

Editorials

Commentary

The honkie

What is a honkie?

The question, probably one of the more significant raised at Hyde Park this year, is difficult to answer.

The definition of honkie can vary from "bigot" to a term including any person with a white skin. The former is acceptable; but the latter is not.

TO SAY THAT any white person, merely because of the color of his skin, is inherently a racist is as rational as typifying any other race. That is, it is not rational.

If it is accepted that honkie is a derogatory term, a conclusion difficult to escape, then one must reject it like all stereotypes.

THERE ARE those of lighter skin who honestly believe in equality and freedom. Those of darker skin have no corner on the market.

Unity is not needed between whites and whites and blacks and blacks. It is needed between those who believe alike.

For Negroes to relegate all whites to the level of honkies, is to reject all those who are sincere in their hopes for a free and equal America.

Ed Icenogle

Money troubles

Perhaps a scapegoat for ASUN's problems this year has been found in the disclosure that the student government operated nearly the entire semester before knowing just how much money it had to spend.

However, this still does not justify the failure of the Faculty Evaluation Book or the World in Revolution Conference; nor does it account for the near extinction of the Free University.

It does however, point to the pressing problem for action in the area of student fees. Student Senate attempted to enter this field last semester with Govt. Bill 24, but has since passed the initiative to the Committee on Student Rights.

What action has been taken on the bill specifically has not been made known. It is hoped that a solution is forthcoming shortly so that ASUN does not need to turn to the lack of student fees as an excuse for inaction in the future.

Randy Irey

Standing head

... by George Kaufman

Luckily, it didn't happen. But you can't help but wonder what would've happened in this state had The Great Carpenter pulled it off — passing special legislation against a minority group.

Constitutionality seemed to mean nothing to our state lawmakers for a while; the constitution be damned, they were ready — yea, salivating at the mouth — to throw "guaranteed freedoms" to the wind and make students an ostracized group of second-class citizens, open to special punishment above and beyond that prescribed for ordinary citizens.

IT IS ALMOST 100 percent positive that the law requiring 30-day suspension of college students found in possession of marijuana would have been overturned by the Supreme Court. But, in order to establish that decision, some student would have had to be martyred in a test case, and Terry would have come out the winner anyway.

Just how long this state will continue to put up with the insolence of Terry's on-again-off-again brand of legislation is an interesting question to ponder. Not only do you not know what party Terry belongs to at any given moment, but it has become obvious the old man is displaying frightening manifestations of eccentricity and mental indecision.

A year ago Terry voiced his everlasting faith in young people, and urged them to take on more and more responsibility. Then, last fall, his precocious nature took one of it's more perfidious turns when he stabbed the 19-vote issue in the back through a series of invective-filled television shows.

This, obviously, did not endear him to students. But the worst was yet to come, as evidenced by the preposterous marijuana bill.

ON TOP OF the pot bill, Terry even had the gall to introduce (among his 200-some other bills), a measure okaying 3.2 beer in Nebraska, presumably so young people would buy at his store in Western Nebraska instead of crossing the border into Colorado or Kansas. His reason: he wanted to "give young people a chance to exercise responsibility."

The shock of this unbelievable chain of events would be somewhat lessened if Terry were, indeed, a crusading foe of marijuana on an intellectual level. But a year ago at a Selleck meeting he clearly revealed his reasoning (keeping in mind he has a vested interest in booze sales):

- Q—Why is marijuana illegal?
- A—Because it is bad.
- Q—But why is it bad?
- A—Because it is against the law.

IF TERRY has had a bellyful of young people, they have surely had several bellyfuls (bellyful?) of him. But we are willing to offer a compromise bill, which he will probably accept since it is in direct contrast to his last stand on the issue. We'll settle for 3.2 pot.



Shifting the sentinel

by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

Washington — Just when Congressional foes of an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system were beginning to feel the glow of success, they have been endangered by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird's potential flanking maneuver.

The leading option now being considered by Laird in the Pentagon's ABM reappraisal is to limit deployment of the system to offensive missile sites, far away from metropolitan centers where deployment was originally scheduled. This shift to strictly missile protection — the "hard point" deployment in Pentagonese — is designed to provide benefits in both international and domestic politics.

