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In the first issue of IGNITE I tried to describe my troubles with Twamley Hall - their refusal to issue me an athletic ticket after I paid ninety per cent of what others who got the ticket paid. (I am a graduate teaching assistant and am taking nine hours which is considered a full load by the graduate school. For the nine hours I am taking I was assessed a student service fee of fifty four dollars - that is, ninety per cent of what full time students pay (those taking 12 hours). I only asked for ninety per cent of an athletic ticket or a refund of the money that would go to the athletic department, but all channels through which the buck was passed turned out to be dead ends. I was repeatedly told that in order to obtain an athletic ticket I would have to pay another ninety cents... otherwise the athletic department would get my money and I would get nothing. Further authority than that no one seemed to have so I began to look elsewhere.

After passing through the third office the buck was passed to Pres. Starcher with whom I made an appointment. I explained to him my problem and he looked quite annoyed.

"Janelle," he said, "you're a member of the faculty now and I feel really concerned that a member of the faculty would quibble over ninety cents." He stood up, "Here," he said, as he reached into his pocket, "I'll give you the ninety cents."

I was shocked! "Dr. Starcher," I said, "I would consider that a bribe!" Though Dr. Starcher assured me that he most certainly hadn't meant it that way. He sat down again.

"Besides," I went on, "What would you do if I told all the teaching assistants to come in and get their money from you for their athletic tickets... and many of them would need more than ninety cents. I think that in all fairness..."

Dr. Starcher nodded with a grunt.

I feared we had strayed from the point so I tried once again to explain just what the trouble was.

"You see, Dr. Starcher, the athletic department is getting my money and I am getting nothing for it. I feel that if you have the right to ask for another ninety cents, I have a right to ask for a refund or ninety per cent of an athletic ticket." I tried to make it as plain as I could but he took the look on his face that I wasn't coming across.

He took on his most diplomatic appearance. "I suppose you might look at it that way, but I prefer to see it in another light. You are a graduate student now, and I'm sure you use the library, for instance, much more than a lot of others. (Then I was treated to five minutes of the "Library Blues" - all the trouble concerning the library that had occurred recently or was likely to occur in the not too distant future.) I fear I was not moved.

"Dr. Starcher, you seem to miss the point. You have no idea how
much I use the library unless someone has been following me around, counting up the hours. Anyway, that’s beside the point. Does the athletic department get some of my money or not?"

He was trying to be patient. "Well, you might look at it that way, but I look at it this way… Everyone’s money goes into one big barrel and then the money is allotted to each of the various departments. You’re money goes into that one barrel, not to the athletic department."

I stared at him incredulously. Here was a new kind of logic I had never before encountered. But I had to keep trying. "Really now, Dr. Starcher… if I put my money into that one fund and the athletic department gets some of that fund then obviously the athletic department gets some of my money or not?"

"Well, I don’t really know," he said glumly. Then he perked up, "but I can find out," and he dashed over to his bookcase and pulled down an official looking notebook. He thumbed through it and then began ciphering on a pad on his desk. "Well, if you paid, uh, ninety per cent of the Student Service fee… then theoretically the athletic department gets $9.00 from you each semester."

That was even more than I had expected. I silently figured out how many paperback books I could buy with $9.00. "I demand ninety per cent of an athletic ticket or a nine dollar refund," I told him. "It’s bad enough that I am forced to pay for athletics at all, but then to not even get the card that allows me to go to the silly games…"

By this time Dr. Starcher was losing patience.

"Janelle," he said, "Why don’t you go to school someplace else if you don’t like the way we do things here."

For a moment I considered asking him to get me a scholarship to Harvard or West Point but I let it drop. "Dr. Starcher," I tried again, "I was always under the impression that if one did not like one’s lot in life that one ought to try to change it… not give up," but I don’t think he got the point.

Anyway, he was beginning to check his watch every few seconds and soon he was standing. "I really do have some other meetings to attend to now," he said, "I’ll talk to the Board of Higher Education about the matter. You see, I have no authority to act in this situation… the policy has been made."

