

# Napalm—matter of principle

Dow Chemical's recruiters are back on campus. This time they took the precaution of furnishing us with a propaganda pamphlet designed to inform us on the altruistic motives behind their production of napalm and to help us background stories on any anti-Dow demonstrations that may occur.

Dow makes it clear in the "information" they supplied us that they do not manufacture napalm for economic reasons. Napalm, they point out, amounts to only one-half of one percent of their revenue. The decision to continue the manufacture of the explosive jell, Dow says, is a matter of principle rather than monetary necessity.

The principle, however, is a rather shoddy one. Though Dow says they are "supporting our commitment in Vietnam" and "backing our boys," it is apparent that in every respect the manufacture and use of napalm is not in the best interests of America.

**TO BEGIN WITH**, we are fighting a very questionable war; a war that has divided our homefront and considerably weakened the international status of our nation. In this context, the use of napalm lends the dissenters, both here and abroad, an emotional tool of unquestioned power.

The national press has argued rather convincingly that the civilian casualties resulting from napalm have been over exaggerated. The fact remains, however, that there ARE civilian casualties and that the horror of military casualties resulting from napalm is one of the primary reasons world opinion has allied itself against the United States position in Vietnam.

The final and perhaps most convincing argument against napalm is the fact that it opens the door to the use of other ghastly modern weapons. How can we, for example, argue against the use of germ warfare by Red China after using napalm in Vietnam?

Time magazine said in a news story that the efforts of the anti-Dow protestors on the campus have been largely misdirected since 60 or 70 other companies are out-producing Dow in the manufacture of war materials.

**ANY COMPANY** manufacturing war materials is indulging in the kind of profiteering most revolting to man. The manufacture of napalm, however, is a serious violation of the international rules of warfare, and a violation whose consequences we will have to live with for years to come. That, Dow Chemical, is why you're having trouble on the campuses of America. That is why you have no reason to expect to leave the campus unscathed.

Jack Todd

Dick Gregory . . .

## Who are real counterfeiters?

The really insidious nature of campaigning in a national election dominated by the two-party system came into new focus for me personally during the final weeks of the campaign. As an independent, write-in candidate for President (though my name appeared on the ballot in some states), I had been circulating handbills which bore some resemblance to a one dollar bill.

My picture appeared where George Washington is placed on legitimate currency; though I was wearing a derby hat and a turtleneck. Since I have not shaved for over a year, any resemblance between myself and our first President is purely coincidental.

**FEDERAL AGENTS** entered my campaign headquarters in Tennessee and in New York City and confiscated my handbills. It seems, according to official explanation, that some of my handbills had been used in coin changing machines. A complaint was registered that my campaign literature was "bugging" the machines.

One wonders how far advanced our technology really is if a machine cannot distinguish between my handbills, with my picture on them, and a legitimate dollar bill bearing the portrait of George Washington! But then again, if such confusion is possible, perhaps the technological age holds unprecedented possibilities for true integration.

I have no doubt that my handbills were "bugging" the machine and that is the reason for their confiscation. I dared to challenge the "machine" dominated two-party political system in this country, along with other independent candidates.

**IN THE** traditional and accepted structure of American politics there is no place for such a challenge. Richard Nixon, for example, insisted that this is a two-party country and would not acknowledge the legitimacy of non two-party candidates.

It is curious and frightening to my concept of true democracy to recognize that I was only accepted by government officials as a serious presidential candidate when my literature was "bugging" machines, both political and economic. I was an announced candidate for over a year. I was the only candidate who had his platform published by a major publishing house (WRITE ME IN!, Bantam Books, June, 1968.)

Yet I was never offered security protection for myself and my family (a privilege accorded even Harold Stassen during the primaries.) Nor was I given security briefings by the President, another privilege accorded the preferred white candidates.

**IT MUST** also be asked who are the real counterfeit campaigners in this country. Is it an independent candidate who prints his own literature and pays for it out of his own pocket? Or is democracy counterfeited by a candidate who attempts to buy his way into the White House with the financial backing of one of the two major parties?

Political ads published during the latter days of the campaign by the Humphrey-Muskie team accused Richard Nixon of trying to do just that with some \$20 million. And the ads issued a plea that the Democratic team be supported to allow them to do the same thing.

It is true that I circulated a few million pieces of campaign literature which bore some resemblance to a dollar bill. It seems to me that is the only legitimate "currency" which should be used to "buy" votes from the American electorate. If such campaign literature is judged by our government to be a threat to the American economy, we should be more concerned than ever about the value of the American dollar.

Waide Allen Syndications, Inc.



Oh well... back to "I LOVE LUCY"

## Editorials

## Commentary

Our man Hoppe . . .

### Honor, peace disrupt Wonderfulland

by Arthur Hoppe  
Once upon a time in the country called Wonderfulland, the people worshipped both a God and a Goddess.

The God's name was Honor. He was a handsome and virile God with a noble brow and flashing eyes. His temples were Integrity and Fair Dealing. And those who worshipped therein were blessed with the respect of their fellow men. Everybody loved Honor.

