

THE PAPER

Vol. I No. 4

East Lansing, Michigan, January 27, 1966

10 cents

St. Bernard Rescues Paper

By DON SOCKOL

After deciding to write a column for "The Paper" I immediately began picking my brain for ideas.

Somehow they just didn't seem to come.

So editor Mike Kindman suggested I simply give students the reasons I left the State News and began writing for "The Paper."

He was also quite helpful in aiding me to formulate my thoughts on the subject.

"Just tell them, in a funny way," he said, "how the State News was stifling your creativity."

"They were?"

"Sure they were," he insisted. "Tell them that any time you attempted serious social criticism Wells wouldn't print it."

"Did I? Wouldn't he?" I asked, taken back.

"Sure," Mike assured me. "What about that column they killed in October?"

"Well, it did save me a libel suit."

"What about those violent arguments you and Wells used to have?"

"You mean the time he caught me swiping the typewriter?"

"Well, then--why did you quit?" Mike shouted, exasperated.

"CAUSE THEY WOULDN'T PRINT THE PICTURE OF THE ST. BERNARD WITH THE HAT ON ANYMORE!" I screamed, almost in tears.

"I liked that picture," I whined.

"That's the reason?" Mike said quietly.

"I liked that picture and they wouldn't print it," I sobbed.

"But I thought you came to 'The Paper' to find an outlet for meaningful social commentary that..."

"That was a great picture and it was my idea and other people liked it so I know I'm not wrong an'..."

"But your writing..."

"I don't care about writing. I don't like writing. I don't even care if I never write. I want my picture with the St. Bernard and the hat. I..."

"Then why 'The Paper'?" Mike softened. "We can't afford to print the picture."

"I know," I said, "but I don't care cause now I don't care if I ever see that stupid St. Bernard in a hat cause it's a stupid picture and I wouldn't let anybody print it even if they wanted to and I just want to get back at that stupid State News and stupid Chuck Wells and the stupid AP and UPI wires and typewriters and stupid people who work up there..."

"Oh, good lord."

"I'll show them," I went on, determinedly.

"So young, so tired, so beaten by the system," Mike shook his head slowly.

"HA HA... HA HA, I DON'T HAVE TO WRITE FOR THEM--THERE ARE OTHERS... HA HA..."



Mike sighed sadly and walked away. "I'LL SHOW THEM. THEY'LL SEE. HA HA..."

And I ranted and raved into the night

.....

Hell Week, As Usual

By LAURENCE TATE

The Decline of the West continued unabated last week. From a variety of sources, we have compiled a list of the week's more spectacular gaffes, in the certainty that if we just tell people about all the dumb things they're doing, they'll stop.

To begin with:

After the reams of publicity the government gave out about Hubert Humphrey's sagging public image, it sent him to the Far East, carefully nudging the public to the effect that this was strictly an image-raising trip. According to recent reports, the public now says it has a better image of Humphrey. Does anybody else find this frightening?

* * *

The Dear - Hearts - And - Gentle - People Award goes to an anonymous little old lady at the Sunday night speech of Vu Van Thai, South Vietnamese ambassador to the U.S. Amid the angry stream of lecture-goers who grumbled in disgust at the "idiots" demonstrating outside, she cocked her ear as the protesters began to sing "We Shall Overcome" and remarked to a friend, "That one fellow is a pretty good baritone."

Imaginative exercise of the week: think up stunts for the new TV show that will offer a top prize of \$50,

000 to contestants who return to the show for several weeks, accomplishing a more difficult physical feat each time. To get you started, we suggest that the fifty-grand in sky diving (one of the stunts actually under consideration) be given to contestants willing to bail out at 40,000 feet hanging on to a wet Kleenex. (If this turns into a new party game, remember you saw it here first.)

* * *

Oops: Just off the coast of Spain, the U.S. government lost an A-bomb. At last report, the search was continuing, and (the AP notes), "Villagers in the area apparently had calmed down." Ah, the Spanish! Imperturbable, as always.

* * *

THIS week's John-Wayne-Men's-Apple-Pie-God-Country-And-General-Motors Award goes to Shirley Lacy, socially conscious poet, for her courageous unmasking in verse of the International Communist Conspiracy, MSU style:

"There once was a Keleher named Brian

"End The War at all cost,' he was e'er cryin'..."

* * *

Shock headline of the week, from the Detroit Free Press condensation of Arthur Schlesinger's Kennedy book: "McNamara Drafted."

* * *

Second shock headline of the week (from the New York Times): "Negro Colleges Recruiting Whites in 'Drive for Excellence.'"

* * *

Variety reports, "Now that 'Batman' has arrived on television, via the

ABC network, a new dance has been kicked off in the discotheques called the Batusi. The article goes on to detail the rash of songs about Batman now hitting the market, and ends ominously with the comment, "A 'Superman' song cycle is believed to be waiting in the wings."

* * *

Earn - While - You - Learn Department: Explaining the rather spectacular hangups in rubbish collection at certain off-campus apartments, East Lansing City Manager John Patriarche said, "These student apartments were all built in the last few years. The problem is a little new to us and we haven't learned how to manage it." The State News reports that Patriarche "did not expect a quick solution."

* * *

Headline on a story which is simply too depressing to go into: "Saigon Propaganda War Enlists Astrology, Song."

* * *

Sellout of the Week: Roman Polanski, director of "Repulsion," has signed an MGM contract and is going to make a vampire picture.

* * *

The WCTU Save-Our-Boys-And-Girls Citation goes to August W. Heckman, president of the Jersey City Museum Association, who in banning a painting of two nudes from a local exhibit said, "That type of painting is not conducive to our cultural goals --nudes excite prurient interests. If we're called provincial, well then we'll be provincial."



VU VAN THAI, SOUTH VIETNAMESE AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, SPOKE AT THE KIVA SUNDAY NIGHT.



THE DEMONSTRATORS WHO MARCHED OUTSIDE AGAINST THE VIETNAM WAR WEREN'T THE ONLY ONES WHO FOUND HIS SPEECH BORING.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
2-7/8¢ PAID
East Lansing, Mich.
Permit No. 52

Keleher Doubts State News' Sincerity

The State News has of late been devoting considerable space to comments on me, with outbursts of emotionalism against my position on the Viet Nam question. However, it has followed its usual policy of substituting invective, banality and doggerel for a dispassionate discussion of the issues, and thereby continues to dis-serve its captive readership.

Some issues that a more responsible organ might bring to its readers' attention are:

1. The validity and significance of the current "peace offense." For all the ballyhoo and scurrying of emissaries hither and thither, the Johnson administration continues to escalate the war in south Vietnam with yet more intensive B-52 bombings of areas held by the NLF and attempted ground offensives (which tend to get bogged down).

