

The march from the inside--a community created

by Mike Hayman

A band of about 50 Mad Dogs, Crazyes, SDS Weathermen, and White Panthers gathered below the CBS color camera. Shouting revolutionary pep chants, they advanced on the parade marshals who had linked arms to keep the shouting radicals from walking through seated peace marchers awaiting the beginning of the rally.

The marshals, peace marchers with the job of preventing violence, held only temporarily. The revolutionaries pushed into the crowd, knocked over coffee, stepped on the seated marchers, and shouted revolutionary cliches. The crowd countered the invaders' clenched fist salutes with waving peace fingers.

Someone began singing, "All we are saying is give peace a chance."

Someone else opened a crate of apples and passed them around to distract from the disturbance.

The noisy band succeeded neither in gaining cooperation nor arousing confrontation. They withdrew into their corners, contenting themselves

with shouting at the television cameras for the rest of the day.

Although last weekend's activities in Washington D.C. were both violent and peaceful—everything from a window breaking spree to the carefully monitored march against death from Arlington National Cemetery to the nation's Capitol—the mood was more Woodstock than Chicago. For many young marchers, their first trip to Washington became a kind of love-in with the city, with its citizens who opened their homes, and even with the police.

The predicted housing problem for the half million marchers never happened because Washingtonians opened their homes. A young couple in Maryland accepted eight Nebraskans whom they had never seen, offered them rooms and fed them meals. Churches donated their buildings for coordination and housing centers. One elderly couple waited at the end of the death march and asked passing youth, "Do you need a place to stay?"

For many of the marchers, their first demonstra-

tion against the war was the march against death from Arlington to the Capitol. For two days, a continuous, single-file line carried the names of U.S. war dead and a memorial candle past the Lincoln Memorial, the White House, and down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol.

Despite two cloudbursts Thursday afternoon and a windy 23-degree cold Friday night, the line never stopped. Along the way, marchers flashed peace signs to sailors watching from the Navy Building; about half the sailors returned the sign.

A marcher who had stopped for a light bought a peace button for a Black policeman at the corner. The Black man apologized that he couldn't wear it. His sergeant had asked him to remove another one that he had been wearing, but he assured the marchers that hidden beneath his orange reflector he wore three Moratorium buttons.

For the large march on Saturday, 6000 volunteers lined the parade route shoulder-to-shoulder to prevent any outbreak of violence. Soon after the muffled drums

and caskets at the head of the parade reached the Washington memorial, the site of the rally, a rented truck drove up and passed out fruit and lemonade.

The endless stream of celebrities at the rally drew only an occasional response from the large crowd, mostly because the sound system was inadequate for the half million listeners. But late in the afternoon at the same time 5000 protesters were running from tear gas at the Justice Department, "Aquarius" danced at the memorial.

While the cast of "Hair" sang from the platform, marchers formed dancing, snaking, hand-holding lines. Five students carrying the letters P-E-A-C-E led a long running line. Four concentric circles of dancing lines encircled a laughing couple in a sleeping bag.

Attorney General John N. Mitchell called it a violent demonstration, and a Michigan paper headlined, "Marchers on Rampage in Washington."

Meanwhile, half a world away, the government of which Mitchell is a part maintains a half million men. They don't dance to "Aquarius."

Nebraskan editorial page

Some see hair instead of head

"Our campus is being polluted! Yes, fellow Nebraskans, on this very campus we have a few (thank God it's only a few) subversives who are spoiling our lives. These degenerates have committed crimes against our sensibilities which must not go unavenged.

For example, they aren't impressed when we attempt to prove our masculinity by laying scratch in our Mustangs.

They soil our hallowed Nebraska traditions by removing their mohair sweaters and navy blue windbreakers and exchanging them for cheap clothing like army shirts and jean jackets. They besmirch the name of our University by giving up their God-given apathy and becoming involved in politics.

But the thing that really makes me mad is the long hair. There are even a few who go without getting a haircut for six months or longer. They look so dirty that it makes me sick.

Whenever we see one, me and the boys show off our ready wit by making clever remarks like, "Golly, that guy needs a haircut!" or "Gee, Wilber, look at the damn hippie!"

When we want to show our girls that we're men, we whistle at the long-hairs and then say, "Oh, it's a boy."

Sometimes they look so bad that I have to bounce them off the wall a couple of times and knock some sense into their pinko heads.

They're chicken, too. Not one of them has ever done anything bad to me except once. That one actually told me that I was insecure when I made one of my witty remarks as he walked by. If he was a man like me, he'd fight!

