

The Nixon apologetic by Dick Gregory

President Nixon traveled from the White House to the Waldorf Astoria, substituting for the number one administration apologist Spiro Agnew, to extend a personal apology to French President Pompidou for the protest demonstrations which had followed him during his visit to the United States.

Nixon's apology gave rise to other voices of dissent, among them Mayor Richard Daley of Chicago. Daley said he thought Chicago demonstrators ought to be complimented for "the orderly manner in which they exercised their rights as American citizens." Thus another footnote is added to the Chicago convention story and the recent conspiracy Trial. When demonstrating in Chicago, one is more likely to get official approval if the demand for peace is limited to the Middle East and not extended to cover Southeast Asia.

It was good to see President Nixon in an apologetic mood, but I would rather see him extending personal apologies to the American people instead of on their behalf. President Nixon has much to apologize for, and perhaps a series of open, public apologies could actually be a starting point toward enacting Nixon's campaign promise of "bringing us together."

PRESIDENT Nixon might begin by

apologizing to little black children in Lamar, South Carolina, for creating the public atmosphere which encouraged the vicious and inhumane attack by a racist, angry mob on school buses delivering students in accordance with the federal law of the land.

The administration stance has been in defiance of law and order, refusing to immediately and thoroughly effect an orderly implementation of the law of the land. Such an official attitude, deploring busing and slighting law and order, is bound to trigger the overturning of school buses, the crushing of fenders and the breaking of windows, and the instilling of terror in innocent little black students.

It is ironic that most folks were beginning to feel such open expressions of bigotry and racism were relics of a past decade. It takes a Nixon-Agnew combination to resurrect such practices once again.

PRESIDENT Nixon would do well to offer a personal apology to the grief-stricken mothers of young teenage narcotics addicts whose lives have been wasted or lost because the flow of heroin into America has not been seriously combatted.

When heroin leaves Turkey on its way to the veins of ghetto youth in the United States, it stops off in Paris for

a curing process. One wonders if President Nixon mentioned that issue to President Pompidou while they were extolling the virtues of French-American friendship.

President Nixon owes a special apology to the legal profession in general, and former Chief Justice Earl Warren in particular, for insulting the highest court bench in the land in offering such mediocre appointments to fill a Supreme Court vacancy as Clement Haynesworth and G. Harrold Carswell.

An apology is in order to all Americans who have lost relatives or loved ones in Laos for the excruciating pain they must feel to hear their President deny that the United States has any combat foot soldiers in that country.

MANY APOLOGIES should be extended to the American consumer. The federal government is well aware of the poisons in the food Americans are buying and eating every day.

The apologies due the oppressed poor in America by President Nixon suggest an endless list. The President should apologize for the government purchase of \$89,000,000 worth of grapes sent to Vietnam to break the back of a boycott designed to help and dignify Mexican-American grape workers.

The President should apologize to hungry and starving white, black, In-

dian, Chicano and Puerto Rican children in America for insisting that they be "protected" rather than fed — for spending billions for an anti-ballistic missile system to protect from an unknown enemy, while the very real enemy of hunger remains victorious in empty little bellies.

PRESIDENT NIXON should apologize to the American public in general for going to a football game which decided the number one football team in the nation when he should have been visiting Indian reservations to see how the number one oppressed people in America could be helped; for making a long distance telephone call to the moon, while long distance rates at home remain unregulated and high, and Bell Telephone anti-trust violations continue; for allowing the Army to maintain an unhampered and unanswerable surveillance of civilians engaged in lawful political activity, complete with data banks and personal files on individuals and groups.

President Nixon may feel the need to apologize to heads of state for the actions of his citizens. But the people of America are finding it increasingly difficult to apologize to the people of other nations for the actions of their President. And, of course, that recognition may just be a reverse way of "bringing us together."

★ ★ ★ RAPPING ★ ★ ★

Editor,

I was nauseated by Suppository in the March 16th issue of the Daily Nebraskan.

First let me say that I agree that this campus should take a step of action towards reaching its goals but what good will destruction do? What more than publicity have the (quote) "brothers" gotten in Chicago, Santa Barbara or New York?

They really haven't accomplished one damn thing! All they've done is hurt a bunch of innocent people — the same thing that they are bitching about in Vietnam. The only main difference is that they are destroying their own country.

IF PEOPLE want some action why don't they do something constructive instead of wearing some damn button that doesn't mean a thing?

Half the people that are supposedly concerned have never tried civilized means of getting action. All they know is wear an old army jacket, let their hair grow long and stick on a couple buttons and they're all set to protest!

