

Conference traumas

The outcome of the World in Revolution might suggest for some shelving the program for next year and admittedly the conference did have more than its share of traumas.

The conference should not be scrapped, however, for several good reasons.

Attendance always seems to be the basic criteria for evaluating a successful program and some of the speakers especially those appearing in the morning faced sparse audiences.

This would suggest that next year speakers are arranged at times which do not conflict with class schedules of 90 per cent of the campus, since the University balked at canceling classes for a ny speaker except Sen. Ribicoff.

Also the Nebraska Theatre was a bad location for speakers since any location within two blocks of a living residence (except bars) will never entice the average student's attendance.

The cancellation of Sen. Ribicoff one day before his scheduled speech can not be blamed on anyone — although his absence left a gaping hole in the conference.

It is interesting though that Ribicoff's absence did not deter hundreds of faculty and students from attending Rep. Conyer's speech, which turned out to be the best received address.

Perhaps the topics for future conferences should be more differentiated to avoid repetition. For example two speakers spoke on education — two different aspects, yes — but students usually attended one or the other but not both speakers. Although Ribicoff's speech was never heard, he also was to have spoken about the same general area as Francis Fisher.

The greatest accomplishment of the World in Revolution was that the entire conference was organized and staged strictly by students and probably for the first time Nebraska Union members and Student Senate worked closely together for the same program.

Neither of the groups individually could have planned the conference as effectively and this type of union should be encouraged for future speakers programs.

Since students have demonstrated that they are capable of inventing new and imaginative ideas for speakers programs perhaps the Faculty Senate Convocations Committee, which hasn't had an original idea or impressive speaker for years, should be disbanded and their responsibilities transferred to student groups.

Cheryl Tritt

No war debts

Editor's noted: Mr. Durand, a frequent contributor, is an instructor in the department of Romance Languages.

Along with the "Crepe Suzette", the "Follies Bergeres" and Jean-Paul-Claude-Belmondo-Killy, every time I have engaged in a typical American cocktail repartee about France, the "touchy" question of the war debts kept gliding over my gin-and-tonic.

I think that it is about time for me to say that the demands of those who clamour for repayment of war debts can only be justified by their complete ignorance of the facts.

The London Agreement of 1953, to which the United States was a party, decided to defer a solution of the question of German reparations in view of the division of Germany, and in order not to hinder the "German Miracle", and attempt to prove that the economic machinery of the capitalist "free" world was more effective than the socialist "system".

As a result, the Moratorium proclaimed in 1931 by President Hoover was still on for all practical purposes and as long as it has not been lifted. None of the debtor countries, including France, can be called on to repay their outstanding World War I debts. (This was acknowledged by Mr. Joseph Bowman, Assistant secretary to the treasury, in a letter published by the Congressional Record of December 7th, 1967, and defying the position of the U.S. government.)

As for the debts of the second World War, and contrary to the beliefs of millions of Americans, France has been repaying them ahead of schedule and owes only a small part of the 300 million dollars which will not fall due till 1970.

It is essential that Americans should know that Frenchman whether he approves of De Gaulle or opposes him, is bound to dismiss claims for immediate repayment of World War I debts as outrageous until Germany resumes paying the due reparations for both wars, far in excess of France's debts!

Americans who want to understand the feelings of the French about the war debts have to consider the following facts:

The late entrance of the United States in the First and Second World Wars (the later caused by a German declaration of war, and known to have occurred against the will of a great majority of Americans) has always been resented by a nation who declared war on Germany in order to fulfill her commitment to Poland. The terrible bombing of civilian populations and the complete destruction of French industry and railroads by American bombers. The experimentation of Napalm over the city of Royan, in southern France, where a handful of German soldiers awaited capitulation and which resulted in the death of more than five thousand French civilians. The bloody and destructive "race" for Berlin (which was eventually lost, since the Red Army entered first in the capital of the Reich).

All those facts have left quite a resentment among those who have loved the "obliteration" of France.

After the war: The pressure put on France to restore her colonial power in Indochina, against the will of the majority of the French population; the support given the French government in its crush of the Algerian revolution; the rebuilding of Germany's conventional military power, now superior to any western European country's.

All those facts have created what may very well be called "anti-Americanism" in France.

Bernard J. Durand



Joseph Alsop . . .

If we should lose the war

Washington — In the prevailing fog of gloom and uncertainty, there are only two things that can be said with perfect certainty about the war in Vietnam. The first is bleakly simple:

There is in fact no comfortable, easy halfway house between defeat and victory.

