

Goodell, Hruska discuss war moratorium

N.Y. Sen. Charles E. Goodell and Neb. Sen. Roman L. Hruska are both Republicans, but in many respects, the similarity ends there.

When appointed to the Senate in 1968 to fill the unexpired term of the late Robert F. Kennedy, Goodell had the image of a moderate-conservative. Lately, he has become more liberal. Hruska, on the other hand, has always been known as conservative in his 15-year senatorial career.

Omaha's Hruska gained national prominence this year when he ran first for the minority whip position in the Senate, and then minority leader following Everett Dirksen's death. Hruska lost both bids.

In ten years as a congressman and 13 months as senator, Goodell has been a prominent civil rights advocate, as well as an active proponent of equal wage-rates for women.

Perhaps their major point of difference is on the number one issue of the day — Vietnam. Hruska has supported the action of President Nixon in Southeast Asia.

Goodell exhibited dovish tendencies when picked for the Senate, but has now gained the reputation as a staunch critic of the war. Several weeks ago, Goodell introduced a Senate resolution that would order withdrawal of all American troops from Vietnam by Dec. 1, 1970.

In exclusive telephone interviews, Daily Nebraskan staff members talked with Sens. Goodell and Hruska to get their up-to-date assessments of the war in Vietnam and the potential effects of Wednesday's moratorium.

Daily Nebraskan—Senator, you have proposed a resolution that would force withdrawal of all United States troops from Vietnam by the end of 1970. What are the chances this will be approved?

Goodell—At the moment there would not be anywhere near sufficient votes to pass it in the United States Senate, but I intend to offer it anyway as an amendment to the appropriate bill when it comes to the floor toward the end of the year. I think the ultimate chances of passage depend on the reaction of the public, the way the moratorium is handled to rally public opinion against the war. I think it's quite conceivable that within a very short time we could have sufficient votes.

Daily Nebraskan—Sen. Goodell has proposed a resolution that would force withdrawal of all United States troops from Vietnam by the end of 1970. What do you think of the proposal and what are the chances this will be approved?

Hruska—Critics of the war and critics of President Nixon's policies for ending the war are no doubt sincere in the expression of their views in ending the war in Vietnam. I trust that it is understood that I am equally sincere when I say that I disagree with Sen. Goodell's proposal for an arbitrary withdrawal of all U.S. troops in Vietnam by the end of 1970. I do not believe that this is the time to adopt the defeatist attitude that has been reflected by recent proposals by some senators.

These proposals might have the effect of undercutting and destroying peace negotiations in Paris. This type of arbitrary cutoff only leads to the conclusion that we will be in Vietnam until the end of 1970. I do not believe this is true. It is my belief that the senate will reject this self-defeating proposal and it is my hope that the President's constant efforts to achieve peace will soon bear fruit and we can soon arrive at a lasting and honorable peace throughout the world.

Daily Nebraskan—Some people have said that if the forced withdrawal was approved, it would be nothing more than a defeat for the United States. Is this true?

Goodell—I don't regard it as a defeat. I think Vietnam clearly is not going to be a victory in any sense. We cannot win a victory in Vietnam by any military means. I think what my legislation would do would be to give notice to the South Vietnamese that one year hence they will carry the entire burden. This legislation would reverse immediately our military strategy from combat high-kill ratio used in forcing the North Vietnamese to make concessions at the bargaining table. This military strategy hasn't worked for six and one-half years and its not going to work in the future.

Hruska—Yes. I believe that if this would pass it would only serve to give the enemy renewed strength and encouragement. If they knew the United States would be gone regardless of what happens

by the end of 1970, they would prolong their present efforts and emerge victorious.

Daily Nebraskan—It seems that President Richard Nixon is sounding more and more like former President Lyndon Johnson when it comes to the Vietnam War. Does anybody know where Nixon stands on the war?

Goodell—I don't know of anybody who knows what his so-called peace plan is. We all are aware that President Nixon wants to get out of Vietnam. But that does not meet the question head-on. Everyone would like to get out of Vietnam. We have to face reality and I think its going to be painful whenever we get out. Vietnam was a tragic mistake and we must take harsh measures, direct measures, that are necessary to get us out.

I am not convinced that President Nixon will take those measures at the moment. My proposal, however, is different since I call upon members of Congress to share responsibility with the President to take action to get us out of Vietnam ourselves. Congress has the power to declare war, we have the power to raise armies, to supply the money or withhold the money from the military. That's why I'm offering my resolution to withdraw all military personnel from Vietnam by Dec. 1, 1970.

Hruska—People should know very well where the President stands. He has outlined his stand on May 14 television speech to the nation and it has not changed. He has proposed de-escalation of the war and Vietnamization of the war as quickly as the South Vietnamese forces are ready to take their place. He has tried to persuade the Hanoi government to offer reciprocal withdrawals and has asked for plans to have a freely elected government in South Vietnam.

