

## Resisters deserve our praise, not prosecution

Recently two Iowa men have been indicted by federal grand juries for failing to register for the draft. They are Rusty Martin, president of the University of Northern Iowa student body, and Gary Eklund, a resident of Davenport. In refusing to register for the draft these men are breaking the law, but those of us who want to avoid the United States' involvement in another war and who would not want to participate in a war should appreciate what they are doing.

By taking such a stand Martin, Eklund and other public resisters around the country focus our attention on the draft registration issue. They are protesting what they feel is an unjust law and hopefully the rest of us will realize that fact, also. To quote a flier printed by the Committee Against Registration and the Draft, "The draft is a basic violation of freedom. It allows the government to take control of individual lives and force them into a war."

Although some people say they do not agree with the law itself, they feel because it is a law that every male born since 1960 must sign up within 30 days of his 18th birthday, it should be followed to the letter, or number as the case may be. But it seems wrong that if a person disagrees with a law for moral reasons he should not take a moral stand on refusing to comply with the law. Civil disobedience has proven very effective in the past as a means of changing unjust rules. Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi, among others, used this method.

The draft registration law also discriminates against men. And what does this law say about the government's opinions of women? Why relegate women to staying home while the men are drafted? If the draft ever is necessary it might help morale if both sexes have to serve — sort of the united effort idea.

Another argument for registering is that it does not necessarily mean you will fight or that the draft will ever be put into effect. However, the government would not have instituted the registration if it did not think it might have to use those names. If the U.S. were involved in a "justified" war it wouldn't need to force people to join the armed services. Plenty of people would volunteer — if this country's citizens felt the war was merited. The draft is only to get people to fight in a war they do not think they ought to be in.

All of this argument about justified and unjustified wars is precluded by the fact that the next major conflict will probably be a nuclear battle. What person in his right mind wants to have anything to do with a nuclear war, whether he fights in it or merely supports it by registering his name for service in it? This point is another reason why the resisters ought to be commended. They are refusing to support a military system which has the potential to incur major world destruction.

Enforcing the law is impossible. There are approximately 500,000 draft resisters nationwide and the courts cannot handle that volume of cases in addition to what they already have. Only the resisters who have made their inaction public are being prosecuted. Presumably these few will serve as an example to the others who have not signed up, and to future resisters, to make them register. However, *The Des Moines Register* reported in its Oct. 17 issue that in Iowa there has not been a general increase in registration. In fact, postal officials all over the country have reported no increase.

We are not suggesting that all young men should refuse to register for the draft. That is, of course, an individual decision. But those who do should receive more support and appreciation for taking a stand against a law which is unnecessary and very possibly dangerous.

## Is bigotry a Grinnell tradition

*From the American Heritage Dictionary: liberal: 2. having, expressing or following views or policies that favor the freedom of individuals to act or express themselves in a manner of their own choosing. 5. Tolerant of the ideas or behavior of others. Bigot: A person of strong conviction or prejudice, especially in matters of religion, race or politics, who is intolerant to those who differ with him.*

I was in the Post Office getting my mail when a member of one of Grinnell's political organizations asked me to read a petition. This person had asked me earlier to sign the petition and I had refused. This time they simply wanted me to read the statement. I did so and once again explained that I wasn't going to sign it. When asked why, I explained that although I agreed with aspects of the group's intentions, the wording of the petition did not voice my opinions on the issue. What followed was a subtle yet potent example of bigotry — Grinnell style.

As I began discussing the issue of signing the petition with two other members of the group, I was drilled on the nature of my beliefs, which I certainly didn't mind. I explained that if I sign a petition, it is because the petition accurately describes my feelings on an issue. They explained the point of the petition was to send a message of concern. I pointed out that in addition to voicing concern the petition

called for specific actions. I am concerned about the issue but am uncertain as to the course of action that should be taken, and therefore I could not honestly sign the petition. The answer I got was that I was "full of s\*#\$." Needless to say, I wasn't suddenly motivated to sign their petition.

The discussion continued touching on several other issues. Racism, sexism and the stable of issues associated with the "liberal" cause. A friend of mine then appeared and he was asked to sign the petition. He explained that he does not sign petitions, vote or take part in anything political. I know that he has thought carefully about his position and although I don't agree with him, I respect him for taking the time to think about and resolve the issue. As one might expect, my Post Office foes were rather alarmed by my friend's statement.

Another discussion ensued and I was quick to jump to my friend's defense. I was getting angry at this point and had to fight to control this anger. I explained that there are people whose approach to many issues is resolved by the fact that they don't see political involvement as the answer. I don't think this makes these individuals any less "moral" or "ethical" than I am; they simply have a different outlook on these issues. Once again I'm "full of s\*#\$." Shortly after this, my friend and I departed.

