

# editorial

## to the editor



Dear editor,

Your portrayal of the so-called black man in Thursday's "Ralph" was not funny at all. First, we don't all come from the ghetto; second, we all do not "fake out" every thing in sight; third, we do not all play football.

When will blacks stop looking like dumb animals in your cartoons? Last time it was the suntan route ("Ralph," Daily Nebraskan, Spring 1975), now it's the black animal that plays football.

The drawing is offensive to me as a black person. The caption is no better.

Get yourself together on your little jokes.

Theresa Gauff

### Not laughing

Dear editor,

What is the Daily Nebraskan coming to when it has to resort to this type of stereotyped cartoon? It was uncalled-for and in bad taste.

If this is the type of "humor" the Daily Nebraskan sees fit to publish, it should call it quits and fold up. There is no excuse for it and as a black student I'm not laughing.

Tony Williams  
ASUN Senator

### Taste overdone

Dear editor,

It is my opinion that the Thursday "Ralph" was humiliating and degrading. All black people do not have big noses and exceptionally thick lips. This character was overdone and in bad taste.

Nilda Gaines  
Kappa Alpha Psi Sweetheart

### Cartoonist insensitivity

Dear editor,

As a member of a minority group, I find the "Ralph" cartoon offensive. But I also feel it shows the ignorance and insensitivity on the part of the author and cartoonist.

It reflects on the general attitudes (which I was already aware of) of the majority population at this university. In the future, I would advise you to omit such obvious forms of racism.

Donna Jones

### Unabridged racism

Dear editor,

The Sept. 11 "Ralph" cartoon was an insult and a prime example of unabridged racism.

If it was intended to be humorous I can assure you it was not. If it was intended to be by any stretch of the imagination enlightening, again you failed. If you cannot handle racial commentary or humor without being derogatory, I suggest you leave it alone.

Deborah L. Logan

### Not high caliber

Dear editor,

I am extremely incensed and offended to see that your paper would stoop to such a low level in attempting to humorously portray a minority person.

Such stereotyped, immature and blatantly prejudicial material cannot be tolerated by minority students on this campus.

As a graduate student from another state, I was informed of the high caliber of this university and its activities, including its journalistic efforts, and that the university and the newspaper represented only the highest quality of student life on this campus.

This was not at all apparent in the running of this cartoon. As a minority student who is dedicated to instilling a

sense of truth and honesty about members of my and other minority groups. I must in good conscience demand a complete apology from both the editor and the cartoonist.

The cartoonist, who is incapable of being objective and honest in his drawings, should be removed and the editor should be more discreet and sensitive in her editing.

Such nonsense cannot be tolerated. Minority students have too long been the object of many types of derogatory slurs whereby whites have gained erroneous impressions of minority students.

This type of ridiculous activity must stop immediately. Action must be taken now to insure that this type of foolishness never happens again. Newspapers are supposed to print the truth.

I will be looking to see that something happens soon and I hope members of the Daily Nebraskan will be more sensible and realistic in their portrayal of minority students.

Dolores A. Simpson

### No comic

Dear editor,

Humor, like beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder and is,

## An Open Letter from the Editor

To be an editor in any field is to be a decision maker. In journalism, many of an editor's decisions must be made very quickly, under pressure of deadline.

Thursday's "Ralph," which I knew to be potentially offensive and inflammatory, ran anyway because I had to make one of those quick decisions. It was the wrong decision.

Along with "Ralph's" creator, Ron Wheeler, I apologize for the cartoon and the lack of sensitivity its contents displayed.

The apology is extended, not only to black students and to the football team, but to every person who has read or will read the cartoon, because stereotypes—however lightheartedly they

as Webster says, "the quality that makes something funny, or the ability to perceive, appreciate or express what is funny through speech, writing or action."

I realize one of our greatest freedoms is that of expression, and as a cartoonist Ron Wheeler is free to express his ideas, but you are only allowed to express those things that "the people" will laugh at—that which a majority of people will agree is humor. This makes you a "comic," and gives your art the ability to make people laugh and better enjoy life.

Under that definition Wheeler is not a comic nor, I doubt, a responsible human being. Neither blacks, women (liberated or otherwise), foreign students, freshman nor football players laugh at your WASP sense of humor.

Somewhere in the sixties we laid aside ethnic jokes: we stopped laughing at racism, sexism and other forms of limited thought. In the sixties it was finally realized that laughing at one another is not the same as laughing with one another.

Your comic strip is behind the times and it makes one wonder whether the purpose of the Daily Nebraskan is to produce news or ignorance.

J. Harrington

may be used—damage all whom they contact.

The Daily Nebraskan reserves always its First Amendment rights. But those rights do not mean license to wound other human beings.

I cannot repair the hurt inflicted by Thursday's cartoon. However, I can and do commit myself to doing everything in my power toward preventing another such incident.

For the remainder of my employment here—and, I hope, far beyond that time—the Daily Nebraskan will strive to avoid perpetuating racial, ethnic, social or sexual stereotypes, and affirms the need to erase those stereotypes.

Rebecca Brite

## the word unheard Forced busing's usefulness as integration tool doubted



By Del Gustafson

In 1966, Prof. James Coleman issued an historic sociological report entitled, "Equality of Educational Opportunity," a report that was to provide the theoretical foundation of the busing movement.

Now nine years, 50 riots and 20,000 absentee students later, Coleman has arrived at the conclusion that maybe he wasn't entirely right.

While Coleman maintains that integration can result in greater academic achievement, he condemns the instrument of forced busing as absolutely pernicious in the pursuit of integrated society.

Rather than breaking down racial barriers, Coleman found, a study of cities on which busing has been imposed by judicial edict showed that busing accelerated the much beoaned "white flight" from the inter-city to the suburb.

Therefore Coleman's thesis is that busing, instead of fostering integration, has led to the retrenchment of segregation in the suburbs.

A mentality pervades the governmental establishment of this country that I feel is composed of two elements: that they alone possess social and political truth and that society is an infinitely malleable heap of silly putty to be shaped and molded into the bureaucrat's beatific vision.

Nowhere is this governmental meddling with the laws of society seen more clearly than in the busing controversy.

When it became apparent that not all parents would permit their children to be bussed to satisfy some abstract social scheme and consequently decided to move to the suburb, the social engineer naturally decided to work for the extension of the city school district and thereby the extension of busing into the suburb.

When this solution was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, a judge in Louisville, Ky., circumvented the high court decision.

He decreed that Louisville schoolchildren living in the suburbs attend their neighborhood school two days a week and be bused to an inner-city school three days a week.

Despite the fact that busing has proved to be a total failure, that it has torn asunder communities, and that it has been shown to be unpopular with an overwhelming number of Americans, both white and black, the judges and bureaucrats do not seem able to realize that the sheer force of law cannot change attitudes toward integration any more than it could change attitudes toward drinking in the 1920s.

Coleman expressed it best: "It is ludicrous to attempt to mandate an integrated society. Integration must come through other means." I pray a few judges and bureaucrats learn this lesson before they mandate a mutilated society.

## RALPH

by Wheeler