During the first nine months of the Nixon administration the President has announced significant troop withdrawals and has cut from the draft more than 50,000 men who otherwise might have been drafted before the end of the year. In the first eight months of the Johnson administration the troop levels in Vietnam increased from 23,000 to 125,000. Thus

the Nixon program, which is in progress, is criticized as being too little by former high officials of the Johnson administration, an administration which not only initiated massive military hostilities but moved in one direction — more troops and continued escalation. This is not Nixon's policy.

Daily Nebraskan—At the moment, is President Nixon following any type of plan or is he just fumbling through?

Goodell—Well at the moment I would say his plan is to continue military pressure on North Vietnam to force concessions and to gradually withdraw troops and hope the North Vietnamese will respond and we can reach a sort of de facto peace. At the same time he wants to involve the Pentagon's plan for a continued presence of American military men in Vietnam well into the 1970's.

Hruska—It is evident that the President's plan to end the war is now in progress. The president has announced that 60,000 Americans be returned from Vietnam. Also as a result of the withdraws and draft cuts, 50,000 Americans who might have been drafted before the end of the year will not be drafted. The President wants to withdraw all American troops from Vietnam as quickly as the South Vietnamese forces are ready to take their place. For eight years the previous administration has coolly and calmly increased the draft, troop commitments, military spending, and the casualties.

I do not think now we should listen to those same voices raised to hysteria shouting for arbitrary withdraw. Steady hands securely tied the knot of the war and steady hands are going to be required to unravel it. We must give the President credit for changing the direction of the war. We are starting to de-escalate, Vietnamization of the war is taking place, men are returning from Vietnam, draft calls have been canceled, draft changes have been proposed, there have been cutbacks in defense spending, and most important, casualty rates are declining. Certainly, President Nixon is moving faster to end the war than the previous administration and certainly

he is moving faster with his peace plan than any of his critics could move in achieving a lasting and honorable peace throughout the world.

Daily Nebraskan—Several senators have mentioned escalation. Is this a viable alternative to Vietnam policy?

Goodell—It's unthinkable and it does not have any substantial support.

Hruska—At this time, the President has rejected a military escalation of the war. He has changed the direction of the war from escalation to de-escalation and is having significant results. I see no reason for escalating the war.

Daily Nebraskan—President Nixon has said the October 15 moratorium will have no effect on Vietnam policy. Is this true?

Goodell—No, I don't think it's true. I think the President used some unfortunate language on that. At any rate, the Vietnam moratorium is going to extend far beyond the students on campuses. I believe spearheading it, and I certainly commend them for it.

Hruska—Many people have suggested that the President said he would ignore the expressions of the Oct. 15 demonstrations. The President said nothing of this sort. What he actually said was, "I cannot be affected by what happens on Oct. 15." It appears to me the President meant that no matter how loud the voices, how raucous the demonstrations, we cannot be diverted from pursuing peace in a satisfactory way. I believe he said he could not be affected by proposals from the Oct. 15 demonstrations that say on our terms."

Daily Nebraskan—Officials of the moratorium have suggested that another be held on Nov. 15 and another Dec. 15. Do you approve?

Goodell—Yes I think continuing the moratoriums until we must appraise the situation as it goes along, however, and see what progress we are making. There may be other ways we can expand and reach the public and focus public opinion the way that it will assist us in getting out of Vietnam completely.

Hruska—All of us in Congress are concerned about Vietnam as is the President. The people of the nation and the students who are calling for these proposals for the moratorium only magnify the disunity in our country and encourages the enemy to hold on as long as he can. It would be my hope that we could unite in support of the President's peace plan and not adopt the defeatist attitude which would only prolong the war and destroy any negotiating position we have. The moratorium war on the American way of life or on constitutional government, a war on a truly democratic society.

Daily Nebraskan—What is going to happen in Congress on moratorium day?

Goodell—Well they may have an agenda, but I don't believe there will be any official business there. I will spend most of the 14th and 15th on university campuses speaking in support of the moratorium.

Hruska—I am sure we will continue to carry out the work of Congress.

Daily Nebraskan—The Vietnam war has dragged on now for at least five years depending on how you look at it. What will happen in the coming months?

Goodell—Nobody knows what is going to happen in the months ahead. The President's policy is to depend entirely on North Vietnam and that's why I think its time we had a policy where we declare what we are going to do. We should tell the South Vietnamese government, which is a very corrupt government that imprisons all its opposition, that they had better straighten out, expand their popular base and take the other reform measures that are necessary to their survival.

Hruska—The war has dragged on for many years but in the past few months there has been a definite change of direction in the carrying on of the war. There is a very strong possibility that within the next few months there will be more troop withdraws. It is my hope and belief that the President's constant efforts to achieve peace will soon bear fruit and we can soon arrive at a lasting and honorable peace.