In addition, on the charge that Cambodia is giving sanctuary to the NLF armed forces (disproved by Seymour Topping of the New York Times and denied by Norodom Sihanouk, who invites international investigation), Johnson has authorized U.S. forces to invade Cambodian territory.

The Administration refuses to even consider admitting the NLF to any negotiations. And the continued presence of American forces in South Vietnam remains a precondition to any negotiations. In other words, despite the smoke screen of the "peace offensive," the position of the U.S. government on Vietnam has in no way been changed.

2. The validity of the charge that the U.S. is "imperialist" in Vietnam (my reference to this particularly incensed the State News, or so it seems). Americans do not like to be told that our government is imperialist in its foreign policy, and we are constantly being told that there is no direct U.S. financial interest at stake in Vietnam.

Yet our major oil corporations are right now engaged in a major building operation at Cam Ranh Bay (in cooperation with the Army) that will make it a highly important installa-

tion which the companies involved will not wish later to give up. South Vietnam is (normally) one of Asia's major rice producers, and Japan--one of our "junior partners in imperialism"--needs that rice. And just recently two of our largest investment banks have become involved in Saigon.

3. The failure of our military operations in South Vietnam. Not for the first time in the war, our government officials are telling the American people that "the tide has turned." This time the line is that massive American troop reinforcements and saturation bombing are forcing the NLF to go on the defensive, and that they are losing territory which they had previously held securely. In reality, the NLF has continued to GAIN territory steadily. Not only are young Americans fighting for the wrong cause; they are losing.

4. The atrocities committed by "our side." Yes, the NLF IS guilty of atrocities. We had better accept the fact that revolutions do not happen in velvet boxes. I deplore those atrocities. But there is a qualitative difference between the soldiers of the Liberation Front assassinating a village chief who has collaborated in an American effort to put his people in a strategic hamlet and the soldiers of the U.S. Army burning the entire village, the rice paddies, and bags of rice plainly marked "gift of the USA." (This scene was shown over CBS TV news last week.)

5. The sudden disappearance of the two U.S. soldiers who were released by the NLF in November. Sergeants George Smith and George McClure have "dropped from sight" in Okinawa after giving a press conference in Cambodia during which they announced plans to tell the American people the truth about the situation in Vietnam.

6. The erosion of our civil liberties caused by the war. Julian Bond--the legally elected Georgia state legislator--is denied his seat because he opposes the war. Students at Ann Arbor lose their student draft deferments because they sit in at a draft board. Several GI's who have demonstrated against the war receive varying stockade sentences. This has reached the point where the American Civil Liberties Union is considering opposing the war (which would be the first time in its existence that it has commented on foreign policy) because of the war's drastic domestic effects.

These are just a few of the issues the State News might bring up, were it a responsible newspaper. If it wanted to go a step further, it might even do an article (or a series of articles) on the role of this very university in Vietnam.

Robert Scheer, in a pamphlet published by and obtainable from the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, has revealed some fascinating facts about MSU, the CIA and Vietnam. It seems that our police administration school trained Ngo Dinh Diem's palace guard and secret police, that Wesley Fishel, working closely with (among others) the CIA and Cardinal Spellman, played a large role in bringing Ngo Dinh Diem to power and securing him U.S. support.

To date the State News' only reaction to this report has been to solicit and print a denial from Mr. Fishel.

But then again, if the State News were to discuss these things, Mr. Berman might not like it Brian Keleher

Lay Down Your Weary Tune

If David Freedman comes by, tell him that a song isn't supposed to bring "influence to bear upon the problems it purports to examine."

Lyric is a fragile art and a limited one. One emotion is enough to express in one poem.

Poets, singers and writers who have a need to express more complex relationships would do well to imitate Shakespeare and Browning and Mao Tse Tung by moving on to forms more suited to their genius. Meanwhile, let Dylan express one emotion at a time. He won't be able to offer alternatives. So?

Freedman also characterizes The Word as "anti-war, anti-hate, anti-adult and (ostensibly) anti-commercial." Is it not the "non-adults" whom the (ostensibly) fast-maturing youth criticize?

To borrow a phrase from another Dylan article on the same page: It must be noted, however, in any criticism of Freedman that his articles remain far more interesting critically than anything else thus far written in "The Paper's" issue-by-issue rehash of old Bob Dylan record blurbs.

"ANDY"

ann. dent David Hubbard of California's Notes, publ
lude Fuller Theological Seminary complains to promote
gical ale, opal lass. and that ing, de-oral



ARTHUR RICKERBY—LIFE
A MORAL DECISION
Only in context are acts good or bad.
that "we can talk ourselves into a lot of a peak of p
things in the name of love unless we sion and V

SNAFU

By LAURENCE TATE

I don't want to be known as an inveterate reader of Time magazine, but in the course of my association with "The Paper" (which, like at least one other publication, is against all the dumb things that are going on) I've been drawn irresistibly to it. Last week I came across an article on the subject of (so help me) "situation ethics." (If you're like me, your immediate thought is, "Does this have any relation to situation comedy?") That you must judge for yourself.)

In any case, the article gets off to a rousing start:

"To the classical Christian moralist, the teachings of the church are moral imperatives that apply always and everywhere to men faced with an ethical decision. To the modern day existentialist, all guidelines are irrelevant; he argues that any authentic decision must arise spontaneously from man's inner sense of what the situation demands. Today, a number of Christian theologians expound a third way--halfway between the two previous paths--which they call 'situation' or 'contextual' ethics."

Well, this sounds appealing: sort of a compromise between the Absurd and the ridiculous.

At this point (and it is a wonder it has taken this long) one's gaze wanders over to the illustrative photograph, which shows a scene on a hillside with the caption "A moral decision: Only in context are acts good or bad." Now, except for the undeniable hillside, it is far from clear just what the contest of this particular act is, since all that can be made out is what appears to be a supine male figure with one knee raised, upon whom lies an indeterminate dark mass that one rather

hopes is a girl, although with all these new trends going around nothing is certain. It is, of course, entirely possible that the man is being attacked by a small bear and/or a large dog, in which case the real moral decision belongs to the bear and/or dog. If this is the case, I must really agree with the existentialists that all guidelines are irrelevant.

But I digress. Most of the article talks about the conflict between strict dogmatists and middle-of-the-roaders on such subjects as marriage, abortion and "transient sex liaisons."

On the strict side are included the Pope and a number of Catholic theologians; on the liberal side range Karl Barth, St. Augustine, and Martin Luther. (This should give the reader some idea of the spectrum of opinion always available in Time magazine.)

