



editorials

Council should slow 'pinball pumps'

The machines chime tribute as the numbers roll by faster and faster going higher and higher.

No it's not pinball. There's no silver ball and you can't tilt the machine. It's a gas pump, grinning its price per gallon at those stuck with the bill.

Lots of things contribute to the high prices, many of which are not under local control. However, the Lincoln City Council does have control over a couple of pennies per gallon. And those pennies are adding up.

Self-service gas stations still remain a distant—1967—memory for Lincoln because the City Council has not allowed them since then. As a result, Lincolniters rack up some good score with their pinball pumps—but no free games are passed out.

Harlow Hyde, independent candidate for the First District Congressional seat, brought up the self-serve issues last week. Although he claims he's not trying to pump the issue for campaign purposes, we have a hard time buying that.

Despite Hyde's motives, the issue deserves discussion.

City Council Chairman Richard Baker says it's a matter of fire safety. Self-service stations are more dangerous, he says.

We cannot accept that. Statistics indicate that self-serve stations are not much more dangerous than stations with attendants.

The real difference is price. It costs less at self-service stations because there is no attendant to pay.

Self-service successfully has swept the rest of the state. Gas station owners say all types of people pump their own gas from businessmen in three-piece suits to the high school kid getting a dollars worth for the big date.

The latest survey by the American Automobile Association indicates that average gas prices in Nebraska are at a record high. The City Council should help stop that mad race to go over the top on the pinball pumps.

Ex-CIA director gets by with little lie because he is establishment member

Washington—The American public probably couldn't care less, but there is a lot of buzzing here about how Richard Helms, one-time CIA director, got off on charges of lying before a Senate committee.

Most Americans these days are alternately enjoying the glorious autumn season or fretting over the expenses of the upcoming holidays and a tough winter.

In Washington, however, there was discussion and debate over whether Helms, who admitted lying under oath for what he believed was the good of the country, should have been punished or treated in the mild fashion he was.

Back in 1970 the Nixon-Kissinger axis was concerned that Marxist Salvatore Allende would become president of Chile in the scheduled free election. Since the Soviet Union and other Communist nations had long helped subsidize Leftist forces and publications in Chile, the Nixon White House reasoned that the United States should do the same for the opposition to Allende.

show you a ghost of the Revolutionary War.

'Only pillar'

The Hon. Leon Jaworski, once confronted with allegations that Kissinger had lied under oath, sputtered: "But Henry is the only pillar left in this Administration."

Helms lied under oath, but so did others who were prosecuted and wound up in the slammer. Helms cited national security in his defense. So did John Ehrlichman, but he never could get it into the record, and he now works nights in a federal prison camp.

In this town there are many connections between law firms, corporations, labor unions, foundations, special-interest organizations, layers of upper-level bureaucrats, lobbyists and hangers-on. Put them all together and they spell establishment.

Launch a major assault on the establishment, and you are in trouble. Be fortunate enough to be a central, even quiet, figure in the establishment, and you wind up pleading no contest to misdemeanor charges. Your name? Richard Helms.

Some purists in this town complain there is a double standard of justice, and indeed there is. Some declare that if Helms gets off this way, others in the establishment will lie to congressional committees in the future. Indeed, they will. Some people say that life itself is unfair. Yes, it is.

There haven't been too many basic changes in human nature since Adam and Eve.

Copyright 1977, Los Angeles Times Syndicate.

nick thimmesch



Millions of dollars were funneled to these pro-American forces in Chile, some of them through the branch of an American bank in Uruguay. The CIA was in charge of this operation, although its specialists already had declared that "the U.S. has no vital interests within Chile," yet also claimed there would be "tangible economic losses" if Allende became president.

The CIA also saw such an event as a "psychological setback" for the United States, while noting that it would not significantly alter the world power balance.

Balance of power

Nixon and Kissinger were worried about such matters as American strength and the balance of power, so they enlisted Helms in the anti-Allende effort. Helms was in up to his neck.