The buck was passed and I waited a few days. Then I returned to Dr. Starcher’s office to fine out the results of the meeting. Dr. Starcher was ready for me. "I have some news," he said, "But I don’t think you’re going to like it. The policy has been made and we simply can’t change it now. Now, next semester we hope it will change, though I can’t promise you anything. Of course, if you’d like to appear before the Board of Higher Education yourself I’ll see what I can do."

"Fine," I said. "You put me on the agenda for the next time they meet."

And that is where the matter is now… except for one complication. Now they owe me $11.75 instead of $9.00. I decided to attend the homecoming game for which I paid $2.75 for a ticket to the north bleachers. I arrived in plenty of time only to find that the N.D.S.U. marching band occupied those bleachers. I wound up sitting in the student section behind the cheerleaders and the Golden Feather. Gosh and golly’s and a fiddlesick.

mixed group. It was then that things began to get out of hand. Someone thought, "Wouldn’t it be a great idea to add more guys and more girls to equal more fun?" From this brainchild evolved such groups as the New Christy Minstrels, the Backporch Majority, and the Kids Next Door.

When it was seen how well folk groups attracted students, (spelled "money"), another person thought, "Why not add a little scripture and make ‘meaningful’ all of this fun."

If I may apply an economic term to the formula, "More guys plus more girls plus old-time religion equals more ‘fun’, the most appropriate one would have to be the ‘law of diminishing returns’. The New Folk is the proof of that law.

The New Folk, which appeared in the Prairie State Ballroom on Wednesday, October 23, is a studio composite of someone’s conception of typical American Youth and the Mormon Tabernacle Choir. They bounced onto the stage, bright as new pennies and eager to sing. The four girls were sexy, but not too sexy, and the five guys were cute, but not too cute. They all brandished smiles which would have put Bert Parks to shame. (I got the disquieting feeling that they would rather let their religion down than their smiles."

For two hours they performed songs, mugged for the audience, acted coy, and projected such purity and wholesomeness I found it vaguely remiss of me. Between songs as "windy" and "Dangling Conversation" they gently slipped us their message. The four girls were sexy, but not too sexy, and the five guys were cute, but not too cute. They all brandished smiles which would have put Bert Parks to shame. (I got the disquieting feeling that they would rather let their religion down than their smiles.)
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The other night at FURMENT I told an audience that the so-called "Negro problem" was merely a cover-up for the real problem, which is the white problem. Furthermore, I said, the white problem is the fact that nearly all white Americans are in one form or another racists. Now some white people know they're racists, and they're proud of being racists. Overt racism becomes the only way they can manage their sense of inferiority and their self-hatred. Other white Americans, however, hide their racism, the way a husband hides his car behind the screen when he meets his girl friend. Looking at these covert racists from another angle, we might call them closet racists.

On the other hand, many white Americans sincerely believe they are not racist. They swear they want to "help the Negro." These are the white liberals. These are the paternalistic racists. They want to care for their children.

I don't think that one treatment will cure all racists. Some need shock therapy; others need analysis; others should be institutionalized before they spread murder and mayhem. But regardless of the kind of racist we are or the treatment we need, we ought to begin by admitting that whites caused the problem, whites perpetuated it, and whites contributed to it. Meanwhile whites are worrying about the "Negro problem."

White people created this racial bag. White people instituted black slavery in America; and it was the most viscous system of slavery the world has ever known -- debilitating more to whites, in fact than blacks, because it means whites are living a lie, are deluded, are in fact, quite insane on the matter of "race." It is a lie and a delusion that there are "races". It is quite simply insane to think that "blood mixes" (except during a blood transfusion), or that there is anything less normal about a black man marrying a white woman than about a Norwegian marrying a Swede, or that parentage or pigmentation deprives people of their humanity or a man of his manhood.

The white attitudes toward black people are manifestations of a profound psychosis. Most whites live in a dream world; and like many other-world fanciers, have the real world a nightmare for those who aren't similarly deluded. It's as if we had 150 million Americans running around, all of whom think they're either Napoleon or the Virgin Mary. They'll do everything they can to avoid admitting that they're deluded. They go on asking black people, "What's your problem? What do you want?" They are, they swear, concerned.