It is of course impossible as always to penetrate Time's rigorous objectivity, but it is significant that the situation-ethics crowd is given the final say in the article. And, by the end, Time feels cozy enough with the concept to call it 'situationism,' which has the sound of real best-seller, like "togetherness."

Now, the basic premise of situationism is that acts "take on moral value only in relation to circumstances." In other words, something may be good if certain things are true, and not good if other things are true. Have we all got that?

I can't really say I've been bowled over by the originality of the idea, but it's refreshing to find out that just by believing what I've always believed I've become part of a bold new theological trend. I can envision already the effect the article will have on the pulpits of our nation.

Situationism will sweep the flocks of America, and soon everyone will be talking about it at parties. (After

Continued on Page 8

THE PAPER

"The Paper" is published by students of Michigan State University as an independent alternative to the "established" news media of the university community. It is intended to serve as a forum for the ideas of all members of the university community on any topic pertinent to the interests of this community. Neither Michigan State University nor any branch of its student government, faculty or administration is to be considered responsible for the form or content of "The Paper."

Please address all correspondence to:
"The Paper"
1730 Haslett Road
East Lansing, Michigan, 48823
Tel.: 351-5679 or 351-6516

Editor Michael Kindman
Arts Editor Laurence Tate
Fund Chairman John Wooley
Advertising Robert Maronpot
Inspirations This Time Ramparts, Esquire

The American Way Of Dissent

DANIEL WALDEN is an assistant professor of American Thought and Language, as well as a writer of numerous articles on Negro history and the politics of dissent.--The Editors.

By DANIEL WALDEN



The subject before us is Dissent. Let me state my position at the outset. As I see it, not only has dissent in America been a socially productive dynamic, but it has been a necessary one. In every era there have been men who have struggled versus those who fought, usually irrationally, to maintain the status quo, no matter the conditions, no matter the need for change.

Far from being a necessarily nasty word, a word that conjures up lurid images of fanatics with beards and bombs, dissent IS the American way. From the Puritan beginnings, to the immediate present, America has been blessed with a succession of principled and concerned men, aware of the discrepancy between our announced credo and our practice, and determined to activate their moral concern. Regardless of the specific grievances, the point is that time and again Americans have NOT been satisfied to have their thinking done for them or their social and economic status rigidified.

The principles, in short, was all-important: men were willing to struggle for their natural rights, for justice, for the freedom to think and speak, for the equal right to intelligently choose among alternatives.

It is with this ongoing struggle, to the continuing tensions that have helped America evolve, and to the continuing necessity for that avenue of social evolution, that this paper is concerned.

To be sure, dissent is not confined to any particular part of the society or political spectrum.

1. A courageous man named Nor-

man Morrison, a Quaker, burned himself to death because he dissented from the prevailing view on the war in Vietnam.

2. Two years ago, William Scranton and Nelson Rockefeller felt compelled to dissent from a powerful conservative minority in the Republican party. (As of a few days ago, according to Barry Goldwater, they are still being blamed for the Arizona's crushing and humiliating defeat.)

3. Not so long ago students in Berkeley rioted for what they considered just cause--freedom of speech. The criticisms are still vicious and lurid. In the words of California's superintendent of public instruction, the leaders were "odd, hairy people, exuding a visible aura of unwashed disinhabitation." As he saw it, "the purpose of higher education is pursuit of truth, not to bring about a new social order." On the other hand, as Alfred North Whitehead saw it, "The clash of doctrines is not a disaster, it is opportunity."

But of course this is precisely the point, for quite often the pursuit of truth in America has been, as George Washington observed, an experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people. In short, in Benjamin Franklin's words: "By the collision of different sentiments, sparks of truth are struck out, and political light is obtained."

A HISTORY OF DISSENT

From the beginning, our history has been rooted in dissent. The decision to leave the Old World for the New World, the decision to break with community, with church, and even with the state reflected an adventurous and experimental attitude. "We hope to plant a nation where none before hath been," wrote an early Virginia chronicler.

What was true of the early pioneers in a national sense was also true philosophically. The experiment of nationalism, of the federal system, of a new colonial system, of the separation of church and state, of the practice of democracy and of equality--all were experimental and depended in each generation on those who would struggle against the forces holding back change and adaptation.

Not that the cost was slight. In order to move toward pluralism Roger Williams had to challenge the oligarchies and constricting Establishment of his day. "We are and ought to be non-conformitants" was his belief. He was banished for his efforts.

It is my contention, then, that pluralism and experimentation characterize our society. Not content with a theocracy, America innovated scores of churches and religions, and a new political philosophy.


It can be pointed out that our politics is an exception. So it is. Our basic political principles ARE absolutistic and unitary. But--because the

road of improvement, for we are making Experiments."

As for those concerned only for themselves, Franklin wrote: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."

A NOBLE EXPERIMENT

Justice Holmes once observed that "the constitution is an experiment, as all life is an experiment." This means that life is filled with chance and risk. And chance and risk depend on the intelligence, the fortitude and the virtue of the American people. The other side of the coin expresses



the yearning for certainty--the embracing of an illusive security that comes through the familiar, the traditional, the dogmatic and the absolute.

In this vein, in the world we know today, people often want guarantees that teachers will conform to certain notions of Americanism, or loyalty, or what have you. It is forgotten that enforced conformity is totalitarian and makes irremediable mistakes.

People also want guarantees that students will not be exposed to dangerous ideas, or controversial ideas. Again, it is forgotten that only by familiarity with ideas can young people mature, grow, develop, and become adults capable of distinguishing between the true and the false. For in the last analysis, to again quote Justice Holmes, "the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas." And that is dissent.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT

Ideas! This word "ideas" brings up extraordinary connotations. Freedom of speech, and of the press, the freedom of inquiry, criticism, dissent--all are guaranteed to us, and all are predicated on ideas.

Still, as Jefferson knew, each generation must vindicate these freedoms anew, and for itself. So it has been, so it is now. Time and again, the attack on non-orthodoxy and non-conformity has been mounted. Then, and now, the consequences of that attack must be described.

It is when we recognize those who would put fetters on the right of criticism, dissent and nonconformity, and consider the implications of their conduct, that we realize that freedom and criticism and dissent are not only a right, but a necessity.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident," wrote Jefferson, the deist, the nationalist, the absolutist; but it was Jefferson the dissenter and pragmatist who wrote that whenever government becomes destructive of these ends action should be taken to remedy the defects.

Not long after the age of Jeffer-

Continued on Page 7

FIRST ANNUAL ROSE BOWL ISSUE

THE PAPER

We try harder.

