

Who Is Wrong?

Knowing that demonstrations are being planned against Dow Chemical Co. today, the Daily Nebraskan would like to reiterate its editorial statements made last Wednesday:

"But if there are University students and professors who believe that the company should not manufacture napalm, we would not discourage them from letting their feelings and opinions be known.

"But only if they do it peacefully and without obstructing Dow Chemical from recruiting or allowing other students to talk with Dow Chemical.

"Students have the right to demonstrate and protest against that which they disagree — and we would be disappointed if they did not make use of this right. But this is good only insofar as it does not interfere with the respective rights of others."

★ ★ ★ ★

But the Daily Nebraskan cannot understand why the manufacturers of this weapon should be the ones to be hit by demonstrations. It seems far more logical to protest against those who use this weapon.

One might say that protests against the U.S. government's use of napalm have been so far ineffective. But it seems unlikely that the protests against Dow which manufactures napalm will be much more effective.

There are other weapons of war which equal napalm in eliminating or deforming mankind. And it seems that one should also protest against these equally-horrifying weapons of war, and specifically those companies which manufacture these weapons.

Granted that napalm seems to be exceptionally inhumane method of waging war. But for that matter are there any means of waging war which are humane?

★ ★ ★ ★

The Daily Nebraskan applauds those who make their opinions known on this issue — as long as they respect the rights of others — but questions whether this demonstration — a protest against the manufacturer and not the user — is not directed against the wrong individuals.

Today, Tomorrow...

Is it not rather ironic that a nation which has been so bountifully blessed should need a special day on which to give thanks for its many gifts?

And is it not rather ironic that the people of this nation — almost without exception — think in the negative — what it does not have — instead of in the positive — what it does have?

And needless to say, the press is probably as guilty as the public of accentuating the negative and de-emphasizing the positive — perhaps somewhat indicative of the society which it reports.

One would have to admit that the progressiveness of this country, and of this campus, has been a result of those who criticize negatively the engrained institution.

But this does not mean that one should never recognize the positive things which have been accomplished, or say thank-you, or at least be cognizant of the many small things which benefit our lives every day.

Today, tomorrow, or any other day, not just Thanksgiving Day, is the proper time to recognize those many things, great and small, for which Americans should be grateful.

Americans need not, and should not, wait for Thanksgiving Day to give thanks. Thanksgiving Day should be just a little part of every day.

Grand Sprix

by George Kaufman

A coed accosted me the other day in front of the Union and said, accusingly, "If you're so liberal, how come you're not a hippie?"

And, being an honest and forthright man at heart, I think it only fair that I should answer this question for all my wondering readers who might very well be asking the same question at this moment.

The truth is, readers, that I once was a hippie. Not many people know about this side of my life because it didn't last long.

Yes, as a young lad of 17, I ran away from home and pilgrimaged to San Francisco to join what was then unknowingly the core and embryo, as it were, of the flower-children who have made the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco so famous today.

But somehow I just didn't fit—I couldn't bring myself to conform to the social mores of this new sub-culture despite the glamour of being a part of it.

For one thing, pot made me sick and LSD made me dizzy. And then when someone told me it could make me impotent, I gave it up for good.

And I just couldn't bring myself to hug other boys at the love-ins. . . . I tried, Leary knows I tried, but I was just too uncomfortable.

And, too, my beard itched and when I let my hair grow long my dandruff got terrible and I found I couldn't go to sleep at night, my whole head itching and burning.

And the bells. My gawd, how those bells drove me batty. Day in, day out, people trooping in and out of my pad doing their thing and jingling the bells. I got these headaches constantly.

And then came the final blow—I found I was allergic to flowers.

So I decided to leave my new friends behind and seek a society where I could be free and live the way I was most comfortable without having to pretend to be something I wasn't.

Somewhere where I would not have to be such a hypocrite just to please my friends and my new 'family'.

So I returned home and learned the greatest lesson of my young life: That to be true to oneself, one does not have to choose between making love and war.

