

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Big Red priorities

Theoretically Nebraska football games are played for the benefit of the students. However, it appears that the athletic department hasn't found this out.

Less than 60 per cent of the students who entered the Orange Bowl ticket lottery will receive tickets. More than 3,600 students registered for the lottery and 2,000 will receive tickets.

This unfortunate ticket situation points out the urgent need for a new ticket policy to accommodate students.

According to Nebraska ticket manager Jim Pittenger the decision to reserve only 2,000 tickets for students resulted from an agreement with the student senate five or six years ago that the athletic department reserve 20 per cent of its tickets for bowl games for students. Pittenger said Nebraska received 12,500 tickets for the bowl and reserved 2,000 for students in accordance with the student senate's request.

Apparently Pittenger's arithmetic isn't very good. Normally 20 per cent of 12,500 turns out to be 2,500, not 2,000.

Where will the extra 500 tickets go? Although they should go to the students, they will probably go to the next priority group—members of organizations that make major contributions to the athletic department. This situation reaffirms the fact that the Nebraska football team is just as much a professional organization as the Chicago Bears.

Granted Pittenger has a hard job since he has received over 27,000 request for only 12,500 tickets. But it is unfortunate that less than 60 per cent of those students who request tickets will have a chance to see their fellow students perform on New Year's night.

Honor thy grandparents

"Golden years" is a term that is used to describe the retirement years of America's older citizens. However, the term "golden years" for a large percentage of the 20 million aged Americans is cruelly ironic since they are faced with poverty, rising health costs, a desperate shortage of suitable housing and isolation from their families.

Last week's White House Conference on Aging again focused attention on the plight of America's aging citizens. The sad thing is that many of the older generation's demands will probably not be met since the group is not militantly vocal.

President Nixon's track record over the last 34 months concerning the aged is nothing to brag about. However, the President last week made a package of promises to older Americans: some kind of minimum income plan, tax breaks, pension reforms, greater opportunities for involvement in service projects and modest expansion of several existing programs.

Glowing promises have often been heard by America's older generation and most of the time they have not been fulfilled. Nixon may have good incentive to live up to his promises since the aged make up 17 per cent of the electorate.

However, it appears that any plan of guaranteed annual income has a rocky road ahead of it. Nixon has personally led a campaign to build up anti-welfare emotions, with the result that his welfare reform bill (with a minimum income provision) faces a bleak future.

Society should have an added interest in the plight of the older generation since it appears that many of the problems of the aged can not be solved apart from those of society as a whole. The nation should probably be working toward national health insurance and a guaranteed annual income for everyone instead of piecemeal programs designed specifically for the aged.

Gary Seacrest



"And what indeed, have we here? Phase '72'"



tom braden

Foreign morality

WASHINGTON—Sen. Fred Harris (D-Okla.), who ran one of the shortest Presidential campaigns on record, espoused the thesis that the United States ought to have a foreign policy "based on morality."

Morality is always an easy target and no doubt the Harris slogan was simplistic. But grant the sophisticates their point, and then try to explain why the interests of the United States require that we should back a dictator in Pakistan against the only democracy in the East.

Not only that. Why should we back a dictator who is certain to lose? Is this realpolitik? Is it in the interests of the United States to be on the wrong side of the moral questions and to be on the wrong side of the power relationship, too?

The answers at the White House are not very convincing. First, it is argued, that when Madame Gandhi was here last month, she gave no indication that her timetable was so rapid.

United Nations action to halt this aggression is already discounted. But, it is pointed out, there is no good reason why the United States should reward aggression by continuing economic aid to India. If nothing is done to condemn aggression, so the Nixon Administration is saying, Russia may get false ideas.

As for Madame Gandhi not telling Mr. Nixon and Dr. Henry Kissinger what she had in mind, isn't there anybody at the White House to read the newspapers? Surely it seems possible that somebody might have figured out that 9 million refugees pouring into India constituted a political and economical threat to which India's

leaders might feel she had to respond.

In short, the White House explanation is as simplistic as the Fred Harris slogan. There must have been other reasons on President Nixon's mind, and it is not hard to guess what they were.

Kissinger has told the Indian ambassador here that there was a slight delay in the cutoff of arms to Pakistan because the Administration did not want to take action which interfered with Pakistan's help in arranging his trip to China. Since this is so, it seems at least permissible to guess that U.S. condemnation of India is related to the President's trip to China. If so, Mr. Nixon is paying a very high price for Chinese rapprochement.

He is breaking off ties with our oldest and only democratic friend in the East and making us an apologist for a policy of ruthless murder all for the sake of not antagonizing China.

How much is Mr. Nixon's China visit worth? What price must we pay to have good relations with Russia's potential enemy? Will it create a balance of power? Or will it encourage Russia to move against the Chinese in order to escape that balance?

Until now, the only opposition to Mr. Nixon's Chinese policy has come from the far right. Only George Wallace, among Democrats, has doubted the wisdom of the President's trip. But these and other questions seem certain to be asked by responsible men now that the United States has made a fool of itself in order to ensure that the President's trip will come off as scheduled.

Copyright 1971, Los Angeles Times