

IN THE IVORY FLOWER by Steve Tiwald

"Any person who alters, forges, knowingly destroys, knowingly mutilates or in any manner changes this certificate may be fined not to exceed \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both."

Any way you look at it, this is a tremendous penalty for a young man to pay for burning his draft card. Even with anti-war sentiment as widespread as it is now, the deliberate destruction of a draft card is a very personal decision that carries a very personal responsibility.

Larry Zink, a former University of Nebraska engineering student chose that path a year ago and now faces potentially 10 years in prison (for burning both his Selective Service System classification notice and registration certificate), plus he has not yet been prosecuted for his further act of refusing induction.

MOST PEOPLE would consider Larry Zink's defiance a very radical action. However, refusal to cooperate with the military should be recognized for what it is — a deeply conservative action.

War means death and destruction, and refusal to go to war confirms life and conserving life.

Hopefully some day all the people in the world will agree to refuse to go to war; then we can put all-out efforts into enhancing life rather than destroying it.

While the action of Larry Zink and the thousands of other draft card burners and induction refusers is thus philosophically based, these young men hope to influence the policies of our nation.

THE GOVERNMENT does not respond

positively to acts of violent revolution. Carrying guns and bombing buildings only adds to an atmosphere of tension, fear, and repression.

The millions of young people who are working for non-violent change should therefore be respected. President Nixon in his campaign said he wanted to listen to young people. He decried violence and said "Let us reason together." Reason rather than castigation. He promised a volunteer army. Let's get on with it, so people need not unwillingly sacrifice themselves on a battlefield or in a prison cell.



RAPPING



To the Editor:

The story concerning my testimony before the Council on Student Life does not accurately reflect my position. First, I do not believe that students have been treated unfairly by the Office of Student Affairs. Indeed, I believe that in some cases the Office of Student Affairs has been too lenient.

My criticism is solely concerned with the existing rules and procedures. Under the existing rules, a student may not raise issues either of fact or of law. (The Office of Student Affairs takes the position that they proceed against only those persons who admit guilt and, therefore, no fact-finding hearing is necessary.)

Moreover, students cannot raise issues of law (such as illegal search or seizure or the obtaining of an illegal confession) because the hearings that he has are counseling hearings and it always seems inappropriate to raise legal issues during such procedures.

Clearly, it would be better for both the students and the Administration to recognize that in some instances their respective interests are opposed. Accordingly they should provide for a hearing during which the University would have to prove an offense and during which the student might claim that (1) the confession was illegally taken, (2) that the evidence was illegally obtained, (3) that he has already been punished and the offense does not affect the University or (4) that he did not do what was charged.

I recognize that counseling is important but it can exist only when the parties involved trust one another. Thus, if the University intends to take punitive action against students, it should not use counseling techniques to obtain information from them.

Sincerely yours,
Wallace M. Rudolph
Professor of Law

Dear Mr. Pederson:

Your picture of the present situation in the Inter Dormitory Association was very accurate. (Daily Nebraskan, February 13, 1970). If I may, I would like to accent a few points made.

Not denying the fact that an all residence hall coordinating body has its merits, there seem to be a large number of misconceptions about its assumed existence.

THE PEOPLE who are serving on the council are all officers in their own halls. Furthermore, earlier this fall, IDA placed in the hands of the individual residence halls the right to self-determination of their own social regulations.

This big step and the other big step involving the

legislative-policemaking channel of the Housing Policy Committee and the Council on Student Life are alone reason enough for IDA to get out of the originator-legislator role.

THE NEXT step towards approval would be a review type approach to IDA solely for communicative purposes towards the other halls on campus. In reality, the first approval to be sought should be the Housing Policy Committee. In turn, if the ten-day review period is rejected or not taken advantage of by the CSL, the proposal would become University policy.

This year IDA has had its problems, primarily in the specific areas of leadership and acceptance of progressive ideas.

THROUGH all this we have seen no element coming up with counterproposals, not even the loyal opposition or the president. It appears that the only reasons for the excellent attendance at council meetings lie with defeating or at least arguing very bitterly with Harper's and Smith's proposals.

IDA now has before it a new constitution for consideration. One thing we may ask of them is to please consider it as it is, not because the non-productive Constitutional Revision Committee didn't write it, but because it offers a new hope for the organization.

IDA, please be honest with yourselves. The campus could use something like you!

Sincerely,
Barry Pilger