Former NU students write of Canadian residence

These letters came to The Nebraskan from NU graduates who chose to protest the Vietnam war by moving to Canada.

Dryden, Ontario, Canada
Oct. 19, 1969

I am proud of my country — my newly adopted one, that is.

People here seem more accepting, less materialistically inclined. Canada is now home for my wife and I. It gives a person from the States, as they are called up here, a feeling almost religious. I suddenly realize the threat of tyranny no longer haunts everywhere I turn.

The one statement I would have to make after scrutinizing Canadian people and politics is that they watch "big brother to the south" and learn from his mistakes.

I work for a good radio station in NW Ontario. I like my surroundings completely — Canada is not too different from the U.S. — I'm disc jockey, newsman and salesman all in one.

I like the people — yes, even the over 35's — in this town of 8,000. There is an atmosphere that 99 per cent of the residents put forth — you came to work for our radio station and we happily accept you. This pervades in personal and business acquaintances.

I, like two of my friends now "dodging the draft," came to Canada because it is the only alternative for a happy life. The Selective Service is the mos' inhuman organization in the supposed free country. I feel I do not owe anything to a country that in common terms is just as "full of it" as the USSR or Red China. In the words of Dr. Benjamin Spock, "I will not be duped."

Tom Pluta

Romans and former countrymen, HAIL!
Speak not lightly of Canada nor think it a distant dreary land. The American nation may peter out somewhere in North Dakota, but a distinguished, technologically advanced civilization does indeed lie outside the northern boundary of your country. It is of Canada that I speak, this

other civilization, this other land, this alternative free and beautiful place.

More than 100,000 of your brothers, cousins and countrymen have discovered this joyous place. (And that figure's no put on!) Forsooth! It has great cities which reek of gasoline. And death. And taxes.

Sculpture by distant Eskimos flourishes, but they remain a mysterious people in the north. I have flown 450 miles to the north of here, picked wildflowers at the banks of the Nelson River (a mighty Missouri of the North) and still not seen an Eskimo. They are a mysterious, very distant people.

But lo! The Supremes laid the Motown sound on us this summer in a sweaty box of an arena. And next year, there will be a pop festival like unto those which destroyed New York State and the Isle of Wight.

Have you dug it?

If not, come hither. We'll consider the matter over coffee at King's Drive In. You'll be right at home, almost.

John Dietz

Dear NU:

The Milander portion of the Canadian immigration movement is well and looking fine. My

wife and I have now completed our final medical examinations (paid by the Canadian government) and within a matter of weeks we will become official landed immigrants.

It almost seems anti-climatic to know we will soon become officially landed. Since our arrival in the country, we have quickly become a part of the normal living pattern of the natives. Seldom does anyone recognize us as from south of the border. When discussion leads to our origin, it usually includes a "Why in the world would you come to a place like Manitoba?" (Sounds familiar, right, Nebraskans?)

We have yet to experience any hostility or coolness to coming to Canada because of the Vietnam war. This includes people in their 20s to those in the 60s. Most react with curiosity and interest.

Wages aren't too great, but it's no problem to make ends meet. Both Mary and I are working; she as a secretary, myself as editor of the weekly newspaper here in Morris. Together we earn approximately \$600 a month. However, there are good chances of my moving up in wages in newspaper work in Winnipeg when the right time comes.

The cost of living is somewhat higher, depending on where you live in Manitoba. Winnipeg generally has higher pay, but then, more expenses. Smaller

towns like Morris prove short on housing facilities and somewhat costly at that. To the north of Winnipeg, practically into the wilderness in some parts, the opportunities are promising if one can tolerate the remoteness, lousy roads and the longer winters.

There is little talk among Canadians about the war. Most of the older types consider it just another one of the United States' shows of superiority against the bad guys (known to all good American patriots as the Communists). But even the ultra-conservatives don't seem to care too much.

Younger, college-age types appear to be very ignorant about the real tragedy of the Vietnam blunder. They are very curious and appear easily persuaded by the anti-war cause, almost out of courtesy.

Nonetheless, some 100 students from the University of Manitoba and the University of Winnipeg demonstrated Oct. 1 at the Emerson, Manitoba border crossing in opposition to the nuclear bomb test in the Aleutians. Many of them went just for kicks, but still showed concern for the militaristic madness that has overtaken the United States.

As for my two good friends in the area who preceded me in emigrating to Canada, they are both doing fine. Friend No. 1 in Winnipeg was recently indicted in Omaha. His reaction to it all: "It's so good to be free."

Friend No. 2 in Ontario wrote recently and seemed concerned that I was so close to the border. He explained that the wind sometimes blows from the south and the atmosphere here might not be too pleasant. Actually, let him rest assured that the air is pure and fresh.

And the living is really great.

Douglas R. Milander
Box 382
Morris, Manitoba

**MORATORIUM
WORK FOR
PEACE**