## "Most goldfish like reggae"

When I arrived here as a freshman I was told that there were two exceptional parties on campus: the International Student's Party and the Grinnell College Gay Community's Halloween Party. Opinions of this kind are purely subjective; however, there has been a steady consensus during my four years here that these two groups throw great parties. The only thing that has changed, and changed drastically in the last two years, is the degree of homophobia and the overtly malicious turn it has taken.

Last year Younkers Hall spearheaded an "alternative party" that coincided with GCGC's Halloween Party. The Younkers party was conceived in fear, belligerence, distrust and the erroneous idea that GCGC was "up to something." Neither GCGC nor the Younkers homophobes have to justify what they are doing; GCGC is trying to develop a higher level of understanding and acceptance in the community, while Younkers is offering an alternative for those who are unwilling or unable to reconcile themselves to the rest of the population. If the homophobes want to throw their own party concurrent to the GCGC, then perhaps they should. Intolerance to others and self-righteousness is not what the Gay Rights movement is about; such postures are better suited to other groups and movements.

Animosity towards the GCGC party, or more appropriately to the organization directly, is running higher this year than in past years. It was our original intention to place 12 posters in areas where the campus community would see them regularly rather than wasting paper, energy, money and time plastering the campus. The signs were quite attractive, but I doubt you saw them; after 12 hours only three were left, the other nine had been destroyed. One of the three was left in the Post Office. After 12 hours the words QUEERS and FAGGOTS had been scrawled over it; after 16 hours someone had ripped it up and put it in a scrap paper bin.

Before we start on a tirade about the halcyon days of Grinnell when such intolerance would not have been allowed, please remember that incidents of this nature have occurred ever since I've been

here. Never on this scale, perhaps, but the undercurrents have always been there.

As it stands now the one interaction between the Grinnell College Gay Community and the rest of the campus is a social event. With only one member of the group living in the dorms and one party a year our visibility is very low. The party is nice, pleasant, easy exchange between the two groups, but the time has come for GCGC to promulgate a more political and information-oriented profile on campus. Speakers, films, gay poetry readings — activity and visibility — could do much to foster a less hostile environment.

We are neither a large nor a hostile group; however our current invisibility allows many to perceive us in terms of the stereotypes they feel most comfortable with. A re-education process is needed, not only on this campus but in every community; we do exist and our existence should

## Important

By the time this issue of the *Scarlet and Black* "hits the street" the board of trustees will have made the most critical decision to date concerning the issue of Grinnell's investments in South Africa. The decision is whether the board will honor its own commitment to fulfill its "ethical responsibility to exercise its rights as a shareholder to influence corporate policy insofar as it affects the general welfare," or whether the board will turn its back on that commitment. The board must answer yes or no; it can no longer respond with maybe. This makes today one of the most important days in the anti-apartheid movement at Grinnell. Thus the South Africa Support Group urges your presence at 4:30 p.m. today at Central Campus to hear the announcement of this decision. A brief history of the issue will illuminate the importance of this day.

In 1973, the board adopted a statement of ethical responsibility, which committed

## Scarlet & Black

The *Scarlet & Black* is published weekly except during holidays and vacation periods by the Grinnell College Student Publications and Radio Committee, 1202 Park St., Grinnell, Iowa.

Postmaster: Send form 3579 to the *Scarlet & Black*, Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa 50112. Second Class postage paid at Grinnell, Iowa.

All views expressed in columns and in "open space" articles are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the *Scarlet and Black*.

Editor ..... Ellen Heath  
News Editor ..... Kimberly MacDonald  
Projects Editor ..... John Hanson

Diversions Editor ..... Catherine Ingrassia  
Sports Editor ..... Jeff Raymond  
Graphics Editor ..... Barry Jarrett  
Assistant Graphics Editor ..... Pat Smith  
Copy Editor ..... Carol Lickenbrock  
Assistant Copy Editors ..... Sandy Sorenson  
Laura Leung  
Advertising Manager ..... Leslie Brockman  
Circulation Manager ..... Leah Watts  
Cartoonists ..... Liz Voigt  
Anne Nolan  
Chris Mortika  
Professional Adviser ..... Bill Deminoff

(USPS 483-000)

## on? Fred Klatz

Maybe it's just me, but I got the distinct impression that these individuals were not being very tolerant of my views, but then again, my friend got that impression too. It seems to me that the true liberal is a person who is tolerant of the opinions of others. Unfortunately, Grinnell students often seem to forget this vital component of liberalism. In fact, what is often practiced is a type of bigotry and narrowmindedness that is deadly not only because it fails to accept different views, but because it stifles the educational process by failing to consider and learn from these different views.