**THE GODDESS'** name was Peace. She was as fair as sunrise, as gentle as twilight. Her temples were Love and Brotherhood. And those who worshipped therein were blessed with serenity and abundance. Everybody loved Peace.

So the people of Wonderfulland worshipped both the God and Goddess with equal fervor and saw no reason to choose between them. And for years they enjoyed the blessings of both, dwelling in serenity, abundance and the respect of their fellow men.

Then one day the people of Wonderfulland and somehow or another became ensnared in a tiny, little war with a little, tiny country far, far away. It was Honor, of course, that ensnared them there.

"**WE MUST** honor our sacred commitments to whomever it may concern!" cried the Warriors of Wonderfulland, brave men and true. "Those who will not fight besmirch our sacred Honor."

"We must not kill our fellow men!" protested the Peace Worshipers of Wonderfulland, good men and kind. "Those who would fight endanger universal Peace."

As the war dragged on, the people grew confused. Was Honor more sacred than Peace? Was Peace more sacred than Honor? They didn't know what to think.

**BUT THE** Leader of Wonderfulland, as leaders will, came up with a brilliant solution of this seemingly insoluble dilemma.

"What we are seeking in this war, my fellow Wonderfullanders," he explained in a moment of inspiration, "is Peace WITH Honor."

And all the lesser leaders and all the would-be leaders saw the brilliance of this and took up the chant: "Peace with Honor! Peace with Honor! Peace with Honor!"

**THE PEOPLE** sighed with relief. "Yes," they said, "that's precisely what we worship: Peace with Honor."

So the Leader made the little war bigger and bigger to preserve Wonderfulland's Honor. But he refused to release Wonderfulland's full might on the little country for fear of endangering universal Peace.

No one could argue with this. Those who would surrender Honor for Peace were accused of blaspheming Honor. And those who would sacrifice Peace for Honor were accused of blaspheming Peace. So the people went on worshipping both with fervor.

**BUT AS THE** war dragged on and on, a strange thing happened. Riots broke out in the streets. The Leader became hated. Neighbor turned against neighbor. The country's abundance was poured into the war. And few admired Wonderfulland as much as they once did.

"But no one has sacrificed more for Peace and Honor than we," cried the people of Wonderfulland puzzled and uneasy. "Why are we no longer blessed with serenity, abundance and the respect of our fellow men?"

Moral: If you have to choose, choose Peace. You'll be alive to enjoy its blessings.

Chronicle Features

### Day after the election: a synopsis of possibilities

The magi reached into the snow-white, bell-tongued ball of holidays at the end of the carol-singing sea and brought out—Richard Nixon.

For better or worse, perhaps till death do us part, we are stuck with it. Everyone is walking around muttering to themselves, "four years... four years." Perhaps it won't be that bad. After all, we can't really do much worse.

True, Nixon is conspicuously tied to Strom Thurmond, is saddled with Spiro Agnew and hasn't answered a question straight since he told a 1962 press conference "you won't have Nixon to kick around anymore." Now we have him to kick around, in the flesh, and ten to one the writers and TV men are about to have a field day unequalled since Lyndon Johnson pulled up his shirt to show his scar to the world.

**MOST OF THE** people who voted for Tricky Dick did so with one thought in mind: a return to the quiet days of Dwight Eisenhower. That return, it would seem, is impossible. We are, however, curious to see if he can really pull it off.

First and foremost — he must end the war. If he succeeds in that, and he should,

he must then settle an economy which may well go into cartwheels at the end of the war.

Then he must tackle the cities. Nixon said in a widely praised statement last spring that he would bring the private sector into the ghettos and get the federal sector out. Current events in Detroit and other cities indicate that this just may work.

He must hope that all the black nocoms who presumably will be returning from the service don't use their know-how to make future insurrections in the ghettos even more devastating.

He must learn how to deal much better than he has to date with the New Left. To do this he will have to muzzle Spiro Agnew and keep his deals with Southern racists and the business establishment quiet, if not eliminate them altogether.

One must admire the way Nixon ran his campaign, even though it appears that another week would have destroyed it. One must also admire his comeback from the defeats of 1960 and 1962, and his triumph over certain personal shortcomings.

**HUBERT HUMPHREY**, after fighting the good fight,

#### Daily Nebraskan

Second-class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.  
TELEPHONE Editor 472-2540, News 472-2539.  
Address correspondence to Daily Nebraskan, Room 31, Student Union, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska 68503.  
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$8 for the academic year. 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 censorship by the Subcommittee or any person outside the University. Members of the Nebraskan are responsible for what they cause to be printed.  
Member Associated Collegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

#### Editorial Staff

Editor Jack Todd; Managing Editor Ed Lemmer; News Editor Lynn Gottschalk; Night News Editor Kent Cochran; Editorial Page Assistant Kelly Merrill; Assistant Night News Editor John Kraska; Sports Editor Mark Gordon; Assistant Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers Jim Brivner, John Dvorak, Larry Eckhart, George Kaufman, Julie Morris, Jim Putney, Terry Grote, Bill Smitherman, Connie Whitaker; Senior Copy Editor Joan Waggoner; Copy Editors Phyllis Adkins, Dave Filipek, Jane Wiseman, Andrea Wood; Photography Chief Tom Ladeby; Photographer J. E. Shaw; Artist Gail Pleasance.

