

Toward a more perfect withdrawal

One needs to look at President Nixon's troop cutback and draft proposals in the light of two basic premises: Now is the time to get out of Vietnam, and the draft needs complete reform and revision.

The arguments for getting out of Vietnam are not new: While intervening to assure the independence of South Vietnam, we have apparently sacrificed much of our own independent tradition by supporting a dictatorship in South Vietnam which has neither the will nor ability to govern democratically.

And the war still drags on after five years of fighting, taking from 150 to 200 or more American lives a week.

Or, as Sen. George McGovern says, when 15 million Americans suffer from malnutrition, "it is time to quit killing Asians and to begin feeding Americans . . . the war is costing a widespread loss of confidence in ourselves and on the part of others around the globe as to our prudence and humanity."

10 years to get out

So, Nixon's proposal to withdraw 35,000 troops by Dec. 15 is a good sign, but much more needs to be done. If completed, the latest withdrawal will mean 60,000 troops brought home this year. At that rate, it'll take about 10 years to get all American troops out of Vietnam.

Then there's the draft. Nixon must be given a good deal of credit for canceling the November and December calls. And his proposal to have a draft lottery for one year and the drafting of 19 years-olds first at least will let students make definite plans after college graduation.

But the draft, forcing a person to submit to the will of others, isn't justifiable.

Much of the violence and passion in the country today, especially on college campuses, arises from the draft — the threat to students and others of being conscripted to fight the war.

Alternative to draft

The alternative to the draft is compensation for service high enough to attract volunteers.

Such a system would increase the federal budget, but it should be thought of more as a transfer of income — from civilian working power lost by draftees.

Even today, three-fifths of the Army, nearly all the Marines, Navy and Air Force are volunteers (granted, some are draft-induced volunteers), as are most of higher-ranking noncommissioned officers and 90 per cent of commissioned officers.

A volunteer, professional military force can work.

So, Nixon gets a plus for taking a good step, but he still has a long way to go.

Nebraskan editorials

Will killing by mistake create trial by error?

by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

Washington — The trial of the Green Berets accused of murder in Vietnam seems likely further embarrass the U.S. government in this most embarrassing of wars.

If the American public blushed at revelations that Americans shot prisoners during World War II, consider how it will react to the unraveling of bureaucratic infighting which led to murder by mistake.

The fact that Col. Robert Rheault has engaged Edward Bennett Williams, possibly the best-known trial lawyer in the country, to defend him against the Army's charges is proof, if any were needed, that the trial will be both highly publicized and hard fought.

Infighting at high echelons

The Army hoped that the Central Intelligence Agency would call a halt to the trial on the grounds

of national security. But the agency has taken the view that it has no objection to full disclosure. This can only mean that CIA Director Richard Helms is determined to back up his Vietnam station chief, and that the station chief is very angry indeed.

There are two questions about the trial which have not been answered in public. The questions lead to at least a sketchy explanation of what took place.

1 — Why did the CIA decide for the first time in recent history to hold a background press briefing to deny that it was involved?

2 — Why did Gen. Creighton Abrams, Army commander in Vietnam, find it necessary to take steps leading to a public trial — steps which included solitary confinement of five men including a colonel — before they were even charged?

At first, Abrams was inclined to hush up the affair. But after CIA had blown the whistle, panic set in. The thing seemed to big to stop.

A little history is in order. In late 1963, the Green Berets took over a CIA operation aimed at persuading the Montagnards to deny their hilltop villages to the Viet Cong, who were using them as bases.

CIA had been providing arms to these tribesmen who have no allegiance to either the Viet Cong or the Thieu government, but who, for profit, were willing to keep out the VC.

Actually, the plan did not work out well. With typical Army thoroughness, the Green Berets tried to persuade the Montagnards to go on the offensive — to join the war. In this, the tribesmen had no interest whatever, but they did provide the base for the intelligence operation into Cambodia in which Col. Rheault and his men were engaged when they were suddenly arrested.

"Tender" Beret handling

When they took over the operation, the Green Berets also took over a CIA agent. They later believed that he had "turned." In the course of their tender handling, he died.

CIA disagreed with the Army assessment of its protege and, more important, with the Army action. From the station chief's standpoint, a brave and loyal agent had been murdered. He was furious. The result of his fury will be an embarrassing public trial unless someone — Army Secretary Stanley Resor, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, or perhaps the President himself — steps in to halt it.

Bureaucratic struggles between intelligence agencies are not new. During World War II, Army G-2 frequently complained about William J. Donovan's OSS. And during the Cold War, the number of agents tripping over each other's heels in Eastern Europe led to Soviet Premier Khrushchev's famous remark to the late CIA Chief Allen W. Dulles, "Of course we have much in common. We read each other's reports."

But both World War II and the Cold War were pupular wars. Ideology confronted ideology, and whatever the mistakes, most Americans thought it important that our side win.

Vietnam is not the same thing. A bungled war, further bungled by bureaucratic rivalry leading to a bungled murder, is not likely to be admired.

Words upon a concert

WORDS UPON A CONCERT by Victor Lewis

The group was the Bobby Hutcherson-Harold Land quintet. His thing was jazz; his bag was progressive.

If you were looking for a beat and a melody that you heard on the radio or on one of your father's old Harry James albums, you were undoubtedly gravely disappointed. Progressive jazz is not like that.

