

Council candidates endorsed

john
vihstadt
different
drummer

Editor's note: The different drummer column is solely an expression of John Vihstadt's opinion. The political endorsements included below are not necessarily those of the Daily Nebraskan editorial staff.

Lincoln voters will be deciding on a number of critically important matters as they go to the polls next Tuesday, all of which deserve comment.

In regard to the City Council, three candidates merit support. Sue Bailey would be a welcome addition to Lincoln government. A former officer in the League of Women Voters, she is also a member of the Crime Commission, the advisory committee of the League of Human Dignity and has served on the Lincoln Goals and Policies Committee. Bailey's civic background and compassionate, people-to-people approach to urban problems make her an exemplary choice.

A man of Max Denney's caliber is not easy to come by. The folksy 58-year-old brother of former U.S. Representative Bob Denney has a wealth of experience behind him in all levels of government. He is remembered for his term as Administrative Assistant to ex-governor Robert Crosby (1953-55). His cautious, deliberate manner will provide a needed balance to a city council that too often plunges into things without adequate study and consideration.

For spot number three on the Council I recommend attorney Bill Thierstein. Thierstein has called for more citizen and neighborhood input on the matter of zoning and opposes hasty, unplanned development of the Stevens Creek area. A member of the Nebraska Council on Alcohol Education, the 36 year-old Thierstein will lend dynamic, progressive leadership to the city.

For the Board of Education, Ted Dewey, Wallace Rudolph, and Martin A. Dinsmore stand out. Dewey was appointed to a vacancy on the board last fall, and deserves election on his own for his performances in office so far.

Rudolph, a UNL law professor, will provide a challenge to some of the more backward concepts still harbored by the Board.

Dinsmore urges increased parent involvement in the education of their children.

There are three city charter amendments on the ballot, all of which will have a long-range effect on the city regardless of the outcome.

Amendment No. 1 clears the way for City Council election by district instead of the present at-large basis. No one needs to be reminded that district elections would provide more equitable representation, closer and more responsible to the people.

A case in point: while more than 40 per cent of all Lincolntes live north of "O" street, not one of the seven City Council members is from that area. Minorities of all kinds are effectively disenfranchised by the current method of selection.

Perhaps the most controversial issue to be decided is Amendment No. 2, "Reconsideration, Planning, and Construction of Major Street and Road Projects" as it is euphemistically called. The amendment, a disastrous creature concocted by the Coalition Against the Radial, calls for either a unanimous vote of the City Council or a majority vote of the Lincoln electorate before any street project costing over \$15 million may be implemented.

Granted, passage of this amendment will kill the Northeast Radial, which may or may not be a good thing. But it will also throw the fate of badly-needed streets improvement into utter chaos.

The unanimous City Council vote requirement will put into the hands of one council man immense power to determine the destiny of roads improvements, leading to frustration and divisiveness instead of cooperation and majority decision.

The third and final amendment will raise the annual salary of Lincoln City Council members to \$4,000. No. 3 must pass in order to upgrade the quality of the council. With the present payment of just \$20 per weekly meeting, only the relatively wealthy and/or independent business people can afford to serve. Larger salaries would encourage more diverse representation and provide an incentive for council members to give more time to their elective duties.

Student regent violates 1-man, 1-vote principle

Doug Voegler is a senior majoring in political science.

by Doug Voegler

I am writing this with the hope that a few state senators will read and consider it. I, as a member of the University student body, am not in favor of LB323, introduced by Hastings Sen. Richard Marvel.

LB323 would submit to the voters a constitutional amendment to place on the Board of Regents "not less than one, nor more than three full-time students of the University of Nebraska." The students shall have a total of one vote.

To my way of thinking, this is inherently unfair. I totally agree with the arguments in favor of having a student member on the Board of Regents in an advisory capacity. He should have every privilege that a present regent has, except the power to cast a vote. He should be allowed to sit in all closed sessions and to discuss freely. Once he is given the vote, however, the evils of this system outweigh any conceivable good. The University is not a private college. It is supported by the tax money of the state. Therefore, all people should have an equal vote in

how it is run. The present system divides the state into districts of equal population. This is fair.

