

There are several ways of looking at the proposed rent increase for Amazon married student housing.

First, the University claims that insurance costs, building repairs, accounting expenses and labor expenses have risen dramatically since 1966. University housing officials say this justifies raising rents from \$42.50 a month to \$45 a month.

Amazon Cooperating Tenants (ACT), a group trying to stop the rent increase, says these are not good reasons for raising the rent. ACT points out that some improvements have included bike racks and the installation of television cable service which is incompatible with the idea of low cost housing.

Another argument against the financial

No rent raise

considerations involved is that of price controls. A raise by non-university landlords of the percentage proposed by the University might be in violation of price controls. While the University is exempt from these controls in this case, ACT says it is questionable whether they should act outside the philosophy of the controls.

Rent increases for Amazon can easily be justified on financial grounds. But before a rational solution to the problem can be made by looking into both sides of the issue something else must be done.

Rent increases for Amazon and other student housing units must not be on a solely "need" basis. This has been done with regard to tuition time and again and it just doesn't work. As with tuition, student housing must be looked at with a philosophy in mind.

Questions must be asked about why student housing exists, how the present situation fits in with current modes of living and whether University operated student housing is a good idea in the first place.

Unless certain questions are asked, unless there are sound ideas about student housing serving as a base for changes such as rent increases, the present haphazard system of administration will cause nothing but grief for all concerned.

The State Board should postpone the current rent increase for married student housing until it can study the total philosophy of student housing. Then, if rent increases can be justified as part of a larger plan, fine. Otherwise, rent increases will continue, fostered by financial crunches rather than sound thinking.

Commentary

On the right . . . William F. Buckley Jr.

Fair elections must prevail

When the South Vietnamese had their election in 1967, Lyndon Johnson invited a bunch of liberal professors to go over there and satisfy themselves that the election was clean. This they did, and one professor from the Boston area reported to the President his conclusion that the election in South Vietnam was as clean as the typical election in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

This comment was the source of enormous underground mirth among the cognoscenti, who understood exactly what the good professor was trying to communicate. That democracy in South Vietnam, while passably fair, is a pretty relaxed thing, along Massachusetts lines. I think it was in Boston, or maybe it was in Chicago, a little while back that an election district reported 183 votes, all of them for the Democratic candidate, and guess what? By sheer coincidence, the 183 citizens had filed in and voted alphabetically! That is democracy plus law and order.

I have always thought that if you're

going to have democracy, you may just as well do it right. After the decision is reached as to what voter qualifications are, let them vote, and go ahead and count their votes. The evidence is overwhelming that the political machine in Brooklyn, New York was recently concerned to return the incumbent to office, rather than to ascertain whom the majority wanted.

It would have been absorbed as routine Democratic graft except that the challenger is none other than Allard Lowenstein, the president of Americans For Democratic Action. Mr Lowenstein has a particular stake in the contest unrelated to the question of whether he will be sent to Congress. He is the young man who has already made the history books in virtue of having persuaded Eugene McCarthy to make the race against Lyndon Johnson in 1968, thereby proving that The System was alive and well. He is as influential among the young as anyone in America, and if he gives out the word that you cannot have a reliable democratic contest in the heart of metropolitan New

York, his constituency will experience a disillusionment that will redound to the benefit of the crazies in American politics.

In his primary contest, every kind of fraud and harassment was exercised. New voters found their registration cards missing. Others were given runarounds. Some spent as much as four hours trying to locate the right polling place, and filing their votes. Others found machines rigged.

One lady wrote, "I was told that I had been redistricted. That I should vote at 75 Cadman Plaza. I left (but there is) no 75 Cadman Plaza. On my walk back I noticed that some people were voting at 140 Cadman Plaza. I stopped in there and was told I would have to go to 75 Henry Street. When I got to 75 Henry Street I was told that it would be another two hours' wait. I gave up."

There were only 30,000 votes cast, and yet the Lowenstein forces are talking about as many as 14,000 irregularities, and hard-core fraud in four to five thousand cases. At that, the incumbent beat Lowenstein by only a few hundred votes.

The evidence suggests that Lowenstein would have won by something like a landslide.

So now it goes to the courts. It being widely suspected that local state judges are not going to upset the political machine that put them where they are, Lowenstein will probably end up in federal court. There he will be given an opportunity to document his grievances, in behalf of the electorate. And the message may go out to the bosses: cut it out.

It happens that Mr. Lowenstein backs enthusiastically almost every mistaken political idea that ever issued out of the social imaginations of man. But that isn't the point, any more so than when us good guys sat around in 1964 worrying how many votes would be stolen from Barry Goldwater by the Democratic poll tenders. Fair elections, like precautions against accidental wars, are in everybody's interest. It is lucky for our international reputation that we didn't invite any South Vietnamese professors over to monitor the Lowenstein election.

