

Ombudsman--- today or tomorrow

Student government has been tossing around the idea of an ombudsman for a couple of years. Tomorrow ASUN will be voting whether to establish the ombudsman position.

Although there has been much discussion recently with the state legislature enacting law to create the ombudsman position, the concept is by no means a recent one. A similar function has been performed in civil governments for over a hundred years.

Quoting from a manuscript: "Of Scandinavian origin, the position of ombudsman was first established as a parliamentary office in Sweden's constitution of 1809. Appointed by the legislative body and responsible to it, the ombudsman's main duty was to defend and protect citizens who felt deprived of basic rights by the government."

The ombudsman concept has been adapted to academic communities in a somewhat modified version. On college campuses, it is usually the role of the ombudsman to help students solve problems which are created by the university institution.

An American Council on Higher Education describes the student ombudsman as a person who relieves individual student frustrations, improves defects in administration, corrects small injustices. "In carrying out his duties, the campus ombudsman follows the civil government concept of ombudsman, which is essentially intended to make an agreeable system of government function as designed rather than to restructure or replace it."

A Michigan State survey has conducted numerous research projects in showing where the most critical need for the ombudsman is. Their data revealed that problems of instruction were at the top of the list. Second on the list, fees and tuition problems. Third, registration and admission. Fourth, housing. Surprisingly, the greatest need was not shown by freshmen, but by seniors.

Moreover, those are some of the details about the concept. They're not too controversial. But there may be some controversy at ASUN today when senators are asked to pass the ombudsman bill. It seems that a few senators are worried about the semantics of the ombudsman proposal which means that the proposal might be referred to a committee for study and then perhaps might appear next fall or next spring only to meet a similar fate. In fact, that's exactly what happened last October.

If we are to have an ombudsman next year, the senate is going to have to adopt the ombudsman bill as it now reads, then move quickly to appoint a responsible student to that position. If not, students will wait another year.

Mick Moriarty



Pseudo-intellec[t]s dig Commie-pinko propaganda

Y. A. F. editorial response

The May 7th issue of the *Daily Nebraskan* produced a highly controversial and questionable article titled "War is not the answer". The article contained so many misconceptions and is of such poor logic and content that its printing was an insult to the intelligence of any thinking student. The following is a brief re-evaluation to bring out some of the more obvious fallacies in the article.

To begin with, the Y.A.F. states no conflict with present policies on the war and has no reason for a public hearing. The open hearings were designed by those who oppose present policy and was presented only for the purpose of expressing their views. And as far as convictions are concerned the author of that ridiculous article has not the conviction nor dedication of purpose to even give his signature.

One wonders at the validity of many of the statements recorded in the article. For instance, the poll of 70 per cent of the Beatrice high school students. It was nice to know but who questioned the guidelines on which this poll was conducted?

A further example of the author's expertise at deceptive and outrageous statements is the observation that 70 per cent of the faculty and students would support the DeCamp resolution. To make this assertion while admitting that no poll was taken nor even a majority of people informed of the resolution is the ultimate in simplistic propaganda. This is beside the fact that it would be daydreaming to believe that 70 per cent of the faculty and students would support such a resolution.

The unknown author again expresses his abundant ignorance by stating that most of the people present were both patriots and conservatives. They would have to be hypocrites to be there and call themselves either. If they considered themselves conservative and believed in the furtherment of freedom, then they would be in support of America's efforts to help the South Vietnamese repel the North Vietnamese aggression and preserve their right to remain free from any foreign domination. The fact that the more responsible state senators of Nebraska, who represent the real conservatives, voted down the resolution indicates that the roots of true conservatism still persist in the minds of the majority of Nebraska's citizens.

The author furthers his ridiculous stand by saying, for some unknown and doubtlessly illogical reason if any exist at all, that Vietnam is incompatible and destructive to the ideals of conserving freedom and our homeland. The logic with which the author used to arrive at such a conclusion would no doubt prove humorously interesting.

