

Vietnam stands firm as NU debates who should take them

by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

Washington — If common sense is still valued at the White House, President Nixon will follow up his speech on Vietnam with hard concessions to those who want rapid disengagement. This would mean an announcement — sometime before Nov. 13 — of a substantial troop withdrawal.

If he has no such plan in mind, he — and the country he leads — faces a time of frightening division and of head-cracking in the streets. There can be no other end to it, and surely Mr. Nixon has too much common sense not to know it.

Moreover, the procession of Republican leaders, including the President's spokesmen in both House and Senate, who speculated aloud on the eve of the speech about everything from cease-fires to troop withdrawal timetables, cannot have lied or been lied to.

Therefore, common sense says that having made himself solid with the Hawks, Mr. Nixon will now do something to appease the Doves.

And yet there is that lingering doubt and the danger that isolation from the real world, the desire of a leader to be thought "tough" and "hardheaded," will cause him to cast common sense aside.

In the wake of Mr. Nixon's speech, it is this possibility which is frightening — that he has lost his political common sense and is ready to pose a "hard line" against the "hard line" of that tiny minority of crackpot militants in the peace movement. That possibility should cause the "Great Silent Majority" — in and out of the peace movement — to shudder.

If this is the reality, Mr. Nixon may find himself on unfamiliar ground. There are short-term political benefits for him in pictures of long-haired demonstrators charging the police. But the long-range odds are more even. The peace movement in this country does not consist of a few professors willing to sign a full-page ad in the New York Times defending Owen Lattimore. It will be hard to label roughly half the population as "soft on communism."

Meeting on the morning after the President's speech, the leaders of the Peace Moratorium here determined that the President's feet must now be held to the fire. Their fears of being linked with the "crazies" of the mobilization are cast aside. They simply do not believe that the Great Silent Majority is prepared to go on with an endless, debilitating and self-brutalizing war. They believe that they are the Great Silent Majority, and they are determined to prove it.

The danger — as in all confrontations — is that the Silent Majority will be crushed between extremists — between the Hawk extremists whom Mr. Nixon appeased with his speech and those peace extremists who really seek confrontation more than peace. And so there is only the common sense of the President and that of the peace moderates which now can keep Washington from violence and which can put Mr. Nixon in tune with the Silent Majority he seeks.

Surely he does not think — as he implied he did — a South Vietnamese army which has never had less than a 10-1 superiority in the field can defeat the enemy without us when it does not do it with us, and loses 10,000 deserters a month into the bargain.

If, in the privacy of the Oval Room, the President really came to believe these things, he is far more simple-minded than is his reputation, and the Silent Majority which he assumes is his constituency is not his constituency at all. It will be an opposition, more sophisticated and now mobilizing.

Ya gotta have a gimmick

by Kelley Baker

Keir Dullea has gone from the mad boy who couldn't touch anyone in David and Lisa to the mad boy who has to touch everyone in de Sade. Dullea made his debut as a catatonic and everyone thought he was a great actor, but by now they realize that a computer expresses feelings better than Keir.

The Marquis inhabits a world of beautiful women where the only ugly one is his wife Rene. He can't really be blamed for choosing Rene as his spouse because the marriage contract was signed during one of the blurry scenes.

De Sade, blinded by love and an out-of-focus camera, thought he was pledging his troth to Anne (Senta Berger). Rene's beautiful sister. Senta runs the gamut of emotions from a to b and bares both her talents in the process.

De Sade tries to change the contract but is opposed by his parents and Rene's mother (Lilli Paumer), who threatens to drop him into the dungeon (and does) if he doesn't behave (and he doesn't). In fact, de Sade spent 28 years in jails and asylums. In her challenging role, Lilli easily rises to the dramatic heights she reached when she did the Pond's facial cream commercials.

De Sade spends the first half of the film in constant pursuit of Anne but she is just as constant in fleeing him. It's as if they were magnetically drawn together but his magnetic pole was pointed in the wrong direction.

The entire movie is a series of flashbacks within the framework of a larger flashback (the film is a nightmare memory of the Marquis just as it is a play within a play).

Technical effects are trite and predictable. Slow motion equals sensuality as does the suffusion of color (usually passionate red). One predictable transition, known as the vertical-horizontal boudoir transition, works this way — anytime a girl in any scene leans her body more than 30 degrees in any direction there will follow an almost immediate movement to the bedroom. The 30 degree requirement is soon modified to include tilting of the head, bending the fingers, etc.

Unfortunately, none of these bedroom scenes is very interesting — despite all the caving, the sex is not at all arousing. There are no involvements between the characters either in bed or out.

