

## ASUN court works; RHA should follow

Only a short time ago, student courts on this campus were a bigger laughingstock than the organizations they served. These little used appendages of campus justice were lucky (or unlucky) if they dealt with more than one case a year. Even the most dedicated trivia freak would be hardpressed to name the chief justice of the ASUN Student Court.

But this year things have been different. No longer deserving the pseudo-kangaroo court label of previous semesters, the ASUN Student Court has made the leap to respectability in dealing with most of this year's campus controversies and appears to be fast approaching the day when it may actually have a backlog of cases. The name Don Armbruster, chief justice of the ASUN Student Court, has at least become recognizable even if it is not yet universally spoken with the quiet reverence usually accorded a judge.

The ASUN Student Court's work began this year with the Gary Brantz Homecoming Queen case. The court decided for Brantz. Its most recent case grew out of last month's ASUN elections when it was asked to decide if the Pro-Apathy and Amurica parties actually existed. The court decided they did not.

Last week it appeared for a time that the ASUN court would be asked to wash out RHA's dirty laundry, also. RHA members Thursday night refused to appoint a chief justice so that the RHA Court could, as specified in the RHA Constitution, deal with the Ray Walden/Kathy Whittaker election appeal. But whether it wants to or not, RHA should elect a chief justice, and deal with the complaint so the new RHA administration can get on with the business of living up to the promises it made during the vacation-shortened campaign.

Granted, the Walden/Whittaker appeal over the lost hour of voting time is hardly the most exciting case in the history of American jurisprudence—if the polls were closed one hour in Cather-Pound-Neihardt to Walden supporters, Ihne supporters presumably were also turned away—but a start has to be made somewhere, and running to ASUN when a problem arises is hardly the solution.

Wes Albers

## Help them sock it to you

"Good morning, sir," said the well-dressed young man at the door. "I represent your friendly Genghis Khan Gas Light Company."

"I'm sure I paid my bill," I said nervously. "Please don't cut me off. I've got a T-bone steak in the freezer I'm saving for the Bicentennial."

"You don't understand, sir," he said. "I'm a sales representative. You see, we're conducting a modest \$2 million sales campaign."

"But I already buy your gas and lights," I said, "not having much choice in the matter."

"We appreciate that," he said with a little smile. "But we're not selling gas and lights. We're selling advertising."

"But I don't need advertising," I said.

"I realize that," he said. "But we do."

"You mean," I asked incredulously, "that you want me to buy advertising from you for you?"

"Actually, you've been doing it for years," he said. "We simply included the charge in your monthly bill. But we felt going door-to-door would be more fair."

"You've got a point there," I said.

He opened his briefcase. "Now, how would you like to purchase this beautifully-illustrated pamphlet on gas clothes driers for only 50 cents, which barely covers our production costs? It's quite a bargain."

"Is it like those billboards I used to pay for telling me to 'Buy a Gas Drier for a Rainy Day'?"

"No," he said, "this is called 'Having Fun in the Great Outdoors.' It's about the joys and healthy exercise of hanging clothes on a clothesline."

"You want me to buy advertising from you to convince me to use less of your product?" I asked. "That doesn't sound like the American way."

"Don't you know there's an energy crisis on,

Mac?" he said sternly.

"I forgot," I said apologetically. "Sell me a pamphlet telling me how much my rates will go down if I buy less. I need to be encouraged to do my duty."

"I don't have one," he said. "Actually, if you buy less, your rates will go up. But if you buy scads, we can let you have it wholesale. That's the American way."

"I guess you're right," I said humbly.

arthur hoppe

## innocent bystander

"But what you desperately need," he said, "is this handsome booklet for only \$2.99. Observe the portrait of our symbol, Randy Acey-Deecy, on the cover. Note his gaunt cheeks, tattered uniform. . ."

"What's the message?" I asked suspiciously.

"It will convince you immediately," he said, "how urgently your friendly Gas & Light Company requires a \$1.2 billion rate increase."

"You mean you want me to pay you to convince me I should pay you more for your product?" I demanded angrily.

