

## EDITORIAL COMMENT

### War and peace

Various colleges across the nation this fall have devoted half-time shows at football games to anti-war themes. The anti-war shows, which have been popular with the students, are apropos since the country is longing for the end of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war.

But Nebraska fans did not get to see a half-time show this fall devoted to peace. Instead, last Saturday the Cornhusker Marching Band put on a patriotic show honoring U.S. military troops.

There was no peace sign flashed by the card section Saturday. Instead, the crowd at Memorial Stadium (named in honor of soldiers killed in action) saw flashes of a tank, a bomber and a naval destroyer.

Saturday's football crowd did not get to hear what the Vietnam war had done to the morale of the nation or the U.S. military. Instead the grand finale of the show saw the band play "This Is My Country" while in a formation spelling U.S.A.

However, an anti-war theme probably wouldn't go very well with Band Director Jack Snider, who is in charge of the half-time shows. For example, last year Snider was quite upset after the card section flashed the peace sign during a game.

There is nothing wrong with being patriotic, but it seems more appropriate to honor peace instead of tanks, bombers and destroyers. After all, any show that honors peace is very patriotic.

### Amendments: for and against

Constitutional amendments are proposed all the time. But there are two amendments now being proposed by Congressmen that deserve special attention.

One of the proposed amendments would limit a President to a single six-year term. The rationale behind the amendment is to relieve the President of many political pressures that arise when seeking re-election and thus free the chief executive to devote more time to running the government.

However, many of the opponents of the amendment argue that political pressure make the President more cognizant of the wishes of the people.

One unfortunate aspect of the proposed amendment is the increased length of the President's term. A six year term is too long since it is very hard to impeach a President. The present four year term gives the President a chance to accomplish something while still giving the voters a periodic chance to decide if they want the incumbent or a new person in office.

The other proposed constitutional amendment would lower the age requirement for serving in Congress by three years. Currently the age requirement is 30 for a senator and 25 for a representative.

Lowering the limits to 27 and 22 are only slightly more realistic than the present requirements. If a citizen is qualified to vote at 18, he or she should be allowed to hold any office. But the amendment will probably have a better chance of passing by only lowering the requirements by three years.

The amendment lowering the age requirements for Congress deserves speedy passage. However, changing the President's tenure does not seem to be in the national interest.

Gary Seacrest

## THE DAILY NEBRASKAN

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

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.

This is the Continuing Story of:

# REVOLTING

...a look at TODAY'S YOUTH



### Foreign aid: the changes that are coming

by Elizabeth Peer

WASHINGTON—For a generation, Americans glumly took it for granted that huge chunks of the national treasure should be handed over to foreign countries. But now, after years of ever-less-cheerful giving, the largess seems to be ending—and so is the unquestioned assumption that the U.S. is forever destined to parcel out foreign aid.

Of course, foreign aid, as it has been known in the past, will not disappear. The U.S. will be sending guns and butter to Vietnam and elsewhere for years to come. And American helicopters will be landing with supplies in disaster areas like East Pakistan whenever the need arises.

But the foreign-aid programs of the future will, nevertheless, be profoundly different. The recent rejection of the President's foreign-aid bill by the Senate paved the way not only for cutbacks but, even more, for change.

In the first place, that oddest of couples—military and economic aid—will no longer be inseparable. The era of mutual back-scratching by partisans of development programs and militant anti-Communists is probably already ended.

Liberals will no longer have to support arms allotments to governments they don't like in order to get economic aid for governments they do like. And conservatives will not have to support "humanitarian" projects in exchange for military aid to anti-Communist regimes.

Strangely enough, nearly everyone wants this separation, including the Pentagon. President Nixon came out of it as long ago as September 1970 when he proposed that three different organizations be set up to handle each component of the foreign-aid program: one for military assistance, one for economic development and one for humanitarian aid.

From the other side of the political spectrum, Sen. William Fulbright of Arkansas has been trying for years to detach military aid from the various foreign-aid bills. To the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the merger of the two has distorted the entire concept of foreign aid.

Yet the system, like so much in the Federal government, went on and on. And Congress, wishing to avoid further dove-hawk imbroglios, simply took the easiest course and let it continue.

A second major change, more controversial than the first, is also a probability. It would entail devoting a larger share of U. S. funds to multilateral aid centers—such as the International Development Association of the World Bank—and somewhat less to bilateral projects such as, for example, the direct, country-to-country aid given to Cambodia.

Indeed, some officials feel that the public elation shown by many delegates from "underdeveloped" countries at the defeat of the American effort to keep Taiwan in the United Nations was partially a result of

their resentment at the Big Daddy quality of bilateral aid.

On the other hand, aid that comes through a multilateral organization leaves the recipients less humiliatingly beholden and, therefore, less prone to accept "suggestions" as to how their economies should be run.

Changing foreign aid will not be easy. Born of Lend-Lease and nurtured in the wreckage of World War II, the program became frankly anti-Communist at the height of the cold war.

Alliances with countries throughout the world were built around U. S. foreign aid and frequently the economic grants were the sweetening believed necessary to make the military pact more palatable. But late in the 1950, the focus of foreign economic aid had shifted from Europe to the less developed countries and these countries, less deterred by the menace of Communism, tended to choose their own paths in international affairs.

During the next decade, it became ever more clear that foreign aid somehow didn't accomplish what it was used to. In fact, many experts began to believe that it was actually counterproductive.

"We stand in the year 1971 at the end of one decade of illusion, with no good reason to believe that we are not now embarked upon another," Idaho's Sen. Frank Church told his colleagues during the foreign-aid bill debate.

That is not to say foreign-aid programs have been universal failures. Even in recent years, there have been notable triumphs. The economies of Korea and Taiwan have been vastly improved as a result of U. S. aid. Brazil has made great strides and India has at last become agriculturally self-sufficient, owing in large part to help from America.

There have also been domestic beneficiaries. The aid program has financed 25 per cent of all U.S. fertilizer exports, 16.4 per cent of all U. S. exports of iron and steel mill products and 15.7 per cent of all U.S. exports of railroad equipment. The program, further, gives U.S. shipping companies 25 per cent of their total revenue from outbound cargo.

Self-interest, therefore, dictates that some form of foreign aid be continued, and Congress will have considerable material to consider when it again takes up the question. But it seems certain that what finally emerges will not have much resemblance to the \$3.5 billion package (58 per cent of which was for military assistance) which the President originally submitted.

Still, the need remains. "You just cannot have a very large part of the world's people violent, unhappy, prey to social unrest and demanding that the food be shared," says former AID administrator William Gaud. "We are either going to have to pay our fair share in the world or it isn't going to be a world worth living in. There really is no alternative to a foreign-aid program."