

Agnew speech a basic threat

Recent statements of Vice President Spiro Agnew concerning the press, and more specifically the broadcast industry, are self-centered and can be interpreted as a threat to the basic democratic belief of fair comment and criticism of government.

In a speech before the Midwest Regional Republican Committee Thursday, Agnew said that power over the television news is in the hands of "a tiny and closed fraternity of men." He questions networks' right to interpret the news by saying that hostile critics could have more influence than the President.

In our society, everything the President does must be reported and commented on. The type of society that would result if the President could say what he wanted without opposition would be one in which Agnew might want to live, but hopefully few other Americans.

About 750 of the nation's leading newspaper editors, radio and television broadcasters, journalism educators and students met in San Diego this weekend for the national convention of Sigma Delta Chi. Delegates at the convention passed the following resolution: "Sigma Delta Chi, the nation's largest journalistic society, at its 60th anniversary convention, rejects and condemns any efforts by the vice president or other government officials to control or impede coverage and flow of legitimate comment on and analysis of the news."

The resolution said that Agnew's criticisms of the press went "far beyond anything that might be considered constructive and, in fact, can be construed as a threat to the American freedom to collect and comment on the news."

Others have also condemned the speech. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, said the vice president to intimidate a news medium which depends for its existence upon government licenses.

"Perhaps the vice president would prefer a different kind of TV reporting — one that would be subservient to whatever political group was in authority at the time," was the statement of NBC President Julius Goodman.

Looking at another side of the picture, the national Freedom of Information committee of Sigma Delta Chi reported this weekend that news coverage problems in Washington continue to be difficult, despite the promise of President Nixon to provide "an administration of open doors, open eyes and open minds." The report said that many government sources remain shrouded by secrecy and evasion, especially the Pentagon and the consumer-oriented federal agencies.

What Agnew doesn't seem to realize is that the main reason for the existence of the press or broadcasting media is for protection of our system of government. If he really thinks the press and broadcasting media are all consciously, deliberately and uniformly working to put the administration in a bad light, then the people of the United States have been exposed to some of the poorest and most ignorant thinking ever to be espoused by such a high government officer.

Roger Boye

So goes the nation

Nixon fails to alter course or stir hope

by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie

There was a kind of predictability in President Nixon's address to the nation Nov. 3 and in the response to his talk on Vietnam. He made it clear that he was not about to be moved by the protesters. Those who hoped he would offer some new proposals for ending the war were disappointed. Saigon was ecstatic, as were the ardent supporters of the Thieu-Ky government. Hanoi and its supporters were bitter in their denunciation.

In a sense, things were no different after he spoke than before. The Administration was firm in its adherence to a "plan" without announced details. The President's policy seemed to be one of buying

time at home and standing firm overseas. He was willing to talk in generalities about a schedule for withdrawal of United States troops and about "Vietnamization" of the war.

It was clear that the rate of withdrawal depended on Saigon and Hanoi and the chances for a negotiated settlement on initiatives from Hanoi.

From the volume of telegrams and letters announced by the White House, and from the post-address polls, it seems clear that the President did buy some time from American voters — but for a substantial price.



The sound of marching effete

By tagging those who disagree with him as "withdraw now" advocates, regardless of their specific proposals for disengagement, he increased the gap between himself and many thoughtful and concerned Americans. He also reduced the chances for turning the continuing debate over Vietnam into more constructive channels on ways and means of ending the fighting.

By refusing to lean on the Saigon government, to broaden its base and to seek a political settlement, the President implied that his primary commitment is to President Thieu and Vice President Ky. He also failed to give encouragement to pressures for social and political reform in South Vietnam.

By refusing to lean on the Saigon government, and various secret diplomatic efforts to convey United States views directly to the North Vietnamese, the President lessened the chances for effective use of private channels in the future. For a temporary propaganda point he threw away a valuable diplomatic tool.

The trouble with the President's speech was not a "hawkish" tone, although there was some of that. He was not oblivious to the pressure for disengagement in our country. A careful reading of the speech reveals his decision to end our participation in the war. But that reading does not reveal the how of that end.