Daily Nebraskan

Vol. 91, No. 41. Recirculation postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Telephone: Business 472-2581, News 472-2582, Editor 472-5000. Subscriptions: \$10.00 per year in advance. Single copies 10¢. Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. Postmaster: Please send address changes to The Daily Nebraskan, 1000 S. 16th St., Lincoln, Neb. 68502. Member Associated College Press, National Advertising Service, Incorporated. Published at 1000 S. 16th St., Lincoln, Neb. 68502. EDITORIAL STAFF: Editor: Bruce Giblin; Managing Editor: Jack Todd; News Editor: Corry Trill; Staff Writer: Alan Plesman; Editorial Page Assistant: Julie Morris; Sports Editor: Mark Gordon; Assistant Sports Editor: Charlie Davison; Assistant Editor: Sandy Kline; Staff Writer: Dave Roman; Staff Writer: Gary Giffin; Staff Writer: Barry McGiffin; Jan Parks; Staff Writer: Christine Matthews; Staff Writer: Ken Carlson; Staff Writer: Gary Tristram; Copy Editor: Lynn Gottschalk; Staff Writer: Jim Evers; Staff Writer: John Schmidt; Photographers: Mike Herman and Dan Ladd. BUSINESS STAFF: Business Manager: Glenn Frazier; National Advertising Manager: Roger Boye; Production Manager: Charlie Bunker; Secretary: Joan Holman; Bookkeeping and Circulation: Allan Brandt; Subscription Manager: Jean Ross; Circulation Manager: David Kershaw; and Gary Meyer; Sales Manager: Dan Cook; Kelly Davis; and Bill Beck; Bill Eichen; Wayne Miller and Bill Fife.



"SORRY T.C.. BUT IT SAYS RIGHT HERE THAT WE'RE NOT SUPPOSED TO GET STARTED UNTIL EARLY 1984."

Our Man Hoppe

Elbie Jay Loves Dissert

Arthur Hoppe

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another chapter of The Real Great Society, that rollickin' tee-vee series featurin' the rootin'-tootin' Jay Family and starring ol' Elbie Jay — the kind of feller who never takes no for an answer. Not that he gets much opportunity.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today he and his two sidekicks Dean and Mac, are settin' in the parlor. There's some whoppin' and hollerin' goin' on outside and the three are lookin' mighty glum.

★ ★ ★

Elbie (irritably): Just you listen to these voices of dissent and disunity out there protestin' my war. For the sake of national unity, why can't they be loyal Americans and support me in my heartfelt desire to bring our boys home from Vee-yet-nayem?

Dean: What are they shouting, sir?

Elbie: As usual, they're shoutin' (he shudders) "Bring our boys home from Vee-yet-nayem."

Mac: Maybe you should make another speech, sir, outlinin' your wise policies and brilliant goals.

Elbie: I made 43 this week already. Each time I get up and I say in my magnanimous fashion that their here's a free country and any man's got the right to his own opinions about the war.

Dean: That's right, sir.

Elbie: 'Course, logic requires I point out that Hanoi is listenin' to every word. And anybody who says he disagrees with me is givin' aid and comfort to the enemy. Not to mention the Republicans.

Mac: That's right, sir.

Elbie: And then I wind up on a kindly note of reasonableness by puttin' the

two together. Any mangy, low-down, no-good, un-American, Commie-lovin' traitor, I say reasonably, therefore has the perfect right to disagree with me. As long as he don't say so out loud.

Dean and Mac (together): That's right, sir.

Elbie: And would you believe it? Some of these polecats are goin' around sayin' I'm tryin' to stiffl dissent. Me! Why, can you think of any man who loves dissent more 'n me?

Dean and Mac (together): No!

Elbie (nodding): That's a word I dearly love to hear you fellows say. If'n you fellows didn't say no to me once in a while I might just conceivably make a mistake.

Dean and Mac (together): Impossible!

Elbie (smiling): Well, you got a right to your opinion. But, truth is, I'm not infallible, I'm only a mere mortal human bein'!

Dean and Mac (together): You're dead wrong, sir!

Elbie (beaming): And I respect you the more for your honest dissent. (frowning) But why can't all folks dissent like that? If'n they did, I'd knuckle under, admit I was wrong and change my humble opinion of myself. No sacrifice is too great, I say, for national unity.

★ ★ ★

Well, tune in again, folks. And meanwhile, as you mosey down the windin' trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say:

"Be tolerant of your fellow man and let him have any opinion he wants. As long as it's your'n. And if'n it ain't, just let him have it."

What Penalties For Pot Users?

By The Collegiate Press

The two men in government who have the most to say about what the government's policy on marijuana ought to be offered sharply differing testimony before a House subcommittee about what should be done to pot-users.

Members of a House subcommittee on government operations, hearing the testimony early this week, showed a distinct preference for Narcotics Bureau Commissioner Henry Giordano's view that pot users are criminals and should be subject to long jail terms and stiff fines.

When Dr. James Goddard, chief of the Food and Drug Administration, suggested that laws concerning marijuana use might be too severe, some of the subcommittee members took him to task.

Goddard told the subcommittee, "I don't think we should make criminals out of the individuals who abuse" the drug.

Giordano, testifying the following day, strongly disagreed. He conceded that existing penalties for possession of marijuana are severe but he said they should remain so even if it means making a criminal out of a pot-user.

The criminal penalties for smoking pot are a deterrent to its use, according to Giordano. He said that if Congress decides to lessen the penalties, "the statistics on the use of the drug will go right through the roof." He added, "To say on the Federal level that we shouldn't have strong penalties for possession just

doesn't make sense to me."