DOMESTICALLY, it would deflate the rising agitation from urban civic groups fearful of nuclear warheads in their backyards. Sites for offensive missiles aimed at potential enemies are far removed from metropolitan areas, so a "hard point" deployment would be in the wide open spaces.

Internationally, this deployment still provides Mr. Nixon with what he almost certainly wants: the Sentinel ABM system in process of deployment, to use as a bargaining tool once weapons negotiations with the Soviet Union begin. If the talks result in agreement, ABM deployment can be halted and the missiles already in place can be removed.

Actually, no decision has yet been made by Laird and it may be delayed until early March, when Laird's budget revisions are due on Capitol Hill. Moreover, the final decision will be made not at the Pentagon but by the President himself. Nevertheless, "hard point" deployment is now definitely shaping up as the most attractive option now open.

CONSIDERING Mr. Nixon's apparent conviction that he can negotiate with the Soviets on

an equal basis only if he can counter their ABM development with his own, a decision against any deployment of ABMs is a highly improbable option. Thus, his only real choices are deployment of Sentinel's in heavily-populated areas, presumably as the nucleus of a much more costly system, or the missile site deployment now under intensive study.

Such "hard point" deployment would satisfy some cold war theoreticians who feel no ABM system, no matter how extensive, could possibly protect the population. Indeed, this is precisely what Mr. Nixon implied early in his Presidential campaign when he rejected the Johnson administration's rationale of deploying Sentinels against a Chinese missile threat and, instead, suggested deployment at missile sites to guard against a more imminent Soviet threat.

This possible shift in the Sentinel has deflated momentarily triumphant anti-ABM forces in Congress, led by two Republican Senators — John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky and Charles H. Percy of Illinois.

THE MAIN reason they have been much more successful this year than last is not so much the cogency of their arguments as the nuclear nerves in big city areas earmarked for Sentinel emplacements by the Johnson administration. Even Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington, a longtime ABM supporter, was shaken by the anti-Sentinel sentiment in Seattle.

In fact, emotional big city opposition to Sentinel development had begun to endanger Senate approval — one reason for Laird's order last week halting deployment and ordering a full-scale Pentagon review. But when this halt was prematurely interpreted in the press as the death of the Sentinel, Laird went on CBS's "Face the Nation" last Sunday to make an impassioned argument for defensive missile spending.

Whether Laird clarified or further muddled the picture by appearing on television at that precise moment is now a subject of discussion, even in the Pentagon. There are signs the White House feels Laird (who has since conferred with the President on this subject) might have overplayed his hand a bit. But he has made unquestionably clear that the Pentagon review centers around how, not whether, the Sentinel will be deployed.

IN THAT framework, the Army will make a strong pitch for the old plan of deployment around big cities, with the potential for expansion into a super-expensive full ABM system. The Army, in turn, will be backed by such articulate ABM supporters as Sen. Howard Baker of Tennessee who view the system as a genuine protection for the people rather than merely a pawn in cold war bargaining.

But there are substantial signs that key figures in the Administration — not excluding the President himself — are deeply skeptical whether any anti-missile system could really provide an invulnerable umbrella over the American people. If the Sentinel, then, is primarily a matter of cold war politics, "hard point" deployment has undeniable allure for Mr. Nixon.

© 1969, Publisher-Hall Syndicate

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone Editor, 473-5256 News 473-5250 Business 473-5200. Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$8 per academic year. Published Monday Wednesday Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations.

Editorial Staff

Editor: Ed Icenogle; Managing Editor: Lane Gethers; News Editor: Jim Branger; Night News Editor: Earl Cochran; Editorial Assistant: Jane Wagner; Assistant News Editor: Andy Wood; Sports Editor: Mark Gorton; Nebraska Staff Writers: John Dwyer, Joe Peterson, Connie Walker, Steve Austin, Bill Smithers, Ken Schellhammer, Sue Petty, Ron Talbot, Jennette Ackerman, Rachelle Singh; Photographers: Dan Lashley, Linda Kennedy, Mike Hayman; Reporter-Photographers: Ed Jones, John Schneider, Cliff Eilers, J.A. Schmidt, Jan Wagner, Phyllis Anderson, Dave Filipp, Sara Schneider, Susan Mast.