If you go to see de Sade, don't go late because the best part of the film is the art work during the credits. De Sade's continual search for "a moment of reality" leaves the viewer searching for his own moment — and it finally comes when he steps out of the theatre and realizes he shelled out \$1.75 for that.

by Bruce Cochrane
Student Senator

I usually try to avoid long and lengthy arguments on subjects such as the Vietnam war, feeling that I am so far removed from those who actually make the decisions about that conflict that argument is essentially a futile effort of rhetoric.

However, last Wednesday Student Senate passed a resolution to be sent to President Nixon and Nebraska's two senators and three congressmen that strongly implied (though didn't state) that Senate as the representatives of the student body deplored the presence of American combat troops in Vietnam and called for their immediate withdrawal.

Then, the Senate refused even to consider an alternative proposal which, instead of calling for immediate withdrawal, supported President Nixon's plan for Vietnamization of the war and gradual withdrawal of American troops.

It appears to me beyond a shadow of a doubt that complete withdrawal of American troops would lead almost immediately to a Communist military victory in South Vietnam.

The prospect of this with the past history of the actions Asian Communists take after they attain victory, actions which include fifty thousand executed in North Vietnam, hundreds of thousands executed in China, genocide in Tibet, slave labor camps — it may well be that we napalm babies but I cannot believe it is deliberate or stated policy while one has just to look to the mass graves in Hue with their slaughtered and butchered to grasp the magnitude of death that would occur following the occupation of South Vietnam by North Vietnam's People's army.

American men are dying, but to remove them and sacrifice tens of thousands of civilians in their place is to adopt the idea that somehow an American life is better or more holy or something than the life of a Vietnamese. I cannot hold with this.

This concept is based on only the most basic of humanitarian ideals. I've mentioned nothing about our honor, our commitment to the ideals of freedom, or our concept of justice, all of which are justifiable reasons for leaving GI combat troops in South Vietnam.

I realize that the message Senate has voted to send, one which I fundamentally disagree with, will be little heeded by those who receive it, so perhaps I should not be concerned but I am deeply disturbed that Senate can take this stand looking no deeper into the question than that in our generation it is fashionable to be against the war, or that they are draft liable, or that we are "tired" of it all.

I do not believe that the majority of the students here at the University would endorse the stand their elected representatives have taken.



THE SILENT MAJORITY

Nebraskan editorial page

Open Forum

Dear Editor:

I would like to make public this letter written to Prof. Bud Narveson.

I am writing you in your capacity as secretary of the University Senate. I unfortunately have a class from 3:30 to 4:30 on Tuesday, and since I do not have the elasticity of conscience exhibited by our liberal brethren in playing fast and loose with teaching obligations to grind their own political axes, I will not be able to attend the University Senate meeting on Nov. 4. But I would like to have the following statement of my views regarding the resolution presented by Professor Stephen H. Voss for endorsement of the Vietnam Moratorium by the University Senate placed on the record.

This resolution is simply another attempt by the totalitarian so-called liberals to force everyone to goosestep according to their own tune. This new McCarthyism seeks to impose a tyranny on the campuses far more oppressive than any even envisaged by its predecessor.

The statement that participation in the moratorium "is likely to contribute to the total educational process" is the most blatant hypocrisy. The moratorium is an avowedly political movement with avowedly political objectives — to pressure the government of the United States to adopt a certain policy or set of policies.

A university faculty is composed — and rightly so — of members of diverse views and social positions.

The sanctity of individual opinion is its fundamental principle.

This resolution is an attempt to impose a particular standard of political con-

formity upon the faculty as a whole. The inevitable, and destructive, corollary is to base appointments and promotions, not upon academic competence, but loyalty to a given political faith.

To be specific, I personally regard the moratorium activities as giving "aid and comfort" to the enemies of this country. Many of those involved are moved by a simple-minded desire for peace-at-any-price regardless of the consequences; but many others consciously and purposefully seek the defeat and even the destruction of the United States.

Adoption of this resolution would stigmatize me as belonging to their company simply because I am a member of the University of Nebraska faculty. I can think of no more noxious form of "guilt by association."

Therefore, if permissible under Senate rules, I wish my vote counted against this resolution.