What LB323 does, is give the student a special franchise not given to any other group in the state. University students, numbering about 40,000, are given a member on the Board of Regents. He has an equal vote with a member who is elected from a district with about 200,000 people. We are living in the times of "one man, one vote." LB323 is in no way compatible with this concept. It is said that students have a special concern with the University which merits this unfairness. Was it not the argument prior to redistricting in the 1960's that the "rural areas" had a special interest which needed protection?

As most students, I am a registered voter in one of the counties of Nebraska. No student is registered to vote "at the University." As a student at the University, I would be allowed to vote for a student member to the board, presumably at a campus election, and then again in my regular regents district. A voter outstate could only vote once. In effect, I have one and one-third representatives on the board opposed to the regular voter's one.

It is argued that being a student at the University gives the student a special interest in the University which is greater than anyone else's. First of all, so do farmers, faculty members, parents and minority groups. Do we enlarge the membership of the board to 100 and then devise a system of representation as used by the 1972 Democratic Convention? Given the diversity of students, the present disinterest of students in the government of the University's affairs and the present status of participation in student

elections (13 per cent at UNL just recently), how can the right of students as a class over other groups to have a representative on the Board of Regents be justified?

I am not saying that the present structure of the Board of Regents is perfect. However, efforts at change should be directed to equitable solutions such as doubling the size of the board (thereby reducing district sizes), and shortening the terms of office to make the regents more responsive.

It seems that we are regressing from what this nation was designed to be. Group pride is wonderful, but it is being carried to frightening extremes. It is assumed by some that the interests of blacks can be fairly represented only by a black, the interests of women, only by a woman, the interests of the Mexican-Americans only by a Mexican-American.

Now we hear from some that the interests of university students cannot be fairly and effectively represented unless there is a student member on the Board of Regents.

It is sad that ASUN is wasting an enormous amount of time and energy on this poorly conceived notion.

suggestion
box

Vihstadt, journalists twist committeewoman's remarks

Blane L. Osterman is a junior in the College of Agriculture.

by Blane L. Osterman

"The Watergate affair disturbs me greatly. It is beginning to be evident that Richard Nixon's relationship with people involved in the Watergate goes clear back to the Bay of Pigs. When the whole sordid mess finally comes to light, I think there will even be a case made of the connection between people involved in the Watergate and those involved in the Kennedy assassination. It may even come to the place where Congress will have to move swiftly to begin impeachment proceedings before Richard Nixon decides to declare martial law and we have no government as we know it."

That is what Frances Ohmstede, state Democratic national committeewoman, said to the Nebraska Young Democrats at its recent convention. It is from this statement that journalists of this state, and the Daily Nebraskan's own John Vihstadt (Daily Nebraskan, April 12), misquoted Ohmstede.

Vihstadt, who more than likely was quoting reporter Larry Wilson of the Omaha World Herald, left out nearly half of Ohmstede's original remarks. Her full remarks make it clear that she believes

Nixon had some type of relationship with the people involved in the Watergate burglary. She does not implicate the President in the Kennedy assassination, but only suggests that the individuals involved in both the Watergate and the assassination can be traced back to the Bay of Pigs.

The different drummer column further stated that Ohmstede said Nixon's impeachment is "the only way to retain democracy." What she really said was that "it may even come to the place where Congress will have to move swiftly to begin impeachment proceedings before Richard Nixon decides to declare martial law and we have no government as we know it." Her remarks, if taken in the context of the entire speech in which she made a plea to the Young Democrats to get involved and be the watchdogs over government, are perfectly justified.

The enthusiastic applause Ohmstede received from the Young Democrats was for her call for us to become involved in the political process of this country. She urged people to work for the government and democracy that this country has developed under, not the kind of government Richard Nixon seems to be developing—a government of deceit and dishonesty.

