

# Nixon vs. Moratorium: situation poses interesting questions

By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

Washington — The reason for deepening concern among politicians and foreign diplomats, including emissaries from Communist countries, over the effect of anti-war demonstrations on President Nixon can be understood only against the backdrop of White House actions just before the Oct. 15 Moratorium.

Contrary to published speculation, the ouster of draft director Lewis B. Hershey and the announcement that Mr. Nixon would make a Vietnam speech on Nov. 3 were not intended as concessions to soften the will of Moratorium sponsors. White House planners correctly judged the implacable mood of the Moratorium as far beyond softening simply by announcing the long-expected departure of the aging and embattled Gen. Hershey.

The real reason for the timing of those White House announcements was that Mr. Nixon did not want to make them after the Moratorium because he would then appear to be buckling to pressure.

Thus, having decided not to make a Vietnam talk to the nation until well after the Oct. 15 Moratorium — a decision being widely criticized here as bad politics — Mr. Nixon felt compelled to announce the Nov. 3 date of his speech before the Moratorium took place.

That decision broke modern precedent for the announcement of a Presidential speech, which never comes that far in advance unless keyed to an event already on the calendar. But so concerned was the President over even the semblance of yielding to external pressures that he dared not wait until after Oct. 15 to make his speech announcement.

It is precisely this impact of the anti-war demonstrations that is beginning to worry foreign diplomats and a good many U.S. politicians, who want the war over. As one of the top non-Soviet Communist diplomats here told us privately, the higher the pressure on Mr. Nixon from the anti-war movement, the more it may inversely affect his decisions.

The reason this is regarded as the possible reaction of Mr. Nixon to the anti-war demonstrations is his own statement on Sept. 27 that "under no circumstances will I be affected whatever" by the growing anti-war protests.

Then, on Oct. 13 in a letter to a Georgetown University sophomore, the President explained his much-criticized Sept. 27 kiss-off of the Moratorium by saying that, "if a President allowed his course to be set by those who demonstrate, he would betray the trust of all the rest... To allow government policy to be made in the streets would destroy the democratic process."

What that implies, in the view of those now worried over Presidential reaction to mounting demonstrations, is that Mr. Nixon will avoid any action that seems to take account of, much less to yield to, "those who demonstrate."

The White House decision to make premature announcements of Gen. Hershey's retirement and the President's Nov. 3 speech both show how far Mr. Nixon is willing to go to prove that he is not being influenced by what happens on the street.

By this reasoning, a Presidential announcement scheduled for Christmas that, say, 100,000 U.S. troops would be withdrawn immediately from Vietnam, might be adversely influenced by street demonstrations in mid-December, as now planned by the anti-war movement.

But what lies ahead on the autumn demonstration calendar is likely to affront the President and affect his decision-making far more than what happened last week. The Moratorium was peaceful and partly middle-class. The next demonstration, including a march on Washington, will be under the control of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, known as the "Mobe," dominated by radicals who may court violence.

The President will have a chance to say what he thinks about the Mobe, the Moratorium, and the war in Vietnam on Nov. 3. But if he comes to view the demonstrations as a test of will power between himself and the demonstrators, the supremely ironic results may be exactly the opposite of what the demonstrators intend—a tendency by Mr. Nixon to dig in and concentrate on his war opponents at home at the expense of the war in Vietnam.

Field Enterprises, Inc.

## PROSPECTUS in retrospect

... Rodney Powell

Well, M-Day is over, and I find myself more confused than usual. I missed the big rally in downtown Chicago (crowd estimates: 3,000 in Tribune, 5,000-7,000 in Sun-Times, 10,000 in Daily News), but I did get in on a morning service featuring Rev. Jesse Jackson and Dr. Harvey Cox, and an afternoon rally and march through the Woodlawn area (one of Chicago's worst ghettos, adjacent to the University of Chicago campus.)

Speeches were normal — get out now, re-order priorities, demonstrators are the real patriots, Nixon-Agnew an intellectual and moral disaster, and so on. Crowds were filled with college and high school students. Adults concerned, but happy to see so many gathered in a good cause, feeling good themselves. Everyone hoping that the times may really be a changin'.

Still, something bothered me. I suppose the high school students most of all. The attitude seemed to be "we've got it, we're right, we're for love, peace and freedom, and anybody who isn't is zero."

Arrogance seemed to be at the moratorium under the surface. Although it may be stupid and reactionary to criticize my peers when everybody's doing it, there's no use denying that I am disturbed.

