

Times are changing?

by BRUCE COCHRANE

In the last several weeks at ASUN meetings, there has been an interesting dialogue going on between senate and the electoral commission.

The electoral commission has twice come to the senate with rules and regulations for the upcoming election based on the premise that elections should not only be fair but orderly. Senate on the other hand seems to have felt this year a little flair and razzmatazz was what was needed. That and a concern for candidates who might possibly be financially unable to compete for election.

THE CONFLICT of interests has led to an unique series of events. The first attempt by the commission to gain approval for its rules and regulations led to statements by several senators that they "most certainly had the right to amend the commission's report as they saw fit."

A court case followed, ruling that approval was the only power senate had over the electoral commission. I feel this was a wise decision, for otherwise senate and those who control it would be able to structure an election in such a way that it would be able to perpetuate itself through unfair tactics.

The second attempt by the electoral commission was met with the same type of arguments — "The rules were stifling

and the amount of money allowed candidates was excessive." The report was not passed in its entirety, with the sections the senate objected to deleted.

The electoral commission met again Wednesday evening, and decided that perhaps if the candidates were responsible, an open style election might be acceptable. Under the pressure applied by the senate, the admittedly restrictive rules were eliminated. However, it was felt that if our purpose was to open the style of elections the amount of money candidates could spend should be left as originally proposed.

The purchasing of posters and banners, the use of loud speakers and caravans, using newspaper and radio advertising all cost money. If you're going to have the one, you have to allow the other.

THE ONLY other observation I have in retrospect is that the people who pressed the hardest for the changes and emphasized the group approach and mass media techniques, were those whose forte are these types of skills.

Since their names are mentioned eminently as candidates, I wonder if the arguments they presented as reasons for the changes were those they were really interested in, or if perhaps the structuring of elections to suit their purposes was more in line with their true goals.

**EDIT
ORIAL**



War by proxy

Editor's Note: The following article was submitted by Hugh B. Hester, Brigadier General U.S. Army (ret.), who spoke here recently.

Mr. Nixon continues to dodge, squirm, twist, turn and run away from the real issues. His latest appeal to the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union to help him out of his bind in Laos is, it seems to me, merely another political plot to disperse dissent at home. He knows perfectly well that the Soviet Union cannot support U.S. aggression in Laos — and this is exactly the U.S. position in that unfortunate country as it is in Vietnam — and still maintain her position as a leading Communist country. The United Kingdom support of U.S. foreign policy, on the other hand, has in recent years become almost automatic.

There is some poetic justice, however, in the position in which Mr. Nixon now finds himself. President Eisenhower was basically a man of peace, although most of his life was spent in the military service. If he had had the support of his second in command, the Vice President, he might very well have withstood the pressure of the military-industrial complex which finally forced him into the French-Indochinese disaster.

MR. NIXON, throughout the eight years he was Vice President, supported U.S. aggressions throughout the world. Most of these aggressions

worked, as in Iran, 1953 and Guatemala, 1954.

United States involvement in Southeast Asia was and is a horrible mistake, but it was not an accident. If this involvement had been successful as it was in many other instances, such as the two mentioned above and Mr. Johnson's intervention in the Dominican Republic, 1965 the whole matter of Southeast Asia would probably have now been forgotten by most Americans and the world.

The problem the President must still face up to, instead of running from it as currently, lies in the fulfillment of his campaign pledges which furnished the necessary votes for his election: Namely, the pledges to end the war in Vietnam and abolish the Slave Act (so-called Selective Service). So far, the President talks peace, but, as was true of his predecessor, he continues to make war, even escalate it as presently in Laos.

THE PRESIDENT'S so-called Vietnamization plan must not be construed as a peace plan at all, because it continues the killing, maiming and wounding of men, women and children, including our boys. Even if "Vietnamization" were to permit the withdrawal of all U.S. forces, it would not be an honorable peace plan because the U.S. taxpayers would still be paying for all the evils and horrors of such a war through U.S. Government stooges.