The statement challenging the right of Mr. Ngo Thanh Tung, secretary to the Ambassador of South Vietnam, to speak at our campus was the ultimate in contradictions. If these

"conservatives" are interested at all in preserving freedom of speech and freedom to examine all points of view, then they should have the courtesy to accept Mr. Tung as an individual whose twenty years of experience in the armed services, fighting both the French and later the Communists, and his experience in the present government would provide an invaluable source of information on the war. Indeed, Mr. Tung's first-hand experience provided much more reliable and valid arguments than some of the all-knowing pseudo-intellec[t]s who base their arguments on unconfirmed facts and Communist propaganda. The students of this campus have been amply exposed to the liberal point of view and to the conservative and present policy of our government, but rarely to the Vietnamese view. The idea that the author had the audacity to question perhaps the most valid view of all, only adds to the compiling list of irresponsible accusations that the unknown author consistently puts forth.

The most prominent discrepancy occurred in the eighth paragraph. The author drew an inaccurate conclusion from Mr. Tung's speech and distorted it to mean that the South Vietnamese were asking for more time and money to support a dictatorship. The facts were that Mr. Tung stated that he desired more money, in the form of loans, and more time in the sense that the Communist terrorists and infiltrators can not be defeated overnight, and much tenacity and endurance are required to free the country completely of all aggressors, and not in the sense that U.S. troops remain longer, indeed Mr. Tung stated that if a faster withdrawal were practical, from both a military and economic standpoint, he would encourage it. Where the author received the idea that South Vietnam was a dictatorship is unknown, and one might question the source of his information and ask him to review past election results.

A few years back when the brutality of the Nazi war machine was still on the minds of the American people, displaying of enemy flags and demonstrations to support their cause would have been regarded as seditious.

Today compliance with such acts is not seditious. We have many examples to prove it. As Vietnamization continues the only popular cause for outright disruption of government dies.

The writer of this article owes the University community, the state of Nebraska, Mr. Tung and his government an apology for his written slander of the truth.

Briggs Bennett
University Chapter (YAF)
Chairman

editorial COMMENT

The politics of revulsion



Mankiewicz
and Braden

WASHINGTON—Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.) has a head made for television, leonine, white-haired, venerable. Half-way across the room sat another handsome man, 40-odd years younger. Leader of a group of veterans of Vietnam, he had just delivered a beautifully written indictment of the morality of his country in this war. Symington was gruff:

"Would you move your microphone, please?"
"Which way, sir?"
"Any way. Get it off to one side so we can hear you. Now, I believe you hold the Silver Star?"
"Yes, sir."
"And the Purple Heart?"
"Yes, sir."
"With how many clusters?"
"Two, sir."
"That means you were wounded in combat three times?"
"Yes, sir."

Symington leaned back in his chair and turned to Sen. Fulbright (D-Ark.). "I have no further questions."

It was high drama in the Senate, and it made high drama on television, and it is the point which Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger miss by a wide margin when they do their planning for ending this war.

The point is that the United States people are becoming persuaded—perhaps are already persuaded along with John Kerry, the veteran whom Symington questioned—that what they are doing in Vietnam is rotten and immoral and must be made an end-of-now.

That is why Democrats have a wide political advantage when they demand a date for the end of the business, a time to leave and to mourn.

The President is stuck with an older style. He is banking on his knowledge, gained from long experience with American politics as it has always been. It tells him that if,

by the middle of next year, he can get American troops down to 100,000 men, and the casualties will be few, and the government in Saigon can go on fighting a small war, everybody in this country will forget about it.

But evidence is mounting that the old style politics won't work any more. Young John Kerry, with his Silver Star, his faintly Saltonstall accent and his memorable statement of last week is one piece of evidence, and five potential Democratic presidential candidates calling for a fixed date to get out is another.

Is there any doubt that theirs is the popular side? The Nixon people are logical. "Look at Korea," says a White House aide; "there's still a division there and we're still paying the bills for the South Korean government and nobody cares."

But the difference is that there is no war in Korea and no insurgency in South Korea, while in Vietnam there is both, and the war will go on and on and the politics of revulsion will grow.