To a true-blue American these "people" are revolting. They are ruining this country and our University. I came to this University to get an education, not to be exposed to a lot of liberal ideas and long-haired communist punks.

Therefore, I appeal to you, my fellow Americans and loyal Go Big Red students. Let's make things the way they were in the 50's.

Wear your penny loafers with pride! Drink beer 'til you get sick and be proud of it. Punch all your buddies in the shoulder and ask them how much they "got" the night before. And above all, don't listen to what all those damn long-hairs are telling you.

Mary Pat Fowler
Staff Writer



RFK lives in ideals

Rapping at random

... Ron Alexander

Today, Nov. 20, would have been Robert Kennedy's forty-fourth birthday. Whether he would have celebrated in the White House or the Senate Office Building is a question in a pointless debate.

The Young Democrats and workers from the 1968 campaign are presenting a living memorial in which we hope to remember what Robert Kennedy thought, what he did, and how he challenged people. The sole purpose of such a remembrance is to ask if Robert Kennedy is alive in his approach and his goals. And is Robert Kennedy relevant to the 1970's?

Robert Kennedy was born a Democrat, and was born into a rich family. His roots were implanted in a social system from which his family reaped benefits in excess of anything most Americans could imagine. Robert Kennedy had it made from the day he was born. He was also above average in intelligence. He had great ambition and vast talents in organizing campaigns, talents witnessed by his management of John Kennedy's successful campaign.

Jack Newfield, a Kennedy friend and journalist, says that RFK was a conflicting, vulnerable man, yet a tremendous healing force and possibly the only one for us this century. He says that Kennedy was the one politician who might have united the black and white poor into a new majority for change.

Robert Kennedy was a political man. He took stands on thousands of issues and used his influence and name to get support for them. Robert Kennedy began to oppose the Vietnam war in Feb. 1966, at which time he said the only real solution to the conflict was a coalition government in the South.

He took national television to Appalachia, exposed the corrupt officials, horrendous conditions, and then lectured America on its responsibility. He helped create a community college in Bedford-Stuyvesant. He offered blacks and poor whites a political voice.

He used his name, his office and his charisma on those problems he felt needed resolving. Robert Kennedy doesn't fit any role of popular idol. He was too political to fill the bill. He spoke against too many traditions, institutions and people to remain unassailable. He had warts and didn't mind their being seen.

What was Robert Kennedy's approach? He was critical to the point of alienation and beyond. He was as much as exiled from Lyndon Johnson's administration. He was anathema to American business, for he spoke too often about paying for American poor. He attempted to provide a purpose for Blacks, youth, and blue collar workers. And from every group he demanded action and involvement.

Robert Kennedy believed in America and her institutions. But the change in direction he sought would have radically changed those institutions. He died before the direction could be changed. Whether or not he could have made America more considerate is unknowable. Whether he will be relevant to the 70's is yet to be seen.

W. H. Auden says: "What he was he was: What he is fated to be depends on us. Remembering his death, how we choose to live will decide its meaning."

DAILY NEBRASKAN

Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Telephone: Editor 473-2222, News 473-2222.
Subscription rates are \$4 per semester or \$8 per year.
Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods.
Member of Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.

The Daily Nebraskan is a student publication, independent of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government.
Address: Daily Nebraskan
34 Nebraska Union
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Editor Roger Reynolds; Managing Editor Kent Cockran; News Editor Jim Peterson; Night News Editors J. L. Schmidt, Dave Filipek; Editorial Assistant Holly Baumberger; Assistant News Editor Janet Maxwell; Sports Editor Randy York; Nebraskan Staff Writers John Dvorak, Bill Smitherman, Sara Schneider, Gary Sacreel, Steve Sinclair, Sachit Singh, Diane Woods, Julie Barrett, Sue Peltay, Sylvia Lee, Ron Whitten, Carol Anderson; Photographers Don Ladd, Jim Dean, Howard Rosenberg, Mike Hayman; Copy Editors Dan Ladd, Jan Perka, Suzi Schindler, Phyllis Adkinson.

Business Manager Ed Tompkins; Local Ad Manager J. L. Schmidt; National Ad Manager Max Brown; Bookkeeper Don Bowlin; Business Secretary and Subscription Manager Janet Boatman; Circulation Manager James Stetzer; Classified Ad Manager Jane Wagner; Advertising Representatives J. L. Schmidt, Joel Davis, Joe Wilson, Linda Robinson.

Open Forum

Dear Editor:

In reference to the squabble over the closing of the charity concession stand by the Athletic Dept., I would say that what is needed is a resolution to investigate ASUN, not the Athletic Dept.

