



memorandum by a prominent conservative circulating among his peers. It tells succinctly and unsentimentally the thoughts and dissatisfactions of an influential group of Americans. Without associating myself fully with its analysis or conclusions, I pass it along as politically eyecatching:

The split that has emerged among American conservatives was bound to do so under the zigzag Republican administration. The split first shows itself over tactics, but upon examination spills over

* * *

into strategy as well. AMERICAN conservatives in general are oriented more towards politics than towards philosophy. The immediate issues are political. It is easier to raise money, to justify your existance, to do something, if you are politically oriented. We could all join in deploring Lyndon and in urging the GOP to take a conservative stance...

But something happened on the way to 1971. America changed. Haven't you noticed? The conservative movement, however, didn't change with it. We are still wearing the politics of the early sixties like a comfortable old shoe. Meanwhile, they've stolen the rest of our wardrobe. At this point I could easily digress into several chapters on Our National Plight. But I'll spare you and simply note in passing the crime scourage, the breakdown of morals, the collapse of the churches, the attack on the military and on patriotism, our palsied response to subversion (yes, subversion) in our schools, the hydra-headed menace of the counter-culture, our fiscal problems, the media; and brooding over the whole mess, our seeming powerlessness to confront these problems much less to lick them, is - the man in the White House.

Here we come to a ticklish problem. Some sophisticated ambivalence seems called for, as befits the tragic human condition. On the one hand, we should continue to try to salvage what we can from the old politics. Every roadblock

William F. Buckley, Jr.

A look at the GOP

helps, and this is what can make politics an honorable profession. But I think we deceive ourselves if we pretend that roadblocks can hold back a tidal wave. So I believe in playing the Washington game, the lobbying game - but never pretending that this will be enough.

I THINK our problems are first spiritual, second cultural, and only third political. But the indirect help that politics can give can be important and even decisive, if we are willing to venture out of the shallow water.

Did you see the article on the Institute for Policy Studies in the current Esquire by Garry Wills? The IPS grew out of that left wing of the Democratic Party in the early sixties. A group of bold, inventive wreckers set about thinking up "unthinkable" programs; and suddenly their programs became gospel among the Libs, and often enough the criteria

of national policy. These guys had enough guts and imagination to be "irrelevant" - and so were able to carve up the face of America. While we plod along . . . I get the feeling that some conservatives would sooner admit to incest than to political irrelevance.

Suppose, just suppose, that we dared to look beyond the next White House press conference; that we were willing to risk leaving the womb of respectability; that we entertained venturesome ideas with minds at least half open. Would we go into shock? Would we be willing to explore a few ideas like these?

WELFARE Let's quit horsing around. The permanent denizens of the welfare rolls, as distinct from the handicapped and the helpless and the temporarily unfortunate, are moral criminals and should be treated as legal criminals too. If parents of a child born out of

wedlock are unable or unwilling to care for the child, the parents should be jailed and the child should be put in an institution. For the second bastard, the parents should be sterilized. (Here I note parenthetically the distinction between punitive sterilization and eugenic sterilization. The latter is forbidden by the natural law, by the Catholic Church, and I trust by other churches. Not so the former though I have no doubt the bleeding hearts would be aghast at the idea.)

Drastic, yes. But does anyone doubt that our present system calls for a drastic remedy? We should never forget that the cost of welfare is only secondarily financial. It breeds a growing underclass that saps the foundations of education, morals and patriotism, that assures an ever-growing criminal cadre. Welfare attacks America.

22.1

dear editor. . . . dear editor. . . dear edi tor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor ... dear editor. . . dear editor. . . dear editor. . . dear editor. . . . dear editor. . . dear editor. . . dear editor. . . dear editor. . . dear edito r. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .dear editor. . .

Voegler's opinions

Dear editor:

This is the first of three letters I am intending to send to the Nebraskan during the course of the campaign. This one shall deal with PACE. The second with NSA and the "People's Peace Treaty", and the last with the role of ASUN. I am doing this because I feel that as a candidate for President of ASUN the student body is entitled to know where 1 stand. I feel this should be printed in the student's newspaper which is accessible to everyone.

Students will have a choice on April 7, between two forms of PACE. Unfortunately,

legitimacy that you would gain. No more could people say that the majority of students are against PACE in any form. Those for and those against PACE have an equal opportunity to rally supporters. It might even get people out to vote, which everyone in ASUN would benefit from.