No one who has studied North Vietnamese policy, labored to read the captured documents and followed on the spot the development of Hanoi's war plans, tactics and strategy believes for one moment that such a halfway house exists today, or will exist in the future. The well-intentioned people who offer theoretical blueprints for such halfway houses are as ignorant of the realities as the people who used to peddle the view that Josef Stalin was really a nice guy at heart.

The North Vietnamese leaders are men with tenacity and courage that seem all the more admirable in the present climate in Washington. They are also men endowed with the most steely ruthlessness. In February they expended their troops at a rate of more than 10,000 men a week and in the week of March 2-9, they were still expending troops so lavishly that their losses exceeded 6,700 men — and this is without counting their wounded!

Take as their population base the 16.5 million people of North Vietnam, plus the 5 million plus or minus under Viet Cong control in the South. Make the appropriate conversion and you find that the Hanoi leaders are in fact accepting losses which, if accepted by the United States, would run from 60,000 to 100,000 men a week in killed-in-action alone.

They are accepting these quite unprecedented rates of loss — ten times as high as the average in the recent past — because they are going for broke. They are going for broke — trying to win the war in a short time — because they know they cannot stand the strain of a greatly prolonged war. And they are ready to make such appalling sacrifices because they want to get their grip on South Vietnam.

To get their grip on South Vietnam at cheaper cost, the Hanoi leaders might well accept one or another of the crazier halfway house solutions that have been proposed in this country. But if that is ever permitted to happen, Saigon will be ruled from Hanoi in a very short space of time.

All the millions of Vietnamese who have put their faith in the United States will suffer cruelly for this misplaced faith. The United States will also have experienced its

first defeat in war since this republic was established. And that leads to the second certainty in the present situation, which is also bleak and simple:

Feeble, needless acceptance of defeat in Vietnam will poison American political life for a generation or more.

The circumstances that preceded the terrible McCarthyism were downright trivial compared to the heinous circumstances that will confront this country after acceptance of defeat in Vietnam. The resulting outcry about "stabs in the back," the search for scapegoats and the accusations of disloyalty and worse can in truth be expected to make the McCarthy-time seem downright cozy in retrospect.

Considering how obvious this ought to be, one is all but driven to conclude that the American left has gone collectively insane. As anyone should be able to see, there is already acute danger of the most frightening sort of a turn to the right in this country. The extreme postures of the Negro racists and the trouble in the cities are quite enough to provoke such a rightward turn.

The President's riot commission was no more than realistic when it warned of the possibility of American apartheid. The risk, God

knows, will be hard enough to circumvent, and that problem will be hard enough to solve without the added poisons that are sure to be engendered by the first defeat in war in American history. Add these other poisons to the present mix, and the American future hardly bears contemplation!

Without regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of past decisions, there is therefore only one safe course to take. That course is to make the needed effort to win the war. Winning does not mean crushing North Vietnam, and it does not demand the measures proposed by men like Gen. Curtis Le May. Winning means no more than forcing the Hanoi leaders to call home their troops and to cease threatening their neighbors in Laos and South Vietnam.

As any rational man should be able to see from the loss rates and population figures cited above, the Hanoi leaders cannot imaginably sustain the kind of effort they are now making for a very long time. If you go for broke and fail, the failure leaves you broken. Hence, there is nothing hopeless in the present situation; but because of the American advocates of defeat at any price, there is a profound danger for the American future.

Drug controversy continues

Washington (CPS) — Under an Administration proposal now being considered by Congress, a student who loans his roommate a pep pill to stay awake during finals will be a federal criminal subject to 10 years in prison and a \$15,000 fine.

The bill, which embodies proposals made by President Johnson in his State of the Union and crime messages would make possession of "hallucinogenic drugs (including LSD) and other depressant and stimulant drugs" a misdemeanor and "illegal manufacture and traffic" and "possession for sale" of such drugs a felony.

The House Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare completed hearings on the bill in early March. Although the subcommittee had not yet scheduled action on the bill, it is almost certain to be passed, possibly in an even stronger form. All but one of the subcommittee members have said they favor the bill.

It may face slightly rougher going in the Senate. At a series of hearings this week members of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee appeared sympathetic to arguments that laws for possession of drugs, especially marijuana, are unenforceable and that the penalties ought to be lessened or completely eliminated.

At one point Senator Thomas Dodd (D-Conn.), chairman of the subcommittee, said, "I have always had doubts" about the severity of marijuana laws, which are much tougher than those proposed for LSD, even though LSD is generally acknowledged to be a much more dangerous drug.

And Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) questioned how effective the government's "education program" on drugs could be when the laws on Marijuana and LSD are so inequitable.