Several congressmen suggested there was no need for the committee even to think about reducing the penalties for possession of marijuana. Rather, they said, Congress should be thinking about making the penalties for possession of LSD more severe, while leaving the marijuana law alone.

Under present laws someone with marijuana in his possession is guilty of committing a felony and may receive up to 10 years in prison and a \$20,000 fine for his first offense. Federal laws regarding LSD now say that agents may do no more than seize a user's supply of the drug.

Both Goddard and Giordano agreed that LSD is far more dangerous than marijuana and that efforts should be made to close the gap in the penalties with respect to the two drugs.

Although Goddard refused to suggest what penalties should apply to pot users, he indicated "they should be like those now applied to LSD." Giordano said applying the LSD penalty to marijuana "would increase the problem tenfold."

Both Goddard and Giordano said the use of pot should be controlled, but the FDA Commissioner recommended cutting off the supply as the primary means of control. Giordano said that in addition to cutting off the supply, the threat of a criminal penalty for possession should be retained as a deterrent to the use of pot.

CAMPUS OPINION

Dear Editor:

I am wondering how a person, who evidently has the intelligence to become editor of a collegiate newspaper, could have listened to Mr. Lane with an open mind and still arrive at the conclusions presented in the Daily Nebraskan's editorial "Credibility Gap."

It seems you have a rather naive attitude by inferring that we should believe the Warren Commission Report and the CBS documentary, simply because they were produced by "responsible people." You fail to realize that first of all, both productions represented only one point of view, disallowing all contradictory evidence and secondly, that the federal government is not the beautiful, uncorrupt organization we would all like it to be.

I cannot help but think you jumped off the wrong side of the fence concerning this issue.

Roger Stark

More Joan

Dear Editor:

Why does the Nebraskan think Joan Baez is such a heroine? All she does is make trouble. She hadn't done any more good than the "passive" people she criticizes. Anybody can sing, even "passive" people.

If the editor would read the books of Dr. Tom Dooley, he would see how hypocritical the Baez view of brotherhood is. Joan is a mere exhibitionist. What good has she done with her protests? Do you think if she protested in Russia — they are murdering aggressors — that they would pull out of Vietnam? No, the Comies would just laugh at her. They'd say, "If all Americans are as dumb as she, it won't be long before we bury them."

To protest is nothing. It's too bad Joanie didn't apply to the nursing school when she came here. Then she might see how much good can be done quietly, without fanfare. She might be able to see how "passive" people have done more good with their adrenalin than she has.

Harriet Lang

Dear Editor:

I attended the discussion held at Schramm Hall Wednesday afternoon at which Joan Baez and Ira Sandperl were present. After listening to Miss Baez and participating in a two-hour discussion with Mr. Sandperl I have nothing but the greatest admiration for their actions.

Their pacifist-humane philosophy is far greater value than the frankly frightening ideas of speaker censorship or "student spies."

When State Sen. Terry Carpenter is able to advocate undercover agents and say "I don't give a damn about what the students think about this," he reveals himself as the very type of personality which Miss Baez and Mr. Sandperl are attempting to resist.

We are out-Nazising the Nazis. They were good teachers, but we are becoming even better. Nonviolence is our only hope of countering the world-wide epidemic of violence.

Joseph A. Bunik

Dow

Dear Editor:

I write this letter as a supplement to the advertisement for the Dow Chemical Company which appears elsewhere in this edition. The ad in question points out what may well constitute complicity in a violation of international law and simple human decency, by virtue of this company's production of napalm.

In making this kind of claim I do not condone Viet Cong terrorism. I do, however, point out two relevant facts: 1) It is simple, historical matter of fact that because of the great American firepower superiority, most civilian deaths are caused by American firepower weapons — and few of those have the macabre sophistication of napalm. 2) We as Americans are responsible for what our countrymen do to the people of Vietnam. For that matter, according to the Nuremberg judgments, their blood is on the hands of anyone who participates in a crime against humanity. The contents of the display case on the first floor of the Union this week may supply relevant evidence as to whether such crimes are being committed.

Today an opportunity presents itself, in the person of the Dow recruiter, to confront this issue. If you wonder what can be done, I suggest that following possibilities: 1) Confront this recruiter himself with the moral question of possible complicity in crimes against humanity. 2) Refrain from buying Dow products. 3) Inform the officials of the company of the steps you are taking and urge this highly diversified company to refuse any further napalm contracts. These officials include C. A. Gerstacker, chairman, and L. I. Doan, chairman of the executive committee. Their address is the Dow Chemical Company, Midland, Mich.