The how of that end should contain some promises to the American people in terms of how the President plans to proceed. It should also include some warnings on the difficulties of ending such a war on satisfactory terms and with full recognition of our obligations to the South Vietnamese people. The President did not do that.

The President's message should have included some clear promises to the South Vietnamese people on what we hoped to do for them, in paying the way for a political settlement. It should have involved a warning that we are not there to protect a given group of political or military leaders. The President's message gave vague promises, but no warnings to South Vietnam.

The President's message carried warnings to Hanoi, but no real promises which might encourage them to seek a negotiated settlement. In fact, one got the feeling he had little hope for such a settlement.

As time passes, and the war continues, the President's time for maneuver will be reduced. The cost of the time he bought Nov. 3 will go up, in terms of domestic opposition, Hanoi intransigence, and Saigon uncertainty. If he is to reduce the costs he must show more willingness to talk with and listen to the American people and a greater capacity for initiatives, in South Vietnam and in Paris.

The Ledger Syndicate, Inc.

Nebraskan editorial page

Open Forum

Times are changing! (Slowly)

by Don Stenberg

Student member, Curriculum Committee
Pre-registration time is here again. And you, miserable fellow students, probably fail to appreciate the spirit of the season. It's sort of like Christmas; and now, just as at Christmas time, you've got to go shopping for your loved ones. Your list probably looks something like this one:
6 hours for Great Grandpa College Requirements
6 hours for Mother Major
3 hours for Father Advisor (The poor soul needs someone in his class)

If you are one of the fortunate few who has a few hours left to treat himself to a few goodies, let me suggest the following.

Physics 61 — This course traces the development of the science of Physics from its origins to the present. This course will probably be a little more technical than Biology 3, but it should be a worthwhile course if you have any interest in how our present space-age technology came into being.

Music 187 — This course traces the development of jazz from its origins to the present day. The social forces that shaped the development of jazz will be one of the major areas of study.

Biology 3 and Physics 61 can be counted toward fulfillment of the Arts and Sciences group E science requirement. These courses have no prerequisites. Sophomore standing is a prerequisite for Music 187. Both are in the catalog.

I hope you will find this list of some use as you prepare your second semester registration. Let me say that there are many other outstanding courses being taught here at Nebraska. I chose these three for special consideration because they are quite new. It was therefore my feeling that their existence should be brought to the attention of you, my readers — both of you.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Telephone: Editor 475-2388, News 475-2399, Business 475-2394.
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.
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.
Address: Daily Nebraskan
24 Nebraska Union
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Editor Roger Boye; Managing Editor Kent Cochran; News Editor Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Dave Phipps; General Assistant Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers John Ovorak, Bill Smitherman, Sara Schneider, Gary Barrett, Steve Sinclair, Rachitar Singh, Diane Wank, Mike Isaacson, Sue Pottley, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers Dan Ladely, Jim Dean, Howard Rosenberg, Mike Hartman; Copy Editors Dan Ladely, Jan Parks, Suzi Schlichter; Public Address.

Business Manager Ed Tompkins; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; Nebraska Ad Manager Waz Brown; Bookkeeper Ron Bowling; Circulation Manager James Steiner; Classified Ad Manager Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Schowen.

Editorial Staff
Editor Roger Boye; Managing Editor Kent Cochran; News Editor Jim Pedersen; Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt; Dave Phipps; General Assistant Holly Rosenberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers John Ovorak, Bill Smitherman, Sara Schneider, Gary Barrett, Steve Sinclair, Rachitar Singh, Diane Wank, Mike Isaacson, Sue Pottley, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers Dan Ladely, Jim Dean, Howard Rosenberg, Mike Hartman; Copy Editors Dan Ladely, Jan Parks, Suzi Schlichter; Public Address.

Business Manager Ed Tompkins; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; Nebraska Ad Manager Waz Brown; Bookkeeper Ron Bowling; Circulation Manager James Steiner; Classified Ad Manager Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Schowen.

PROSPECTUS in retrospect

... Rodney Powell

What has become of freedom of the press? My last two columns, full of hitherto repressed information of astonishing relevance, have been repressed by the supposedly "independent" Daily Nebraskan?

