS EVER SEEN.

William F. Buckley Jr. . . .

Nuclear arms in Vietnam

I begin by saying I do not repeat don't believe it was all a Communist plot, but only because the Communists most likely didn't think of it.

Certainly the mysterious, anonymous telephone call served their purpose. The anonymous call that reported to the staff of a Senate committee that the Pentagon was considering the use of tactical nuclear weapons in South Vietnam, as witness that Professor F. C. C. Garwin of Columbia University, an expert in the subject, was off on a mission to Saigon.

During the ensuing ten days, that became the talk of the world, the moralizers rushed to their typewriters, their pulpits, and their rostrums, to denounce the United States.

Harold Wilson of Great Britain, who was in Washington apparently because he was temporarily out of ideas on how further to mismanage British affairs, contributed his opinion, namely that the use of such weapons would be "sheer lunacy."

Pretty soon the Pentagon

and the White House were sputtering their denials, and indeed it transpired that Professor Garwin was in Saigon on business wholly unrelated to the atom; which, as a matter of fact, is a pity.

The pity is that we are saving our tactical nuclear weapons for melodramatic use, for use, presumably, at the apocalypse towards which we may very well be headed in the long term.

Take, for instance, the discussion of the use of the tactical nuclear weapons in the defense of Khesanh. By this

time, so much attention has been given to the plight of Khesanh that to use these weapons, for the first time in military history, in the defense of Khesanh, suggests a mood of total desperation, perhaps even of panic. That interpretation feeds on itself, even as a bear market is said to justify itself.

The time to introduce the use of tactical nuclear arms was a long time ago, in a perfectly routine way, when there was not a suspicion of immediate crisis, of panic.

Professors Speak . . .

War inflation, price too high

Editors Note: Mr. Ivan Volgys, University Political Science Instructor is another contributor to the Professors Speak series.

Lt. Alan Williams, Military Hospital, Saigon, South Vietnam

Dear Allan:

Your letter dated January 17, 1968 reached me yesterday and I am anxious to answer you immediately. Sitting in the relative quiet of Nebraska your scribbled notes disturbed me and I am writing you to clear up not only your confusion, but perhaps clarify also my own thinking.

Of course I am proud of your courage to learn so well and so satisfactorily to write with your left hand and understand that you were lucky to escape by losing an arm only. It is good to know that you have not forgotten the old admonition "Dum spiro spero" . . . at least I have tangible evidence in your actions of recent weeks that not all that I've taught you and those 38 other young people who took International Relations from me is completely forgotten. I am shocked and saddened to hear that "Curly" Hammond is dead.

The mental anguish, the questioning, that went into your letter is reciprocated here. We are locked in a crisis of the intellect here as well as in the area of Dak To or in the Mekong Delta.

You ask the question of why Curly had to die and why you had to lose your arm. You complain bitterly about the decoration you received, how little will make up for the lack of an arm and you ask me rightly "Where did my nice theories about the underlying cause of the conflict being the different interpretations of the national interest" lead me, what kind of answers will they provide to you and to others.

I too have questions . . . my nice theories crumble, often

there is need to reinterpret them. Let me try to explain . . . if I can at all.

It is true that I conceived as needless and useless, but I did not object too loudly as long as I felt that the United States was trying to accomplish a political power-play, insisting to show that we are a Pacific power, for better or worse, that we are there to stay.

But the ground has now shifted . . . the questions of the morality of our efforts and our means are now called into question. As Walter Scott in his Personality Parade put it on February 4, we are in South Vietnam to "prevent a blood-bath."

So far according to official sources 18,000 American boys, about 100,000 South Vietnamese and at least that many Viet Cong and North Vietnamese died, the wounded reach literally millions, the displaced and the forced and unforced refugees total at least one million people.

And in the moral dilemma of the century I ask the question just as you do: Is it worth it? Is the price we pay equal the reward? Is it better to be dead than Red?

After all this last question is at the heart of what we're doing. We are saving a coun-

try from "going Commie". We are stopping "Communist expansion" and once more we are carried away by the messianic hopes of "saving the world for democracy" or "fighting a war to end all wars."

Are the lives of the millions who suffer worthy of the goal of saving South Vietnam from going Red? Would there have been more death had the Communies taken over in Vietnam.

To these questions, I am convinced the answer must be given in the negative. No, the suffering is too high a price to pay for the freedom we hope to give the South Vietnamese. They do not know the term democracy as we know it, they do not value it; the vast majority in the countryside are affected by the war adversely and they do not care who is to win or lose . . . as long as there be someone left alive.

I do not believe that anyone seriously believes that we are saving them from death when we wreck havoc with their economy, dislocate them from their villages, and —quite unintentionally, to be sure—rain bombs on them in the cities and on the countryside. We are losing the war in Vietnam, in the hearts and minds of most people, save those who cling tenaciously to power which we back with

To those who wait

(ACP) — While patience may be regarded as virtuous by the older generation, it is not a virtue coveted by the growing student generation, says the Ball State News of Ball State University in Muncie, Ind.

The newspaper's editorial continued:

History, in many cases, reveals the futility of patience. "Be patient," the older statesman of four generations said to the enslaved Negro. "You will have your day." So the Negro was patient. And "his day" was put off until tomorrow.

"Listen to all that protest," says the older generation which fights wars, domestic and foreign, from their desks. "There's no respect for age. These students are irresponsible. They make a mockery of freedom."

Freedom does demand responsibility. But responsibility also requires freedom and events. If an individual's life is put in jeopardy for a cause, then he has a right to question responsibly the reasoning that says his dying is necessary.

The same hold true in a university. If an individual is getting a second-rate education, he has the right to demand something better. If he is treated like a child in the determination of important policies that affect his campus life and as a "young adult" in the less important areas, he should be able to actively seek a cure to this administrative schizophrenia.