There is the same sort of arrogance in the play Hair, to open here soon. Reader's Digest is behind it; almost everybody likes the score of Hair, feels it and believes it, but does that mean it's really very different from a thousand other entertainments? Not really — just more energetic and enjoyable.

Now that seems to me the principal difficulty — a drastically limited view of what is and isn't human.

If you're for the war, drive a station wagon and are shocked by "filth," you've had it.

I realize that I may interest few but myself. It's just that I'm tired of seeing and hearing variations on the theme: "If only the bad guys would stop being bad, and give the good guys a chance." But the bad guys won't go away, and the good guys mess up, too.

We're all bad guys in one way or another. No need to feel particularly guilty, but certainly no reason to be arrogant.

In their column today Rowland Evans and Robert Novak speculate that additional days of Moratorium planned to protest the Vietnamese war may cause President Nixon to dig still more solidly — and stolidly, in the opinions of many — into his trench of opposition to war protests.

Such an opinion is given further credence by Vice-president Spiro Agnew's Sunday remarks, calling leaders of antiwar protests, "dissidents and professional anarchists," and "impudent snobs." Presuming that someone in the Administration pulls the Agnew strings, his opinions must have been approved somewhere.

Although it is a disheartening possibility that more days of Moratorium may alienate the very officials it has been designed to convince, there is one paramount reason for its repetition: repeated protest can prove that war opposition is a growing, not a passing, feeling.

To prove that ever growing numbers of Americans oppose the war will be the November challenge for Moratorium organizers across the country.

The best ways to meet this challenge are to get more and more people involved, and at the same time to involve a great cross section of the American electorate.

Local as well as national Moratorium leaders are well aware of this challenge. The NU committee is considering plans to spend one of the two Moratorium days (Nov. 13 and 15) working to gather support in the community.

They can take inspiration from Yale students who planned, according to Time magazine, to telephone each household in the 380-page telephone directory of New Haven, Conn.

The canvass was wildly successful. The New York Times reported that some 50,000 residents, one-third of the New Haven population, turned out for a two-hour rally.

The Times called the rally "an unforgettable expression of deep public desire to get the United States out of the War." Moreover, the story talked of "a mixed crowd, old and young, square and hip."

Just such a mixture should be the goals of the November Moratorium in Lincoln. The Moratorium committee should be congratulated for the idea, and at least 4,000 students should be eager to help carry it out.

The number of persons who participated in October Moratorium activities here and across the country were amazing and heartening. With their help, plus a few more Agnew speeches and Nixon off-the-cuff remarks, November can show even stronger and firmer stands against the war America doesn't want.

Holly Rosenberger

### 'Words to the wise'

## Conscience-conscious by Ken Wald

I guess it was inevitable. YAF has finally arrived. According to a reliable report in the October 20th Nebraskan, there are about twenty people on campus who profess allegiance to this bastardized offspring of William Buckley's paranoia. Lest any student be tempted into joining YAF, let him note certain facts about it.

First, its national advisory council, sort of a people's presidium, contains such sterling leaders of the legislative process as Strom Thurmond, Barry Goldwater, John Bell Williams, Carl Curtis and Glenn Cunningham. In addition, members of this sect seek their advice and consent from that noted political theorist and cosmopolitan figure, John Wayne. This combination of political acumen and ability can be expected to produce policy statements so timely and lucid that they would cause Father Coughlin to twirl in his grave.

Also deserving of careful scrutiny is the organization's name — Young Americans for Freedom. Judging by their statements condemning virtually all demonstrations and protest movements, the right wing cultists support freedom just as long as no one exercises it. There is one noticeable exception — they wholeheartedly uphold the liberty of the U.S. military establishment to drop bombs wherever they please. After all, it is the Christian thing to do.

As a third point, it would be valuable to examine the viewpoint of this cell group toward the issues of the day. With respect to Vietnam, one of their spokesmen declared "... we believe victory is possible in Vietnam." Such a statement tells us more about the speaker than it does about the war. It tells us that he interprets victory as the destruction of land, people, and spirit. It tells us that he is so in awe of "honor" that he will utilize dishonorable means to secure it. It tells us that he is blind to reality.

Equally absurd is the premise advanced by the group's ex-officio leader, Barbara Green. She claims that an American withdrawal would mean that 40,000 men had died in vain. Atta girl Barb. Let's wait some more so that maybe ten or twenty-thousand additional men can die right alongside the others. There is just no better way to sanctify blood than by spilling more on top of it.

Finally, one should note the extent to which this group violates the basic precepts of a supposedly democratic movement. One would expect that in a democratic society, political organizations would try to open their structures to allow mass entry.