They're not concerned. They're mad. If we want to learn something from black people, then we mustn't ask them (for the millionth time) what they want. (It doesn't take too much intelligence to figure that out.) Ask them what we want. Ask them how we look to them.

We look like racists, of course. Does that mean we are? Yes, it does.

Again, it's like asking the psychiatrist (who has dealt all his life with psychotics) if we're crazy; and he tells us yes, we are, definitively.

We whites really can't ask everything of our Black brothers. We can't create our own delusion and then assume Black people are going to cure us, or, at least, cure us painlessly. It's like asking the psychiatrist to cure us without admitting we're crazy. We can't solve 'the problem' without admitting it's a white problem, and that the root of the problem is the mad vicious fantasy of white superiority -- superiority in all forms, those of paternalism as well as those of segregation.

This paternalistic superiority reveals itself in myriad ways. To take one example: Whites now are agonizing over whether Blacks want segregation or integration. But this is a false problem, another sneaky racist question. It's racist because it's based on the assumption that it's up to whites to decide whether Blacks will be segregated or integrated. We keep asking, "Well what do you want?" He'll say, "It's none of our business. It's not a real problem. It's a psychotic problem like John Doe in the asylum trying to decide whether to invade Russia."

Let the man live his life. "Don't make it your business what he wants, where he lives, what he does -- unless it's to help him (after he's asked for your help) to get the monkeys out of his way."

Why should a white man decide "whether to have segregation or integration?" It makes as much sense for someone to be worried over whether I should live next to bearded people or clean-shaven people -- whether I want to integrate or segregate. Even if bearded men do tend to be lazy, immoral, fight on Friday nights, and have rhythm, I still feel it's nobody's business where I live or whom I marry.

Black people aren't demanding a breakdown in law and order. They're demanding that the law be enforced. They're not advocating the overthrow of constitutional government. They're not advocating the decline of democracy. They're advocating the practice of democracy in this country. They're not advocating pogroms,lynchings, and degradation. They're advocating that people act as sane, responsible human beings.

Nov. 2 is the anniversary of the self-immolation of Norman Morrison in protest to our murderous war in Vietnam. Nov. 7 is the anniversary of the self-immolation of Roger LaPorte in protest to our murderous war in Vietnam.
Selective Service: Double Jeopardy
by Thomas DeBaggio
reprinted from The Rat 7/13/68

WASHINGTON, D.C. (INS) — The Justice Department has begun prosecution of second-time draft resisters.

Three or four young men have been arrested and taken to court in recent months for Selective Service law violations after having served time for earlier draft offenses.

Violation of the draft law is the only felony which does not wipe out a man's draft obligation.

Not since the Korean war have men been imprisoned for second-time draft violations, but a new Selective Service law passed last year specifically directed them to seek such prosecutions. It suggests induction immediately after a man has been released from prison. Under the new law the Justice Department is also directed to "proceed as expeditiously as possible with a prosecution... upon the request of the Director of Selective Service or (to) advise the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing the reasons for its failure to do so."

In practice, a Selective Service official told INS, individual draft boards recommend to their local U.S. Attorney individual violations for prosecution.

Previously requests for second-time prosecutions were refused by the U.S. Attorney because of the previous offense, conviction and imprisonment. "A second prosecution would have no beneficial enforcement effect," a U.S. Attorney in San Francisco told Selective Service in declining to prosecute a case. He added: "To the contrary, it might well arouse the ire of the court and thus in the long run harm the Government's enforcement policy."

In arguing against this position, Daniel Ober, Selective Service Counsel, equated a prison term with a man's draft obligation. He maintained that prison sentences less than two years in length "offer quite an inducement to a registrant to violate the law."

The sentence length also is nudging the World War Two record average of 33.4 months. In 1967 the average sentence had jumped to 32.1 months from 25.4 months the previous year. Maximum sentence under the law is 5 years and a $10,000 fine.

Sentences increase in times of war and stress.

Men convicted of Selective Service law violations are scattered throughout the federal prison system. A majority of them are apparently being kept in minimum security prisons.

Determination of where a prisoner serves his time is education, offense and the area of the country the individual is from.

