This additional section of the CARBON is an attempt to express some views on the national and local scenes—views which perhaps haven't had voice in the publications existing on campus. We accuse no one as we feel these articles would have been printed if the authors had submitted them to the editors. We only seek to show by printing these pages here that there are students who do not agree with many of the opinions expressed in the weekly publications—there is "THE OTHER SIDE."

**********

Over the past three or four years the World has witnessed the development of an Anti-war movement unparalleled in history. This movement has directed itself against the military involvement of the United States in the Civil War in South Viet Nam and against all War and all governments that advocate War.

To date the war has cost the United States over forty thousand lives, billions of dollars and an immeasurable loss of moral strength and purpose. We have gained nothing tangible for our sacrifices.

I will say here that I am in agreement with the decision to become involved in South East Asia. I am in disagreement with the manner in which that decision was made and with the proportions that involvement has taken.

But the fact remains that we are there. We can only try to answer the questions of why and what we are to do.

The question of the morality of the U. S. involvement is the key to the answer why. I maintain that all War is immoral. We did not start the war, nor did the South Vietnamese. South Viet Nam and South East Asia were in danger of being over run by Communist troops. We entered the conflict in order to end it, not to prolong it. To this end we have succeeded in bringing the Communists to the Negotiating Table.

Negotiate with the Communists for peace and afterwards completely withdraw all combat troops from South East Asia, and make certain that no one man can again make a decision as that which got us involved in the first place.

Stephen Swercheck

One feels inexpressible sorrow by—
Never hearing the song of a nightingale
Never seeing shafts of light radiating from its mother, the sun
Never smelling all the sweetest scents of flowers and foods and spring, you can smell spring you know.
Never feeling the tough of your beloved
Never experiencing his love
Never being able to express your love not even by a kiss, a word or a gesture, you can express love that way you know.
Never dappling in that clandestine forest
Never running through the brook that winds its way through your life
Never experiencing all the world's most beautiful joys—there are things never smelled or felt you know.

Never comprehending that people can live in different worlds
Never understanding that there are things to be done and places to go which will lead us down different paths
Never ever accepting someone else's way of living. People do live in different ways you know.

Penny Stiglich

 Spiro Agnew is the voice of the silent majority. You can belittle him if you want but he is the only American today who dares to say what many of us are thinking.

He speaks with the trustworthy voice of Americans who are frightened by what has happened to their culture and who viewed the '60s as a disastrous decade of crime, assaults on patriotism, flaming ghettos, marijuana. . . .

I believe Mr. Agnew is using the only weapon that he has at his side—words. Remember that when you put Spiro Agnew down you are doing so to a large segment of America.

Tim Berger
Cicero wrote 2000 years ago, "I cease not to advocate peace, even though unjust, it is better than the most just war." I wonder if that is what Lord Neville Chamberlain had in mind when he said on September 27, 1938: "How horrible, fantastic, incredible, it is that we should be digging trenches and trying on gas masks here because of a quarrel in a far away country between people of whom we know nothing! ... I would not hesitate to pay even a third visit to Germany, if I thought it would do any good. ... I myself am a man of peace to the depths of my soul." Chamberlain made good his promise two days later when he met with Hitler to negotiate the appeasement of Nazi Germany with a gift of Czechoslovakia.

The people of England and France were undoubtedly behind Chamberlain and Daladier, perhaps motivated by the fact that they did not want to be drafted to the military service. They couldn't see that if they gave in to Germany, they would sooner or later be fighting in their own country for their very lives. They also couldn't see that Hitler could not enforce his demands at this time. Even one year later, while Germany was overrunning Poland and the British and French were ignoring their defense pacts with Poland, Britain alone could have annihilated the entire German armed forces.

The Viet Nam war may be an ideological war to the North, but it is a war of self-determination for the South. It has been said that it is a civil war. That is ridiculous. When Viet Nam was partitioned it became two separate countries with two separate governments. Civilian lives are lost and there is graft and corruption in the political structure and there are millions of dollars made yearly on the black market, plus countless other unChristian activities profiting from and adding to the misery of the Viet Namese people. Is there any of this that does not take place right here in these United States in peace time? And we have had nearly 200 years of comparative prosperity and education in which to correct the situation. It is war over there!

One would suspect that the dissenters to the war in Viet Nam are those who are afraid of the draft (rightly so) and who are willing to believe the reports of the drafters and the politicians on the inequities of the war. There were those same inequities in every war that has ever been fought, including the Revolutionary War, out of which an all new concept in government "by the people" was born; including another war in which the most monstrous form of government ever conceived was destroyed.

It is wonderful when a generation takes on ideals and the concept of right and wrong, but that generation must not lose its perspective on reality. If it does, it loses its ideals. When you deny the right to dissent, you deny the freedom of choice, and you begin to lose other freedoms until there is nothing left but the establishment. We cannot allow the opposition to be subdued if the will of the majority is to continue to be heard. The majority may not always be right, but neither is the minority, and if you refuse to hear an alternative plan how can you know that you have the best solution or the right one?

I have died in Viet Nam.

But I have walked the face of the moon.

I have befouled the waters and tainted the air of a magnificent land. But I have made it safe from disease.

I have flown through the sky faster than the sun. But I have idled in streets made ugly with traffic.

I have littered the land with garbage. But I have built upon it a hundred million homes.

I have divided schools with my prejudice. But I have sent armies to unite them.