Vol. 1 No. 3 East Lansing, Michigan, January 20, 1966 10 cents

The Children's Crusade: "The Paper" Looks At...

It isn't easy being number two. Our leading competitor says 35,000 students read his publication. We can only say that our readers care. He says he writes for the average student. We only write what we think we'd like to read if we weren't writing it.

We can't promise that what you read in "The Paper" will be read and liked by 35,000 other students. We're only number two, and our readers may even be a minority.

But we can offer you better writing than our competitor. And we promise you more careful editing, and personal attention to our readers' thoughts and reactions. We have to. We're only number two.

Subscribe now and help us stay number two:

_____ \$1 for ten issues

_____ \$1.50 for two terms

Name _____

Street _____

City, State, Zip _____

"The Paper" 1730 Haslett Road East Lansing



Founders were both deistically dogmatic and yet pragmatic, too, our constitutional system has been progressively adapted to the changing circumstances of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Again, the cost was felt. Jefferson, who believed that a little rebellion now and then watered the tree of liberty, who challenged the Federalist establishment, was told by President Timothy Dwight of Yale that his 1800 triumph would mean that "our churches would become temples of reason, our psalms of praise Marseillaise hymns, our wives and daughters the victims of legal prostitution . . . and our sons disciples of Voltaire and the dragoons of Marat." The spectre raised reminds us of the ugliness of Salem, 1692, and McCarthy, in the 1950's.

Of course, the real feat of imposing organic political practices on static constitutional principles, of developing an evolutionary and experimental political system out of a rigid constitutional framework, was done by men. In contrast to those who said, with Pangloss, "this is the best of all possible worlds," Benjamin Franklin wrote to a friend in 1786: "We are I think in the right

The Revolt Of Theatre: A Controversy

The following letter was received after the appearance of the first issue of "The Paper," which included Laurence Tate's theatre review, "The Season So Far."--The Editors

To describe the reviewing efforts of Brad Smith as "manure" is perhaps unfair--unfair in the sense that his work is of such an inadequate quality that he is deserving of sympathy and not condemnation.

But you, Mr. Tate, have a head on your shoulders; you know what you do and cannot be so easily excused. I followed your efforts as the State News "critic" through the major portion of last year's season, and when your reviews ceased to appear, I assumed that either you or your superior had seen the light . . . C'est la vie.

To begin with, Mr. Tate, I don't believe you have ever written a theatre review. I define a review as a critical analysis of a theatrical performance. Despite an occasional mention of the performance you claim to have seen (I know you were there), your basic criticism has always been of the author's work. You don't like the play "Taming of the Shrew"; "The Crucible" and "Goa" you hold in contempt. You are certainly entitled to your opinion, but as a critic you are not entitled to dismiss a production on the grounds that you do or do not like the script.

It is my opinion that you use this technique as an excuse for not analyzing the production, the actual reason being that you are not qualified to analyze it--a fault that could be excusable if you didn't insist on playing God. After all, who is mightier than a "Critic of the Theatre?"

Perhaps the only people who are sufficiently concerned about the inadequacy of your "reviews" are in the theatre department, and if we complain, it sounds like "sour grapes." I shall risk that charge and your glib phrases because as a theatre major I consider it my responsibility.

To write a "review" one should have an expansive knowledge of acting, stage movement and composition, scene design, lighting and costuming. To leave any of these areas unmentioned is to be less than adequate.

I should make one last point very clear, Mr. Tate. I do not object to your dislike or disgust for the majority of productions presented this season. As a critic this is your right. Certainly it is possible for an entire season to be bad, and to deny it is to do a disservice to the public, to the people involved in the production, and to your own integrity.

I find the favorable reviews in the State Journal to be equally as inadequate as those found in the State News and "The Paper." To put it on a higher level, you have an obligation as a journalist working for a free press to substantiate your opinions. If you don't, regardless of their glibness, they do not belong in print.

I sincerely hope that I have offered some information that will be of value to you in your future efforts. I'm assuming, of course, Mr. Tate, that you really don't want to be "just glib" and play "God." I'm assuming, Mr. Tate, that you really give a damn.

Edward Abry
Graduate student in theatre

Laurence Tate replies:

I have read Mr. Abry's letter a number of times, and I am still not sure I know what his precise criticisms are.

The major one--that I seem not to subscribe to his definition of a theatre review--is clear enough, and I shall deal with it shortly. His further criticisms seem to be 1) that, being conceited, I am inclined to "play God"; 2) that, being incompetent, I am employing various subterfuges to disguise my ignorance of theatre; and 3) that I fail to substantiate my opinions.

I shall not argue the question of my conceit.

I have not been consciously employing self-defensive subterfuges. I have tried to say what I had to say in a decently readable way, period. As for my competence, the most important thing is that I think I have reasonably good taste.

Beyond that, I have for many years gone to the theatre as often as I could, in New York and London, in Chicago and Detroit, and of course at MSU. I have read a considerable number of plays, and a number of books about theatre. I follow the better critics (Robert Brustein, Albert Bermel, Kenneth Tynan, etc.) and draw such lessons as seem pertinent. The degree of my competence is naturally limited by my youth, but nobody has world enough and time anyway, and we must all face that. I want to learn a great deal more about theatre.

Mr. Abry's assertion that I fail to support my opinions is susceptible of several interpretations, and is perhaps not a separate point. However, since Mr. Abry directed last term's production of "The Crucible," and since in a summary report of the season I dismissed the production in two paragraphs, I believe it wise to explain certain circumstances.

At the time of the production, it appeared doubtful that "The Paper"

would become a reality. Loathing the play, I went to it from some obscure sense of duty, found the production uninteresting in itself and left at the second intermission.

When I came to review the season some weeks later, I did not feel the show was worth more than a couple of paragraphs. Had "The Paper" been in operation at the time of the production, I would have stayed the entire evening and written a detailed review. I tend to doubt that Mr. Abry would have been pleased with the results, but I would have perhaps escaped the accusation that I fail to support my opinions.

But perhaps not. Since Mr. Abry's criticisms are based primarily on my late unlamented State News days, there is one more circumstance to be clarified before we get to the heart of the argument. What I wrote and what was printed in the State News under my name often had remarkable little relation to each other.

I had then a rather stronger literary bias than I hope I have now, but I almost always wrote in some detail about the specifics of the performance. A great deal of the detail was cut. However, I cannot believe, judging by some of Mr. Abry's comments, that he has read all the reviews he claims to have read. His description of what was printed is simply not accurate.

