

Student mover has to choose

It used to be that students with a social conscience were more or less one small but happy family, united against the Vietnamese war, racism, outdated and irrelevant university education. They resented the isolation and insensitivity of the university toward growing problems in the society outside its walls.

As it has grown, this family has split even more ways than did SDS at its national convention this summer. However, two major wings seem to be developing, and concerned students are faced with the problem of choosing not issues, but the methods of dealing with these issues.

One wing might best be called reformist. This faction wants to carry out traditions born with the Berkeley free speech movement of 1964, a movement toward student voice in their universities. This development usually has come first in social areas, then academic, then moved to the relationship of the university to the community.

In general, members of this group see the university as wasted potential, on both the individual and institutional level. To an individual, they believe, one of the major purposes of a college education should be to develop sensitivity to the world and the capacity to think — not to regurgitate bodies of knowledge, but to learn to examine with an open mind past knowledge and current problems and to produce thoughtful, hopefully new and useful solutions to them.

They see that the universities as institutions should have brainpower and money which could be applied most valuably to current social problems, and that such involvement also could teach students a great deal that would help them as individuals deal with the societal ills that are among their main concerns.

Students in this group might sincerely have participated to change Columbia University's slumlord policies in New York City or supported the right of citizens of Berkeley to turn a vacant lot into a needed park. They ultimately are dedicated to sweeping reforms of college curriculums, to increase their relevance, to help students prepare to meet needs of today and tomorrow, of the American dispossessed.

The second group works on many of the same issues, but on the premise that these issues ultimately will destroy existing institutions (including universities). The group has adopted this stance because it believes the needed changes can not come about within the social structure which those institutions support. Students in this wing believe revolution must precede the desired social changes.

Every major faction of SDS is included in this second group; at the summer fracas each declared its support of the ideals and policies of Mao Tse-tung. Members believe violence is the only ultimate answer, destruction the only way to open change.

They are joined by small, but extremely vocal and visible groups endemic to various campuses. Such a group, according to a column in Thursday's *Nebraskan* by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, seems to be in control of student dissent at Harvard. One of its leaders stated that blowing up buildings might lead to real consideration of problems; he concluded that nothing else can. A Nebraska student who spent several days at Cambridge last summer was disturbed at the readiness of many students she met to move, to march, to demonstrate, but unable to explain to her what any of these were trying to accomplish.

Although Nebraska has been a fairly quiet campus, rumblings of both types of student movements, mainly the former, seem to be increasing. However, speeches and discussions at Time Out, especially with James Birenbaum and Carl Davidson, assure that the different positions are being thought about on this campus.

Student power movements show no sign of abating; as Nebraska becomes more active in them these choices are likely to develop. Too, the political scene in the post-college world is shaping along the same lines. This choice will become relevant for more and more people.

They are relevant today to students who don't like the America they see and want to do something about it, beginning with the university, their microcosm. These students must look carefully at the directions of student power movements and goals which shape them — and must decide which, in conscience and candor, they can support.

Holly Rosenberger

Stop barking

Pass through the revolving doors at the south entrance of the Union and up the stairs on any given school day, and you will find that canine breeds are not the only ones who bark.

Running a close second in the race to see who can bark the loudest — man or man's best friend — are the ticket hawkers for this or that organization.

This week, probably because the Miss Black America Pageant and the Kosmet Klub show are scheduled on the same night, ticket salesmen from both sponsoring groups bargained students who passed through the main lobby with the incessant "hard sell." Such practices are not only raising the decibel level of the Union atmosphere, but they also are annoying.

In his inaugural address, the President said that "to lower our voices would be a simple thing. In these troubled years, America has suffered . . . from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuades. . . . We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another. . . . so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

It would be great if all barkers would take his advice.

And if that fails, it would be in the interests of University students if their representatives in the ASUN — instead of temporarily approving girl scouts organizations — persuaded the Union Board to adopt an ordinance against barking in public.

Kent Cockson

Nebraskan editorial page

Campaign promise of Black capitalism is empty

by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

Washington — The latest shakeup in President Nixon's faltering program of Black capitalism has saved Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans from potential political embarrassment but moved Mr. Nixon's campaign pledges to the negro ghetto still further from redemption.

Stans breathed a sigh of relief this week when Thomas F. Roeser, a young Chicago corporation executive with superb Republican connections, allowed himself to be kicked upstairs out of the directorship of the Commerce Department's Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE). What the Administration had feared was Roeser resigning with a blast exposing the absolute failure to develop Black capitalism since Jan. 20.