Sincerely Yours,
John Braeman
Associate Professor
of History

Dear Editor:

Thank you for the Nov. 5 headline story concerning the Faculty Senate's refusal to endorse the moratorium. Congratulations are in order for Dr. Edward Megay and those that supported his motion to keep the university separate from issues that are not directly germane to its official functions.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Telephone: Editor 473-2388, News 473-2387, Business 473-2599.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$6 per year.
Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods 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.
Business Staff:
Business Manager Ed Icenogle; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager Margaret Ann Brown; Bookkeeper Ren Rowlett; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager Janet Bosman; Circulation Manager James Steiner; Classified Ad Manager June Wagoner; Advertising Representatives J. L. Schmidt, Margaret Ann Brown, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.

Dr. Megay's motions was especially admirable in view of the fact that he participated in the October moratorium. It would be nice if the opposing faculty members could see past their emotionally-freckled noses and consider the long-range implications of their actions.

Sincerely,
Duane R. Tappe

Dear Editor:

The Nebraskan quoted me (Oct. 22, page 4) as saying "there are not any aspiring writers at the University."

A week or more after a telephonic interview, I cannot recall my exact words and so cannot say flatly, "I was misquoted." But the curious wording — "not any writers" — leads me to guess that either the reporter misunderstood me, or that this is a typographical error for "not many," which would be a moderately accurate statement — supportable by the relatively small number of entries in the annual fiction and poetry contests, and by the paucity of contributions to the magazine "Scrip."

If there were literally "not any aspiring writers," the writing courses taught by several of us would be superfluous.

Further, I specifically did not say that my only reason for holding a somewhat negative attitude toward

writers' conferences was based on "unfavorable printed reports." I did use essentially those words without, as I recall the word "unfavorable", but I also mentioned that I had known writers and would-be writers — none from here, as it happens — who had attended such gatherings, and had come away unimpressed.

There may be, of course, many "aspiring writers" who remain for one reason or another, unknown to us. As a teacher of writing, I hope there are. But if they exist, they would be doing themselves and the campus magazine a favor by revealing their presence by submitting manuscripts to the magazine and for the annual poetry and fiction contests.

Wilbur Gaffney
Associate Professor
of English

Dear Editor:

I appreciate your running the short article which I wrote for the Lincoln Journal. However, I was disappointed that you cut the last two paragraphs. I believe they are crucial in terms of summing up what I said.

Walter Bruning

Editor's Note: The two paragraphs, which were inadvertently left out, follow.

"Drill has been reduced to a trivial amount. Finally, those students who participate in the ROTC programs can verify the high level of instructor participation by the military personnel in student advising and counseling activity.

"The immoral aspects of war are real, but within the framework of the public university, military science as a practical profession cannot be denied academic status."

Either or

by June Wagoner

Ah, homecoming.

... A time when old grads return to recall past collegiate glories and cheer the "Scarlet and Cream" on to another victory (can you hear the soft strains of 'Hail Varsity' in the background?) And as alumni wonder down familiar paths marking campus landmarks reminding of those by-gone days ... They're really missing the boat.

All summer this writer came in contact with many Nebraska alumni, who when learning that I was an NU student, had abundant questions and opinions concerning the University.

Their interests ranged from the political attitudes of the students to the quality of education. And their interest as alumni and taxpayers was both justified and gratifying.

Many of their questions reflected a good amount of thought but also a lack of knowledge about University life today. Their assumptions and fears were often based on the extensive press coverage given troubles on other campuses and resulted from the too human trait of generalization.

This is not to say that there are not common problems faced by all universities. But with re-occurring questions about Communist professors, rampant sex, or racial conspiracy, it becomes obvious that some are missing the forest for the trees.

There is a wide, and widening, gulf between college students and the adult population. But it has definable boundaries which are only aggravated by the stereotypes and generalizations that increase daily. The best, the only way, to bridge this gulf comes from a basis of accurate, personal knowledge. This homecoming celebration can also be a homecoming education.

If you are questioning what is happening on college campuses, why not use this perfect opportunity to explore the realities and the reasons? You'll find students very willing and quite able to discuss the issues of the day. If you are concerned with the cost of education, why not make sure that your money is being used to the best advantage.

Instead of looking at displays, find out about the innovations in education today. Stop by Love Library and see if you think it's adequate for about 10,000 students.

Evaluate the quality of student life at NU (or do you know what the quality of student life is?) what about relevant education, academic freedom or de-personalization? And of course there are the extremely important social issues of the draft, racism and the war.

If you are really concerned about these things, about how students feel ... ask one.

But ask only if you really want to learn. If you find yourself reacting to the personal appearance of students to such an extent that you reject them on sight, then go back to your cocktail party. (By the way, some of you look pretty strange to some of us). Or if you do more talking than listening, then you've forgotten what education is.

But do try if you can. Try because tomorrow when the last toast is drunk to those good old days, you still have to go on living in these new days, good or bad.