Now: Mr. Abry defines a theatre review as a "critical analysis of a theatrical performance." He lists such aspects of performance as lighting, costuming, and scene design, and asserts that it is to be inadequate to neglect any one of them. He further asserts that a production cannot be dismissed because the script is bad. He concedes the critic the right to express his loathing for a play, but seems to relegate such expression to a drastically subordinate position.

I honestly don't know what to make of all this. Taken liberally, it seems innocuous. Pushed to extremes, it is insidious, the sort of straw man that Mr. Abry would not be comfortable trying to prop up for very long.

I wish Mr. Abry had taken time to say what he means by a "theatrical performance." If the term does not very importantly include the script (and it seems not to), the definition is clearly nonsense. It is an extraordinary and not necessarily welcome thing in the theatre to see a performance that is interesting in itself, without relation to the play being performed.

A critic ought to be no more than a playgoer--well-informed, discriminating, and intelligent, but no different from any other member of the audience except in that he will express his reactions in print. He ought to be the "judicious" playgoer to whom Hamlet refers, "the censure of the which one must in your allowance

o'erweigh a whole theater of others."

If a critic sees a play and writes a "critical analysis of a theatrical performance" in which he brushes off the script as irrelevant, he has either spent a very unusual evening in the theatre or badly falsified his experience. And vice-versa. (Admittedly, I've spent some very unusual theatrical evenings at MSU, but that is neither here nor there at present.)

It is simply preposterous to expect a playgoer to sit in a theatre and take note, quite systematically, of the respective merits of the scene design, lighting, stage movement, etc. It there is something worth saying about these things, it will come out as part of his total response. Critics too often fall into the fallacy of feeling obligated to manufacture something to say about things they have no real feelings about. I have manufactured such inanities on occasion, and regretted it.

Finally: OF COURSE I can dismiss a production if the script is awful. All the sincere work that went into "Goa" just compounded the embarrassment. If Mr. Abry thinks any non-masochistic critic is going to spend his life going over the acting, costuming, and scene design in productions of that calibre, he is quixotic, to say the least.

Well, that is that. If I have been glib, I apologize. If Mr. Abry will excuse me, I want to quit while I still give a damn.




By JIM DEFOREST

Many Spartans are planning to spend Spring Break in a fairer climate than ours--like Siberia?
* * *

LBJ scores the diplomatic coup of the year! He sends diplomats roving to resolve the peace in Vietnam, then names one of his Beagle puppies after the opposition's leader. I thought he'd NEVER top that picture of his gall stone scar.
* * *

Poverty is related to Virtue. When I'm broke I can't buy beer.
* * *

Many ex-State Newsmen For "The Paper" now write, All this goes to show my friend, We'd rather switch than . . .



Second Genesis

At nineteen I rose from the dead,
Rose from the sacrifice, rose from the bludgeonings,
My sacrificial blood bled out,
No more the Abraham-yielded calf.

And now,
Twenty-one, I hold breath,
Can walk the land,
My proud passion sown--
All masquerades rolled away
With the vault-stone.

Two years, then, of wakefulness,
And I, least alone,
Have found loneliness something not unkind,
Have discovered best the whole
Far, far surpasses any sum of tireless, perfect
parts.

ELAINE CAHILL

Coming up in Holmes Hall: Dr. Robert Darkie to speak on birth control and the population explosion, 7 p.m., Wed., Feb. 2, in Room 106 Holmes; James Hundley, assistant professor of sociology, to speak on student protest movements, 8 p.m., Wed., Feb. 9, same room.

Advertising Space
in
THE PAPER
is available
Contact Us Now
Call 351-5679 or
351-6516

MSU Jazz Ensemble Western Michigan Jazz Band	Northern Michigan Jazz Band Central Michigan Jazz Band
INTERCOLLEGIATE JAZZ FESTIVAL	
Erickson Kiva	
Sat. Jan. 29 at 2 and 8 p.m.	
tickets at: Union Ticket Office, Music Department, Marshall Music, Cap and Gown Series Office (Kellogg Center)	
Students \$1.50	Adults \$2.00



William Cannon calls this his "Antonioni shot."

An Interview With William Cannon

As I talked with William Cannon before the second showing of "The Square Root of Zero," I began to wonder if he would hold out for the rest of the evening. He was perspiring quite heavily, and seemed unable to stand in any one position for more than a moment or two. He spoke in bursts, each cluster of words separated from the others by a nervous laugh and a wave of his cigarette. But once the show was over and the crowds were gone, Cannon relaxed--his sentences grew longer, and he laughed only when there was a reason to laugh. The ordeal was over, and he felt that his film had passed the test.

But more important, he had passed the test as well, for Cannon finds it difficult to separate himself from his work ("I can't bear to think of its being shown when I'm not here," he confessed.) This was pointed up in one of those incidents which, as though Yankee Stadium were suddenly lit with a flashlight, seems to provide illumination far beyond its potential.

My wife and I were to join Cannon and several others for coffee, and as

we waited outside the State Theater for someone to bring the car around, a young man approached Cannon and told him how much he had enjoyed the film, although, he confessed, there were parts of it he hadn't understood. Cannon seemed surprised, and asked what it was he hadn't understood; the young man fumbled for words, and then admitted that he hadn't understood a bit of it. Cannon laughed; "Maybe we ought to start watching you."

It struck me afterwards that this one phrase summed up Cannon's aim in producing motion pictures; he wants people to watch him, or, rather that part of him which is projected on the screen. He doesn't feel compelled to make statements about the nature of things, nor to invest his films with material for the symbol-hunters. All he asks is that he be allowed to be funny; everything else follows from that, for he feels that humor derives from truth and that truth is the substance of art.

Cannon seems to be singularly free

Continued on Page 6

'THE PAPER'S' CLASSIFIEDS GET RESULTS

How can we say that, when we haven't even run a classified column yet? Easy: we ran one little ad last week!

ATTENTION MEN--Looking for company? Three coeds are looking for fun but not husbands. Must be over 21, looking for like relationship. Call any time after 10 p.m.

) and the three girls involved received about 100 calls during the week.

We don't know whether you will get the same results. Your ad might not capture as many imaginations as this one did. But we guess five or ten thousand people read "The Paper" each week, and we're just beginning to build. That provides a few chances for calls.

And anyway, where else can you be guaranteed a special classified column for coming events (concerts, lectures, meetings, parties, happenings) that will be read by everyone who's anyone at MSU. (Perfectly amateur readership surveys indicate our readers are among the best anywhere.)

And where else are you offered a chance to sound off, at \$1 for 50 words, on anything that upsets you. (We only censor out spelling errors.)