The Bureau of Prisons denied reports that there are special plans for liberal treatment for the near-record of draft law violators. A Bureau spokesman said that their best estimates did not indicate there would be a dramatic jump in draft law violations thus over-burdening present facilities which would necessitate any special procedures.

In a related development, the Pentagon announced that they have rejected a plan to draft prisoners other than draft law violators into the Armed Forces. Such a plan was in effect during World War Two. Approximately 2,000 prisoners were inducted into the Army during a three-year period beginning in 1942.

Jehovah's Witnesses make up 60 per cent of the men imprisoned by the Government for Selective Service violations. Their religious tenets bar Army service as well as civilian assignments offered conscientious objectors. They do not fight their cases through the courts and, according to a Bureau of Prisons official, they are model prisoners.

In practice the prosecution of second-time draft resisters by the Justice Department has hit hardest those men who received light punishment for first violations. The burden also falls on men who were imprisoned at an early age.

A man imprisoned at 20 would have a good chance of getting out and still being within the prime draft age.

The Vietnam war is now the longest war in American history.

The long, brutal war is also responsible for the near-record number of men behind bars for refusing military service. Government statistics show 756 men imprisoned for draft law violations. There haven't been more since 1947 when the figures reflected ballooned World War Two draft calls. Nearly four times as many men were imprisoned last year for refusing military service as in 1964.

Length of the Vietnam war has also been a determining factor in this type of case, say Justice Department officials, because it has swollen draft quotas.

One official said: "The possibility does exist that there could be repetitious convictions only because the conflict continues for so many years."
Many years ago, Thorstein Veblen described the principal qualification needed for success as a college president as being "a ready versatility of conviction."

The low ethical estate of academia is not new, but it does seem to be getting worse as administrators increasingly hide behind the tradition of the well-rounded gentle-man scholar. At the same time, the focus on unethical and bureaucratic practices which were aptly described by Mario Savio as Kafkaesque.

They engage in secret attempts to fire people with whom they disagree; in unexplained attempts to limit the term of reappointments; in about the pea in a shell-game, they persist to influence promotions, and they play fast and loose with academic ethics in a variety of other ways.

Today's students of higher education are being misled, especially those who attend universities. They believe they are attending an institution which is primarily an educational institution, when, in fact, they are attending a multi-utility where the concern with federal and foundational grants, the ob-promotional practices in which the supposed principles are shuffled out. Read Newman and his "Idea of a University"; read Caplow and McGee's "Illegitimate Capital". They engage in secret attempts to fire people with whom they disagree; in unexplained attempts to limit the term of reappointments; in about the pea in a shell-game, they persist to influence promotions, and they play fast and loose with academic ethics in a variety of other ways.

Much that the students did at Berkeley was wrong, but beneath the out. Read Newman and his "Idea of a University"; read Caplow and McGee's "Illegitimate Capital". They engage in secret attempts to fire people with whom they disagree; in unexplained attempts to limit the term of reappointments; in about the pea in a shell-game, they persist to influence promotions, and they play fast and loose with academic ethics in a variety of other ways.

The new essay folder is out-in several senses. This time it's entitled "Comparing the benefits of the Communist system and Free Enterprise" or somewhere thereabouts. (It really doesn't matter what it's called as long as we, the good guys, come out on top of them, the bad guys.) His usual demonic possession shows through again, and that was his goal of elevating John Bircher style patriotism. The irrelevance of last year's winner clearly demonstrates the futility of trying to justify such a cause. But, enough has been said by other illustrious souls concerning that aspect of this farce.

But consider who the judges of this contest are? Rumor has it that several bourgeois executive types of several great American corporations in Minneapolis do the deed. I ask you, can these men be objective in any manner whatsoever? We all know in whose favor Stewart would slant it. But what if an essay is written which honestly displays the massive faults in the free enterprise system as well as those of the communist system? Bet your sweet ass nothing will happen to that essay. Only a hard line reactionary can win this contest.

