

Should we keep off the grass?

Drugs are definitely here in Lincoln and people are interested in them.

Many groups have gone to great lengths to prepare literature and programs condemning the so-called "drug culture." Most of these have come from responsible groups whose leaders are still reacting to anti-drug scare tactics used in the 1930's. They are, for the most part, pointless.

Marijuana, perhaps the mildest drug of the new culture, is probably the most often attacked. One of the most common charges is that grass users usually go on to harder drugs.

No one argues that heroin addiction is a good thing, but many question the theory that grass leads on to harder stuff.

Unlike most drugs, marijuana does not build up a resistance in the body. Indeed, it takes less and less grass for the experienced user.

Most regular users say it takes only a very small amount for them to get stoned. This has been verified by such anti-drug authorities as Dr. Sidney Cohen.

In an ETV interview last spring Cohen said that though marijuana could be psychologically addictive, there was no evidence that it led to heroin addiction. Though most heroin users have used grass first, they have probably also used milk or pabulum or aspirin.

When pressed most drug "authorities," pro or con, will say there is simply not enough information on marijuana to determine its effects. Actually, the only thing sure about marijuana use is that a first offense in Nebraska can get you seven days.

Another argument is that if marijuana does not lead to harder drugs then the drug culture does.

However, the psychedelic community generally deplors the use of hard drugs. Heroin, cocaine and the like are regarded as degrading by those who consider a psychedelic experience the ultimate in individuality.

The heroin addict is shunned by the drug culture, as well as normal society. If anything, the drug culture guides people away from hard drugs.

But, there are dangers in the culture. LSD and methedrine, better known as speed, are accepted parts of the culture. These are dangerous drugs. Many people don't come back from LSD trips and speeding can burn out a young body in a short time.

With all drugs there is a need for care in use. This is often not available to those who use drugs socially.

But, the drug revolution cannot be turned back by unbacked statements and repressive laws. Prohibition didn't work and neither will drug repression.

Drug use should not be approached irrationally on the basis of "It's bad because it's bad." Youth are probably more turned off by this sort of argument than any other.

The drug scene should not be a source of hysteria among police and parents. It should be approached thoughtfully and studiously.

Aldous Huxley saw society heading toward drugs early in the century. Now, the drug scene is here. It will not go away no matter how much it is repressed and preached against.

But, rational thought and research might produce facts to modify and accept the culture before it tears down the society that bred it.

After all, free choice of safe alternatives has always been the ideal, though not the practical, American way.

Bill Smitherman
News Editor

THE NEBRASKAN

Telephone: Editor: 472-2588, Business: 472-2590, News: 472-2589. Second class postage paid at Lincoln, Neb.
Subscription rates are \$3 per semester or \$8.50 per year. Published Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday during the school year except during vacations and exam periods. Member of the Intercollegiate Press, National Educational Advertising Service.
The Nebraskan is a student publication of the University of Nebraska's administration, faculty and student government.
Address: The Nebraskan
34 Nebraska Union
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508

Editorial Staff
Editor: Kelley Baker; Managing Editor: Connie Winkler; News Editor: Bill Smitherman; Sports Editor: Jim Johnston and Roger Rife; Nebraskan Staff Writers: Gary Seacrest, John Dvorak, Mick Moriarty, Marsha Bangert, Dave Brink, Steve Strasser, Pat McTea, Carol Goetschius, Monte Gerlach, Charles Harner; Photographers: Dan Lasky, Mike Hayman; Entertainment Editor: Fred Eisenhart; Literary Editor: Alan Boye; News Assistant: Andrea Thompson; Copy Editors: Laura Parfisch, Jim Gray, Warren Orr, Blythe Erickson; Night News Editor: Tom Lamsworth; Night News Assistant: Leo Schleicher.

Business Staff
Business Manager: Pat DiNatale; Coordinator: Sandra Carter; Subscription and Classified Ad Manager: Jan Boatman; Salesmen: Greg Scott, I. Jane Kidwell, J. J. Shields; Circulation Managers: Chuck Balduff, Barry Pilger, John Wagoner.



Post-election analysis reveals Ultimate Truths

by ARTHUR HOPPE

The election analyzers have now analytically analyzed the election results to explain what they all mean. It is therefore now time to analyze the election analyses to explain what they all mean.

