



Olive may change hands

Pressured by the Soviet Union and Congress, Secretary of State Henry Kissinger again has taken to the world's airways, olive branch in hand, in search of peace for the Middle East.

The prospect this time is that the olive branch will either be shot from his grasp outright or given to someone else to carry.

Spoiled by semi-success in Vietnam and Cyprus, this modern day Metternich is finding Arab-Israeli problems harder to handle than a soggy bagel. If his endless trips between Middle East capitals have not brought peace, they have at least assured him of a good job with a travel agency when he retires.

The problem, of course, is that Kissinger has finally run up against people even more stubborn than himself. The Arab-Israeli problem is a long-standing one and not about to be magically solved by the first curly-haired, charismatic American who stops in promising peace and military aid.

Even though he is not the Superdiplomat some like to think, Kissinger does deserve praise for his work thus far. That he has not been successful only attests to the endless ifs, ands and buts of diplomacy.

The United States would consider recognizing the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) if the PLO would recognize Israel's right to exist. Israel is willing to withdraw from the Sinai of Egypt will make a formal declaration of non-belligerence toward Israel. Egypt is willing to sign a new Egyptian-Israeli accord only if Israel

makes similar agreements with Syria and the PLO.

To this merry-go-round of proposals and counter-proposals have been added additional pressures from the Soviet Union and Congress.

The Soviet Union would like to shift negotiations back to Geneva where the Middle East peace conference would be called back in session. Such a conference would take the edge off U.S. influence in peace negotiations as well as take the spotlight off Kissinger. It would also, U.S. officials fear, be an excellent stage for Soviet propaganda.

Meanwhile Sen. Charles Percy said this week that Israel should "pull back essentially to the 1967 lines" or risk a loss of support in the Senate on the question of further military aid. Faced with that horrible prospect, the Israelis may finally get down to some serious negotiations.

While an Israeli pullback to the 1967 borders is not desirable and probably not necessary to achieving an agreement, a conciliatory attitude on the part of both Arabs and Israelis is needed. Both groups would fare better by reaching an agreement on their own than by leaving a settlement up to the politicking of an international conference.

The alternative is less promising. If the Egyptians and Israelis continue their present stubbornness, the planes flying between Cairo and Tel Aviv may soon be carrying not diplomats, but bombs.

Wes Alber

ASUN elections need more polling places

(Editor's note—Doug Voegler is an ASUN senator.)

The ASUN spring elections will soon be here. At the ASUN Senate meeting on Jan. 29, members of the ASUN Electoral Commission stated their desire to see increased voter turnout in the ASUN elections.

There is, in my opinion, absolutely no valid reason for not placing ASUN election polling places in the major residential complexes. There should be a polling place in the Harper-Schramm-Smith complex, the Abel-Sandoz complex and the Cather-Pound-Neihardt complex, in addition to those in the Nebraska Union and on East Campus.

If you look at a "real" election, you will find polling places in every precinct. They are scattered among the residential areas. They are placed where people live. People have a right to vote and the election officials have a duty to facilitate the exercise of this right by the voters.

At one time, the ASUN election was a battle not just between rival candidates and parties but between the "Greeks" and the "dormies." The prize was "control" of student government for a year. Usually the Greeks were trying to continue a monopoly while the dormies were seeking to establish one. This is where the "great fear" of having polling places in residence hall complexes arose. If it was easy for the "dormie" to vote, heaven forbid, he might actually do it.

Some argue that polling places in the residential complexes would "discriminate" in favor of those who live there. Doesn't having a polling place in the M & N Building favor ROTC students? Doesn't having one on Hamilton Hall favor chemistry majors or one in Andrews Hall favor English majors? Aren't those in the Fiji or ATO house "favored" by a polling place in the Union when compared to the student on 10th floor Harper?

Another "great fear" was the specter of "dormies" being herded up like cattle by some candidate and stampeding the polling place to vote without really "thinking" about the candidates and issues. Supposedly during the long cold evening walk to the Union their own free will would surface, and by the time they got there they could vote sensibly.

