

Setting the PACE

UNL's Program for Active Commitment to Education (PACE) has added a new twist. In addition to the optional tuition surcharge each student may assume, a fund raising program is scheduled for Saturday.

A one-dollar fee admits students into UNL's Memorial Stadium to see a touch football game, witness a bicycle race and hear a rock concert. All proceeds will go for more low-income scholarships funded through the PACE program each semester.

PACE is easily the most successful student-initiated program from which the UNL community now benefits. A large attendance tomorrow at the stadium will make it even more successful.

Everyone is urged to support the PACE program every semester by giving an extra \$3.50 along with tuition payments. Tomorrow's event is another opportunity for everyone to again contribute. Let's all do it.

Kicked upstairs

UNL has proven to the state once again that it is a testing ground for talented young faculty members and administrators. The name "C. Peter Magrath" will become a memory to this campus on July 1, 1972. Magrath has accepted the top post at the State University of New York (SUNY) in Binghamton.

A large number of students and professionals in this institution will remember Magrath in a most favorable way. And most deservedly so. Magrath's career of four years at UNL has been one of constant promotion. He recently completed a temporary stint as UNL's number one administrator. In that position he was challenged greatly. His response to that burden was most credible and outstanding.

Magrath's honesty with students and those around him is his greatest asset. His willingness to aggressively coordinate all aspects of this University express his ability to contribute greatly to the SUNY system.

UNL's loss is SUNY's gain. In this case, SUNY is the lucky one. We will miss C. Peter Magrath.

Barry Pilger

editorial



Phil Schrier is a member of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and is president of the UNL Young Republicans.

by Phil Schrier

With an ever-decreasing number of American casualties in Vietnam, draft calls the lowest in almost a decade, and a volunteer army in the making, it would appear that the annual spring-time peace demonstrations would find little to protest about. However, the protesters are now—with the lack of American combat deaths—lamenting enemy casualties and setbacks. They justify their call for immediate and total American withdrawal with erroneous generalities about supposed indiscriminate bombing and by asserting that we should not get involved in a "civil war."

It would be difficult to convince South Vietnamese civilians—driven from their homes by Soviet tanks, bombed by Soviet rockets, their relatives killed by Soviet arms—that this is a "civil war". One might also have trouble explaining to the terrorized Laotian and Cambodian civilians that the thousands of North Vietnamese troops occupying their villages and killing their relatives with Soviet arms are merely taking part in a "civil war."

The most recent stir of demonstrations is over renewed U.S. bombing of North Vietnam. Official reasons for the bombing were to protect American troops and prevent the conquest of South Vietnam.

Probably the main objective the North Vietnamese have is discrediting President Nixon's Vietnamization policy, resulting in the election of a President willing to abandon Southeast Asia to North Vietnamese aggression. The North Vietnamese have confidence in their allies in the U.S. The confidence is so strong that they committed 12 of their 14 divisions to the invasion, leaving the homeland virtually unprotected, and did not bother with the tactical necessity of dispersing and camouflaging their supply concentrations.

Fortunately, we now have a President with enough integrity to risk his political career to take advantage of this gross tactical error. The error will most probably result in the defeat of the enemy with a much lower cost in human lives, thereby upholding the American position as a dependable ally.

It seems curious that the supposed "peace" demonstrators never mention in their protest the enemies' official policy of terror tactics, the haphazard rocketing of civilian population centers or the mass massacres of civilians. It may be revealing that those who appear to seek peace most

avidly in Vietnam do not censure terror tactics used by the enemy. They never suggest that the enemies' withdrawal of its invasion force or willingness to give up its plan of conquest might also be a way of ending the war.

One stumbling block we run into in Vietnam is people who say: "Let's talk to the North Vietnamese and try to settle this over a bargaining table, without needless killing." Previous experiences should have taught us that the only thing a Communist listens to is the barrel of a gun.

The results of our "talk" with the Communists have been broken treaties and agreements. The Communists have frequently broken the treaty they signed in 1954, making the Demilitarized Zone an international boundary. They have broken the agreement they signed with us in 1968 that stopped our bombing of the North. The only times they have even gotten down to serious talks in Paris is after we renewed our bombing. One sad fact remains: You can't use Western logic with an animal as ruthless as a Communist. You either talk to an animal in his language, or you are wasting your breath.

In the case of the Vietnam conflict, the U.S. must "wield a big stick" if it is to regain its reliability as a trusted ally and a strong blow is to be dealt to world communism.

guest
opinion