FIRST, WHAT do they mean to Mr. Nixon?

Here, the analysts have shown conclusively that the political debts Mr. Nixon garnered by his intensive campaigning plus the gain of several Senate seats assure his re-election in 1972.

Then the analysts have shown conclusively that the enemies Mr. Nixon made, the divisiveness he created and the loss of a dozen governorships assure his defeat in 1976.

Thus we see that Mr. Nixon will now be returned to the White House in 1972 if he wins the election.

BUT IT IS CLEAR that Mr. Nixon's

Southern Strategy worked in Ohio, New York and several other Northern States.

Unfortunately, it didn't work too well in the South. It didn't work too well in Illinois, either. But that was because Adlai Stevenson III is the son of Adlai Stevenson.

Similarly, the son of Gene Tunney, the son of Robert Taft, the son of Joseph P. Kennedy and the son of a Rockefeller all won. True, in Maryland, the son of Senator Tydings was beaten. But he was beaten by the son of Senator Beall.

THUS THE RESULTS prove a candidate is fortunate these days if the voters know his own father.

In several areas, however, victory went to candidates whose own fathers the voters didn't know. These unknown fathers include the fathers of Governor Reagan, Governor Wallace, Senator Stennis and James Buckley.

But they were elected, most analysts agree, on the strong Conservative tide that engulfed California, Alabama, Mississippi and half of Ohio. It didn't engulf New York, where two Liberals piled up 60 per cent of the vote over Conservative James Buckley, who won. But then he's William Buckley's brother, which proves something about brothers. It's unclear what.

MEANWHILE, most analysts agree, a strong Liberal tide engulfed California, Minnesota, Wisconsin and half of Ohio.

The problem in California was that both tides engulfed the voter. Each voter. The California voter walked into the voting booth, the results show, and voted in a Conservative mood for Governor, a Liberal mood for Senator, a Conservative mood for Attorney General and a Liberal mood for State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

THIS PROVES what we have all long

felt about moody instability of Californians.

So a thoughtful analysis of the State-by-State analyses explains what they all mean.

They all mean that the voters, in a conservatively-liberal or vice versa mood, want either fresh new faces or experienced leaders, who stressed law and order or bread and butter issues to go to Washington and get America out of Vietnam immediately or sooner or later.

THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN. The mandate is clear. If we are going to preserve our sanity in these troubled times, if we are going to preserve our cherished democratic heritage, if we are going to preserve our inalienable right to vote as we please, then we're going to have to abolish election analyzers. It's them or us.

Overkilling to a draw

by Frank Mankiewicz and Tom Braden

WASHINGTON — Looking back now, it appears to have been the year of the overkill. Richard Nixon might have taken a leaf from what is said to be the forthcoming book of George Wallace and gone only to those states where he had a good chance to win. Instead, he indulged in more than 20. The result: Angry Democrats will come to Washington disposed to skip the usual amenities.

Spiro Agnew, too, indulged in overkill. In at least 30 of the 37 states he visited he called respected citizens — well-nigh certain of taking their posts as honored representatives — everything from radical-liberals to promoters of crime, violence, drugs and pornography. They can hardly be expected to return him the polite respect which we teach our children should be the due of a Vice President.

Overkill begets overkill. Republican prognostications of sweeping victories leading to seven Senate seats led reporters, including these, to doubts so grave as to lead in turn to incaution.

"The Republicans will lose seats in both the Senate and the House," we predicted on Nov. 1, and we were half-wrong. But the President was more than half-wrong, and the Vice President a great deal more wrong than that. Looking back, it is hard to find anybody who was not at least half-wrong, except the great American people who provide the ultimate judgment of wrong and right.

At least they do so in a procedural sense. But a free election is not, after all, an end in itself. What matters is what the people want it to do, and here it is hard to duck the conclusion that they want it to do pretty much what they have been doing.

Take crime, for example. Did the voters say that the solution for crime was the no-knock and preventive detention advocated by Mr. Nixon and overkilled by the rhetoric of Agnew? Then why did they defeat Sen. Joseph Tydings (D-Md.) who wrote the bill and pushed it through?

Or take "permissivists," one of Agnew's favorite overkill words. Did the voters decide they don't want any more

"permissivists"? Then why did Californians defeat the man who started the whole thing, Superintendent of Public Instruction Max Rafferty who ran as usual on a platform of being against "heavy-booted slob who like to stomp on old ladies with polio"?

