

UNCLE MIL'S

fun & games



STYLING
SNIKES

CONTEST PICTURE

How to try for Prizes

After finding appropriate signature from below, decorate entry in any neat way with paint, crayon or pencil. After decoration is finished, fill in your name and give your entry to any B.S. distributor so a winner can be selected.

FORM No. 17

HALL PASS

Pupil _____ Teacher _____

Date _____ Period _____ Time _____ Room _____

Destination

_____ Activity Office	_____ Library
_____ Athletic Office	_____ Nurse's Office
_____ Audio-Visual Office	_____ Principal's Office
_____ Counselor's Office	_____ Rest Room
_____ Custodian's Office	_____ School Paper
_____ Dean of Boys'	_____ Study Hall, No.
_____ Dean of Girls'	_____ Room No.
_____ Detention Room	

Receiving Official _____ Time _____

FORGERY FOR FUN & PROFIT ★★★★★★

To help speed you on your way with the contest picture, the writers of The Bull Sheet have compiled the largest collection of non-legit John Henrys' ever gathered by Hunan paws. Use these names on hall passes, or student request slips. In fact the uses of these names are limited only by your imagination.

Al Bush *Paul Jennings* *John Hancock*
D Meier *Charles F. M. O'Leary* *C Meier*
E. Putman *Mr. Tucker* *R. B. Batterer*



First Prize
2 tickets to the
Policemans' Ball
Courtesy of Chief Lane

Local Winners Automatically
compete for this Prize!!!



Don't Believe It Unless You
Read It In The Newspaper
Department

by George R.

Recently, I ran across a small booklet entitled "Holy Joe. In case you happened to miss it, the plot ran like this. Holy Joe is a very religious soldier who attempts to convert others. (The booklet fails to tell what a Christian was doing in the Army learning to kill others, so use your imagination.) Finally, fed up with Joe's preaching, his sergeant sends him into battle, where he is killed. The sergeant sees the error of his ways and repents, but Henderson, another soldier who earlier rejected God, does not. Moments later, both are killed.

Now the plot thickens. An angel of the Lord, who appears to be a man with wings, calls the men from their graves. Their souls, which also have human form, follow the angel. The sergeant is saved, but Henderson is not, since his name is not in the "Book of the Living". He is cast into a Physical Hell, complete with fire.

This is all very nice, and was good for a laugh. But to expect anyone to believe that nonsense is too much. I believe in God; but not on a gold throne, as this book pictures. Matt. 12:36 warns that all of men's words will be taken into account on the "day of Judgement". This pamphlet interprets this as meaning a soundtrack movie, shown atop theater of clouds. (I'm not making this up; it's all drawn out in comic-book style.) If the movie of every man's life is played on the "Day of Judgement", that day should rival in length the "Day of Creation".

Throughout the entire heavenly portrayal, clouds are visible. The author fails to state, however, where he read that heaven is a physical thing, much less directly above earth.

And it gets worse. The Lord asks an angel, "Does his (Henderson's) name appear in the Book of Life?" Whereupon the angel thumbs through a hardbound volume resembling an unabridged dictionary and replies "No".

The final blow comes when the book contradicts itself by having Henderson condemned to eternal Hell. Then quoting II Peter 3:9, which says that God is not willing that ANY should perish, but that ALL should be saved. In other words, it's never too late to repent; God is not troubled by passing of the spiritual soul from the body. All He asks is that we, as sinners, repent.

"Believe on the Lord Jesus and you shall be saved." (Acts 16:31) Does the author, Luke, mention a deadline? Of course not. There isn't one. Rejoice and be thankful, through our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, Amen.

SHORT NOTES

by L.G.

Write off to the City School Board for the addition to Bosses High. We needed it about as badly as we need the crew that's going to occupy it.

The rumor that the smokers on the staff have given up the habit is a filthy lie. The truth is they've given up tobacco.

We understand the sheriff recently confiscated some wild hemp plants from the ISUE Campus and has them growing in his office. Apparently he's outgrown his craving for busts (take that however you want) and needs something stronger.

Remember, it takes a dead fish to float downstream. (Explanation next week; I'm out of space any time here.)

What's Really "Wrong" With Young People?