Many have a difficult time trying to snap their fingers to this type of jazz. This is because the rhythmic pulse is felt, not displayed or used as a metronome to guide an audience's tapping feet and snapping fingers.

Progressive jazz

Progressive jazz caters to a certain group of people; this group is relatively small. This type of audience consists of people who have passed the fundamental stages of listening to jazz. These people are in a position where they can reach past face values and dig what the cats are saying as a group and as individuals. I mean really get down and dig, cause that's what it's all about, it's deep, man.

As a group the quintet was a very mellow type of group with a good sound.

The musicians worked well together. A sense of communication was present in the air, harmonizing a varied mass of deep feelings contributed by each musician through his playing. These feelings formed a pattern, when distributed back to the musicians provided a network of tangents followed by every musician of the group like a map. This is a map created by the musicians, spontaneously on the spot.

But don't get me wrong, there is a framework. This is a framework made up of chord progressions and an abstract melody. This sets the mood. With the mood established, the improvising starts; then comes the communication.

As individuals, the players' abilities varied.

The sax man was very good, sporting a very difficult style. His style is similar to the late and highly respected John Coltrane, and to the present day Wayne Shorter, sax man with the great Miles Davis quintet.

Bobby Hutcherson was just out of sight. Good technique, an excellent use of notes and chords, and a fantastic way of getting around his vibes are all credits to his ability.

Bass man "tuff"

The bass man (although it was hard to tell because of inadequate amplification) was really a "tuff dude." He was phenomenal on his bass. The bass player may have been new in the group, indicated by the fact that he was reading charts. But he was cookin' just the same.

The drummer seemed to be the weakest member of the group. He was unorthodox in his style — which, far from being to his advantage, but presented hangups. Although he promoted some good licks, he didn't complement the group as much as he should have. Bobby may have felt that way at times, judging by searching looks he would give the drummer.

The piano player was definitely on his job. He knew what was happening all the time, and he had the mind and ability to really produce.

Of an ending chord one can say that the Bobby Hutcherson-Harold Land quintet really has its stuff together and can really hold its own in the progressive bag.



"WE'VE SPENT SO MUCH ON DEFENSE THAT THERE'S NOT MUCH LEFT TO DEFEND."

Sen. Edmund Muskie

One less war saves \$5-\$10 billion

As I write this column, the Senate is moving into the final days of debate on the Military Authorization Bill. At no time in my memory has the Senate discussed such legislation as critically and in such detail as it has this year. The Armed Services Committee cut Defense Department requests from \$22 billion to \$20 billion, a reduction of \$2 billion.

Beginning with the debate over the Safeguard Antibalistic Missile system, critics have attached a variety of requests, including authority to buy an additional squadron (23 planes) of the C-5A

But, if we are going to really cut defense spending, we need to go behind individual proposals for planes, missiles, ships and armament to the basic decisions which determine the size of our general forces.

About 60% of our \$80 billion defense budget is spent on general forces. That expenditure, in turn, is based on our treaty commitments around the world. We are prepared, at this time, to fight two major wars and one minor war at the same time.

The assumption on which the policy is based (that is, the possibility of a major war in Europe and a major war in Asia, plus a small war in the southern hemisphere) was adopted years ago.

Not what they used to be

Conditions have changed. If we do not reduce or modify our commitments we cannot reduce our general forces. If we do not reduce our general forces we cannot make any major cuts in our defense budget.

Two alternatives are open to us: (1) we may rely more heavily on tactical nuclear weapons in a major military engagement; or (2) we may cut troop levels.

The first is undesirable because it would tend to escalate a minor incident to a major nuclear war. The second can provide a more realistic allocation of our resources for national defense and domestic development.

Expert estimates indicate savings in the order of \$5 to \$10 billion annually if we were to change our contingency formula to one major and one minor war.

Such a policy change should not be made lightly. We need to look at the implications of such changes for our own security and that of our allies.

But we need to look hard and long at the possibility of a "contingency plan" change if we have any hope of preventing further astronomical increases in our defense budget. The Military Authorization Bill should mark the beginning, not the end, of the defense debate.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone: Editor 473-2358, News 473-2359. Business 473-2390. Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$4 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations at 34 Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Neb. Member of Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government.

I KNEW THIS WOULD HAPPEN! FIRST THE COMMUNISTS GAINED A Foothold IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE WHEN THEY TOOK CUBA!



THEN THEY STEPPED UP THE WAR THAT THEY WERE WAGING AGAINST THE FREEDOM LOVING PEOPLES OF S. VIETNAM SO THAT IT WAS NECESSARY TO SEND MORE U.S. TROOPS



DURING THE SUMMER OF '68 THEY OVERRAN AND CRUSHED THE PEOPLES OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA!



OBVIOUSLY THE COMMUNISTS WERE BEHIND THE TROUBLE CURRENTLY RAGING IN THE MID-EAST



NOT CONTENT WITH THIS THEY MOVED INTO OUR OWN HALLOWED UNITED STATES AND BEGAN INCITING RIOTS IN THE GHETTO AREAS OF OUR BIG CITIES!



TODAY OUR COLLEGE CAMPUSES ARE UNDER SIEGE BY COMMUNIST BLACK MILITANTS, COMMUNIST SDS'ERS, COMMUNIST HIPPIES, AND NOW ON TOP OF IT ALL...THIS...