I have objected, but such is the tyranny of the times that I fear they shall never be printed.

My only concern is that you readers be presented with all the information necessary for a Richer, Fuller Life, and so I must pause to shed a tear for your impoverishment (the fact that I am to be paid for each column printed does not, of course, concern me. Monetary matters are of interest only to capitalist pigs and other fascists, whom we all know are now historically irrelevant).

Musing (in my humble way) about the on-going march of history which has revealed the transitory nature of so many things (everyone over 30, the Western Cultural Tradition and all that rot), I found myself wondering, "What has become of Helen Snyder?"

Remembering my undergraduate days, I could not help but recall that she was then so much more than merely Helen Snyder — she was an Issue. She, the defender of the innocence and purity of Nebraska's young womanhood; she of stern visage, impervious to blandishment, the Queen of in-coparentis; she, one of the few women on the NU campus capable of arousing real passion?

Compared to those halcyon days the issues on campus now (as reported in The Daily Nebraskan, my only source of information) seem strangely sterile — representation on various policy-making bodies, concern with curriculum — in short, tackling the bureaucratic mess deemed necessary for any large institution.

I even note concern about the Student Union. This is indeed admirable, but no one has yet put his finger upon a real sore spot — the shockingly rough toilet paper used in the men's rest rooms. This problem touches almost all male students, and yet Student Power has been strangely silent regarding it. But then not for nothing are NU students called Cornhuskers.

What has become of the ad hominem attack? Alas, it has been transferred to such national representatives of Evil Incarnate as Richard Nixon (who can't even read his own speeches correctly) and Spiro Agnew (who, unfortunately, can). They are too remote for really effective hate. Oh, for a Villain close-at-hand: Chicago is fortunate — Mayor Daley provides more emotional release than Hugh Hefner ever dreamed of.

But I digress. Nostalgia grips me and clasps me to her bosom (and a firm one it is, I must confess). Is Helen Snyder walking the streets? Tending bar at Casey's? Playing the accordion at Marie's (allowed an occasional solo on "Lady of Spain" — Ted Mack, where are you?)?

These questions return to me as I lie awake listening to the muggings, and when I fall into a fitful slumber, I am haunted by the image of that Keeper of the Key to the chastity belt of the Midlands. A disembodied voice asks, "Where are the snaws of yesterday?" and then in a blinding flash of revelation I know — they are falling in a fresca commercial.

Dear Editor:

As a college professor, I am more or less inclined to believe that one of the functions of a university is to educate. I was therefore particularly disturbed by both the unanimity and superficiality of the student responses to Nixon's speech reported in the Nebraskan Nov. 6.

It is shocking that these students, several of whom I know personally to have excellent minds, should attack the President's speech as "full of lies, distortions, half-truths and general stupidity" and at the same time talk confidently about the United States' policy of aggression, or of Nixon's "pride in the inevitable deaths" that the war will cause.

But it is to their teachers, not to them, but one must direct the obvious question: why are these students unaware that their opinions are not self-evident truths and that the New Republic or Evans and Novak may be charged with distortions and half-truths even as the National Review or James J. Kilpatrick?

The obvious answer, to be sure, is that most of their teachers seem equally unaware of the fact. The groundrules for any faculty lounge discussion of Vietnam (at least in the Liberal Arts college) are these: that the war is unjust and immoral, that it cannot be "won" (whatever is meant by the word), and that rapid withdrawal will finally save lives and bring "peace." To question these dogmas is both social and intellectual heresy.

If this is so, then universities cannot claim to be arenas for objective and disinterested debate, but are instead institutions for the propagation of a specific philosophy of life (secular humanism) and indeed of a specific brand of politics. All of which means, alas, that a parent should think twice before sending his children to one.

Left-wingers doubtless will see much significance in the fact that of the students interviewed, only a freshman

girl undertook an extensive defense of Nixon. Might I suggest that this is not because she is as yet unenlightened and unlearned, but because she is as yet untrained in those responses which are socially acceptable in the mod mod academic world.

R. D. Stock, Assistant Professor of English

Dear Editor:

I would like to clarify part of an article about myself.