How recently has it been since you heard an analysis of "what's wrong" with the young generation, or reasons that young people have "gone wild" and are "rebellious"?

Explanations range from "they're teaching Communism in the schools and the nation has become too tolerant and permissive" to "the younger generation lacks a sense of identity due to their lack of heroes and the assassinations of the Kennedies and King."

You've heard them, and your parents may have their own explanation. They're easy answers that make good sense to a lot of people who can only understand easy answers.

If you are interested in getting down to the heart of "what's wrong" with this generation, start with its freshness. The ideas of young people are by nature fresh, idealistic, unspoiled by what older people might label "the hard facts of life." The person that says we've been misled is really saying that he can no longer properly relate to the changing world.

World War II was a crisis period for this country. All came to the aid of their country, and to hear that the neighbor's boy gave his life in battle to preserve this great country forged iron-like patriotic bonds between the American system and the American people. Not only World War II, but the whole American lifestyle serves to reinforce patriotic pride in this system, and age cements these bonds.

But young people, if one can speak in such general terms, are able to view the system without the iron bonds of patriotism that preclude any objective observation.

And most young people are more intelligent than a generation ago due to a higher quality of and easier access to education. This sharpens the perception. Of course some parents have dominated their children and produced only mirrors of themselves.

It is valuable to note that the young people who are rejecting the American system in the harshest terms are those with the most intelligence, from the best universities, and from relatively free-thinking families. I, at least, believe that intelligence and freshness of ideas are two of the most important qualities of leadership. Older politicians may be intelligent but their freshness of ideas is either lacking or limited. Nixon's outlook is clearly

stagnated, but even Birch Bayh's statement "The system won't work unless you work through the system" shows his age.

Most politicians admit the nation has a list of problems a mile long, but they believe that simple reform is all that is needed. Of course they think that. They must preserve the system that is to them their whole livelihood.

What exactly is the "system" that so many young people are rejecting? Generally, it is the system of limited government and free enterprise. The system, that under the guise of "individual freedom", allows businessmen the virtual control and exploitation of our society while democratic control through the government is limited and ineffectual. We are told to believe that expanding government is bad while expanding corporate growth is necessary. It is the system that says it is the politician's business to hold down taxes while a tiny minority of business executives set the economic and social pace of the country. It is not that the problems can't be solved; it's that they result from the system and the system must be changed if the problems are to be solved.

The political activities of the '60s reflected student discontent, but resulted only in despair and frustration. The campuses are "settling down", the rhetoric is being toned down, and revolutionary organizations such as the SDS have disbanded. The test of the union will be in its willingness to adapt to the desires of a new generation.

* * * * *

BUSING: A NATIONAL DILEMMA

It appears at this point that all major presidential candidates are opposed to busing (except for George McGovern.) All, of course, find nice ways of saying it: "I support quality education", "I believe in the neighborhood school", etc; but the point is, all are against it.

Why? Is this a reflection of the thinking of the American people? Is the local school indeed the popular choice?

For these men, yes. How many of them, after all, ever attended a Stanley Hall or a Lincoln? How many have known the joys of playing baseball on a cinder field? Or sat in a classroom where adequate lighting was a principal's vision? Likely, the answer



Hey little girl, want to buy a BULL SHEET?

Sure, everybody gets the SHEET at Bosse.



Busing, cont.

is zero. The majority went to a Plaza Park, or a private institution, as do their children. Judging from the areas these men live in, is it any wonder that they want neighborhood schools?

A point is made that if children are bused, they can't stay after school for activities. A legitimate question is this: why can't two buses be run-- one after the final class, and one later. The easy answer-- it would cost too much. This in turn raises another question: if the school board in Evansville found one-half to three quarters of a million dollars to finance a new administrative building at Bosse, why can't it put out a little cash for the students? Who is the school designed for?

The opposition is also fond of citing black leaders who are against busing. What they fail to mention is that these leaders are opposed to one-way busing; they would like to see the suburbanites shipped into the city. Is it fair that the poor only should be shuffled around? Thomas Jefferson would turn in his grave.

