

Hickel takes the arrow in the front

by FRANK MANKIEWICZ
and TOM BRADEN

The first time Walter J. Hickel appeared before a national audience was in Miami Beach, at the Republican convention of 1968. Director of Communications Herbert Klein, then Richard Nixon's press secretary (Presidents have directors of communications; candidates have press secretaries), trotted him out — in Spiro Agnew's phrase.

The convention being rather dull, Klein brought forth one governor every morning and another every afternoon to announce his support for candidate Nixon. All of them, of course, had previously done so, and it afforded no surprises, but it was the only news in town, and Klein knew it.

Hickel seemed uncomfortable that day, re-celebrating his loyalty to Mr. Nixon, and it was a harbinger of the future. He was always uncomfortable re-celebrating his loyalty — but that seems to be what this Administration is about. In the absence of program, all that's left is hail to the chief. It finally undid Secretary Hickel, who angered the hard-eyed office managers who surround the President becoming "controversial."

The lesson taught by Hickel's political demise is not lost on other Administration stalwarts. By the time this appears in print, Mr. Nixon may have named a new Republican national chairman, and it is no accident that Donald Rumsfeld, the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the antipoverty agency, is a prominent candidate.

Rumsfeld, who fired the top two men in the Legal Services program — the only really effective OEO activity — last week, is a White House counselor in addition to his antipoverty duties. His predecessor, R. Sargent Shriver, headed the OEO and had Cabinet rank under Lyndon Johnson. But L.B.J. regularly scorned Shriver and on one celebrated occasion had GOP Senate leader Everett Dirksen announce a presidential desire to cut OEO's budget.

Rumsfeld, however, is in good political standing, and it goes far to explain the firing of Terry Lenzner, the aggressive former Harvard football captain who made the Legal Services program such a successful instrument of the poor and obtained for it at the same time the wholehearted support of the largely conservative organized bar.

At OEO, Rumsfeld supported Lenzner and his activist lawyers. When Ronald Reagan tried to veto a legal program because it exposed the illegality of his attempts to cut off welfare recipients and had antagonized the big agricultural growers in behalf of migrant farm workers, Rumsfeld overrode Reagan's veto.

When Sen. Gordon Allott of Colorado objected to the activities in his state of Legal Services lawyers in behalf of migrant farmers, Rumsfeld supported the program. But when the Mississippi Republican chairman, Clark Reed, who is also the real Republican honcho for the South, complained, Rumsfeld refunded the Mississippi program, after a long delay, but then took evasive action.

Reed's complaint was serious not because it had any more validity than any of the others but because Reed was an important politician at the White House. Rumsfeld told Lenzner it was

a complaint with which OEO Legal Services "had to deal."

Lenzner, who never saw himself as part of the Nixon team, thought political complaints could be ignored if the job was done well.

Rumsfeld knew better. He picked up Reed's proposal to "regionalize" Legal Services, which Reed saw as an effective way to put Legal Services decisions under political appointees who were on the Nixon team.

Rumsfeld may have seen it as a necessary political maneuver, but Lenzner saw it as a threat. So did

the American Bar Assn., which is less concerned, in the last analysis, with Republican political success than it is with keeping nonlawyers from practicing law.

Rumsfeld backed down on the Reed proposal for "regionalizing" but instituted some bureaucratic guidelines to accomplish the same thing. Lenzner protested and was fired. Now he and Hickel both understand that at least the appearance of politics comes first. If the Legal Services program survives, Rumsfeld may have discovered the magic formula.

Letters

Stock reply

Dear Editor,

Gary Seacrest seems to imply, in his analysis of CUE and the Regents, that CUE consists of malcontents causing trouble on a campus now serene, pacific, and concerned only with discussing football. This imputation is in my view quite unfair.

If in fact public funds have been incorrectly or unwisely managed, then this is a matter of permanent concern. CUE, as I understand it, does not intend maliciously to embarrass anyone either in student government or administration, but it would like to establish safeguards against such fiscal mismanagement (if that is what it proves to be) occurring again.

Moreover, so long as ASUN retains its ties with the radical NSA, and is potentially able again to stray beyond what many believe to be its proper functions, then this too is a matter of permanent concern. Surely it is better to discuss these issues in a time of quiet than in a time of crisis.

Considering what has happened and is happening on other campuses, it does not seem to me "trouble making" to consider dispassionately how we may preserve order, responsibility, and political impartiality at Nebraska.

Sen. Batchelder's solution is in my opinion immoderate. As I am sure he would admit, he was speaking for himself and not necessarily for any members of CUE. However, solutions are needed — the events of last May have not been evaporated by Mr. Seacrest's sunny attitude. And so far as I can see, CUE is the only organization around presently offering any. Before its members are branded spoilers and malcontents, I should like to see other groups suggest equally intelligent and temperate remedies.

After all, it is really too depressing to see the Left defending the status quo, while the conservative student (and some in CUE would repudiate that label) is forced to assume

the most disagreeable and vulgar of roles, that of dissenter.

R. D. Stock,
Assistant Professor of English

Alternative to Ralphie

Dear Editor,

I have a modest proposal for those who have written to complain about the Husker football team's lack of "image" with the nationwide media.

Viewers of the Colorado game will recall that Colorado required about half a second to establish a positive, hard-charging and memorable "image." When Ralphie The Pregnant Buffalo thundered out onto the field, scattering handlers and students, she attracted every camera in the stadium. While I would admit that the Husker mascot, the Big Red Oaf, is more memorable than the old Ear Of Corn, I don't recall seeing much of him on TV.

I suggest that the University Pep Squad begin phasing out the present mascot, starting at the Orange Bowl, in favor of a big, red Irish setter (or two). Such a coup would ineradicably establish the Huskers' image as "The" Big Red before the nationwide audience, over pretenders such as Oklahoma and Cornell.

Even though an Irish setter would be a big improvement, perhaps someone else has an even better idea. Say, a live big red elephant, a stuffed big red whale, an inflatable big red baluchitherium, or whatever.

Ned Nolte

The girls in the band

Dear Editor,

We, the women of the Nebraska University bands, wish it known that we do not support Toni Hilliard or the Women's Action Group in their crusade against the marching band. We do so for the following reasons:

1. Miss Hilliard has never tried out for the University band, and has never even checked to find the number of us interested in marching outside.

2. Miss Hilliard is evidently not aware that the marching

band practices outside regularly in cold, rainy, and snowy weather. This is not true of most of the co-ed high school bands she points out.

Though we do not all agree individually on whether or not to march outside, we are unanimous in feeling that any change in the band structure should properly come from those it concerns, and those who will have to work under these changes: the members of the University bands.

Miss Hilliard may be presenting her cause to the Faculty Senate, but it is not ours.

32 Women of the
Nebraska University Bands

Rule, Britannia

Dear Editor:

As strife increases in this country it becomes evident that we need a new approach to "the American Way." Such an approach has recently been suggested by Fenton DeSade, presidential nominee of the New ArchConservative Party.

DeSade's plan is simple. In essence, he advocates an end to civil strife through the intervention of an outside party, namely England.

His plan calls for the return of the colonies to that power. This would have far reaching, but I think important, effects.

With an outside power to deal with our own civil strife, we good Americans could concern ourselves with more important things. We could, for instance, claim cruel treatment and lack of representation by the British government.

After a time we could hold a revolution. It would be a grand social event and I'm sure everyone would want to come. Then everyone would be happy.

Those who want a revolution would be happy. Those who want to defend the "American Way" would be happy. Those who want to fight Communism or "creeping socialism" would be happy.

The program has many merits. I would urge its consideration.

Sincerely,
Schadracque Bushido