But when he was questioned about it under oath in early 1973, Helms waffled and wavered and did not tell the truth.

When Watergate rushed and the CIA investigation followed, Helms secrets were revealed. The Department of Justice initiated its inquiry into Helms' testimony two years ago, and the Carter Administration was left to see the case through.

Helms had been in trouble before in this town and was never prosecuted. While Watergate figures were scorned and spat on in public, Helms was feted at small dinner parties by leading members of the establishment, including senators, journalists and others who should have been investigating him.

That was his good luck as a long-certified member of the establishment. Henry Kissinger enjoys the same good luck. Kissinger also lied under oath a fair number of times, but show me the person who will prosecute him and I will

letter to the editor

Thank you for an interesting account of the Fourth Polar Bear Chess Tournament (*Daily Nebraskan*, Nov. 2). However, I would like to call your attention to a rather large factual error.

The article states that Loren Schmidt was beaten by Brett Martin in the tournament. This was not the case. In fact, Bruce Draney, Brett Martin, and Loren Schmidt tied for first place with four wins, no losses, and no draws. (This tie was because of the large number of entrants.)

The trophies were awarded on the basis of tie-breaking points. These are determined by the results of the player's opponents through the tournament.

Since Mr. Martin's four opponents scored 10½ points as opposed to my opponents' 10 points, he was awarded first place, and I second.

Loren Schmidt
Captain, UNL chess team

Bottle bill: a question of resources

With the issue of whether Nebraska is to have a bottle bill (Legislation seeking to discourage the use of throw-away bottles) again fast approaching, it is appropriate to place the comments of Mike Simpson, Midcontinent Bottlers of Omaha (*Daily Nebraskan*, Nov. 4) in perspective.

It has long been recognized that the strongest, and perhaps only, opposition to the bottle bill has come from those with vested interest in the retention of nonreusable bottles: the container manufacturers.

James Curtiss

guest opinion

Their influence has been strongly felt in other states, where they have marshalled their resources to defeat or repeal bottle bill legislation time and again.

In Washington state, an initiative providing for a mandatory five cent deposit on bottles and cans was defeated

The author is a second year student at the NU Law College. He is from Lincoln.

after a \$1 million newspaper and television campaign opposing the measure.

Similar "victories" have occurred throughout the nation and will continue so long as (1) the public is misinformed (2) state legislators continue to sell out to the bottle industry.

This nation currently manufactures 60 billion throw-away bottles a year, requiring 3.8 million tons of glass. Moreover, it is an avowed goal of the bottle industry to increase production to 100 billion nonreusable bottles annually.

Given such an outrageous waste of our natural resources, one thing is clear: non-reusable bottles are not economically desirable.

Energy requirements to manufacture glass are considerable. Between 6 and 7 million British thermal units (BTUs) are needed to make a ton of glass from raw materials. In one year alone, the unnecessary expenditure of energy to produce nonreturnable bottles amounts to 211 trillion BTUs. This represents the energy consumed over the amount required to produce only the returnable bottles would reduce the energy used by about 40 percent, contrary to the allegation by Mr. Simpson that the use of nonreturnable bottles saves energy.

As for the economic "benefit," nonreturnable bottles bestow upon the consumer, it has been determined that the use of throwaway bottles adds seven cents to the cost of a beverage above the cost of the same beverage in a returnable bottles. Complete conversion to nonreturnable bottles would save consumers \$1.4 billion per year. Finally, the aesthetic costs of increased roadside litter are categorically ignored by the bottle industry in its never-ending campaign against the returnable bottle. Americans discard 60 billion cans and 30 billion bottles annually, creating solid waste disposal problems of immense proportions.

There is no doubt that nonreturnable bottles represent a convenience for the American public. The larger issue, however, is whether we can continue to tax our resources at an ever-increasing rate without serious consideration of the real costs associated with such consumption.