Also noted are the mass demonstrations in the busing districts. It would seem that a goodly portion of our population stand against the measure. And surely their intentions are honorable-- to save the neighborhood schools. Equal education all the way, but keep it near home. Of course, it's probably just a coincidence that these protests always occur in the

affluent areas. But it is interesting to note that the very people who assailed Martin Luther King's theory of "breaking unjust laws" so vehemently are the ones who are violating the attendance regulations by keeping their children home.

The situation is approaching the old gag-line "I don't mind them, but would you want your daughter to marry one?" Unfortunately, this country should be long past laughing at such statements. Crying might be more appropriate. It is indeed shameful when a leading magazine columnist labels busing "the first step toward slavery" (Milton Friedman, Newsweek, Feb. 29, 1972). But this shame is what we see everywhere. Particularly disheartening is the North, where attitudes are supposed to be more lenient. Rioters from middle-class neighborhoods overturned buses in a Michigan city this fall; (what if Chicago's Daley had been there to "shoot all looters to kill or maim"?) The only difference between the North and the South is that the South is more honest.

Busing may not be desirable. But if we wish to see equality, it is our only choice. Education is a right and not a privilege. We cannot deny this right because of a person's address. To refuse this right is to trample the Declaration of Independence under foot and to jeopardize the future of this nation. We must support the program or pay the costs.

* * * * *

JL

Another great issue's coming up soon!!!

R. J. Green--hmm--what is it?

(In this week's edition of the School Spirit, there appears a letter to the editor written by Ronna J. Green (a Bosse student). It deals with the actions of a certain NHS pledge, and with disrespect towards America, in general. The following is a discussion of Ronna's beliefs.)

RJ Green--hmm--what is it? It sounds like a gluttonous manifestation of the repressive American society. I might normally dismiss this RJG as a joke, but unfortunately I can't do so because America is filled with people of similar character--the "America- love it or leave it" common garden variety of blind patriots.

I do not wish to attack Ronna as an individual, for she is not such. She has sacrificed her individuality to become one of the faceless, mindless robots, or "Silent Majority". She seems willing to serve, and not question, the State, and such is the duty of all citizens in a totalitarian government. By being a "Vocal member of the silent majority", Ronna exposes her American dogma for all to see, and be either rejected by free souls, or accepted as "Gospel-truth" by others of her mindless gender.

Let's examine some of her statements in detail. Ronna says, of her letter to the editor, that "I thought I made it clear that anyone who dislikes the U.S. enough to show disrespect at a moment which is irrelevant to whatever is going on, he should try to find something better. There's a time and place for most things, but as far as I'm concerned there's never a right time to show disrespect to one's country."

Ronna naturally assumes that a NHS induction is totally unrelated to the American society, or the flag which represents it. She is typically wrong. The purpose of NHS seems to me to be to honor the students who have devoted their talents to becoming a part of the structured school society. My previous existence at Bosse seemed to be devoted to this goal, and for this I received the "honor". Since my ideas had changed from the time I filled out the NHS application to the time I received notification of my acceptance, the flag incident was a symbolic notification that henceforth, Rick Elmendorf chooses goals different than those of the majority

of the American society--conformity.

If one understands the true symbolism of the incident, the action does not appear irrelevant to the occasion.

I do not condemn those who consider NHS to be a true honor, I only ask of them, paraphrasing Henry David Thoreau, to "Let me step to the music which I hear, however measured or far away."

In the flag incident, I was also declaring that America has not earned my respect, due to the masses of Americans, in many respects not unlike Ronna, who have entangled us in Vietnam, caused a separation of Races, raised the money-god to an exalted position, called for the discontinuance of many civil liberties, and generally have done their best to stifle dissent.

Another belief that Ronna has stated for the Bull-Sheet follows: "I don't think we're dying in Vietnam to make our country better. I think what we went to Nam to accomplish, which was train Vietnamese to fight their own war, was right. However, Communism and socialism is one thing I don't feel the U.S. needs and to delay the making of Communist and socialistic governments is a worthwhile cause. The less Communist and socialistic countries we have the less our chances of being taken over by one of the above mentioned governments."

Of all of RJG's statements, I find none so frustrating and detrimental to world progress. Ronna, like so many Americans, automatically equates Communism (capital C) with socialism, and defines America's foreign policy as designed to prevent socialist governments from evolving. Perhaps Ronna would have us attack Great Britain, Sweden, West Germany or other European nations, which have all adapted socialism to varying degrees.