Not so with our friendly neighborhood elitists. According to the above-quoted Steinheider, YAF has not yet conducted a membership drive. Members have been recruited through, to quote, "personal chats with friends and acquaintances." How democratic can you get?

In sum, if you want your horizons broadened, your in-class education supplemented and your intellect stimulated, avoid YAF. To the leaders of that organization, a word of advice from the Roman slave Publilius Syrus: "Let a fool hold his tongue and he will be taken for a sage." Miss Green and Mr. Steinheider — you have betrayed your cover.



"Where do they get those crazy ideas...?"

## Nebraskan editorial page

### U.S. can better prove self here

by Whitney M. Young Jr.

The message of the popular will that came through the Vietnam Moratorium Day loud and clear was: Let's Get Out of Vietnam. The country is fed up with as frustrating and essentially meaningless a war as any in our history.

The war in Vietnam has tragically diverted America's attention from its primary problem — the urban and racial crisis — at the very time that crisis is at flash point. The war has created a disastrous drain on our national resources — economic, human, and spiritual.

Just in dollar terms, the war eats up tax revenues better spent on relieving poverty and hunger

The war is costing at least \$2 billion per month. That means the whole "War on Poverty" costs about a month's fighting in Vietnam. All housing programs — including the still-born Model Cities program — cost about the same as a month of war.

The war cost for ten weeks equals what was spent on all federal educational programs last year. The money spent this year on food stamp programs for the poor and on school lunch programs for poor children amount to the cost of a week of war — and thousands still go hungry because, they are told, the necessary money isn't available.

Cities are hard-pressed to keep vital services up to the present inadequate standards because of lack of funds, yet their residents' taxes go to support the hungry war machine.

New York City, for example, sends \$9 billion a year to Washington in the form of taxes used

for military purposes. That's more than the total budget of the city itself. And a third of that goes to Vietnam.

Every hour the city sends taxes bound for Vietnam greater than the cost of running a high school for a whole year. Every month the city's dollars that wind up in Vietnam come to the amount needed to build new housing for 12,000 families.

The war has an extra dimension for black people, who are asked to die abroad for something we don't have at home. At the same time we are victims of a backlash that owes much of its existence to frustrations over the war.

By a strange twist of human folly, the groups that are most at odds in this country today — whites and blacks from working class and poor families — are those whose young men are dying in disproportionate numbers in Vietnam.

Even within the armed forces, the war is increasing tensions as a direct result of growing frustrations and bitterness. What started out as the best example of racial teamwork is rapidly eroding and is adding to the already severe tensions in the black community.

The war can't even be defended in terms of international policy, since America has become a laughingstock in the eyes of nations who can't understand how such a rich and powerful nation let itself become bogged down in the swamps and jungles of a Vietnam, in opposition to its own vital interests.

The most effective way for America to win credibility as a democracy in the eyes of the world is through the immediate resolution of its domestic crisis rather than through futile wars in faraway places.

Millions go to bed hungry in American every night. Our black ghettos are wastelands. The urgent needs of rural black people are shamefully neglected. Young people — black and white — are in revolt against a system that pursues military adventures instead of domestic justice.

We must turn away from Vietnam. We must end the war immediately. We must pour our vital resources back into our own land, our own cities, our own people.

### DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone: Editor 472-2288, News 472-2299. Business 472-2299. Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$4 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods at the 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.

Editorial Staff: Editor Roger Cove; Managing Editor Kent Cockson; News Editor Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Dave Filipp; Editorial Assistant Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraska Staff Writers John Dvorak, Bill Schuchman, Sara Schneider, Gary Seacrest, Steve Sinclair, Bachitar Singh, Linda McClure, Mike Barrett, Sr., Peltay, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers, Dan Ladely, John Hoelscher, Jim Dean, John Hollanderth, Mike Hayman; Copy Editors Susan Jenkins, Susan Masid, Cecilia Winkler, Susan Schlichtmeier, Val Martin. Business Staff: Business Manager Ed Isomaggio; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager Margaret Ann Brown; Bookkeeper Ron Bowlin; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager Janet Boatman; Circulation Manager James Stetler; Classified Ad Manager June Wagner; Advertising Representatives J. L. Schmidt, Margaret Ann Brown, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.



"I THINK GOING TO COLLEGE IS GREAT... I'M EVEN BEGINNING TO LOOK FORWARD TO IT... I'VE EVEN BEGUN TO TAKE SOME CLASSES."