Dr. James Goddard, com-

missioner of the Food and Drug Administration, described an extensive "education program" in drugs being run by his department. Kennedy responded, "I think we need more study before we can develop an effective educational program. LSD is 1000 times more dangerous than marijuana, yet we have a lesser penalty for it. In light of those inequities, do you think young people will pay any attention to an educational program?"

"I don't believe they will," replied Goddard, who has often expressed doubts about penalties for the possession of marijuana.

Two educators who appeared before the subcommittee argued that the present laws against marijuana are unenforceable.

Dean Helen Nowlis, director of the drug education project of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, told the committee that criminal penalties for possession of marijuana should be removed. She said, however, that she was against legalization of marijuana until more research could be done on it.

She agreed with Kennedy that the legal inequities make it difficult to convince people not to use marijuana. "I wish," she told the subcommittee, "every one of you had to face thoughtful young people who may or may not use marijuana and who ask you

to justify such penalties and at the same time explain why a bill regulating merely the mail-order sale of guns, who do kill and maim more people both accidentally and intentionally, than all drugs put together, cannot get to first base; or why alcohol, which ruins the lives of countless millions and has been demonstrated to be associated with many crimes of violence, is widely advertised and promoted and freely available to all adults."

She also expressed the fears of many deans and administrators about the tactics used by law enforcement officials in cases such as the police raid on the State University of New York at Stony Brook: "The great majority of students, teachers, and administrators find many widely used enforcement techniques both repulsive and destructive. Undercover agents, informers, invasion of privacy, tapped telephones are an anomaly in a situation where we are desperately trying to substitute inner controls for outside control, to foster individual and group responsibility, to encourage mature behavior by expecting mature behavior."

Although many deans have expressed these fears, the major national education associations, such as the American Council on Education, apparently plan no action on

the drug bill.)

Dr. Dana L. Farnsworth, director of the Harvard University health service, told the subcommittee bluntly, "The present laws against possession of marijuana are so severe they're not being enforced."

But the subcommittee heard conflicting testimony from two government officials who appeared before it.

Harry Giordano, commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics told the subcommittee that, if penalties for marijuana were eliminated, sellers of the drug would "escape justice." He said 70 per cent of federal marijuana arrests were for sales and that many of those for possession were persons "in possession of large quantities of marijuana, clearly destined for the market."

Food and Drug Commissioner James Goddard told the subcommittee that he "respected the judgment" of enforcement officers such as Giordano, although he had earlier questioned the severity of marijuana penalties.

This disagreement led Dodd to say at the end of the hearings that "We must resolve the conflicting judgments of educators and law enforcement officials before we enact any new legislation on drug abuse."

Thus, it is possible that several senators, including both Kennedy brothers and possibly even Dodd, who is generally regarded as a conservative, will speak out against the severity of the laws against possession of marijuana and LSD. Dodd's subcommittee may even decide to report out a bill to lessen the penalties for possession.

But such a bill is not likely to get very far. Nor is the Administration's LSD bill likely to be stopped in the Senate. Few members of Congress are likely to vote for lower drug penalties in an election year.

Wayne Kreuzer

Elections 1968: calm progress?

The prospects for an exciting ASUN election this year look rather slim. After last year's election-fiasco this might be preferable.

Last year's election was probably the most exciting in the school's history. In many ways it was also the most tragic.

The excitement and tragedy in the spring of 1967 were both a result of the ASUN election split between Ron Pfeifer and Dick Schulze. Together they presented a perfect team for student leadership. It made little difference who held what office.

But in opposing each other they stirred a turmoil on campus which is still felt today. Their split resulted in the election of one of the school's poorest Student Senates (or Councils) and the alienation of many of the University's best leaders from student government.

Originally Pfeifer and Schulze were running together along with Gene Pokorny. Schulze was the presidential candidate, Pfeifer was the first vice presidential candidate and Pokorny, second vice presidential candidate.

People still disagree on why they split. Here I won't even attempt to fully answer this question. (Frankly I have always thought the split was so unfortunate that I have never understood how it happened.)

Leaving Pokorny out of the picture, I will say that outside forces — mostly backward seniors inflated by their own importance and in many cases unfamiliar with student government — seemed responsible for initiating the unwise decisions that led to the split.

Basically Pfeifer and Schulze differed little on ideology, student goals or their concepts of student government. They are both liberals, highly intelligent, romantic (maybe to a different degree) and good representatives of the modern University individual. Perhaps Schulze proved the best politician.