Also, we'll run the usual things, like apartments for rent, lost and found, personals, employment, automobiles, Hondas, real estate, animals, service.

Just \$1 an item for any of these.

Call 351-5679 or 351-6516 almost anytime, or send to 1730 Haslett Road, East Lansing.

Deadline is around midnight, the Monday before publication.

Remember, "The Paper's" classified got results.

The Square Root Of Zero

Coming Up To Cannon Is Like Coming Up To Kools

By RICHARD A. OGAR

Always leery of appeals to popular culture, I walked into the State Theater fully expecting to see a self-consciously hip version of "Beach Blanket Bingo." Pop and camp were in, and I was certain that the hucksters had finally decided that it was in securely enough to risk a little money in exploiting it.

But after talking to the film's director before the show, I wasn't so sure any more; William Cannon didn't strike me as being a huckster--moreover, he wasn't in the least pretentious. In fact, he seemed like nothing worse than a man who had turned over years of hard work to the public and was scared to death they wouldn't treat it well. And before 15 minutes of the film had passed through the projector, I knew I was wrong; "The Square Root of Zero" wasn't camp or pop--it was just good imaginative fun.

Cannon makes no secret of the fact that he wants to entertain, and it is unfortunate that the word has become such a critical pejorative. The reason it has is, of course, easy to understand; the avowed aim of Hollywood is entertainment, and it is very difficult to deny that Hollywood produces incredibly bad pictures. But it is quite wrong to assume they're bad because they're entertaining; all art--even the most serious--must entertain if it hopes to have any sort of audience.

Unlike many contemporary artists, however, Cannon refuses to excuse himself by explaining that entertainment is a vehicle for "higher values" of some sort; with deliberate contrariness, he has made entertainment his sole concern, and has proved, moreover, that it is no detriment to art. So convinced is he of the truth of his proposition that Cannon has made a deliberate attempt to remove his film from reality to such a degree that it nearly becomes an exercise in aesthetic distance. If art is by definition once removed from reality, "The Square Root of Zero" is always at two, and occasionally at three, removes, for Cannon presents his audience with a pudgy self-professed beatnik named Zero (Michael Egan) who writes novels in his sleep, his fingers ranging feverishly over the keys of an imaginary typewriter.

Zero then takes over the creative reins and "thinks" a novel in which he and his best friend Alan (James Gavin) row to an island off the coast of Maine where they find themselves in company with a number of incred-

ibly boorish tent-campers, among them the wealthy Liggets--Arch (Don Woodbury), May (Mary Bower), and their strikingly beautiful daughter, Jane (Leslie Davis). And finally, Zero's self-characterization "collaborates" with May to write a very bad play which is presented at a camp show, and imagines a mock-marriage between Alan and Jane. The result is that the film, although it takes off from reality, goes so far beyond it that the process becomes reversed, and art itself becomes the reality.

Cannon accomplishes a similar sort of sleight-of-hand with his characters, most of whom, in the comic tradition, are stereotypes. But the stereotypes are exaggerated to such an extent that they become self-parodies. (The best example is Nell, the vacationing prostitute, whom Jeri Archer--the Belle Poitrine of Patrick Dennis' novel "Little Me"--brings to delightfully decadent life.)

Ineptly handled this device could degenerate into mere burlesque, but Cannon evades the trap by his use of understatement. The characters may be outrageous, but they do not behave outrageously; over-done and under-reacting, they become extremely funny even when they behave normally.

Although much of the humor is derived from situation and dialogue, Cannon also makes full use of technical effects, such as stop-action or reversal of either the film or sound track. Perhaps the most notable effect is the spirit-type writer which clacks out direct quotes from Zero's novel--complete with misspellings and revisions--across the bottom of the screen. But Cannon can be funny with nothing but a camera as, in a brilliant parody of the Hollywood staple, he focuses upon Nell's somewhat ancient derriere (scarcely covered by her skimpy bikini) and takes in every pucker of fatty tissue with loving care.

If the movie has a major flaw, it must be the tinge of amateurishness which creeps in every so often. But one could hardly expect that it wouldn't: this is Cannon's first feature film, produced on an extremely low budget, and most of his actors had no prior experience in film-acting. And it may be that these defects actually re-enforce Cannon's theme: for if the acting is undeniably that of the stage, everything is that much more artificial, and if the mikes aren't always placed correctly it's just that much more real.

We would like to apologize for the photography in this issue. Since the State News has already published pictures of every construction site in the area, we are unable to offer our readers the creative photography to which they are accustomed.

"The Paper" is friendly, clean, housebroken, energetic and exciting, and it needs a roommate. If you want to join, please call 351-6516 and be prepared to trade \$55 a month for the thrill of your lifetime.

OTHER THINGS AT THE QUESTING BEAST

211 ABBOTT ROAD

Tue.-Sat.: 10:30 to 5:30
Wed.: 10 to 8

BOOKS — BIBLES — REFERENCE — SPECIAL ORDERS SPARTAN BOOK STORE

A SUPER MARKET FOR EDUCATION

223 - 225 Ann Street

East Lansing, Michigan

BOOKS — CHILDRENS — PAPERBOUNDS — M.S.U. TEXT BOOKS

SDS Leaders Speak Here

'THE MIND THAT STYLES ITSELF RADICAL'

Two leaders of the Students for a Democratic Society spoke here last Wednesday at a well-attended (150 to 200 people) open meeting of the MSU chapter of SDS. Their remarks have received the characteristic lambasting in the local press.

In order to do some justice to the ideas of Carl Oglesby, national president of SDS, and Mike Locker, of the SDS national office, "The Paper" here reprints excerpts from their informal talks, as recorded by our somewhat faulty recording equipment.

MIKE LOCKER ON POWER STRUCTURES

If I were to study Lansing, specifically Michigan University (sic), I'd want to know what kind of relationships the university has to the, what I'd call the powerful elite . . . real estate and political (parties), labor unions, etc.

Now Hannah, the president, has some other associations besides being president of Michigan University, Michigan State. He has some very interesting ones. The others on the board of directors . . . also have some very interesting holdings. That is, their primary function is not to instruct the Michigan State University. They have many functions.

Now, when I say this, I don't mean to imply that these people are conspiratorial, evil or men with big cigars in striped suits. They may be that, but that's not important.

The reason these men sit on the Michigan State University board is a very functional reason. In certain other activities they need these types of positions. For instance, if somebody from Michigan State sits on a large bank in Lansing, which I bet they do, I would venture to say that you'll find the accounts of the University of Michigan (sic) in that bank. If they sit on a construction company, there's a good chance, say, it's the construction company they use . . .