Nicholas Von Hoffman

A populist commentary

WASHINGTON (KFS)—By the time George McGovern got to the podium to make his acceptance speech he had reassured a lot of people whose hair was scared straight up at their earlier impression of him as "the prairie Populist." He'd done that not only by waffling on some of the major issues the democratic National Convention was toying with but by appearing to be the political tough guy. In politics we Americans are frightened by anyone whom we call a "true believer," and reassured if a man shows himself to be an ordinary louse.

Senator McGovern never has been either, but his apparent transition during the week in Miami Beach from the one to the other encouraged people who get nervous in the presence of a politician who may not be a hypocrite. St. George got just dirtied up enough so that the experts could say his candidacy is "viable." In the process of gaining viability he has gone somewhat out of focus. In that respect he differs from the Populists of the past who, whatever their follies, never left you in doubt as to their politics. In the 1896 Democratic Convention, the last to nominate a near-genuine Populist, the guy who played Frank Mankiewicz was the Governor of Illinois, John Peter Altgeld. Like Mankiewicz, he had the votes, and more so because to win at Chicago in 1896 meant driving the incumbent Democratic President out of the party. Unlike

Mankiewicz, he could say, "Our people are in earnest. They will have neither straddling on platform or straddling on candidate. . . Those prudent, cautious, wise gentlemen who have to consult the tin roosters every morning to see what their convictions should be during the day can have no show in this convention."

At Miami Beach in the McGovern headquarters there unquestionably was a certain amount of tin-rooster consultation.

But then Altgeld was not of the George Raft school of political toughness brought into vogue by John F. Kennedy, the outer toughness of having to prove yourself and overcome the insecurities bred into upper-class preppies.

Altgeld had no inner or outer political need to get a reputation as a tough tactician. He was tough. What made him that way was a settled, distinct and well-developed set of ideas about what would be good for America.

That was not the case with the convention in Miami Beach or with McGovern and his people as they showed themselves through the week. Vietnam aside, what you got from them was inclinations, leaning, tendencies toward. Benign, to be sure, but so indefinite that no amount of accommodating flexibility would contradict their supple doxology.

For all that, though, McGovern has gone far enough toward Populism so that the themes of 76 years ago have a present ring. Who is talking here, a black welfare

mother in Miami Beach or Lorenzo D. Lewelling, a long-dead Populist governor of Kansas:

"We have so much regard for the rights of property that we have forgotten the liberties of the individual. . . the monopoly of labor-saving machinery and its devotion to selfish instead of social use have rendered more and more human beings superfluous, until we have a standing army of the unemployed numbering even in the most prosperous times not less than one million able-bodied men."

In the intervening time our population has grown somewhat less than three times while the "standing army of unemployed" has risen five or six times or larger, depending on how you want to calculate it.

To deal with this, Populism had a coherent program that looked to the use of government power to restore and maintain a gentle, not destructively competitive free-enterprise system. Some of the main elements in the program were the nationalization of the railroads, democratization and increased accessibility of the people to the political process, heavy anti-trust legislation and the graduated income tax, something that George McGovern is still seeking to this day.

In 1896 there was, above all, the issue of silver coinage. What this grudge fight really had to do with was who shall have the benefit of the government's power to create money and credit. It's an ancient

American struggle that goes back to Andrew Jackson, the losing of which insured the primacy of Wall Street, and accounts for the fact that you must pay such enormous interest charges on your house, your car, and everything else you buy on credit.

The Democrats of 1972 do not have as logically formulated a program. Nor does what they do have get to the heart of the structures that bind us and force us to repeat our failures, except perhaps in the area of anti-trust. The banking, finance and credit structures, the mechanisms that "allocate our priorities," are left alone; the indicated direction for future action remains primarily bureaucratic and unpromising for the individual spirit.

Some of Sen. McGovern's supporters suggest that he is secretly a man with a well-defined program which he'll pop on us when he gets in the White House. Let's hope we're not going to have that again. Then, he may not have thought it out himself yet. He's been taken up by the war issue for years now and if he's like most Presidential candidates he probably has little taste for economics.

Or, the consultations of tin roosters aside, he may doubt he can speak well enough to get his meaning across. He is dry George McGovern in 1972, and not William Jennings Bryan in 1896, who lost, but lost right, laying it out vivid and clear so that others might not lose.

Copyright, 1972, The Washington Post
Thursday, July 20, 1972