Are they determined — as the White House at one time suggested — on a stronger defense? Or, as Agnew put it, that they were opposed to rad-lib who thought defense expenditures too high? Then why did they elect Lowell Weicker (R-Conn.) who opposed the ABM and voted for McGovern-Hatfield and whose

election — despite his party registration — can hardly be counted as a plus for the President?

Looking back now, it is clear that the President's use of the Social Issue was a flop (witness the defeat of George Murphy who stood to gain most by presidential overkill of the incident at San Jose), but it is equally clear that the Democrats' use of the economy as an issue was also overkill. It worked where unemployment was over 6%, as in Michigan; it did not work where unemployment was about 4%, as in Ohio and New York.

Looking back, the only thing that seems to have been proved is that the famous Southern Strategy is dead, dead in the Northeast where Republicans gained and in the mountain states which Democrats swept, as dead in Georgia and South Carolina where Mr. Agnew labored hard — as George Wallace is alive in Alabama.

But that, too, is a procedural decision, having to do with politics — and not with the tougher questions about what the country wants to do. On those tough questions the voters — ignoring the overkill — came to no decision at all.

Dr. Hip Pocrates

Dear Dr. Schoenfeld:

If a married girl (age 19) wants a tubal ligation must she first have had at least one child? Or can she only obtain this operation because of infection or some other medical reason?

Is it possible to have a spinal anesthetic? How long must a person be hospitalized? And finally, what is the approximate cost?

ANSWER: Tubal ligations involve cutting the fallopian tubes (the passages between the ovaries and the uterus) and tying off the severed ends. The result is usually permanent sterilization: Attempts to reconnect the fallopian tubes after such a procedure are rarely successful.

Total hospitalization for a tubal ligation is about four days and the cost runs between \$600 and \$800. When the surgery is done following delivery of a baby the cost is less and only a extra day's stay in the hospital is necessary. Spinal anesthetic may be used.

But I doubt if a reputable physician would do a tubal ligation on a 19 year old girl who had never borne a child. You have left about 20 potential child bearing

years. Once a tubal ligation is performed it's too late to change your mind.

Dear Dr. Schoenfeld:

Four years ago I contracted serum hepatitis and was hospitalized for a month. Bed rest and proper diet, etc. were recommended for at least six months following my release. But I didn't follow the advice.

Now especially when I run around and get run down — I turn yellow. Sometimes worse than others. Is there anything I can do about this crummy color? Have I fouled up my liver?

ANSWER: Serum hepatitis is usually caused by sharing syringes and needles or through transfusions of contaminated blood. The other type of viral hepatitis, infectious hepatitis, is transmitted through feces or possibly urine or saliva.

Serum and infectious hepatitis cause an identical disease state. Symptoms include nausea, vomiting, fatigue, darkening of urine, light-colored stools and yellowing of the eyes and skin. Viral hepatitis weakens the liver and makes it more susceptible to further attacks.

Make sure you're under the care of a physician who gives you periodic checkups.

Dear Dr. Schoenfeld:

I am a male, age 19, with a height problem. I am only 5'9" and have been for the past two years. I believe that I should be taller because the result of the male adults in my family are much taller.

I heard that male hormone injections will increase the height of a male individual. Is that true?

ANSWER: Maybe a professional basketball team would consider that you have a problem but your height is about average. Hormones are used experimentally to increase height in some cases though I doubt you would be a candidate. An endocrinologist could determine whether you're capable of further growth by examining x-rays of your arms and legs.

Last summer I met a German inventor who had patented a method of removing nicotine from tobacco. He couldn't find one manufacturer interested in the process. Why? Nicotine is apparently necessary to cause addiction to cigarettes and the tobacco industry wants to keep its customers hooked.

Filters on cigarettes may turn out to be nothing but a gimmick. A study in the *British Medical Journal* of September 19, 1970 reported observations on 36 cigarette smokers. Some used "high retention" filters and some "low retention" filters. Those using "high retention" filters puffed their cigarettes more frequently and thus received nearly the same amount of nicotine as those using "low retention" filters.

Dr. Shoenfeld welcomes your letters. Write to him at 2010 7th Street, Berkeley, Calif. 94710.