#### Business Staff

Business Manager J. L. Schmidt; Bookkeeper Roger Boye; Production Manager John Fleming; National Ad Manager Phyllis Shoemaker; Business Secretary and Classified Ads Linda Urie; Subscription Manager Jan Bozinger; Circulation Managers Ron Parvika, Rick Doran; Advertising Representatives Meg Brown, Joel Davis, Glenn Friend, Nancy Gofflett, Don Looker, Todd Stauffer.

Inside report . . .

## Secrecy alters Saigon's refusal

by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

**WASHINGTON** — The embarrassing and surprising refusal of the Saigon government to go to the negotiating table in Paris is in no small part the product of a security blackout that kept South Vietnamese authorities in the dark about preliminary arrangements for a bombing halt.

Indeed, behind studied confidence in the upper reaches of the Johnson administration, that President Nguyen Van Thieu ultimately must send a delegation to Paris, there is deep concern. This is coupled with a retrospective wish that the Saigon regime had been brought more frontally into the three weeks of negotiations preceding President Johnson's bombing halt announcement last Thursday night.

**ONLY THIEU** himself, Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky, and perhaps one other top official were privy to the U.S. plan as it developed from Oct. 9 to last Thursday. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, on orders from Washington, had warned Thieu not to let his official family into the secret of the delicate negotiations going on in Paris.

Bunker's explanation to Thieu reflected Washington's desire for total security. Bunker's explanation: if Thieu spilled the beans to top officials of his own government, there would have been leaks all over the place, the element of secrecy regarded as essential here would have been lost, and political backfires against deescalation would have started in Saigon.

What complicated this was that Thieu himself apparently did not realize the extent of opposition within his own government. Thieu, in fact, at least temporarily lost control over his own administration and was unable to deliver the support for the U.S. plan that Bunker expected.

**ACCORDING TO** well-placed authorities here, this inability of President Thieu to persuade his own government to support President Johnson was a total surprise to both Bunker and Washington. But there is reason to believe that Bunker was counting on a few more days for Thieu — and Bunker himself — to break the word to leading Saigon politicians, including both Catholic leaders and right-wing politicians in the National Assembly, and win them over to the peace plan.

The original target for ending the bomb halt, had all gone according to plan, was Nov. 6 — one day after the U.S. election. Through this timing, Mr. Johnson would avoid any accusation of playing politics with war and peace in Vietnam.

What threw the timetable out of whack was the unexpected speed with which Hanoi told U.S. negotiators in Paris that they would accept a Saigon negotiating team at the Paris peace talks — the toughest of all the obstacles in the way of a bomb halt.

**WHEN THE** President received this word from Paris, he and his principal advisers considered holding off until the day after the election, sticking to the original timetable. They decided not to for an obvious reason: U.S. lives could be lost in those intervening three days. But that decision cut short Thieu's time to prepare his own government for the news.

Against that background, the somewhat similar plight of newly-elected President Eisenhower in 1953 has now been brought out for study inside the Johnson administration.

Hard-line South Korean President Syngman Rhee reacted with uncontrolled bitterness when the U.S. (under the aegis of the United Nations) signed a ceasefire with the North Koreans. Not only did he denounce the ceasefire, he threatened to march his South Korean troops north, raising the spectre of clashes between South Koreans and Americans. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sent Gen. Maxwell Taylor, top field commander, an urgent message to keep Rhee "on a tight leash."

**RHEE'S FURY** FADED. With his troops dependent on U.S. ammunition and supplies, his position was hopeless. The threat of a march to the north petered out and the ceasefire held.

This is the pattern Johnson administration officials are now confident will be duplicated in Saigon. If the Saigon boycott truly jeopardized the Paris talks, the political reaction in the U.S. could be swift and remorseless, leading to a break in the Washington-Saigon axis and perhaps an irresistible demand on the new President to bring the boys back home and leave Saigon to its own devices. That possibility will weigh on Thieu today as it did on Rhee in 1953.

(C) 1968, by Publishers-Hall Synd.

## Graffiti . . .

(In case you think we're making progress department, part II.)

Help Biafra. Shoot a Nigger. (Written in the hall, Abel Sixth Floor.)

## Topical Poets & Tropical Fish

Are easy to come by  
And live in a dish.

A pleasure to have  
They tingle the mind  
As they shine in the shallows  
And eat their own kind.  
But fate, fans, is fickle  
And "the paper" is dear  
To those who clean fish bowls  
And the public's left ear.

So, please don't change the water  
When we drop in the polls  
Or come Tuesday morning  
We'll be—bellie-up in our bowls.

J. K. BROWN

T.E.