In a democratic socialist form of government, the citizen is granted all the rights enjoyed in a capitalistic government. Socialism is better than capitalism for many countries, especially underdeveloped ones. (What does a peasant know about free enterprise?) What right does the U.S. have to force its own form of government on other peoples? This makes America the aggressive government, not the Communists.

In conclusion, I am grateful for the rights I receive as an American citizen, but realize that these rights are not confined to only Americans. I fear that there are those Americans who would take away or limit my rights, simply because I appear to have ideas different from theirs.

The question the Bull-Sheet puts before the student body is "Can our student government and school administration provide needed programs and reforms without excessive delays?"

The school administration must prove that it is willing to listen to and cooperate with the student body, and that it will give the student body a bigger voice in curricular and extra-curricular activities.

The student council must prove that it represents the entire student body, not just the elite, college-bound group when it plans activities and considers reforms.

The burden of proof that change is not only possible, but around the corner, lies with the above-mentioned groups. If they cannot meet the challenge, as outlined below, it will add strength and validity to revolutionary ideals.

Two reforms that have already been put before the administration and student council are:

1) An alternative to detention. A positive system of correction would replace the present negative one. Instead of serving detention, a student might sit in on a student council meeting, a Human Relations meeting, pick up litter in the Bosse area, do chores for teachers, have rap-sessions with administrators, or a number of other possibilities.

2) An alternative to early ECA assemblies. A student wishing not to attend a Pep or other type assembly could possibly go to the library to study, or go to a student lounge (which should be established) and meet with friends.

The administration and student council have made a good start on the alternatives to detention. What must follow is definite programs in both areas.

The Bull-Sheet also proposes several other reforms, and will see that action is taken in each area.

1) Concerning Scarlet & Gray, we propose that the entire student body be allowed to vote whether we want S&G as a requirement for any activity. The vote will be totally binding, unless a new vote is later held, and the results are different.

a) the student body will also vote as to whether we want a National Honor Soc-

iety, a faculty-designated group of "superior" students. NHS was voted out of existence in a school where this was tried.

b) it should be the student body, not members of the faculty, who set standards for those students (such as cheerleaders) who represent us in public.

c) in other areas that affect the student body as a whole, we propose that the decisions be made by the entire student body with democratic voting procedures.

d) graduation exercises will be discussed in detail at a more appropriate time.

2) Room for a student lounge can be found, especially upon completion of the new addition. Student council should take action in this area.

The Bull-Sheet also supports:

1) A different grading system. The present system is not only based on the fear of getting low grades or the disappointment of coming up with grades less than A's or B's or the embarrassment of making poorer grades than your friends, it is not indicative of the education a student receives. Also, inequality is inherent in the system, which is often compounded by a prejudiced or incompetent teacher. Alternatives are:

a) pass-fail, which is self-explanatory. Class ranks can be designated by SAT scores.

b) in a system adopted by U of E, only A's, B's and C's are given. A person failing only has to repeat the course to receive his credit. Failures do not count against the student.

2) Genuine efforts to update classes and stress contemporary society. The administration and especially faculty should make efforts to bring subjects up to the '70s, yet treat all subjects objectively. The new class on 'Environment' is a solid step in the right direction.

3) Requirements (6 semesters English, 6 semesters social studies. . .) should not be absolute. Special exceptions should always be made for students who might benefit more on a deviation of the required subjects.

The Bull-Sheet supports all of these programs and reforms, even if the list is not complete. The Bull-Sheet stands for reform, and publish in the desire of effecting change. We have been labelled by some as a "gripe-sheet", or a "negative paper", but these labels come from either ignorant or bigoted minds.

ANNOUNCING

An Alternative to the Senior Picnic

BULL-SHEET

TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 1972
AUDUBON PARK

9:30--3:00

The official picnic costs \$3.75; Why be ripped off??
Ours is

FOOD, SOFT DRINKS, MUSIC
(There will be a charge for swimming)

Need a ride to the Park? Contact any staff member.

PLEASE!!

If you must have beverages other than soft drinks or
milk, bring them in a thermos or another container..
DON'T bring liquor bottles into the park!!!!!!!!!!!!

paid for by the Citizens For Bull*Sheet