It is very simple politics. No questions asked. Does "get out" mean no more gasoline for the South Vietnamese army? No more ammunition? No more helicopters? Does it mean that the Saigon government won't be paid?

Pressed on these points, Democratic candidates answer that these questions can be faced after we set a date for withdrawal. But to be definite is becoming dangerous.

Gently, Ed Muskie (D-Me.) reminded a lady in his audience that we have a responsibility to assist in the reconstruction of Vietnam, and that we would have to exercise that responsibility through whatever government is in power, even if it were the present government.

"If that's the way you think," she snapped, "you won't get my vote."

It was a fair example of the politics of revulsion, which has the virtue of being a threshold for action. But Democrats, who are its beneficiaries, owe honesty an explanation of what we do after we "get out—now."

Battle over draft focuses on Senate floor

WASHINGTON, D.C. (CPS)—The battle over the military draft, fought earlier this month in the House of Representatives and this past week on the streets of the capital, now moves to the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has sent their own version of a two-year extension of the Selective Service Manpower Act of 1967 to the Senate, where it faces a stiff floor fight and possible filibuster from draft foes.

Student deferments, however, appear doomed, as the Senate Committee agreed with the House and the President's recommendations in ending 2-S deferments. The Senate committee wants them to end after expiration of the current draft law, this July 1.

The House bill revokes the deferments of anyone who has been in college since April 23,

1970—this year's freshmen and beyond.

House liberals failed by only two votes to limit extension of the draft to one year, and it is likely that a compromise coming out of the Senate debate will be a one-year extension of the military draft. Despite the growing opposition in Congress to the draft, especially since the emergence of the controversial war crimes hearings and trials as a key Capitol Hill issue, the efforts at abolishing the Selective Service System are given slim hopes.

The Senate committee request is much closer to the bill requested by the Nixon Administration, while asking for a 100,000 man cutback in the armed forces total by June 30, 1972.

Major sections of the proposed bill, compared to that already passed by the House, include:

Student Deferments: Both the committee's request and the House bill would abolish student deferments, with the Senate version effective July 1, 1971 for all new students, and the House bill retroactive to April 23, 1970.

Extension of the Law: Both committee's request and the House bill extend the military draft for another two years.

Conscientious Objectors: While retaining current standards for a claim of conscientious objector status, the Armed Service Committee proposal would keep the period for alternative service for COs at two years, and it would allow the President to call up for another year of alternative service any CO at any time during a four-year period after his CO assignment, in case of "national emergency."

Military Force Level: The

Senate committee calls for a reduction by June 30, 1972 of the military force level to 2.4 million persons, while the House bill freezes U.S. men in uniform at 2.6 million.

Pay Increases: Largely in an effort to increase enlistments, the House urged a whopping increase of \$2.7 billion, while the Senate voted pay increases of just over \$1 billion.

Local Boards: Neither the House nor the Senate committee called for any revision in the arbitrary procedures of the more than 4,000 semi-autonomous local boards, even though the administration would like to centralize draft information, and even consolidate and re-locate some boards; the Senate committee would require the express consent of the state governor before local boards could be consolidated or re-constituted.

DAILY NEBRASKAN

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, Marsha Bangert, Dave Brink, Carol Goetschius, Steve Strasser, Bart Becker, Mike Wilkins, Charlie Harpster, Marsha Kaim, Steve Kadel, Dennis Snyder, Ann Pedersen, Roxanne Rogers, Vicki Pulos, Steve Arranette
Sports editor: Jim Johnston, Sports writer: Warren Obr
Photographers: Gail Folda, Bill Ganzel
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 Lanaworth, Bill Smitherman, Laura Willers, Night editor: Leo Schleicher, Night editorial assistant: Sara Frask.

BUSINESS STAFF
Coordinator: Sandra Carter, Salesmen: Steve Yates, Barry Pilger, Jane Kidwell, Ken Sevensker, Tom Hafel, Pat di Natale, Business assistants: Janice Stapelman, Charlotte Owens.

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, College Press Service.

Address: The Daily Nebraskan, 34 Nebraska Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.