

Over and over

Daily Nebraskan editorial policy is the product of an editorial board consisting of Editor-in-chief Jim Gray, Managing Editor Tom Lansworth and News Editor Randy Beam. Individual editorials represent the views of the writer but not necessarily those of all editorial board members.

Old lawsuits never die—their appeals just keep droning away.

At least that's the way it is with the several suits attempting to block collection of student fees.

It seems to make no difference that all appeals thus far have gotten no results. Nor does it seem to make any difference that in a student election last spring the majority of students voting approved parcelling of the fees to current recipients. Nor does it seem to

make any difference that a number of undisputed and extremely beneficial programs would be unceremoniously scrapped if fees were not collected. The endless appeals and requests just roll on and on.

The most ridiculous part of the appeals situation, however is that the appeals go on *ad infinitum* even as strides are being made in the planning of a system which could totally revamp fee collection.

This summer, the offices of Chancellor James Zumberge and ASUN put a good deal of time and effort into drafting plans for future equitable distribution of fees.

These plans, while still at the drawing board stage, will attempt an equitable solution for distributing student fees with at least adequate student input. The new plan, it would seem, could answer most or all of the gripes voiced by the prosecutors in the case—if they care to give any input into the plans.

Currently, a task force is being set up to investigate aspects of the proposals in relation to student health. Input from all areas of the University—faculty, administration and especially students—will not only be accepted, but most likely solicited.

This, it would seem, would be the ideal situation for those who have complaints about the current fee structure to voice

criticisms and to suggest alternative patterns. Most likely in the near future other task forces will be set up to investigate other areas of fee concern. These too, will be admirable opportunities for input.

Even after the task forces' work is done, the proposal will offer a myriad of ways to let criticism be heard.

Final action on the proposal will be taken by the Board of Regents. Interested students can, with little trouble, lobby for their causes with individual regents and, in fact, the entire state. The regents could conceivably alter the plan after hearing complaints and before giving it approval.

Those involved in the suits cannot legitimately claim ignorance of the proceedings now. All developments in the chancellor's proposal have been presented at regent meetings and in articles within the local and state news media.

This exposure makes it not only the right, but the duty of those who are complaining about the present fee structure to attempt to do something about the proposal.

If the complainants refuse to offer input and influence the proposals now being arranged, one can assume those involved are interested only in destructive change, ignoring all possibility of constructive alteration.

Jim Gray



Clark blunders

john
vihstadt
different
drummer

As if Jane Fonda's profound utterances were not enough, the American people recently have been blessed with Ramsey Clark's illuminating reports on cruel and barbaric American atrocities in Vietnam.

As a member of the anti-American, pro-Communist International Commission for Inquiry into United States War Crimes in Indochina (its very name indicates its holy objectivity), the former attorney general denounced America's policies in flaming rhetoric. Sample: "The United States of America, the richest and most powerful nation in history, is unleashing the cruelest means of destruction it can conceive on an undeveloped agrarian Asian people."

Clark, lamenting the deaths of a few North Vietnamese civilians who fell victims to U.S. bombing, asserted that civilian extinction is a deliberate policy on the part of the White House. Playing disc jockey on Radio Hanoi, he implored the North Vietnamese to "forgive the Americans for their criminal acts."

Now, no one doubts his sincerity, but why didn't Clark speak against the war when in a legitimate position to do so—when he was with the Johnson Administration?

Moreover, why is Clark so strangely silent about the North's military conduct? His humanitarian impulses were not sparked when Communist regulars carefully mined Hwy. 1, slaughtering thousands of civilians fleeing southward from their "liberators" at Quang Tri.

And he had not a word to say when hundreds of South Vietnamese civilians recently were discovered to have been executed My Lai-style by Communist occupation forces. Some of these civilians were buried alive. The fact that the North Vietnamese will not allow the International Red Cross to

inspect their POW camps also does not offend Clark's sensibilities.

Our astute visitor found, to no one's amazement, that everyone he spoke with in North Vietnam appeared to believe in the Communist crusade.

"The people of this country (North Vietnam) believe their cause is just," Clark concluded. "Every person I have seen has shown by his acts and his words his total commitment. This lesson is the hope of the future of mankind . . . We must learn that a people who believe their cause is just, however poor or few, can never be conquered."

We would like to ask Clark just who is it that is doing the conquering? What is the "justness" of the Communist cause—the conquest of South Vietnam? Furthermore, the man seems to forget that the Germans and Japanese of a generation ago also believed their cause was just, and they were conquered. Certainly, just because one feels his or her cause is just does not necessarily mean that one's cause, is, in fact, just.

Sharp criticism of Jellyfish Clark's acts was immediate, ranging from administration spokesman and Secretary of State William Rogers to ultra-liberal Sen. William Proxmire. Rogers called Clark's conduct "contemptible" and "beyond belief," while Proxmire said Clark's visit was "a mistake . . . a serious blunder."

Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) went so far as to label Clark a Communist dupe who fits nicely into the North Vietnamese propaganda machine.

Ramsey Clark claims he toured North Vietnam "to seek the truth." Trouble is, he went to the wrong country. And remember, this is the man George McGovern wants as the next FBI director.