I have beat down my enemies with clubs. But I have built court­rooms to keep them free.

I have built a bomb to destroy the world. But I have used it to light a light.

I have outraged my brothers in the alleys of the ghettos. But I have transplanted a human heart.

I have scribbled out filth and pornography. But I have elevated the philosophy of man.

I have watched children starve from my golden towers. But I have fed half of the earth.

I was raised in a grotesque slum. But I am surfeited by the silver spoon of opulence.

I live in the greatest country in the world, in the greatest time in history. But I scorn the ground I stand upon.

I am ashamed.
But I am proud.
I am an American.

McManus, John Adams Inc.

If you are interested in contributing to "The Other Side", your articles would be appreciated so that the paper can be printed periodically.

Articles may be placed in the Information Office or in Room 350.

* * * * * * *
Are we so concerned with our immediate problems that we are not preparing for the major problems of the future? The Alumni Office confirmed my belief that the students, upon graduation, seem to lose their avid interest in the affairs of Marian College. This appears to be logical since the college affects our lives for only four short years. However, isn’t it ironic how we devote so much time and energy to the effort of producing and establishing ultimatums so that the college will change to a more compatible position with our beliefs? We are here four years. For the Administration and the faculty, Marian is their life. This is their occupation, their grasp on security. If one has a position in the business world and takes pride in his work, he is not going to intentionally destroy the business which keeps him economically stable. He is going to try and make decisions which will better his business. The Administration of Marian is no different. It projects to the future when making important decisions and listens to major counsel, for if the wrong decisions are made, Marian goes bankrupt, Marian is not accepted in the community, or Marian is no more.

The older generation does not think along the same lines as does the younger one. I often wonder why? Having lived through at least two, and presently a third, war, they should want peace more than we, but they are also more dubious and distrustful. We should be the impetus to keep them trying. They become slow to change for fear of the consequences. We should urge them forward. They long for the past because it was stable, the world could not be destroyed in one day. We must show them that we do not have this nostalgic connection.

We press for our ideals, but the Establishment has been tempered by reality. We probably do know more at our age than did the previous generations, but their experience raises them above our level at present.

Let us spend our four years gathering information and opinions so that we have a better basis upon which to make our decisions. We should learn how to logically and rationally persuade in order to implement our ideas. We should not demand.

There is a reason for most decisions. If this reason is seen to be irrational, then there should be sufficient movement to rationally discuss and solve the problems. It is in this discussion and solution step that one must regard reality vs. ideality, the major conflict between generations. For example, let’s say the college loses face in the community because of some reactionary’s speech. Ideally there is no reason why Marian should not invite him to speak. Realistically, however, Marian is a struggling college community and cannot afford a serious setback in Public Relations. We, as students, have been viewing only our side of the argument in most of our confrontations with the administration. No one is right 100% of the time, including the Administration.

Let’s gather facts, remain open-minded, and discuss a problem with the Administration. If we can show that our view will be better for Marian College, it will be solved in that manner. However, we must rationally persuade and not demand, for it is in demanding that one perceived a threat.

Robert Crouch

*********

The White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health

The White House was the scene on December 2, 3, and 4, for the President’s Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health. President Nixon called this conference to advise him on how best to eliminate hunger and malnutrition among the poor in the United States. Beyond this the Conference was asked to focus attention on the nutritional needs and problems of all Americans.

The President asked the participants to specifically consider the following questions:

1) How do we ensure a continuing surveillance of the nutritional health of the American people?
2) What should be done to improve the nutrition of the more vulnerable groups of Americans for whom the Federal Government has a special responsibility?
3) As we develop new technologies of food production, processing and packaging, how do we monitor the wholesomeness and nutritional value of our foods?
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Project SEED

On January 11, 1969, Joseph White, then Chairman of the Marian College ACS-SA Chapter, attended the charter meeting of the American Chemical Society National Tutorial Assistance Student Steering Committee at the Air Host Motel in Chicago. The steering committee is the driving force for the tutorial assistance program set up under the ACS Project SEED (Subcommittee for the Education and Employment of the Disadvantaged), an activity of the ACS Committee on Chemistry and Public Affairs. Last year and several years earlier members of the Marian College Chapter ACS-SA taught one or more science classes at St. Rita School. Last year this was the Chapter's participation in Project SEED.

On November 15, 1969, Karen Barnhart, present chairman of the Marian College ACS-SA Chapter, attended the second meeting of the National Tutorial Assistance Student Steering Committee in Chicago.

This year's participation in Project SEED by the Marian College ACS-SA Chapter was an "Introductory Survey of Chemistry—a laboratory course" directed by Karen Barnhart with David DeBrosse and Joanne Benedict as assistants.

Seventh and eighth grade pupils from Holy Trinity School, chosen by their teacher, John Tachach, '69, attended the Saturday morning sessions from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. on November 8, 15, 22, and December 6 and 13. After each session the participants were guests of the Chapter for lunch in the College Cafeteria.

At the close of the session on December 13, certificates for successful completion of the course were presented to: Mary Barbarich, Cheryl Pierson, Nancy Traumer, and Vincent Urbanic. Certificates for participation in the course were presented to: Edward Abraham, Mary Condon, Paul Sevenish, and Donna Vollmer.

The Marian College ACS-SA Chapter is planning to offer two more such courses during the first and second quarters of the second semester.