Stephen H. Voss

Instructor of Philosophy

Fuzzy

Dear Editor:

As a member of the University Counseling Service, I wish to go on record as being opposed to James H. Walters, who now attempts to whitewash Dick Gregory's remarks and, in the manner of the new left, to hide behind the fuzzy idea of "academic freedom."

Mr. Walters forgets that excesses such as those mouthed by Gregory are sure to bring excesses by those who oppose the destruction of private property now done in the name of "civil rights," the denigration of the flag as an essential symbol of national unity and the betrayal of every man who ever fought for this country in Gregory's characterization of our troops as Nazis.

I am ashamed of the fact that Walters is a member of the University faculty. To say that Gov. Tiemann — or anybody else — has no right to know or cheer for the things Gregory advocated is to tell us that we have no right to

know the name of the person making threatening telephone calls. Such name-calling is always distasteful, but it is a matter of self-defense.

I am glad to know the name of at least one of the pro-Communist slobos who cheered Gregory. If I see him coming up my front walk, I shall now be able to take appropriate actions against him. Now if the other lovers of Chairman Mao, Gregory, Baez and the like would like to step forward . . .

Frank S. Devine

In Defense

Dear Editor:

Scott Smith has implied that I am an extremist, an infiltrator, a subverter, an advocate of the overun of the U.S. and that the Russian banner that I have is an absurdity, a stain, an ugly mark upon the H.S.S. complex.

How can he judge me as a subversive simply from the color of my window? How can he project his feelings and opinions and see them as universal?

Scott Smith was the first person to express displeasure at my window shade. It was Nov. 7 at 19:30 hours that I first learned of his views on "political extremists."

I was returning to my room when I saw between 10 and 15 of his "storm troopers" bludgeoning upon my door. I identified myself and asked them what they wanted. Their spokesman informed me that they wanted my banner. (I have been informed that it was their intention to force their way into my room, rip down the banner and make a pyre of it in the mall. "This is not cricket my fellow students," it is, in fact, breaking and entering, assault, theft and destruction of private property.)

I made no move to unlock the door. Their spokesman, who reeked of spirits, became quite irrational and began to shake with rage. It is quite possible that I could have met with physical abuse had not the overwhelming majority of the persons on my floor turned out to support me. The troopers then made their first rational move, they left, with the threat that they would have the banner before the week was out.

That banner is just a piece of cloth to me, it keeps the sun out of my room in the day. What menas something to me is my right to display it.

In my view, that the banner remained for nine weeks with no protest means that nearly all the people who saw it thought, "He can display what he wants, this is a free country." The Daily Nebraskan has brought it to my attention that some of the Nebraska lawmakers disagree.

Scott Smith mentioned that no one would be able to display a U.S. flag for long in Russia and I am forced to agree. I had naively thought that this was the difference between a "free" country and a Communist one, obviously the difference is not as great as I had imagined.

When I get a better understanding of the wording of the law and the meaning of the words "friendly nation" the banner may again be seen. If you see it at some later date do not think that it supports the Communists and their plans for world domination, think of our freedom of speech, expression and rights as individuals for this is what signifies.

I have not been asked by any student assistant, resident director or public official to remove the banner, but I have removed it in compliance with the law quoted and seemingly interpreted by the Daily Nebraskan. It is not my intention to violate the law, but I do question its validity and constitutionality.

I feel that a strong nation, one with strong popular support can allow much freedom of speech and expression, perhaps this is why I felt depressed as I took down the red banner.

Now Scott Smith climb back in your tree but remember that if you cut too deep into the roots the tree may die.

Jim Clement

Strife

Dear Editor:

I would that every joint, marijuana or tobacco, were a bullet, that we could end a war more quickly and bring a generation home.

I would that psychedelics were explosive in another way, that people could die more quickly and mercifully, less in soul and more in body. For short lives can have more meaning than long ones eroded into the monotony of habit and the misery of insanity.

When we realize that this is not the never-ending war on Communism that politicians talk of winning, but the growing pains of maturing nation such as we have seen before, in Russia: we can apply to present strife Thomas Paine's statement:

As parents, we can have no joy, knowing that this government is not sufficiently lasting to insure anything which we may bequeath to posterity, and by a plain method of argument, as we are running the next generation into debt, we ought to work at it, otherwise we use them meanly and pitifully ("Common Sense").

Echoed by J. R. Tolkien: . . . Yet it is not our part to master all the tides of the world, but to do what is in us for the succor succor of those years wherein we are set, uprooting the evil in the fields that we know, so that those who live after may have clean earth to till. What weather they shall have is not ours to rule. ("The Return of the King")

If the flower children, about whom and among whom are all manners of homicide and suicide which they could object to or abstain from, are really looking for love, let them look to this reasoning. If they see love not, have they the strength for love?

Robert G. Dairymple

(The Nebraskan reserves the right to condense letters. Unsigned letters will not be printed.)