"Gosh," he said, "you've been doing it for years."

Well! Needless to say, I slammed the door in his face. How stupid does the Gas & Light Company think I am?

By the way, would anyone care to buy a T-bone steak? (Low down payment, E-Z terms.) This offer expires in 48 hours—or 24 if we get a warm spell.

(Copyright Chronicle Publishing Co., 1975)



## Viet bloodbath better than years of casualties

For the first time in the history of the Vietnam war we are finally hearing some good news—the Communists are undeniably winning. It's about time.

Let's face it. Even the most naive idealist knew in his troubled sleep that the Paris Peace Accord would not last. Given the history of Indochina, Communist ideology and the dictatorial stupidity of the Thieu regime, Kissinger's peace pact and the following Nobel Peace Prize was a joke.

The fact that we were embroiling ourselves in someone else's civil war was obvious to most of the world except the American government.

The two halves of Vietnam never represented different peoples with different identities. Despite the fact that Hanoi committed itself deeply to the support and later direction of the conflict in the South didn't change the observation that the fighting was still between Vietnamese. It was only a question of deciding what group of Vietnamese would govern.

The Pentagon Papers underscored this by the statement that "from later interrogations of captured infiltrators United States intelligence officers learned that until 1964, almost all the infiltrators were native Southerners who went to the North in 1954."

Korea should have taught the U.S. that in Communist containment, it is important to avoid a protracted land war in the Asian world.

Korea should have taught us the dangers involved in alienating allies, the overtones of racism, imperialism and the impossibility of achieving anything but a dubious victory in guerrilla warfare.

Today, it is the inability to win in Vietnam that most bothers Americans. We like to be winners and it irritates us that our football team isn't number one,

that our economy refuses to straighten up, that the Arabs won't kowtow to us and that some two-bit country like North Vietnam can shame us. It hurts our American ego.

Related to this is the persistent, irritable question—was it all in vain? The answer has to be a reluctant and tragic yes.

Vietnam was a mistake. The slow, sorrowful leaves of history reveal to us millions of men who, fighting for one cause or another, have died in vain. This time it happened to be U.S. soldiers.

### bruce nelson cynic's corner

Unfortunately, Americans aren't going to accept this and they'll look for scapegoats. President Ford has found his in Congress but I suggest, if you need one, look to the Pentagon Papers.

In those ghastly documents in March of 1965 Assistant Secretary of Defense John McNaughton quite frankly defined the U.S. aims in Vietnam as: "70 per cent to avoid humiliating defeat, 20 per cent to keep Vietnam out of Chinese hands and 10 per cent to permit the people of South Vietnam to enjoy a better, freer way of life."

Some are distressed at possible repercussions on our allies and our world prestige.

Hans Morgenthau has written that "the prestige of a nation is not to be determined by the success or

failure of a particular operation at a particular moment in history. The pages of history record many examples of nations which secure in their possession of great power. . . have suffered defeat or retreated from exposed positions without suffering a loss in prestige."

Unfortunately, the U.S. in its foolishness has tried to persuade the world that the failure of this particular operation in Vietnam is the do-or-die stand against communism. The fact that only Australia, New Zealand and South Korea helped us in Vietnam shows how unconvincing we were.

Instead, our prestige dropped steadily during the war. Wisdom, a close relative of prestige, dictates that when one is faced with an impossible situation, one should back off.

Even George F. Will, a conservative columnist for *National Review*, wrote dismally last week that "The U.S. government tried to speak (the language of force) for a decade and couldn't get its message across. And now the government wants a 793rd chance to tidy things up in Asia."

Those who fear a Communist bloodbath in the South can only hope that it will be a modest one. From a purely numerical standpoint, one bloodbath is less tragic than endless years of casualties.

Other than the initial terror, most of the Vietnamese probably will benefit from Communist rule. They haven't had freedoms of speech and press under Thieu, so those won't be missed under Communism.

Indeed, at least under Communism the people won't starve, which is something of which capitalism cannot boast.