I'm finding more and more that the sanctity of individualism, something that is an integral component of most "liberal" views, is not always practiced in terms of personal actions by those who hold these "liberal" views at Grinnell.

My inquisitors at the Post Office told me that political activism is a Grinnell tradition. I applaud them for wanting to follow in a tradition they believe in, but I question whether this tradition of activism, of true liberalism is being fully realized today at Grinnell. In addition to questioning the world around us, perhaps we should question ourselves, our beliefs and our actions. I hope that bigotry is not a Grinnell tradition.

## Hering John Kerr

not be perceived as something threatening and deserving of such petty and malicious behavior. My homosexuality has ceased to be an issue and a "big deal" for me; as a member of the Grinnell College Gay Community I can only hope that it ceases to be an issue and an object of ridicule to those responsible for the recent incidents of aggression.

It would be a foolish self-deception to believe things can be reconciled overnight, either here or in the 'big world'. However, before any gains can be made we must change our ostensibly invisible and passive posture to a visible and active one. Who knows, in the end we may make more gains at a party than a lecture, but before any gains can be made a process must be set in motion. As long as our existence is an issue or a big deal to you, it will have to be an issue for us.

## y for SASG efforts

the board to using its influence in corporations for the betterment of society. The means of influence was to be the stockholder resolution or proxy resolution. Such resolutions are initiatives formulated and voted on by shareholders in a corporation, calling on the management to carry out a certain policy. It is clear that the students who proposed this statement viewed South African investments as a case in which the board should exercise this ethical responsibility.

Since 1973, the board has not voted in favor of any shareholder resolution concerning South African investments, or any other resolution concerning "the general welfare," despite several requests by students to do so.

It was into this atmosphere that the present anti-apartheid movement was born. Because of the board's inaction and the failure of shareholder resolutions to make

## Letters: BCW "deceiving" prospectives

To the Editor:

The idea of a Black Cultural Weekend does not offend me in the least. Neither do I mind a weekend for black prospectives. I understand that an effort should be made to recruit black students since, overall, there are so few here. What I do resent, however, is that the two events always seem to fall on the same weekend.

Grinnell, wrongly or not, does not cater to its black students in the manner that a Black Cultural Weekend implies they are catered to. Black prospectives here on Black Cultural Weekend are led to believe that Grinnell has a larger black population than it actually does and they are led to believe that there are more events with "black" themes than there actually are. Is the recruitment of black students so difficult that black prospectives must be specially brought in on the one weekend when Grinnell College does manifest its concern for, and interest in, the black experience? The combination of the two events — Black Cultural Weekend and Black Prospective Weekend — is very deceiving to those students who will possibly attend Grinnell. They will have to spend four years and \$40,000 if they do choose to come here. They might as well see Grinnell as it really is — even if Grinnell is not what it ideally should be.

It seems that Admissions is only concerned about the numbers and not the actual students. All prospectives, black or white, receive the royal treatment. Receiving special attention (i.e. tour guides, eating in the "best" dining hall, seeing only rooms that have their beds made, etc.) is one thing. Totally deceiving those prospectives by inviting them on a special weekend that occurs only once or twice a year is wrong and should not be standard operating admissions procedure. — Linda Pavela

## BCW article lead offensive

To the Editor:

Last week an article on Black Cultural Weekend appeared on the front page of the *Scarlet and Black*. There was not a name attached to the article, so I do not know to whom I should address this letter. Therefore, it will be addressed to the editor. I would like to say that I, and many other black students, found the opening paragraph very degrading and offensive. The article, despite the first sentence, is very accurate, so I am not objecting to everything that was written. However, the first paragraph, which reads, "Although planned and organized by the minority

students, this year's Black Cultural Weekend will touch upon topics of interests to all students." is completely out of line. It should be stressed that Black Cultural Weekend is designed not only to interest blacks. Black students have always planned Black Cultural Weekend to be enlightening and educational for EVERYONE, not only blacks. As a matter of fact, we hope that white students will take an interest in our culture, which is the main goal of the weekend. In the future, I hope that such a lack of attention or insight will not remain unchecked by fellow students. — Natalie Ward

Editor's note: The S&B regrets the choice of words in the lead to that article. The author, John Hanson, did not intend to imply that BCW would not naturally appeal to the entire campus community, and neither did I.