However, they did split and a needless fight ensued which in many cases divided living units and made good friends enemies. Campaign marches almost became brawls. A once friendly campus was filled with curses, threats, lies and false accusations. Two green papers were printed. Threatening letters were sent. There was excitement.

But along with the excitement came the tragedy. When Pfeifer left PSA, the party also lost most of its experienced or competent senatorial candidates. PSA filled the empty positions with many candidates which had earlier been rejected.

Schulze — who truly once promised to lead the school's greatest student government — for a while came under the conflicting influences of reactionary, status quo Greeks and super-independents eager to control student government. This strange combination was sure to provide little benefit for anyone.

Pfeifer, on the other hand, led a group of crusading underdogs. Mostly juniors and other underclassmen they resented the treatment Pfeifer had gotten from the seniors. Pfeifer — like McCarthy in the Democratic Party — represented a fight against the corrupt, worn-out establishment. It was never as much a fight against Schulze as it was against Schulze's supporters. Like Schulze himself, the leading Pfeifer supporters tended to be liberal, intelligent youths. They naturally followed Pfeifer who remained honest to their attitudes.

In the end it all became rather confusing. Schulze — always an excellent candidate — won but few of the people elected with him approached his stature. Pfeifer — a candidate with great potential — lost. With Pfeifer all of the other potentially good senators with only a few exceptions also lost.

The split was needless. Pfeifer, most of his supporters and Schulze should have obviously been elected together.

The split provided much excitement, but perhaps a less exciting election this year will turn out better.

Roger Stark

Racism conflicts with liberty

"Extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice." Racism in the defense of liberty is a direct contradiction of principles. Nowhere and at no time can liberty prevail if persons of a certain racial group are all classified and categorized collectively. No person can believe in man's basic freedoms and rights and still believe that one race is better than another, or that all individuals of one race are the same.

Former governor Wallace is advocating a totalitarian form of government — not a free society of independent people. He is advocating that not only the country, but more important, individual lives, be controlled by the white, politically affluent Americans.

As I meet more and more people who are going to support Wallace, I find it ironic that these same persons are usually violently opposed to socialism. They obviously have a direct contradiction in thinking, for there is no difference between considering all persons of a certain race collectively, and considering all citizens of a certain country collectively.

Although there is no excuse for racial violence, there is a reason for it. That is the direct result of prejudice and bigotry. Just as social welfare is not going to change these attitudes and opinions, neither is the advocating of the annihilation of a certain minority group going to make that group more docile and obedient.

It is interesting that the vicious irony which exists when the white person is prejudiced toward a minority group, which leads to certain individuals of that group rebelling against the white person, who in turn finds greater conviction for his prejudice. It is the responsibility of the bigoted white, not of the rebelling minority individual, and not of the state, to abolish his prejudiced attitudes and end this irrational and destructive cycle.

Just as the white supremacist has no virtue, likewise the black supremacist has none. The beliefs of both persons can be equated, for they both advocate the dominance of all individuals by one certain group or race.

Daily Nebraskan March 18, 1968 Vol. 91, No. 30 Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb. TELEPHONES Editor 475-3534, News 475-2599, Business 475-2599. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods by the students of the University of Nebraska under the jurisdiction of the Faculty Subcommittee on Student Publications. Publications shall be free from copyright by the subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraska are responsible for what they consent to be printed. Member Associated College Press National Educational Advertising Service. EDITORIAL STAFF Editor Cheryl Tritt, Managing Editor Jack Todd, News Editor Ed Ionenaga, Night News Editor J. L. Schmidt, Editorial Page Assistant Jane Wagner, Assistant Night News Editor Willard Gentry, Sports Editor George Kallman, Assistant Sports Editor Bonnie Bonnett, News Assistant Lynn Pizorek, Staff Writers: Jim Evinger, Barry Skarlin, Mark Gordon, Jim Parks, Josh McCullough, Janet Staveland, Andy Cunningham, Jim Peterson, Bonnie Poczorny, Phyllis Adkinson, Kent Cookson, Brent Skjerve, John Durnal, Senior Copy Editor Lynn Gotchabal, Copy Editors: Betty Pennington, Dorey Pitts, Jane Berry, Holly Murrell, Christie Schwartzkopf, Photographers: Mike Hayden and Dan Laidly. BUSINESS STAFF Business Manager Glenn Fritsch, Production Manager Charlie Baxter, National Ad Manager Leola Meehan, Bookkeeper and classified ad manager Gary Hollingsworth, Business Secretary Jan Bostman, Subscription Manager Jess Ross, Salesman Dan Crum, Dan Locke, Kelly Drath, Todd Baughman, Debra Mitchell, Joel Davis, Lynn Womack.