

Target Right wing

It would seem that if students at this University wanted to do some complaining about radical minorities which are distorting the views and opinions of the majority, there is no better target than the radical right.

It is currently popular to aim at the radical left. This craze is especially popular among the politicians. And it seems that university administrators across the nation chose the same target.

Witness the attention focused on the Black Panther Party, which has never had many more than 1,000 members. And then look at the headlines that have enveloped the Angela Davis case. To describe it simply, paranoia. The Bobby Seale-New Haven case is no different.

This national phenomenon is also present on the local level.

Honest answers to some simple questions will prove this point. If you read the papers, even once a week, you are informed enough to name this University's supposedly conservative students. They always claim to represent the majority. However, few, are legitimately elected to any office.

If you're honest with yourself, you can probably also name the organizations to which they belong. Ironically, the rightists have enough ABC acronymical organizations to make FDR turn over in his grave.

Without much of a mathematical endeavor, you can easily tally the membership in the organizations. The radical right numbers less than 200.

Nevertheless, they have press statements ready for every political issue which arises, and in virtually every one of their press releases they say, "We speak for the majority of students when we say..."

They also claim to represent the majority when they testify to legislators and when they address the Board of Regents. Currently, they are seeking to improve their credibility by taking over the Young Republicans club. By doing this, they plan to use the YR club for their own political ends. They want to, and probably will pass volumes of fanatical resolutions at the YR's future state convention. If they succeed at this, it will surely be the dupe of the year.

Dupes only go so far, though. The *Daily Nebraskan* predicts that the fanatical right will be effectively destroyed when student elections roll

around in a couple of months.

This prediction is based on only one assumption, and that is, if they have the guts to enter.

A question of integrity

Prominent Grand Island citizen Richard E. Spelts is finally starting to make statements about his commission's report.

Over the weekend Spelts told the *Lincoln Journal and Star* that he does not want to get into a debate with anyone about the report. He said that if the commission met again, they would come to the same conclusion about Stephen Rozman.

Although Spelts himself does not want to debate with anyone, there are quite a few people at this University who would like to debate with him.

The reasons are so obvious that to many faculty members they are probably repugnant. First, Spelts has said he has no second thoughts about the procedures followed by his commission. Apparently he thinks it's fine and dandy for an investigative commission to conduct hearings, whereby those who testified were not under oath, as were those who testified before the faculty fact-finding committee.

Perhaps Spelts also considers it absurd to point out that his commission had no court reporter, nor did it record testimony and transcript. On the other hand, the Holtzclaw committee produced a five-volume transcript of testimony of over 1,000 pages.

The Spelts Commission Report was 26 pages, not of facts, but of opinions and recommendations. Spelts and his attorney had the temerity to deliver to the Board of Regents 26 pages of unsound, invalid conclusions with few facts.

Worse yet, the Board has apparently accepted it.

And Spelts is out in Grand Island justifying his commission report by saying that the Regents' decision not to rehire professor Rozman is popular with the people of Nebraska. Well, it might be popular. Spelts is probably right about that. It was his commission's report which is responsible for the public snow job of making Rozman a scapegoat.

Hopefully, when the faculty meets Monday they will not overlook this whole affair. It is definitely a question of integrity.

Mick Moriarty

dear editor . . . dear editor . . . dear editor

Once upon a time

Dear editor,

There once was an Unacademic Affairs Committee, appointed by the Board of Regents, and it was scheduled to meet at the Military and Naval Science Building to consider the firing of a political science professor, S. Vladimir Roosman, charged with incitement to commit acts of disobedience. According to the Regents, Roosman was tampering with the easily malleable minds of the adolescent student population the preceding May, at which time the Military and Naval Science Building was being occupied. He had been convicted of the testimony of witness XXX, who has since declined to be identified.

Believing the action of the Board of Regents to be supercilious, as well as illegal, professor Rozman threatened to file suit against the Board. Under this threat the Board commissioned a committee to report on the May incident, and Roosman's part in it. The report to the committee had just recently been released, and it started flatly that Professor Roosman was innocent on all counts. But the Regents, to prove that their actions were neither supercilious nor illegal, stood fast on their decision to have Roosman fired. This did

seem to be a bit of a sticky wicket for this Board of Regents, who seemed to think that inept, illogical action was a new virtue in the twentieth century; when in all actuality, the same turn of mind was quite openly admired as much as 2000 years ago. Nero Claudius Caesar Drusus Germanicus was a firm believer in the philosophy that this Board of Regents seem to practice, and look where it got him.

No, I am not accusing this Board of Regents of aspiring to the same material goals that Nero did, but I do think that their methods, though clandestine and esoteric, were the same that Nero used: Blind Hatred, Injustice, Bigotry, Inconstance, and Meglomania. The Meglomania of this board is a good topic for detailed discussion. Their arguments might have been something like this.

We have been given the power, through the democratic process, of popular election, to govern the University in the best interest of the populace that we represent. We deem it necessary to maintain the campus, even if we have to fire all of the professors. At least we will have a football team that the state can be proud of. The quality of the institution is

not important, as its existence. This fact happened to have been borne out by a newly elected governor, who was willing to sacrifice the quality of the institution to give some of the people of the state what they really wanted—lower taxes, and a college degree to hang above every fireplace.

Yes, the students of the University were subordinate to the goals of that aboriginal state. For that reason they could spend four years graduating from an overcrowded, mediocre institution, so that they could carry on in the steps of their illustrious, mediocre politicians, who represented their mediocre interests in the great mythical national capitol.

Phil Kloemper

Questions Regents

I first became concerned with the situation when I asked myself the question, who do the Regents represent? This question should have germinated in the minds of the Regents as they searched their intellect for the answer as a guide for their actions. Since they have reached this answer themselves, I must only guess by the results of these actions as to their own personal decision.

I have concluded that they

must represent the ignorant majority (which is unfortunately no longer silent) of Nebraska voters who, in a backlash of emotion, created by a much exaggerated May "disturbance" cry for the justice of repression to swoop down from the sky and censure the University, along with the regents scapegoat, Assistant Professor Rozman.

This feeling has also spawned the taxpayer's hero, who, with his handful of merry men plan to butcher the University's budget, "trim the fat", and reduce its already faltering academic prestige to that of a first rate Nebraska vocational trade school.

This action by the voters and the governor seems very questionable in its intent to better the University. I wonder why the Regents then can't stick their necks out and act in the best interest of academic quality at the University. What then is the best interest of the University, or further, what is the University itself if it is not the aggregation of students and faculty which are the structure and the unity of the institution.

Is the University the 20,000 students who are its base, the 500 faculty members, who are the inspiration and stimulus of creative thinking or is it a

political football tossed about by the often removed, poorly enlightened voters who seem to be the controlling force behind the Regents actions? It's quite evident (by the apparent disregarding of the Holtzclaw committee's conclusions) that the Regents don't represent the faculty, who they have also, perhaps intentionally slighted through this show of power. I am also convinced by the growing frustration and dissent among students that they surely do not attempt to represent the students.

This misrepresentation by the Regents, in this political power play, the firing of Assistant Professor Rozman, of one individual, is only a small portion of the injustice born of their decision. The intent to repress the stimulus for creative thinking, the spark which ignites students to the true potential of knowledge, the drive needed to stand alone in virgin research, in new ideals, is being smothered and removed as a non-academic quality.

What irony at a time which is so crucial to the development of a leader, that instead another sheep is blindfolded at the University of Nebraska.

Alan N. Spencer