WE LIVE in a country that has the world's highest standard of living and are probably the most civilized nation in the world too. Why don't a few people start acting like it? You don't have to destroy everything just to change it.

Jan Detwiler

Editor,

I am tired and frustrated of hearing the many so-called "liberals" on this campus discuss, debate, talk, and argue about the problems that our society has created and must face up to. I think by now most people who have been conducting this continuous rhetoric have come to agree that we are a very "sick society" and something must be done.

If only these same people would get out of The Crib and out of their living units — hopefully they might open their eyes to what they can be doing right now.

Just by discussing an issue there is no way a person can fully realize the genuine conflicts and realities that are involved in this issue. Why don't these same people get out into the community and do something for those who live in poverty?

Discuss with them their rights as citizens and the opportunities that are available to them. Talk to these people about birth control. Take some of your precious time spent engaging in "rhetoric" to explain to a high school drop-out what his rights are as a human being in this society that offers him nearly nothing.

I AM quite aware that Lincoln, Nebraska, is not the best place to find out first-hand what the "urban crisis" is all about. However, this is where we are at right now and this is where a large percentage of the students will remain.

Therefore, I most strongly believe that we have no excuses for not doing something right here in Nebraska. It might surprise a few of you that 15% of Lincoln and Lancaster County residents meet poverty guidelines.

What have you accomplished lately that will directly affect these people's lives?

SAUL ALINSKY remarked that an issue is something you can "do" something about. Here we reside as college students — wanting to control our own destinies and not wanting to be spoon-fed; yet, at the same time many sit around waiting for someone to tell them what they can do. Why don't these people use their own initiative to get out and experiment with their own knowledge and creativity — instead of merely talking about what needs to be done?

It is so much easier to sit in the Union and talk with fellow "intellectuals" about all of society's ills.

However, have you ever challenged yourself by attempting to organize and work with those who are different than you are — "through their own experiences"?

I am extremely convinced with the great emphasis placed on rhetoric at this University. I believe it is time for the students on this campus to reallocate some of their own individual priorities.

Since power is defined as "the ability to act" — we must get off our "rhetoric" now, and "act" before we are too late. In other words — we need a little less talking and A LOT more doing!!

Eileen Sommerhauser

In the Ivory Flower

by STEVE TIWALD

The events of the last two weeks at Creighton University in Omaha are a classic example of the struggle over *Who governs the university?* It is a model of students working for change "through the channels," then outside people influencing the inner decisions of the university, in this case control of students' social lives.

Let's review the events chronologically. The students wanted the right of visitation in their dorms. This proposal, called "open dorms," was not a radical request. It asked for visitation for limited hours of the afternoon and evening on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays.

CREIGHTON'S All University Committee on Student Life and Policy, made up of representatives of the administration, faculty and students (comparable to N.U.'s Council on Student Life), passed the proposal. The Dean of Students, Thomas Burke, approved the proposal and it went into effect several weeks ago.

The dorm governments were in charge of and responsible for the visitation periods. There were no problems. Surveys were conducted and these indicated that students overwhelmingly supported the policy.

However, the Omaha World-Herald came out with a story that inferred that visitation was immoral. Students quickly learned that outside influences, especially large financial contributors to the university, dictate university policy.

STUDENT LEADERS told me "The administration is a puppet of the three or four main financial contributors, like Peter Kiewit," C.U.'s Board of Directors, pushed by these contributors, rejected the visitation policy.

Obviously the two basic issues in this struggle are *Who*

governs the university and more specifically in this instance, *Who governs the student's outside-of-classroom life?*

It's an old fight. The principle that students participate in decision-making that affects their lives, especially when it concerns out-of-classroom activities, is in practice on campuses across the country. (But not at Nebraska University, by the way.)

THE CREIGHTON students showed themselves to be responsible adults and worked through the channels to effect change. But it was proven that the channels only went so far, then outside people — not living on campus or affected by the rules — had final say over students' lives.

The Creighton student government took the leadership role in attempting to resolve the problem. Active non-cooperation was used as a tactic to make the administration and Board of Directors know that the students were unhappy about the policy rejection.

Last Friday, water in dorm sinks was turned on to run up a large water bill, but the plumbing system in the dorm (built by Peter Kiewit Construction Co., by the way) could not handle the load and there was minor flooding.

AS OF WEDNESDAY afternoon, the Board of Directors had just met in emergency session and directed C.U. President Clement Schneider to draw up an open dorm policy, to be announced Thursday afternoon.

Hopefully, this will mean victory for the students. What was a model case of students working through the channels, then being stomped on by outside influences, may turn out, after all, to be an example of the exercise of the student self-determination principle. Right on!