To all ye aspirants of glory and saviors of truth who may attempt to write something that would reflect the truth about both systems; don't bother. Save your pen strokes for a cause that at least can be won. You can't dent Jack Stewart's little campaign by attacking it. Just let it itself by ignoring it to death. Eventually when the contest is purged of liberal entrants, it will fall to the hands of the diarrhea-mouthed ravers that have long dominated the ranks of the ultra-right. That alone will kill it.
ACADEMIC FREEDOM BEHIND MACHINE GUN MOUNTS
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It seems likely that the term 'public decency' is more vulnerable to the process of pluralistic ignorance than anything since the farse of prohibition. Described as 'belief in a social norm that in reality is non-existent', pluralistic ignorance occurs when a majority of individuals believe their personal actions are contrary to a public norm. In truth, no such norm actually exists, but the illusion that it does rests upon a basis of pluralistic ignorance.

Considering the reaction of some college administrators and state legislators to certain four letter words, I think we should give them the benefit of the doubt. While some would accuse them of playing politics (which in itself constitutes a form of pluralistic ignorance) or displaying fantastic hypocrisy, it might be fairer to assume that they are unfortunate victims of pluralistic ignorance. Although the majority of administrators and legislators employ colorful rhetoric in their private roles - like the majority of our citizens - they presume the norm of public decency is such that terms like 'hell' and 'damn' much less, originally untainted Saxon terms as 'fuck', 'shit', etc. Although such childish naivety is occasionally refreshing, it is more often disgusting. It is indeed difficult to believe that "intelligent" adults can be so far removed from the world of reality and so oblivious to the behavior of others.

Regardless of the amusing aspects of pluralistic ignorance, a real danger exists in the possibility that a non-existent norm of decency could be enacted into law and imposed on individuals. Thus, amusement and disgust turn to fear when legislators begin to play "let's please the public" and threaten political interference in academic affairs because a campus newspaper employs "indecent" expressions. If the use of so-called obscenity is a legitimate cause for political suppression, one is hard pressed to discover any excuse that does not constitute legitimate cause.

Some would argue that a campus newspaper must be censored because it represents the university in the larger community circle. If this is the case, an administration should candidly admit that such a paper is simply a propaganda organ for specific interest groups. Further, if the public relations aspect of a campus newspaper is accepted, it is obvious that reasoning excludes underground or off-campus papers. Such tabloids do not represent the administration, the faculty, or the entire student body of a university, but simply represent the opinions of the authors. Freedom of speech, written or verbal, is partially based upon the fact that it potential readers disagree with the views expressed, such author will soon be begging for an audience. Thus, if an individual is actually embarrassed by four letter words (bless his soul), he is free to refrain from reading them. One should add that the existence of an underground newspaper at U.N.D. is commendable, for it adds a degree of maturity, sophistication, and excitement that was heretofore missing. Few - if any - circumstances justify censorship of a legitimate campus newspaper; absolutely no circumstances justify censorship of off-campus or underground publications.

The dangers, as well as the humorous aspects, of pluralistic ignorance are many. Conversely there is a social danger inherent in full freedom of speech. If pluralistic ignorance concerning obscene four letter words disappears entirely, our society will constantly be in search of new words which will be labeled "indecent". The existence necessity of obscenity is a social fact, for the most rewarding outlet of frustration is the utterance of a word or phrase that is considered illegitimate.

---

ABRAHAM LINCOLN:
"Allow the President to invade a neighboring nation whenever he shall deem it necessary to repel an invasion, and you allow him to do so whenever he may choose to say he deems it necessary for such a purpose - and you allow him to make war at pleasure."

J4 Lines
by Mike Evangelist
Corporal Jason frolicked through the window glass; Spooky Leslie rode a sweating steady-steed past. "Whoa, Steady," Leslie cried, stopping fast, "I want to touch that fruit on his flumky ass."
The street swallow swore a hot yellow streak. "Gimme a dime, gimme time to be true." (Ragged pants, rugged face, blue twisted shrew.) "Gimme a dime, gimme time to be meek." "Holy moly, woman," Jason replied. (Fox fixed his swimming cabera good.) "Lemme have your string, now open or close." She picked her spot and damnsely stood Before the burst window, glass on wood. Jason zipped down, half crazy inside.
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