



to the editor

Letters appear in the **Daily Nebraskan** at the editor's discretion. A letter's appearance is judged on its timeliness, originality, coherence and interest. All letters must be accompanied by the writer's true name, but may be submitted for publication under a pen name or initials. Use of such letters will be determined by the editor. Brevity is encouraged. All letters are subject to condensation and editing. Send letters to: Editor, **Daily Nebraskan**, 34 Nebraska Union.

Unhappy fan

Dear editor,

It has been said many times that the fans here in Nebraska are the best in the nation and I agree completely. I was pleased with the student turnout for the Sept. 7 pep rally: they really came out, despite the rainy weather and the fact it was filmed over the dinner hour. This really proved that they are the greatest fans.

But, unfortunately, our "mighty Husker football teams" don't seem to share this spirit. Two of our speakers came to give speeches at that pep rally; they stood under umbrellas (which few of the fans had as they were requested to put them down), spoke for approximately five minutes and then left the scene while the fans cheered on for some 30 to 40 minutes to show the nation our Husker spirit.

As if that wasn't enough, one of the jocks had the gall to say he wanted to get in out of the rain and eat dinner.

Little more needs to be said about this; I just hope the appropriate people take heed.

A Disgusted Cornhusker Fan

Boycott reaction

Dear editor,

Many students supported the Sept. 8 boycott of RHA hours so that parents and students could see all that the current visitation policies entail. Among those who did not support the boycott were two floors in Smith Hall.

We feel it is important that some of the reasoning behind this decision be known because of misinterpretation by others. The fact that some individuals across the campus expressed disapproval of the boycott in no way reflects their feelings on the current visitation policy—they simply disagreed with some of the concepts presented by the boycott. Many individuals also believed that since what we are striving for is self-determination of visitation policy, the fact that some did not go along with the boycott only further would demonstrate to parents and students that a change in visitation would in no way infringe upon the rights of those who would prefer a more structured atmosphere.

But, the reasoning behind the decision is not the issue at hand. Instead, the real issue involves basic rights. We, as the officers of Smith Hall government,

The Militant Taxpayer

To all
U.S. Citizens
lets flush out
the communist.
The thieves
The drug peddlers
The rapists
The property
Etc. cooperate with
the medical & law
enforcement

had to draw some conclusions. When the boycott issue was presented to us:

First, the decision of whether or not to have RHA hours is that of the individual floor.

Second, the basic unit of democracy is the floor.

Third, the floor is a small community with its own government, able to determine what best suits the individuals of that floor.

And fourth, it is the duty of all hall governments to be representatives of the residents of that hall, subject to their wishes, approval and disapproval. Because of these things, we took the issue of the boycott to the floor to reach every individual of this hall—the way any important issue should be presented in a democracy. We gave them a choice in the most democratic way possible.

Isn't what we are striving for self-determination? Through self-determination, aren't we giving the

individual a choice? And if we are giving the individual a choice, in the interest of democracy, shouldn't they be able to voice their opinions, whether they are part of the majority or part of the minority? Isn't it a tenet of American democracy that the rights of the minority be respected and preserved?

If the current visitation policy is to be replaced by infringement upon the rights of the minority, isn't that a direct contradiction of what we are trying to achieve? And if we are going to replace the policy by such things as public harassment and infringement upon the rights of the minority, we begin to question the cause.

Nancy Podany
President, Smith Hall
Chris Michael
Secretary, Smith Hall
Nancy Farber
Treasurer, Smith Hall

Pakistan prodded to recognize Bangladesh

This guest opinion was written by members of UNL's India Association.

Sometimes Pakistan has been portrayed as a peace-loving country with no evil intentions towards India. On the other hand, India has been painted as a country interested in continued hostilities towards Pakistan, torturing the Pakistani POWs, who allegedly had gone to Bangladesh to strengthen the "Moslem Brotherhood." Such is not the case.

On August 28 India and Pakistan concluded an agreement in New Delhi to repatriate 90,000 Pak-POWs and

Pakistan has come a long way to recognize the realities of the situation. Nevertheless 2 million Bengalis, their jobs, properties and wealth have been confiscated and languishing in Pakistani concentration camps. Their only task being that they are Bengalis.

The responsibility for not enacting the provisions of the Geneva Convention rests on Pakistan, which did not think it proper to enter into negotiations to release her POWs.

During the war a joint command of the Indian and Bengali armed forces was formed. And it was this command

to which Pakistani occupational forces surrendered at Dacca. As long as Pakistan refused to recognize the sovereign and independent state of Bangladesh, and officially continued the state of war against her, it was impossible for India to release 90,000 POWs.

However, the provisions of the Geneva Convention to restore peace and settle the unresolved items between the parties, stipulated further negotiations between them. Mr. Bhutto, then Pakistani president and now Prime minister, did not follow up the agreement by further negotiations because of his domestic political problems. Therefore, it will be responsible to accuse India for Pakistan's inability to implement the Geneva agreement. During all this period India had been pleading for continued talks to arrive at an agreement on the issues.

Pakistan violated the provisions of the Geneva convention and the Geneva convention when they engaged in indiscriminate and brutal killing of innocent civilians, students, intellectuals and anybody suspected of being a Bengali. They abducted thousands of Dacca university women to their barracks and kept them as slave mistresses and raped them. The Pakistani occupation troops killed more than three million Bengalis in the course of war—a speed of killing which even Hitler's Nazis could not

achieve.

The Pakistani friends, rather than appealing to the conscience of the mankind, should appeal to their own conscience to fulfill the expectations of mankind which include:

—Immediate recognition of Bangladesh by Pakistan.

guest opinion

—Pakistan give up militarism and Jihad mentality and restore peace at home and thereby aid restoration of peaceful conditions to the sub-continent.

—Pakistan restore good neighborly relations between Pakistan, India and Bangladesh and live in a spirit of peaceful co-existence in which each party's sovereignty, independence and territory is guaranteed.

—Pakistan open up channels of communication with the other two parties for mutual cooperation, for constructive goals and for lasting understanding.

—India and Bangladesh offer unconditional cooperation for the achievement of these goals and offer to resolve any disputes through mutual negotiations rather than force.

