

Judgment day

The students' lawyer has been one of the most misunderstood, contested, revised and touted programs presented by an ASUN administration in several years. Now all that is missing is the lawyers.

ASUN has proposed two men for the position. According to the student government proposal, the men will split the part-time duties of the job.

The nominees, Bruce Hamilton and Doug German, are well qualified for the positions and should be approved by the Board of Regents. The men would bring with them to the positions the respect and experience obtained while they worked for Legal Aid.

They would bring more important assets, though: youth and an understanding of the problems students face.

The board should approve the selections so the Legal Aid to Students Office can get underway.

The endorsement of these two men, however, should not be considered a wholesale endorsement of the students' lawyer program. Many objections can be raised about it.

First, it is very expensive. The cost will be more than \$9,000 a year, making it the most expensive single program in ASUN history.

Second, the lawyers cannot litigate cases. Because they cannot, it raises serious questions about how truly worthwhile the service will be.

Third, no real research was done to determine if the students' attorney will be put to the use necessary to justify such a large financial investment.

But there seems to be only one way to find out if it is going to work: try it. A good place to start would be to appoint the men nominated by ASUN.

Michael (O.J.) Nelson



"THE TAPES ARE COVERED BY EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE."



"THE TAPES ARE CONFIDENTIAL."



"THE TAPES ARE AMBIGUOUS."

"THE TAPES DO NOT EXIST."
—CARICATURIST
© 1973

to the editor



Just another bureaucrat

Dear editor:

I've tried to contain myself, but Ann Henry has gone too far. "It's hard to say how we fit in to the system." If "we" is ASUN, it doesn't generally. And from the Henry interview (*Daily Nebraskan*, Nov. 7) it isn't hard to see why. Of course, she doesn't know what student concerns are, she lives off campus and doesn't ask anyone.

Henry, you were elected as a student representative, so start acting like one. You're responsible to the students, not to making life easy for the regents. In fact, one just might ask what difference there is between an Ann Henry, ASUN president, and a good low level university bureaucrat.

Henry's election, to the extent it was not dependent on her sorority's backing, was because she promised to effect changes in dormitory life. But on Wednesday, she wasn't sure dormitory students wanted changes. Did they want it then? Yes, the election said so. Do they want it now? Yes, says their law suit. Yes, says the football day boycott. "Gee, I don't know," says Henry.

"Oh, things are pretty stagnate right now but things will pick up once some things get started." Gosh, Henry your term's more than half over. If

THE CREATION OF AN "INDEPENDENT" PROSECUTOR



anything is to get started it must be through tough, advocacy methods. We've asked the regents for consideration long enough, let's demand it. But maybe this isn't possible from the Henry administration. Maybe next year we should elect a male.

Howard Roark

Fine print

Dear editor,

In the *Daily Nebraskan* (Oct. 26, 1973) editorial "All's Fair in War," you refer to Egypt's "reasonable" demand that Israel withdraw from the lands conquered during the 1967 Six-Day War. In the event of Israeli withdrawal, you suggest, Egypt would then be willing to attend a peace conference.

Are you acquainted with the events preceding the Six-Day War of 1967? For several years, Syria has been using the Golan Heights for target practice at Israeli's settlements in Galilee.

Shortly before the outbreak of war, Egypt declared a blockade of the Israel's part of Elath and commanded U.N. forces in the Sinai to withdraw, so that Egypt could proceed with its loudly advertised mission of destroying Israel. In short, the 1967 boundaries were used as staging areas for aggression.

Moreover, the 1967 boundaries were ill but indefensible against a Pearl Harbor type sneak attack. Had the recent Egyptian and Syrian assault been launched from the 1967 boundaries, Egyptian and Syrian troops might have occupied Tel Aviv and Jerusalem by now, and a final solution to the Jewish problem in the Middle East would be well under way.

Yet, you blithely suggest that Israel yield to Egypt's "reasonable" demands for a return to these indefensible, chronically violated boundaries.

You point out, Egypt would attend a peace conference in exchange for Israeli withdrawal, and the resulting permanent peace settlement would be more in Israel's interest than retention of the present buffer zone.

Under normal circumstances, I would find your point convincing, but I have read the fine print and you apparently haven't. Egypt's condition for a lasting peace is the "settlement of the Palestine problem." What this euphemistic and seemingly innocuous phrase entails is the liquidation of Israel, whose entire territory and population are to be turned over to the Palestinian guerillas. In other words, the Israelis can have peace by agreeing to commit national, collective suicide. What could be more "reasonable" than that?

Israel's withdrawal to the 1967 boundaries is only the first act in a planned scenario which would culminate as its eradication of Israel. Is this what you mean by a just and equitable Middle East peace? Or is the peace you have in mind the peace of the grave?

Ford—a better idea

By Keith Landgren

"Let's turn out attention to the business of America," President Richard Nixon said. "Let's quit wallowing in Watergate," he said.

Yes, let's. Let's confirm Gerald Ford, impeach Nixon, and get busy.

Amazing how one of the biggest landslides in American electoral history brought America here. But it was the 1972 election, and that was the Segretti-Mitchell-Haldeman-Ehrlichmann election, so maybe it's not so strange after all.

But no matter how we came to be here, America is here, and America may as well deal with the situation the way it is. We have a president who won't govern. Maybe he can't govern, but it's all the same: the nation is leaderless.

The American electorate is thoroughly disillusioned with politics in general and with the President, particularly.

America has no vice president, no attorney general and no cabinet officers of any distinction.

The Nixon guard, blamed for the Watergate mess, has been replaced by a Laird-Haig-Wright-Garment-Buzhardt clique every bit as offensive as its predecessor.

"Your commander in chief has given you an order," he said, and from this America learned that real generals are at least as unpleasant as lawyers who think they are generals.

America has, in fairness, a reasonably distinguished foreign policy. But does anyone really believe Nixon is the brains behind foreign affairs? Kissinger's the one, and always has been, and will be under the Ford administration.

U.S. domestic policy is best explained by a literal translation of the Latin verb *veto*: I forbid. And he does, and he does, and he does. Curb the warring power of the executive? I forbid. Cut military extravagance? I forbid. Raise the minimum wage? I forbid.

Unless the business of America is opposing things, we are not engaged in the business of America. America is not doing much of anything.

So, after a pause as George McGovern supporters snicker into their fists, let's learn from our mistakes. And let's learn lots from our big mistakes. Let's correct the 1972 election. It was a lousy, dishonest, unusual selection and America should forget it.

Grounds for impeachment are easy to come by. The secret bombing of Cambodia will do for page one. Page two could be anything on Watergate. There's probably something on one of those two tapes Nixon says don't exist. The things existed when Archibald Cox wanted them, and they probably still do.

With Ford in the White House and Nixon in court, a cabinet drawn from a bipartisan selection of the finest men still in politics and the 1972 election well behind us, let's really get on with it.