CARL OGLESBY ON THE LIBERAL MIND

What is the fundamental difference between the mind that styles itself liberal and the mind that styles itself radical? It has to do with this question--can a system's inequities be changed by the system itself.

Now, what the liberal says is that making empire is only forced on a nation with the financial and structural dynamic of the United States and it is, after all, the time-honored course for great nations to take. It's one of the ways that encourage the United States toward many, many roles simply because the United States exists in itself in the particular way that it does. It has some quantity of power, some quantity of excitement, a quantity of acceleration that naturally extends it toward other places and that naturally results in the dominating of their countries by our society . . .

IMPERIALISM IN VIETNAM

Something like the relationship that Mike just talked about as between American corporations (in the Dominican Republic) could be shown also to exist between American corporations in Vietnam. Then it would be a clear matter of the sustaining of an imperial sphere of influence for good, hard-headed simple economic reasons.

In our effort to explain the reasons for the war we've confronted real difficulty in explaining it this way, because it doesn't appear that Vietnam is in any case a clear economic or market imperialism. Now,



Carl Oglesby

Mike Locker

I think it's possible to describe that war in Vietnam and that the description is at bottom one that could logically and easily be called an imperialist reason . . .

I would suggest that it may be possible to talk about several different kinds of imperialism in the world now, and that the war in Vietnam might be explained in terms of several dimensions of that general category.

It's in the United States' interests, for example, to maintain a very powerful ally in Asia in Japan. Now, Japan presently doing a great deal of traffic with American business is nevertheless in need of establishing itself in Asia proper. Japan needs food and as time goes by it will need more and more. And Japan being increasingly productive industrially is going to need market outlets more and more.

JAPAN AND VIETNAM

I don't think it will strike as a very favorable development to the American businessman that Japan will start selling her industrial products in the United States. As a matter of fact, the use by Japan of the United States as a market may strike fear into the hearts of a great many people . . .

It is now possible for Japanese steel producers to sell a ton of steel in the United States at a price lower than what has to be charged by Bethlehem Steel, U.S. Steel and so on.

The feeling (among American businessmen) is that unless something is done to cut back the urgency of developing for the war, American business is going to find itself in the very silly position--the industrial power of the world confronting Japan, just decades ago on its back, and unable to compete in the sphere of her own market. For these and other reasons, it may seem to American policy-makers important to establish other markets, other sources for Japan in Asia. Now an important one can be Viet Nam, especially South Vietnam.

South Vietnam produces a lot of rice and Japan consumes all the rice she can get hold of. Vietnam is going to be industrializing herself one day, if this war ever gets over, and Japan would like to have a place to sell machine tools. It may be then that one of the reasons for fighting the war in Vietnam . . . is that we wage a war of proxy imperialism that's fundamentally taken with the name of another state.

CHINA, RICE AND VIETNAM

There are interesting indications that there is a revival, incidentally, of the 1930's co-prosperity sphere ideology that led Japan into rampage against the mainland. I think it's also a possibility that there is a proscription imperialism that takes account of the rice-producing capacity of South Vietnam in particular, and the terrific need for rice that China can be counted on to have over the years ahead of us.

Then maybe one of the things we want to do is deprive China of access to food that it sorely needs. In this case, even though we have no need at all for the rice that South Vietnam can produce, it may be very important for us to keep China away from that rice.

One way to do that is to hang on to South Vietnam to insure that the

people who run the government there aren't going to go off on any trade missions to Peking. Maybe a similar reasoning holds true when we imagine the future politics of an independent Saigon, as it looks to an independent Hanoi. There is also the possibility of a very plain kind of market imperialism there.

THE OIL DEVELOPMENT (8 vari)

I'm intrigued by the figure, approaching billions of dollars being spent by private industry and by the government in the Cam Ranh Bay development. There's a very beautiful natural harbor in Saigon, Cam Ranh Bay. Some famous wars were fought there.

In fact, the bay is now being dug out by the Corps of Engineers so that it will be able to accommodate six big ocean-going bottoms, room for six oil tankers. In cooperation with the Corps of Engineers, Esso and Shell are establishing just there at the harbor what is going to turn out to be the biggest cracking plant in the East.

Now, of course, there are some very plain military reason for bringing refinery equipment to Vietnam, but . . . the refining equipment that the military needs has been there as a matter of course, under the banner of the Shells, the Texacos, and the Essos; it goes there as a matter of course when the Army goes.

What's happening at Cam Ranh Bay is bigger than all that. Now, if we are going to commit that kind of money, that kind of energy to developing Cam Ranh Bay, I don't believe that Johnson is telling the truth when he says we seek no territorial gains of our own. I think it's clear that from developments such as this that the United States must have already committed itself long since to a very long-term stay in Southeast Asia, in South Vietnam in particular . . .

Cannon

Continued from Page 5

of that pretentiousness which infects so many contemporary experimenters in the arts. Despite the advertising for the film, he does not feel that it is particularly new-wave: "It's not camp, it's not pop art, it's not a happening--it's just me," he says, and documents it by adding that he wrote a play in essentially the same style when he was 12 (he is now 28).

Cannon is rather distressed by people who insist on reading ulterior meanings into his film, and feels that the fault stems from a college education. Professors, he says, tend to make the student suspicious of anything which seems obvious by insisting that the simple is merely a mask for the complex, that nothing is as it actually appears, and that to miss the hidden values is to miss everything. Thus, the student is convinced that if a movie seems quite clear to him, he has somehow missed the point.

Cannon is himself a college graduate, although he feels that he had to "undo" his education somewhat before he was prepared to devote himself to film. He received a B.A. from Columbia and went on to pursue a masters in fine arts (which he didn't complete,) and a masters in business administration (which he did). Cannon felt the M.B.A. was necessary if he expected to succeed as a producer, for all the ideas in the world are useless without the money to put them on film: "Few saw the connection to becoming a filmmaker," he says, "but I did. Making movies is a busi-

ness before it's an art or a craft."

The idea for "The Square Root of Zero", says Cannon, came to him after he learned that a friend of his owned an island off the coast of Maine where people came for the privilege of living in a tent for a few weeks. He wrote his script in a month: there wasn't any real hurry, except that, as Cannon says, "I was broke, I had my new degree, and if something didn't happen fast, I would have to get a job."

Once he had the script, he searched for someone willing to give him \$75,000. "I felt that more would be presumptuous for a first effort, and less would be asking for failure" and finally got help from Mark Lawrence, the man who also backed "David and Lisa" and "Lord of the Flies."