Saved that embarrassment, Stans also is relieved — for the time being — of pressure for a program. Yet, failure to nurture candidate Nixon's most innovative proposal cannot be laid at the door of Maurice Stans, an orthodox Republican financier ill-equipped for creative undertakings. Rather, it is symptomatic of a brutal fact: the utter lack of interest in the Black ghetto by the occupant of the White House Oval Office.

Republicans who are interested in the ghetto were distressed early this year when Stans seized control of Black capitalism by creating OMBE. They were reassured, temporarily, when Stans selected Roeser, 41, public affairs officer of Quaker Oats in Chicago, as OMBE's head.

Roeser, a Republican partisan and ideologically a conservative, was an ardent Nixon supporter long before Miami Beach. At the same time, he had become deeply committed to improving life in the ghetto through civic work in Chicago. Thus, Black capitalism was to him a golden opportunity to involve his party in the ghetto without departing from Republican principles.

Even if he had enjoyed full backing from Stans

and the White House, Roeser would have been severely handicapped by OMBE's grotesque financing. Without any funds of its own, it depends wholly on the willingness of other agencies — the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Housing and Urban Affairs Department, and the Health, Education and Welfare Department — to transfer funds to OMBE programs.

Moreover, Roeser has had no cheer-leading section in the White House. Dr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who heads the Urban Affairs Council staff there, is a liberal Democrat with little enthusiasm for wedding the negro and the business community. Conservative White House aides seem bored by the ghetto. Nor has any single Presidential assistant been given responsibility for Black capitalism.

Untidest of all has been Roeser's relationship with Stans, his boss. When Roeser found \$500 million in other departments' funds that could be used by OMBE and urged Stans to negotiate with his counterparts for their transfer, the Secretary flatly refused to venture into such boat-rocking activities. The substitute was a press release pledging that \$301 million will be spent through next June. Where it will come from is anybody's guess.

Even worse was the conflict between Stans and Roeser over long-term strategy. As we reported three weeks ago, Stans blue-pencilled to extinction Roeser's plan for a quasi-public corporation to develop ghetto enterprises. Stans has not developed even a vague substitute in its place. To this hour, no blueprint for Black capitalism has gone from the Commerce Department to the White House. Nor has Roeser distinguished his unhappiness with Stans' preference for press agent gimmicks over substantive programming.

With Roeser violating the Nixon administration's unwritten prohibition against exhibiting too much zeal, his departure from OMBE was preor-

drained by mid-September. Stans succeeded last week in avoiding Roeser's resignation by getting him to accept a "policy-making" job as his assistant for minority enterprise.

Roeser's successor at OMBE is negro Abraham Venable, a non-Republican civil servant not expected to follow Roeser's example in prodding Stans. Actually, Venable is expected to be a Black front man while OMBE is run by Anthony Chase, quietly transferred from Stans' own office to OMBE's No. 2 post. Chase, who ran for Congress from the state of Washington last year, is even less likely than Venable to cause trouble.

In fact, the only reason for hope is Sam Wyly, a very rich young (35) computer tycoon from Dallas who has been named head of OMBE's advisory council. Liberal-leaning Wyly, who personally contributed well over \$100,000 to Richard Nixon's 1968 campaign, actually has access to the Oval Office — one reason why Stans was not overjoyed by his appointment.

Clearly somebody — perhaps Wyly — must penetrate the protocol curtain to stir the President from his solitary splendor and remind him of campaign commitments to the ghetto. Otherwise, the future of Black capitalism will surely be more bureaucratic shuffles and no fulfillment.

Soul gab Black economics must be real

by Kenneth Secret

In the past Black people have been misled by whites to believe that their economic status was merely accidental. They were swayed into thinking that economic deprivation was economic deprivation. Within the context of deprivation, it symbolizes that the reason black people were "ghettoized" was mere circumstance derived from their own economic errors.

Black people were brought to America as enslaved colonists for the American imperialist colonial government. The effects of slavery were not actually vivid until the shackles were removed and the Black man remained stagnant because of racism. The Black man's only alternative for survival was to become economically dependent upon his imperialistic oppressor for survival. The phrase "economically dependent" should be utilized instead of economically deprived.

Black people also were disillusioned by the white man into thinking the mere change of class as upward social stratification would improve their "ghettoized" predicament.

Black people have now come to realize that their ghettoized phenomena is not a result of their own economic deprivation and economic ignorance but of American imperialistic colonial racism. In order to break away from this colonialism, Black people have denounced the symbols of their imperialistic oppressor. They have denounced patriotism, nationalism, white society and conformity to white culture, all of this to consummate Black identity.

But after appropriation of Black identity, Black Brothers and Sisters yet had to find some way to blockade their identity from imperialistic racism, and further colonization — in essence, to become economically independent. Thus Black people are able to combat in unity against American imperialism and intervention, having the ability to determine their own destiny. This is economic Black power.