Business Staff

Business Manager: Roger Sore; Local Ad Manager: Joel Davis; Production Manager: Randy Irey; Bookkeeper: Ben Bowlin; Secretary: Janet Bottoms; Classified Ads: Jean Sauer; Subscription Manager: Linda Ulrich; Circulation Manager: Ron Pavetta; Nick Doran, James Palmer, Advertising Representatives: Max Brown, Gary Grotz, Linda Rhames, J. L. Schmidt, Charlotte Walker.



Carte Blanche

by Larry Grossman

It was inevitable that Nebraska should eventually be shaken out of its comfortable conservative view of the world. Swept in by the winds of change the radical event which everyone denied could happen here, struck the city in the late hours of Thursday, February 13.

As expected, the state and city governments were without contingency plans to deal with the emergency. Their response was thus the action of frightened men confronted with the unexpected they struck back with a vengeance.

THE GOVERNOR went on television and radio early Friday morning and declared that he would not tolerate a shut down of the University. He stated that things like this may be allowed to get out of hand in California and Wisconsin but he would not be the governor to whom the people of Nebraska could point an accusing finger and say:

"He collapsed under pressure and allowed the radical change to keep our children out of school."

The governor next met with his cabinet and worked out a formula for dealing with the crisis. The National Guard would clear the snow from the sidewalks and the city of Lincoln would clean the streets. He was heard to have said at the end of the meeting, "No damn snowstorm is going to shut down our University."

FOLLOWING THE MEETING, the governor mobilized some 5,000 National Guardsmen and ordered them to the University of Nebraska city campus. Directed to open the school at any cost, the Guard, armed with shovels, snowplows, rakes, spades, and hoes attacked the snow.

They first cleared a path to the new classroom-office building Grandfather Hall. As they broke through the ice barricade at the door, they were greeted by loud cheers and raspberries from a group of sit-in demonstrators who had been holed up in the building for seven days in support of efforts to institute a department of Serbo-Croatian studies and admission of all Yugoslavian applicants.

HAPPY TO BE freed, the demonstrators rushed out over the newly shoveled paths. A group of janitors who had been held as hostages, openly wept when they saw the Guardsmen had shoveled a path to freedom.

Once the crisis had passed, an investigation took place. Senator Karpainter blamed the snowstorm on "fancy pants, bearded, degree-holding meteorologists."

The senator also heaped derision on the press which had advised people to stay home Friday and Saturday to avoid confrontation with the drifts and falling snow.

The radical change in the weather had been stopped and defeated by the prompt action of the governor and his staff. The governor had acted in the best American fashion and had triumphed through his cool determination and icy calm.

Campus Opinion . . .

Comment on the Liaison Committee

Dear Editor:

I appreciate Mr. Dvorak's article on the Liaison Committee in your paper (Feb. 19) and am compelled to write you about some overtones of that article which, I feel, do not truly portray the Committee. It is also possible that I may have developed some over-sensitivity after having served three years on the Liaison Committee.

Our academic community consists of three important groups: students, administration and the faculty. In order to make progress, we must have all three groups to work together in solving our mutual problems without interfering our respective areas of responsibilities.

OUR COMMON objective is to work for the best interests of the University as an educational institution serving the people of the State. This can be achieved only by promoting mutual understanding and trust, by working hard with persistence and anticipation, and NOT by seeking power, domination or dictation by a particular group.

Many present as well as past members of the Liaison Committee, I am sure, will attest that this philosophy and associated practice have guided the Liaison Committee in fulfilling its duties.

Sincerely yours, Loh C. Tao Professor

Dear Editor:

RE Randy Reeves's column, Pourquel, February 21, Friday.

Randy Reeves's attempt at political polemics came down hard on my sensitive ears. I would argue, contrary to what Mr. Reeves has written, that:

SENATOR Strom Thurmond's conservatism is not radical but reactionary.

The conservatism can be expected to admit the value of honest disagreement as can all thinking people.

A conservative's philosophy does not implicitly reject tolerance.

Mr. Justice Fortias has not insisted that freedom is preferable to justice.

Rod McCall

The Daily Nebraskan is solely a student-operated newspaper independent of editorial control by student government, administration and faculty. The opinion expressed on this page is that of the Nebraskan's editorial page staff.