

opinion/
editorial

Pickets hopefully to strike speakers from fee debate

What? Picketers in front of the Administration Building? We thought that went out with Vietnam.

It may seem like a response straight out of the '60s, but what can be expected from a '60s decision? The two students protesting the NU Board of Regents' new policy banning mandatory student fee support for speakers simply reflect the type of '60s action taken Saturday by the regents.

Cutting off all mandatory fees because of public protest that generated from a group of students concerned about having their student fees bring a "hate America" philosopher such as Jane Fonda to UNL is a giant step backward into the past

decade.

Although the picketers are a bit reminiscent of days gone by, we applaud their efforts. According to Cecilia Gibb, one of the picketers, their first goal is to flood the regents with protest letters. She said student response generally has been favorable, with only a few students disapproving. Supposedly, more students are getting their picket signs ready.

We admire the efforts of these students who are exercising their rights as Americans. They are operating under the same premise the right to protest on which the Young Americans for Freedom based their stop - mandatory - fees - for - spea-

kers campaign.

Saturday's regents' meeting is testimony to the fact that YAF members were successful in their campaign. Let's hope that these two students - representing a majority of students who oppose the regents' decision - are as successful in their attempts to reverse or at least improve, the new speaker policy.

They have the support of the majority rather than the minority behind them.

Picketing seems to hail back to the days when students fees were once again the subject of student-regent dissent. Obviously, UNL did not learn its lesson then, for, five years later, we still are arguing over what

student fees are for. It seems we are moving backward as time moves on.

Let's hope that this will be the last we will see of picket signs. More importantly, let's hope that when these signs clear up, so will the controversial issue of mandatory student fees.

Correction

Due to a typesetting error, a Daily Nebraskan editorial Wednesday incorrectly reported that Talks and Topics budgets \$32,500 for major speakers. The correct figure should have been \$2,500.

Politicians stir issues before campaign trail dust settles

The current lull before the political storm provides a good chance to reflect on issues which may be left in the dust as the 1978 campaign livens.

1978 is President Carter's year of put up or shut up. He must accomplish major legislative victories as well as provide firmer guidance for the nation. He has completed his learning period and he now must begin to lead the nation in a definite direction.

Two initial victories he must win are ratification of the Panama Canal treaties and the completion of his energy package. He has put his political reputation on the line with these issues and cannot afford to lose either.

There is much talk around Washington about Carter becoming a one-term president; some say through his own choice, others say through incompetence.

The Carter presidency will be judged on how he handled the pressing domestic issues which existed when

for the treaties is known, but his vote remains to be decided.

Finally, an issue of national significance and interest is being raised in the Republican governor's campaign.

The use of the congressional franking privilege (free mail for government-related business) by Rep. Charles Thone has become an issue in the governor's contest.

While the propriety of Thone's use of the frank remains for the voters to decide, the issue deserves discussion.

The franking privilege was the subject of a recent lawsuit by Common Cause, the citizen's lobby group. The suit charged that much of the material sent out under the frank did not constitute official necessary business and was used for the representative's political benefit.

The issue here is not the response sent to constituents who contacted representatives, but the use of mass mailings in which the purpose and need is less clear.

It is imperative that Congress do as much as possible to improve its current low standing with the American people.

Eliminating such self-serving mass mailings from the benefit of the franking privilege would be a step in the right direction.

Using Congressional offices for self-perpetuation should be limited as much as possible.

Deliberate wrongdoing may not be present, but examples such as the current charge against Congressman Thone do not serve to improve the image of Congress or politicians in general.

I. Kent
wolgamott

he took office. He has begun to deal with these problems and has submitted legislation to Congress.

Questions about Carter's ability to work with Congress on legislation deemed necessary by the president will be answered this year. This perhaps will be the most important benchmark of any presidency.

On a related subject, Sen. Ed Zorinsky recently announced his intention to allow a public opinion poll to at least partially govern his decision on the Panama Canal treaties.

While the Zorinsky method may be popular, it raises many questions.

Taken to its logical conclusion, the Zorinsky method could eliminate the need for national or local legislatures. We could merely hire Geroge Gallup to conduct national opinion polls on all issues, or institute some type of national referendum system.

Admittedly, the wishes of a representative's constituents must be taken into account when he decides any issue. But he also should consider his own feelings and beliefs; after all, he was elected for his good judgment and he should exercise this judgment.

Sen. Zorinsky's vote will be watched not only by Nebraskans, but the entire nation. His personal support



letters to the editor

A Monday editorial in the Daily Nebraskan suggested that the regents' decision to cut mandatory speaker funding was a wise one politically and a deadly blow educationally.

They are elected with the understanding that they will develop sufficient insight and knowledge from being involved with the university community, and that they will make decisions concerning the university community from their better judgements.

How can people in the opposite end of the state (the regents' constituents) really know what is best for the university community and its students?

Is restricting the stimulative thought

process of students best for the constituents "back there", or in the best interest of the majority of students?

The whole idea reminds me of Senator Ed Zorinsky and the Panama Canal issue.

He appears to be placing heavy emphasis on his constituents' opinion. But in such a heated issue concerning the nation's future, how many of Zorinsky's constituents have the insight Zorinsky has gained through listening to Senate debates?

Scott Whitcomb
Senior Journalism Major

Right to display

Since early December 1, the ECKANKAR Student Society has been the subject of an unjustified vendetta of some person or group of people. Books, literature, and even the identification boards from the Nebraska Union have been torn down and tossed into the nearest wastebasket. Not only is this action illegal, immoral, and unconstitutional, it just plain does not make any sense.

ECKANKAR teaches that each person or group of people has a right to their own ideas. We are not crusaders and we are not

out to convert anyone to our awareness of life. The literature and books are merely being presented for those who are looking, even searching, for greater awareness.

As we respect the thought and property of others, we sincerely hope that others will respect us. Every time these books are stolen, we believe that this person will realize that his actions are theft and cannot be justified by any legitimate belief system. With this realization, we hope that our right to display material at the union will be respected.

Keith Larsen
Graduate student