Murder by proxy is, it seems to me, even more immoral than murder by direct action. The current assertion by the Nixon Administration that no ground troops are presently involved in Laos is almost certainly false. Transferring Green Berets from the army to the CIA changes nothing. T. D. Allman, N.Y. Times News Service, exposed this attempted fraud (St. Petersburg Times, Florida, March 9, 1970).

But even if it were true, such propaganda would still be obscene wherever or whenever used. U.S. bombs from U.S. planes that kill, maim and wound people constitute U.S. military involvement just as surely as does ground troop involvement.

And so long as the Nixon Administration continues the war by hiring others to do its dirty work, the President will be primarily responsible, for he and he alone, can stop the war any day he accepts the principles of the Geneva Conference, 1954. The same was true of Mr. Johnson during his more than five years as President.

ONLY BY honoring his campaign pledges, can Mr. Nixon escape the bind in which he now finds himself, restore the moral character of our country, or achieve the magnificent society he promises almost daily. Accordingly, all concerned and informed people must now put maximum pressure upon the President to honor his campaign pledges.

★ ★ RAPPING ★ ★

Editor,

Your use of a quote out of context ("Two children the limit, three a sin") as a headline for your article in your Friday March 13 issue was rather unfortunate, especially since it appeared to be a gratuitous slap at a large number of people whom I had no intention of attacking. The impression would be easy to gain from the headline that anyone who now has or who has had in the past more than two children is somehow a "sinner."

IT HAS only been within the past year or less that there has been wide-spread public awareness of the dangers inherent in further population increase and of the imminence of the appearance of its effects. Children born or conceived prior to that time certainly could not be said to have been brought into the world by deliberately irresponsible parents.

Furthermore, there are those children to be considered who came into being unexpectedly and not as the result of deliberate forethought.

It would be both pointless and unfair to lump these parents into the group whom I would consider "sinners" in the context of the headline — those people who with full understanding of the facts and with conscious fore-thought now plan for and after this time produce children beyond the numbers of self-replacement.

I HAVE no quarrel with those who at any time in the future decide to raise large families — but the humanly responsible way to do it in the light of the evidence now rapidly accumulating is to have no more than two personally conceived children and adopt as many additional children as they desire.

Richard K. Boohar
Assistant Professor of Zoology

★ ★ ★

Editor,

After four years at this institution I firmly believed few things could move me to write a letter to the Editor of the Daily Nebraskan. But I feel the plaintive cry of the hairy-chested Oh No bird rising in my throat. I am writing this letter from the lounge of Oldfather Hall. I am surrounded by cigarettes at my feet and trash covering the table at which I am writing.

The litter in this lounge area is unbelievable. The trash receptacles are but half full and yet the room closely resembles a rather complete garbage dump. This scene is the product of not a few but of many.

AS A GROUP college students perport to be the concerned group in our society. A great many lines are written each day in this paper about peace, poverty, population and pollution. But as I sit here I wonder if the concern expressed for these issues is real or merely the end result of hot gases escaping from empty heads.

On April 22 a group of individuals are planning Earth Day. The program could be best described as a teach-in on pollution. I am confident that this will be a day in which one could gain an excellent understanding of the problems we face in the field of pollution.

As a result of this experience some students will cast the accusing finger at the petroleum industry, the automobile companies, the sewage plants and the chemical companies. Worthy lines will appear in the pages of this paper as to the many successes of Earth Day.

I FOR one strongly disagree with form of evaluation. The final success or failure of Earth Dy should not be measured in words or lip service but in results. The results should be measured in the lounge in Oldfather. If the students who use this lounge continue to pollute their environment how can they hope to deal with pollution on a grand scale? If awareness leads to remedy then Earth Day will be considered a success. But if awareness brings no change in places like this lounge, where have we succeeded?

The final test of the upcoming Earth Day program should be measured in this small lounge in Oldfather Hall on April 23.

Gary R. Blum