What ASUN and supporters of the resolution do not seem to realize is the tremendous amount of money involved in fielding athletic teams.

Think of the amount of money required to transport 50 football players and their gear to away games. Reduce this figure to say an average of 15 participants in each of the other sports—basketball, baseball, track, swimming, etc. The cost to the student were he forced to support this program would be unbearable.

That the Athletic Dept. can be self-supporting should be a factor for praise rather than for inquisitorial resolutions. The Athletic Dept. must have a monopoly on concessions to help it continue to be self-supporting.

Otherwise student ticket prices will inevitably have to be raised. Do the supporters of the ASUN resolution want to pay \$15-20 or more for a season football ticket? I do not. Do they want to pay \$10-15 for an all-sports ticket? I do not.

Charity does have its place though, and I suggest that those who are so concerned

about charity quit competing with the Athletic Dept. and work through the proper channels by giving more generously to AUP next time around. I am sure it could use greater support.

Mike Butler

Dear Editor:

I was amazed to read Professor Stock's letter in which he said that he was disturbed by the reactions of a random sample of students to Nixon's speech. On the contrary, it is his letter which should be the source of concern, for it revealed fundamental misconceptions about the purpose and process of college education.

What his letter seems to imply is that the task of college teachers is to mould students to think exactly like themselves, and that the success or failure of a teacher is to be measured by the extent to which the views of his students on political questions agree or disagree with those of Professor Stock.

It is obvious that Professor Stock is impatient with the Vietnam debate which, unfortunately, he is willing to blame upon his colleagues. But perhaps what bothered me most in his letter is the fact that he is not willing to credit us (students) with more maturity and independent judgment.

John A. Zana

Dear Editor:

An open letter in response to Prof. Edward N. Megay's letter of Nov. 10 to an anonymous colleague:

It was heartening to learn that you are well versed in the politics of the era of Socrates. If not in the current university political system. As I look around I am sure your anonymous colleague is pleased to be compared with Socrates, however unfavorably.

It might have been more interesting if you were to relate the behavior and conduct of Socrates rather than simply the "charges" against him. Surely you are aware that the difference between conduct and "charge" is often substantial. This is especially true in the event the charges are leveled by the common rabble. Remember the McCarthy (Joe) days?

Few of us have the stuff to become Socrates.

While your anonymous colleague admitted to having been labeled a troublemaker, your letter charged him as one. Might not your disparaging remarks as to "why" rest entirely upon the "charge" rather than the fact?

I'm surprised that you think your colleague surprised with the internal politicking of university staff and administration. Isn't the introductory course in Political Science required of us all as a matter of course at the B.A. level? If not, it should be.

The student reporter did a

commendable job in his article. Staff members should not require review of quotes or interpretations in order that students can do their best as freely as possible. This is to remind you that the article is the reporters', and further, the word "whine" is yours not the reporters'.

Friend Edward, I salute you for having the guts to make your caustic remarks openly. Hopefully you are enough of a "practical" politician to reserve your gummy approach for those already labeled, and for the lower and non-administrative ranks.

Bert Evans
Assistant Professor

Dear Editor:

To C. M. Dalrymple, writer in the "Open Forum" of the Nov. 13 Daily Nebraskan:

Since "Nixon himself is ignorant of the basic powers given the people by the constitution..." I suggest you point this out to the Supreme Court, which will then explain this aspect of the Constitution to our President. (Interpretation of the Constitution is a duty of the Supreme Court.) Of course there is the possibility that the Supreme Court justices are also so ignorant of the Constitution that they do not understand the Constitution as fully as you do.

You imply the President is at fault because "... he chooses to ignore public appeals." The fact that a President does not immediately act upon such

appeals does not necessarily mean he has not considered the merits of the appeals. If a president should heed public appeals, which should he heed?

A government whose policies are instantaneously formulated in favor of whomever can assemble the noisiest or biggest mob is not a government I would like to live under.

You state, "More participated in the Moratorium than have ever voted for any American president." A writer in the editorial page of the Nov. 13 Omaha World-Herald states, "... ten times as many Americans voted for George Wallace as took part in the Oct. 15 moratorium." (I feel that the World-Herald dislikes Wallace as much as it dislikes protesters.) I resent wishful thinking being passed off as "fact." Could someone provide some "facts" with better documentation?

Paul Bondo

Dear Editor:

May I suggest that your November 12 editorial supporting Governor Tiemann's re-election in 1970 is premature? A decision one year prior to the election, without knowledge of other possible candidates or even about Tiemann's platform for the next four years, does not reflect thoughtful consideration of alternatives and consequences.

Jerry L. Peir