## Obermiller congratulated

To the Editor:

I would like to congratulate Ray Obermiller for receiving the Master Coach Award from the College Swimming Coaches Association. It is a richly deserved recognition. I have never met a coach who is as universally respected and admired by his athletes as is Ray. Congratulations Ray! I know that there are countless Grinnell swimmers across the country who are very happy for you. — Jim Tederman

## Main Hall damages

To the Editor:

We the residents of Main Hall would like to inform the campus community of damages and inconveniences the hall has suffered as a result of all campus events held in Main and Gardner Lounges. In the past, Main Hall has been cooperative and tolerant in accordance with these events. However, the same cooperation and respect has not been returned by those in attendance.

The focus of our concern is the hall elevator. So far this semester the elevator has suffered damages to its padding, walls and telephone at the times when parties were being held in the hall. As a result, our hall funds have been considerably depleted. In addition, partygoers have used the elevator and stairs to go carousing on the upper floors (and in some cases

have disrupted and vandalized these floors). We would like to remind those who attend these events that the elevator and hall stairway are off limits to party activities. We do not wish to implement security measures at the cost of the campus community. Therefore, we would appreciate responsive consideration and thoughtfulness in the future. — Thank you, Main Hall Council

## Durkee disagrees with Stringfellow

To the Editor:

On Oct. 14, the Grinnell community listened as Dr. William Stringfellow offered us his apocalyptic vision of the nuclear arms race. I shared some of his ideas, but was both surprised and irritated to hear him repeatedly vilify nuclear science and scientists, blaming them for our current problems. In fact, it became apparent during the ensuing question period that Dr. Stringfellow had a very poor opinion of science in general. In the interests of fair play, I would like to direct my comments to two of his favorite phrases.

1) "The 'so-called' scientific method" — This method of inquiry, which demands the meticulous accumulation of data and the unbiased, rigorous interpretation of this data, is the only system yet devised which is capable of providing a solid base of reliable information which can then be used to elucidate such disparate phenomena as the workings of a cell, the evolution of a star, or . . . radioactivity. Dr. Stringfellow's openly cynical attitude is particularly unfortunate in view of the current nationwide crisis in science education. It is an ignorance of the scientific method, its usefulness and its limitations, that has led many well-meaning, but ill-informed, people to seriously accept the doctrine of "creation science," for example. Pandering to such anti-intellectualism exacerbates an already undesirable situation.

2) "Science is immoral" — Science, a way of knowing, is probably best defined as "amoral." The questions a scientist asks and the data he obtains are, intrinsically neither moral nor immoral. For instance, the knowledge that an atom of U-235, when bombarded by high speed particles, will undergo fission with release of tremendous quantities of energy is neither more nor less "good" than the knowledge that the complicated flower of an orchid represents a fusion of originally separate parts. How knowledge is applied constitutes the real test of morality and an informed, scientifically literate citizenry is an important determinant. In turn, it is the scientist's responsibility to inform the public; this is especially true when a potential for abuse exists and is why workers in recombinant DNA research today are making their concerns known and why hundreds of scientists, in various organized efforts throughout the world, are protesting the build-up of nuclear weapons. In the final analysis, it is the morality of society which is reflected in its uses of science.

In defense of the atomic scientists of the 1940s, it is worthwhile recalling that they were commissioned to build a weapon which would both end the war quickly and, from the point of view of the U.S. military advisers, give an edge over the Soviet Union. Freeman Dyson, in his popular book "Disturbing the Universe," writes that the scientists were certainly morally justified in pursuing this goal, considering the circumstances. Nevertheless, there was increasing doubt and soul-searching among those who knew of the bomb's terrible destructive force. Many attempts were made to communicate these concerns to the president. It is now apparent, 40 years later, that Truman was never informed of these petitions (one might say they were suppressed) and his final decision to use the bomb was influenced almost wholly by the generals. Therein lies a lesson for all of us. — Lenore T. Durkee, assistant professor of biology

## Jim Hunter

viewed, at least partially, as an attempt to pacify student opinion. the college community must not allow this to happen. The goal of the anti-apartheid movement is to work towards meaningful change in the role of U.S. corporations in South Africa. It must therefore use the tools which the board offers towards that end and let it be known if those tools prove inadequate.

On the other hand, if the proposal is rejected, it becomes clear that the board has no intention of willingly upholding its 1973 commitment. In this event the campus must renew its call for immediate divestment, using whatever means are appropriate to the task.

No matter what the Board of Trustees decides, this is a day on which all those who oppose Grinnell's support of apartheid must make their views known. We urge that you attend the announcement of the board's decision this afternoon at 4:30.