What is the difference if someone runs up and down a residence hall and yells "let's all go down and vote for Joe Doe, our dorm president, who is running" or if a guy runs around his fraternity yelling "let's go to the Union and vote for our brother who is

guest opinion

running with the XYZ party." Does the fact that one group must encounter the external environment on its pilgrimage to the polls make a difference? Anyway, what business is it of the Electoral Commission what motivates a student to vote?

What it boils down to is this: people vote in the ASUN election - not dormies or Greeks, or ROTC majors - but people. The Electoral Commission must ignore these labels which are placed on groups of students. However, the Electoral Commission cannot ignore where students live when determining where to place the polls.

There is no logical reason why there should not be a polling place in residential complexes where thousands of students live. Not only will these polling places benefit the students that actually live in the complexes, but also those who live nearby (such as the Phi Mus, Chi Phis, etc. next to HSS, or the KKGs, Kappa Sigs, etc. near Neihardt).

I have seen the ploy of not placing polling booths in the major residential complexes go on for long enough. It would be intolerable for it to continue for one more election. The massive increase in voter turnout and the ensuing legitimacy that ASUN would gain is easily worth any extra expense or effort which might be involved.

Any decision contrary to such a logical, reasonable, sensible and fair concept clearly, in my opinion, must rest upon arbitrary, capricious, unfair, discriminatory and unconscionable grounds.

However, should the ASUN Electoral Commission not be able to reach such a decision by itself, should they try the same old ploy and play the same old games with the ASUN election as in the past, I shall take recourse to the ASUN Student Court and have them ordered to so proceed.

Vietnam new nostalgia trip

It's a bad dream, a recurring nightmare. They're talking about Vietnam again. Can this be true? Are those gun-happy mental midgets in Washington serious?

But no, there it is—"FORD ASKS CONGRESS FOR EXTRA 300 MILLION FOR VIETNAM." It must be true. I'm not dreaming and those aren't reruns.

There's that crook Thieu on the television set. He's saying that if we don't come through with the aid, then Vietnam and ultimately the whole world will be lost to the communists. So what? With the mess the world's in now, whoever does finally get it is just asking for a big headache.

Besides, Thieu will just use the money to buy a color television set or a new snowmobile. Or maybe he needs it so he can lock up more dissidents who don't approve of his corrupt regime. Whatever the Communists do to Vietnam, it couldn't be any worse than what Thieu's already done. He makes Fu Manchu look like Charlie Chan's son.

Putting personalities aside, let's get back to the question of bombs and rockets. If you think \$300 million is a lot, wait till the Communists overrun Saigon.

Better put your college career, and maybe your life, aside. Kiss the girls goodbye. Strap on your flight jacket or grab an M-16. We're off for Vietnam. Maybe we can break the 50,000 dead or missing-in-action record set by our older brothers.

Of course, there's no victory in this war. We'd only be flogging a dead horse in a losing effort—spending our time in a cesspool where the waste is human life. But, as you know, it's our

duty to uphold the righteous cause of democracy—no matter how bad it stinks. Besides, God is on our side. And that makes a world of difference.

As far as I'm concerned, the only good to come out of Vietnam has been high-grade marijuana and a hard-learned lesson. Apparently, even these two are not easy to come by nowadays—especially the latter.

Kissinger tells us our credibility will suffer if we let Vietnam fall into the hands of the Communists. Ford says it's our moral duty to protect our allies. I say, what do you do with a festering wart. Cut it off—before it's too late.

There are alternatives to sending aid to that speck of a country across the sea. For one, it's rumored that Richard Nixon would like a part in our foreign affairs. We could resurrect him and send him to Saigon. His sneaky, conniving mind would be worth a 100 divisions of Marines to Thieu.

joe dreesen

smiling grimly

If all else fails, there is a final possibility. For once, we might let sense and sanity determine our actions and keep out of Vietnam. But this time, I'm afraid I am dreaming. Things don't seem to work that way.