Black people also have become cognizant that the myth of class struggle and upward social stratification as a remedy for "ghettoized" Blacks is a "white" lie. Blacks are now aware that it is a race struggle and white racism is the cause of their economic dependence. Black ghettos are not just accidental dilemma, but are planned reservations for colonized Blacks.

In the Black ghettos today, there are white and Jewish bloodsuckers sucking money — Black economic circulation. It is evident that with this kind of economic racism by pigs, Black people cannot prosper. In the ghetto economy the Black people are 99 per cent consumer. To become independent, black people must begin to control market of their own economy and other things that directly impinge upon them.

Black people are now applying coercion on the Jewish and white bloodsuckers to purify their economic practices. In this process of purification, the imperialistic bloodsuckers must either come around or get knocked around. White colonial economists call this absurd and out of balance with the autonomous economy. This assertion proves American imperialists' desire to sustain the black colony.

America justifies its revolution against Britain on the premise that it was a strike for independence and a right to determine its own destiny. We brothers justify our struggle on that same basis.

We too shall become advocates of revolution if our independence is not peacefully recognized. We will have our economic independence from colonial imperialistic racism, and if not, the failure of America to submit will evolve to its revolutionary termination; and in revolution one wins or one dies.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone: Editor 475-3288, News 475-3289, Business 475-3296. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods of the Nebraska Union, Lincoln, Neb. Member of Intelligentsia Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

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

Editor Roger Boyd; Managing Editor Kent Cockson; News Editor Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Dave Fligg; Editorial Assistant Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers John Dvorak, Bill Smitherman, Sara Schwulder, Gary Soarrest, Steve Sinclair, Bachitar Singh, Linda McClure, Mike Barrell, Sue Parley, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whiffan, Carol Anderson; Photographers Dan Lashley, Jim Dean, Howard Rosenberg, Mike Hayman; Copy Editors Susan Steidle, Jan Parks, Susi Schlotzmeier, Phyllis Adkinson.

Business Manager Ed Iacono; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager Margaret Ann Brown; Bookkeeper Ron Rawlin; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager Janet Boatman; Circulation Manager James Stetter; Classified Ad Manager June Waggoner; Advertising Representatives J. L. Schmidt, Margaret Ann Brown, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.



"Greetings: You have been chosen by your fellow workers to fight inflation . . ."

Relevant requirements Times are changing?

If you will recall, in my last column I promised I would devote this week's literary attempt to a consideration of the Group E (natural science) requirement.

I'll admit that this doesn't seem likely to provoke a violent demonstration on the part of the student body or for that matter even keep you awake for the next minute and a half. But I think you will find if you read on that there is a very special kind of logic that must be used when dealing with group requirements.

Argument 1. Group requirements have been established to "encourage" (the degree of encouragement depending upon how badly one wishes to graduate) the student to explore as many areas of the academic spectrum as possible in order that he may become a well-rounded and liberally-educated individual.

Although I feel that there are a few other more important reasons hiding somewhere in the depths of faculty politics, I will, for the purpose of this discussion, accept this traditional argument in favor of the group requirements as a valid one. It does, in fact, have some degree of merit.

To explain the second argument for your consideration, allow me to give a quick synopsis of the proposed change in the Group E requirement.

Currently it is possible to fill the natural science requirement without taking a laboratory science (by taking, for example, Math 114, 115, and Physics 61.) Various other options also promise to open up as more courses like Physics 61 are added to the curriculum. To meet this impending crisis

the Curriculum Committee has proposed a change in the Group E requirement to stipulate that at least two semesters (out of three) be spent in courses that have a lab, unless the student should choose to take two semesters of math, in which case only one lab science course would be required. The effect of this change, combined with the currently existing rules governing the Group E requirement, is to create a requirement that permits a minimum degree of flexibility and a minimal opportunity for diverseness on the part of the student.

Argument 2. The student is better off with a narrow, non-flexible program than one in which he has the greatest opportunity for individuality and exploration. This argument would seem to follow logically in view of the actions taken by the Curriculum Committee.

Being only a naive student, I cannot reconcile these two arguments which seem to say two different things about the same thing. Perhaps someone can enlighten me on this point.

At any rate, the Arts and Sciences Advisory Board is currently studying this problem and I feel that they may well have found a solution that will allow for much greater flexibility but will still be acceptable to the faculty. If not, I hope that some form of compromise might be reached that will be of benefit to all parties concerned and that will serve as another (if indeed rather small) step in the improvement of the educational system at Nebraska.

Don Stenberg
Student Member
Curriculum Committee