Things come to those who wait, but only those things which aren't very important.

Cater Chamblee Sight and sound

The President's Analyst, starring James Coburn, is a film exploring some of the wilder possibilities inherent in the President's requiring the services of a competent analyst.

The security problems would be overwhelming, right? Particularly if there were intramural competition, both in style and substance, between the two agencies responsible for security, (the FBI and the CIA, get it?). And then there are all those countries who would be legitimately after the analyst.

It would be satisfying if one could say the film were a brilliantly acted, brilliantly directed screen comedy successfully exploring some of the paranoid tendencies built into the structure of American life today.

Because that is what it starts out to be from the moment Coburn, as the shrink, is overcome by the therapeutic value of a black CIA man's ability to successfully to relieve his racial hostilities in a socially accepted manner by murdering an occasional spy.

It continues along these lines when we are introduced to the head of the FBI, a short, rigidly puritanical anal-sadist using his office to fight as best he can the decadence around him.

And the fact that all the FBI men are very short, rigidly puritanical anal-sadists, uptight to a man adds more to the comedy's exploration of our scene.

Fine, also, is the point that as soon as Coburn runs, every embassy in town sends their men out to grab him. We are hardly surprised at all that the chief Russian spy is a good friend and confidant of the CIA man, beautifully acted by Godfrey Cambridge, and that the two of them work together against the FBI, who have orders to kill Coburn so that the secrets will remain secret. After all, isn't that the way things happen these days?

Indeed, that everyone in the film is totally and absolutely mad makes it, well almost normal. True to life, as it were.

Unfortunately, the comedy breaks down at this point, particularly when Coburn falls in with a hippy folk-rock band (only because every comedy must have a hippy bit these days).

From here on out, despite nature and a chick and the truly mad conversation between Coburn and an FBI agent, who patiently explains that he really must kill Coburn because his orders say so. The movie is pointlessly energetic.

The ending in which the real enemy is revealed to be the phone company is a disaster, despite Lee Remick's erroneous opinion to the contrary (Can one trust the taste of a man who doesn't like The Ginger Man? I think not).

The entire phone company section is only the director's desperate attempt to tie all his loose ends together so that the picture can stop. Not end-stop. For there is no logic, no necessity in this particular ending.

Which is a shame. For the indirection of the last third of the movie and the pointlessness of its end betray the bright promises implicit in its beginning.

But there will be those, I suppose, who will argue that the film is too far removed from reality to bother with.

Who could believe that the FBI and the CIA peopled by bureaucratic madmen cheerfully willing to break every law, moral or civil, in adherence to the dictates of their leaders' paranoia? Or that J. Edgar Hoover is a perverse little bigot trying to force the rest of us in to the tight box of a world he finds so comfortable? Or—they ask a lot of ones credibility here—that L.B.J. seriously needs a good psychiatrist? I mean, what's funny about that?

Dan Looker

Sneak preview

Performers love applause. It's the applause, they say, that keeps the old-timers like Jimmy Durante and George Burns coming back year after year.

Newspaper writers also have their own odd form of audience appreciation that keeps them pounding at their typewriters. Nothing makes them happier than an irate letter to the editor or phone calls in the middle of the night from tuning crackpots.

The only response this column has gotten is

that occasionally someone tells me he liked an article. I might as well be booted off a stage!

In a last desperate attempt to salvage my writing reputation I am going to run a series of atrociously controversial articles with such topics as:

—Why we should adopt a racist foreign policy,
—Why a Democrat supports Nixon for the GOP presidential ticket,
—A prophesy of doom in two parts.

Part I: It is true that the United States has no foreign policy.

Part II: Why our cities won't even be nice places to visit in a few years.

Nixon seems to be immensely popular these days. Prophecies of doom also seem to be in style. (That may be because the two subjects are synonymous.)

It seems to be appropriate to take a look at both subjects—from a radical, new point of view, of course. The other article will show how racism can be a liberal new direction in American foreign relations.

For some strange reason such predictions have always been popular, probably because nobody really believes them even though they might wish they could.



Outlook

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 91, No. 47
Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Feb. 23, 1968
TELEPHONE: Editor 472-2588, News 472-2589, Business 472-2590.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 for the academic year.
Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year, except during vacations and exam periods, by the students of the University of Nebraska 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.
Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
EDITORIAL STAFF
Editor: Cheryl Tritt; Managing Editor: Jack Todd; News Editor: Ed Isenogle; Night News Editor: J. L. Schmidt; Editorial Page Assistant: June Wagner; Assistant Night News Editor: Wilbur Gentry; Sports Editor: George Kaufman; Assistant Sports Editor: Bonnie Bonness; News Assistant: Lynn Plaski; Staff Writers: Jim Evinger, Barb Martin, Mark Gordon, Jan Parks, Joan McCullough, Janet Maxwell, Andy Cunningham, Jim Federer, Monica Pokorny, Phyllis Adkinson, Kent Cockson, Brent Sainnor, John Dvorak, Senior Copy Editor: Lynn Gottschalk; Copy Editors: Lucy Fenimore, Dave Filip, Jane Ray, Shelly Murrell, Christie Schwartzkopf; Photographers: Mike Hayman and Dan Ladey.
BUSINESS STAFF
Business Manager: Glenn French; Production Manager: Charlie Baxter; National Ad Manager: Leta Macher; Bookkeeper and classified ads manager: Gary Hollingsworth; Business Secretary: Jan Rostman; Subscription Manager: Jane Rose; Salesmen: Don Crook, Dan Lecker, Kathy Drexel, Todd Rangel, Debbie Mitchell, Joel Davis, Lynn Womack.