At their March meeting, the Regents amended the ASUN plan to include some form of mail refund, in addition to something like a refund window. Any form of refund process is an administrative hassle, and expensive. Now we have two refunds with ASUN's plan. A mail refund means that checks would have to be used for payment. They would have to be channelled thru the capitol and the state, at the cost of \$.35-\$.50 a check. An accurate mailing list would have to be kept up and there would be extra forms, envelopes, and postage to handle. Several extra employees would have to be hired by the Bursar's Office for several weeks to process the refunds. All of this expense would come out of the budget of theAdministration, not out of PACE funds raised. With tight budgetary problems this certainly would be a strain. Perhaps ASUN should agree to pay for the expense of administering the program out of its budget, or at least share the cost. The Regents Plan is not perfect either, but from the discussions I've had recently with several administrators, I think it would be the best plan. It would be the most convenient for the individual student, and easiest for the Bursar to handle. I urge all students to vote for this alternative. PACE is admirable in its basic intent. If this idealism can be matched with pragmatism, then the University can become an

outstanding example to many other schools who might want to consider a program like this. **Doug Voegler**

Rockets no joke

Dear editor:

The Rocket Grease and Freedom Party wishes to counter the claim that they are running their campaign as a joke. We are a joke as much as we consider ASUN a joke. While our campaign methods and platform statements may appear absurd, we urge students to examine the context that they appear in. ASUN exists on the absurd notion that students have power. ASUN is conducting elections in which only a few students will vote, to illustrate student power. This is absurd. The Electoral Commission is supervising the campaign under a number of absurd rules. Other candidates are running under the absurd premise that they will give students a voice in running the University. This year has aptly demonstrated that the Regents and the Administration allow ASUN to exist as a farce into which students can funnel their frustrations, in vain, Even that great illustrator of what students can get working through the system was imperiously threatened by Regent's veto. Thus-ASUN as it exists is Campaigning absurd. legitimately is absurd. The Rocket Grease and Freedom Party is absurd, but validly so because it aims to demonstrate the above through its absurdity. We make one serious statement; if we are elected, we will do our best to destroy ASUN as it exists now. What will replace ASUN? That's up to the students. Perhaps the whole idea of student government is absurd. We'll see what the students want.

MICK MORIARTY, editor **CONNIE WINKLER**, managing editor JOHN DVORAK, news editor GENE HILLMAN, advertising manager JAMES HORNER, chairman, publications committee

EDITORIAL STAFF

Staff writers: Gary Seacrest, Bill Smitherman, Jim Pedersen, Steve Strasser, Dave Brink, Marsha Bangert, Carol Goetschius, Charile Harpster, Bart Becker, Mike Wilkins, Dennis Snyder, Marsha Kahm, Roxanne Rogers, Vicki Pulos, Ann Pedersen. Sports editor: Jim Johnston. Sports writers: Warren Obr, Steve Kadel, Photographers: Mike Hayman, Gail Folda. Entertainment editor: Larry Kubert. Literary editor: Alan Boye. East campus editor: Marlene Timmerman. Artists: Linda Lake, Greg Scott. Design editor: Jim Gray. Copy editors: Tom Lansworth, Don Russell, Laura Willers. Night editor: Leo Schleicher. Night news assistant: Rodney Wortman Wortman.

BUSINESS STAFF

Coordinator: Sandra Carter. Salesmen: Steve Yates, Jane Kidwell, Greg Scott, Barry Pilger, Tom Hafel, Cindy Feld, Ken Sevenker. Business assistants: Janice Stapleman, Charlotte Owens.

Telephones: editor: 472-2588, news: 2589, advertising: 2590, Second class postage rates paid at Lincoln, Nebr. 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 Intercollegiste Press, National Educational Avertising Service, College Press Service. College Press 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.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1971

students will not get the ultimate choice of whether they want PACE or not. I see no logical or moral reasons why this decision should be denied them. No doubt ASUN is afraid of the possibility that the plan could be voted down. If this happened, then it would put them in an embarrassing position, since they have spent several hundred dollars advertising and consistently have said that student support for the program was great. Petitions and endorsements from organizations may indicate student support, but they do not substitute for the ballot box.

I personally feel that PACE would not be voted down. A simple way to run the election would be thusly: give the students three choices; the ASUN plan (A), the Regents Special Committee (of which I was a member) plan (B), and no plan (C). If A plus B is greater than C, then the one, A or B, with the most votes is passed. If C is greater than A and B, then the matter is simply and quickly ended. Certainly you run the risk that your plan could be defeated. I think the risk is worth the

THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

Rocket and Co.

PAGE 5