



William F. Buckley, Jr.

Lam Son 719

The news is that the military operation against Laos, which was originally called Dewey Canyon II, is now called Lam Son 719, and the symbolic meaning of that change in terminology is crucially important. It suggests what should all along have been suggested, namely that the operation is a South Vietnamese operation not an American operation. That it would not be feasible except for the logistical and air support of the United States means simply that we have a veto power over extensive South Vietnamese military activity, even as the Soviet Union has a veto power over extensive North Vietnamese military activity. So what?

But now consider, in the light of this move towards a convincing Vietnamization, how strange, indeed how inexplicable, some of the reactions that have come in. George Pompidou, for instance, is quoted as saying "I deplore the events in Laos and I condemn them, and with me, so does France." By Mr. Pompidou's reasoning, French forces struggling to liberate the homeland in 1944 and 1945 should have stopped at the borders of Belgium and Germany, rather than press forward to victory. It is altogether unclear why it was correct for France to fight her enemy, Nazi Germany, in Africa, Italy, the Lowlands, and indeed into Germany itself, but wrong for South Vietnamese to move into Laos

to defend itself against the use of that nation as a corridor for hostile enemy troops.

Mr. Pompidou went on to say, "there can be no military solution. The solution can only be political, thus negotiated." When politicians speak that way, one has the feeling that their descent into cant suggests that not even they take seriously what they say.

A stone's throw from the Presidential Palace in Paris, negotiators are beginning the third years effort to find a political solution to the chaos in Indo-China. Suppose the North Vietnamese were to take another year? Or another two years? Or another ten years? What are South Vietnamese supposed to do in the meantime? Visit Gay Paree?

Political solutions, more often than not, are reconciliations based on military realities. The military reality in Indo-China is that the political solutions to which the North Vietnamese agreed in 1962 respecting Laos have been utterly ignored. The reason why has not been so much the military weakness of Laos and South Vietnam, as the restrictions placed upon Laos and South Vietnam by the United States government. It is as though we had said in 1944 that we would help the exile government of General Charles DeGaulle to liberate France, but that Nazi forces surrounding France must not be touched.

The intransigence of the

negotiators in Paris is a direct result of their belief that the military situation in Indo-China argues a strategic usefulness of obduracy. The South Vietnamese desire a political solution too. They are less adamant in such matters than leaders of all Western struggles. The men Mr. Pompidou grew up admiring, in whose war he fought gallantly, were demanding things like unconditional surrender. The South Vietnamese, with considerable restraint, have not said that they aim once and for all to remove from Hanoi the militant imperialists who have soaked Indo-China in blood during the past ten years. They merely ask that the United States grant them, and that the community of nations applaud their use of, the fundamental military mobility consistent with international law to deprive the enemy of the use of a neighboring state for the purpose of mounting continued aggression against the independence of South Vietnam.

The absence of any reaction that can be compared to that against the Cambodian operation is heartening, and precisely it is explained by our understanding that South Vietnam should not be expected to inherit our political incumbrances, which because we are a great power, attach to any operation the apocalyptic overhead of potential great power collision. —So that operation Lam Son 719 it is, and must hereinafter

be thought of as being.

The news should come from Saigon, not Washington; to the extent possible, Saigon should begin to use mercenaries — Sons of the Flying Tigers — in order to diminish the formal participation of United States

armed forces. And those who desire the long sought for political solution should cheer the news that, finally, military action is proceeding of the kind that precipitates political solutions. This is going to be a long one, but the moves are exactly in the right direction.

Statement

We, the undersigned, note the Regents' statement that they would not condone "action which threatens to disrupt the educational activities of the University" (Defined as refusing to leave the M & N building on the morning of May 5, 1970) from anyone: Tenured or untenured faculty or students. We also note that the Regents have chosen to single out only one man for discipline in the matter, and to ignore many others in the same situation. We feel it our duty (in agreement and solidarity with the letter of faculty members Hilliard, et al.) to inform the University community that we, too, refused to leave the M & N building on the morning of May 5, 1970.

Steve McElroy
William J. Kohlhaase
Timothy A. Dindelar
Michael Barret
Jacki Barret
Michael A. Richardson
Paulette M. Sydow
Steven Strasser
Michael Nelson
Ray G. Stangel

Howard L. Hansen
Ed Anson
John R. Cunningham
Len Pavelka
Douglas C. Hintz
Martin F. McMahon III
William Cockwood
Dave Minneman
Jerry Soucie
Keith Bartels
Carl Circo

... dear editor

Defends Love Story

Dear editor,
I write, not as a counter-attack, but for the benefit of those who may feel as I do about *Love Story*. What Kelley Baker has to say in criticizing both the movie and its author may or may not be true—depending upon the point of view. (I stand in defense of *Love Story*, as a work expressing a beauty so often repressed in day-to-day living. That is the freedom to be one's self. I long for the freedom to live and grow and learn by experience without the fear of the negative critic eye which so ruthlessly suppresses.)

I have only found playing in the snow as stimulating and refreshing—a richly rewarding experience.

If *Love Story* signifies love and brotherhood, the key to acceptance of fellow man, that is the ideal I strive for.

And if appreciating *Love Story* classifies me as a "physical and mental thirteen-year-old," then I'll have to stand and admit to being that. For the truth is, I find that this book/movie contains beauty of people I would like to see preserved.

LB190

Rita Mines

Dear editor,
LB 190 is a bill to provide a

uniform policy for the acquisition of private property for publicly financed projects. The intent of the bill is to allow for equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of these projects; consequently it would require that the University act in a responsible manner toward the surrounding community as the campus expands eastward.

Generally, the bill allows payments for moving expenses, as well as payments for losses of property as a result of moving. The bill requires that replacement costs, rather than market value, be paid to any person who is displaced from his dwelling owned and occupied by the individual; the bill also would require that the agency which is purchasing the property grant financial assistance to those displaced persons who had been renting or leasing a dwelling, in order that those persons may find a safe and decent place to move or in order to allow them to make a down payment on the purchase of a dwelling.

Because of University and city purchases in the area, most of what used to be the Malone neighborhood is gone. That neighborhood was predominantly composed of black people. Isn't it a strange coincidence that both the University and the city could

so readily justify to themselves the destruction of this area. Remember that the University will continue to purchase property in the surrounding regions as it is financially able to do so. I suggest that as students we have an obligation to see to it that this University acts in a manner which insures citizens just and equitable treatment. Write to your representative in the State Legislature to express your concern for LB 190. A copy of the bill is available for you to read in the ASUN office.

Linda Schaefer

'Meaningless trivia'

Dear editor,
In response to the letter by Gary Carter in the February 12 issue of the *Daily Nebraskan* I would like to say that the important issues facing the student of today are of maximum importance (ie. the firing of Rozman and Hubbard).

If Carter considers these matters to be "meaningless trivia" then he'd might as well return to ag college and get the education he deserves!

And above all—a crossword puzzle—how childish can you get?

Paul Baker

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN



MICK MORIARTY
editor

CONNIE WINKLER
managing editor

JOHN DVORAK
news editor

PAT DINATALE
advertising manager

JAMES HORNER
chairman, publications committee

Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590. Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Neb.

Subscription rates are \$5 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday through Friday during the school year except during vacation and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The *Daily Nebraskan* is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government. Address: The *Daily Nebraskan*, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.