In the story printed Wednesday, Nov. 5, there was reference to my being dismissed from a high school in Ankeny, Iowa for saying an "Anglo-Saxon word for sexual intercourse." (Incidentally I was very interested in how "the word" was presented by The Daily Nebraskan. Maybe you felt that saying it outright would be using poor judgment. Perhaps you have editorial pressures on yourself. This word has some very peculiar qualities and consequences.)

I said the word in answer to a question concerning an example that I had brought up in class. We were studying the rise of liberalism in nineteenth century Europe. I cited an example of a problem which is pertinent to liberal values. A Wayne State College teacher had been dismissed at least in part for saying the word.

I identified the word by saying it had four letters and meant sexual intercourse. A student asked me what the word was.

I said that the question put me in a difficult situation, but that I felt that I could say the word without endorsing its meaning or advocating its use as an epithet. I said that I would say it as a fact — an event that contributed to a teacher being dismissed. (Ironically I would be dismissed because I "related" this teacher's story.)

I said it. Again I told the class about the manner in which I was using it. I was not using the word as an epithet aimed at a person.

I was fired for refusing to pledge that I would never use the word again in any con-

text in Ankeny Senior High School.

I just couldn't allow that kind of censorship.

The school board, administration, teachers, and I never discussed how I may have hurt my pupils. The use of the word in any way seemed so unjustifiable that an absolute prohibition was enforced.

I thank you for the opportunity to reveal from my perspective how this dismissal took place. It is important that this story be clear. I'd be interested in reactions to the dilemmas in this incident.

I'd like to turn to a more affirmative realm — a place called Camelot — a place where persons, men and women are becoming in wonder full ways. Centennial College is such a place.

I'd like to thank the people there for being and becoming. You who are about a joyous and sometimes despairing odyssey in search of many-charactered ultimates — I thank you.

There is a meeting in this place — a coming to know — a knowing, not just flinging theses about but a knowing of wholeness and fulfillment. There is discussion, not just the flaunting of long words but attempts to live the words spoken, to know deeply the meaning of knowing, to realize the world of an other openly and ecstatically. Questions, immense questions raised — persons authentically relating to great dilemmas.

Joy! — an open blissfulness of each with each with a yes embodied fully. Oh yes, despair too — persons deeply agonized by disturbance and injustice; but there is a willingness to stop the horrors inflicted on men by themselves and by others.

But again an ongoing affirmation of those so very "red" red balloons yessed and each softly, gently, scintillatingly joyfully with each. An act for two, a scene for two (act II, scene II), roam-

ing with jubilation — one with one wonderfully.

There is so very much to say, to live.

Ron Kurtenbach

Dear Editor:

The critique of the poetry in the University of Nebraska Review 3 seemed needlessly harsh. The verse was regarded narrowly and misinterpreted. Perhaps it was the weakest feature of the review, that hardly warrants the disdain of "surely there are more people writing better poems than those appearing".

The Rogers poem and one of Siporin are jointly dismissed as "based on faith in an acid trip". The cultural oneness with peers in Rogers' "Neon: My World" transcends the drug scene. Indeed the poem itself is — if at all — loosely drug linked. Through his drug metaphor Alan Siporin expresses a conflict of the times. His other poem "Lightness and Darkness" vividly expresses the existential choice.

The other poems have also been equally and hastily misjudged. I find the critic rather than Gary Hill guilty of cliched phrases with his comment "the age of the generation gap". Furthermore I find sympathy and not indifference in the poet as he says "woman, go ahead".

Tom Deeds' "I been railroaded" is particularly significant in light of the Chicago Conspiracy trial. The Review has shown greater merit than a mere willingness to print obscenities.

The critic speaks of Ann Miller's "Paragraph Poem" as "no more than rambling thoughts about one of those doom-despair-structure themes". The poem specifically states the opposite: "... like the world was going to end. Well it wasn't. He knew it and I knew it." It is rather an essay of communication.

Perhaps the critic felt a balanced review was required and since the play, story and photographs were commended only the poetry was left to attack. The quality of the review is not limited to the prose, drama and photographs, but extends to the poetry as well.

I find the magazine most commendable and congratulate the staff on its efforts.

Jane Purizer