When I remarked that "The Square Root of Zero" looked as though it had been fun to make, Cannon disagreed; fun on the screen, he insisted, is the result of hard work on the set. More than talent, he says, making a movie requires diligence: "It is easy to come up with something that is good, but not so easy to come up with something that is good enough." Cannon suggests that those making their first film shouldn't know too much about how to make one: "If you know too much you'll be frightened and it will never be made. You should, however, THINK you know everything. More important, the people around you should THINK you know what YOU'RE doing, because they don't know what they're doing either."

R. A. O.

Dissent

Continued from Page 3

son, there were the New England reformers. Transcendentalists, they often acted like English utilitarians. They not only insisted on inalienable rights, but they considered the consequences of the denial of these rights.

For this reason, William Ellery Channing celebrated the decline of Puritanism by emphasizing man's reason over authority. In Theodore Parker's view:

We are a rebellious nation. Our whole history is treason; our blood was tainted before we were born; our creeds are infidelity to the mother church; our constitution, treason to our fatherland. What of that? Though all the governors in the world bid us commit treason against MAN, and set the example, let us never submit.

Similarly, as Thoreau observed, when the doctrines of morality and political expediency clashed, it was



the duty of the individual to follow the higher law. With this assertion Thoreau announced that he was not born to be forced; he could not for an instant recognize that political organization as HIS government which was also the slave government's. Thoreau put it this way: "Unjust laws exist; shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once?"

MEN FIRST

Thoreau's answer: if the injustice "is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law." That is, "we should be men first, and subjects afterward," for, he concluded, "There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly." As Frederick Douglass knew, "If there is no struggle, there is no progress."

So it was with Thoreau, a man with long hair, who often didn't shave, who often dressed carelessly and was called by some the Village Nut. In his time, of course, many wished he, and Lincoln, and others were silent. But the practical consequences of silencing him would have been ORTHODOXY.

To illustrate this, think of the criticisms of the abolitionists in the 1950's. "Whenever you found an abolitionist," wrote a Boston paper, "you found an anti-hanging man, (a) woman's rights' man, an infidel... a socialist, a red republican, a fanatic



Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

teetotaler, a believer in mesmerism and Rochester rappings." And keep in mind that the Richmond Enquirer wrote in 1856 that the slogan of the Republican party ought to be "free niggers, free women, free land, free love, and Fremont."

Think! What if these dangerous ideas HAD been silenced? That they weren't was not because the censors were lazy. No--the costs were too high.

Today, as the pressure for conformity mounts again we must recall our long tradition of freedom, pluralism and experimentation.

We must abhor the principle of censorship and the principle of conformity that assumes THE TRUTH is known, and that anything that deviates from that known truth is heresy.

We must recall the roster of names we honor--Jefferson, Paine, Adams, P. Henry, Emerson, Thoreau, Brownson, Jackson, Lincoln, Whitman, Henry George, Bellamy, Howells, Henry Demarest Lloyd, Debs, Crane, Dreiser, Norris, Douglass, DuBois, James Farmer, Martin Luther King, and so on.

We must remember, as the Su-

preme Court warned in the Barnett flag-salute case, that "compulsory unification of opinion achieves only the unanimity of the graveyard."

Finally, it should be kept in mind that a dissenting minority today may be a majority tomorrow. Senator Fulbright was recently called names by a few of his colleagues for his criticism of the foreign policies of the Johnson administration, and the President regarded Fulbright's criticism as a kind of personal rebuke if not personal and party disloyalty. Yet Fulbright believed that "far from being the danger many of us make it out to be, responsible dissent is one of the great strengths of democracy."



THE LESSON OF DISSENT

If there is a lesson in this event and others of similar vein in the last decade or so, it is, according to James Reston, "not that there has been too much criticism but that there has been too little and that usually it has been too late." The democratic process, in an ethical framework, must be kept open and viable.

The point is that in the United States where there is a discrepancy between our professed ideals and our practice--that is, concerning freedom of speech, equality of treatment and opportunity for all, regardless of color or creed, and equal justice--then it is the duty of Americans to work openly to close the gap.

This is what Franklin and Whitehead had in mind, it is what Myrdal was writing about, it is what Fulbright was trying to do, it is what Martin Luther King and the Negro rights movement are attempting. The challenge is here, what is wanting is the will. Remember, feel, think, act--for truly, "The clash of doctrines is not a disaster, it is an opportunity," to build a better world for all, literally.



Why They Lock You Up At Night

By DOUGLAS LACKEY

MSU offers few spectacles so curious and so stupid as its lemming-like migrations to women's dorms each night at closing hours. This phenomenon can be no more rationally explained than scientists can explain the movements of lemmings; indeed, these problems might be the same.

Let me enumerate the reasons why closing hours exist, and why none of them hold water:

1. "The doors are locked not so much to shut girls in, as much as to keep undesirables out" (presumably the few sad perverts that each year attempt entry and get chased off while all the girls hide under the beds). Plainly insufficient; since this explains only why the doors are shut, not why keys are denied to residents. Clearly locking in is as important as locking out.

2. "Closing hours exist since the university must know where students are, so they may be contacted in case of emergency." False on two counts and insufficient on a third: A) If this were the case, the university would provide means for contacting students at ALL hours (or do emergencies strike only between one and seven?) B) If this were the case, the rules would be the same for men as for women. C) This reason fails to explain why girls must be kept in--why they simply couldn't leave any number at which they could be reached.

3. "The rules exist to assure that girls are properly housed." Nonsense. A child knows enough to get in out of the rain--any girl who stays out of the dorm has obviously found someplace to stay in East Lansing or elsewhere. Further, if this were the reason, the rules for men and women would be the same.

4. (Rarely stated but most obvi-

ous;) "Closing hours exist to preclude premarital sex involving women students." This "reason" at least explains the strange asymmetry of the rules for women as opposed to men--but it is A) ineffective and B) unjustifiable:

A. The rule is completely ineffective since it operates only between one and seven. Obviously it fails to stop sex in the 18 remaining hours. Perhaps the university believes that sex only happens between one and seven or that what's "safe" at twelve is "dangerous" at one--but this is merely stupid. If the aim of the rules is simply to reduce pregnancy, then they are both ineffective and self-defeating. The girl in a general rush to get things done by one will most likely be more careless than one who has the leisure of the whole evening.

B. If this is the rationale for the rules, closing hours represent a blatantly authoritarian attempt by the university to intrude on the private lives of students: a) If premarital sex is immoral (which it isn't) the university "in loco parentis" may assume some rights to act upon discovery of its occurrence; it cannot from this, however, argue that it has the right to attempt to prevent it BEFORE it occurs; no public institution can assume such right. b) The only effects premarital sex might have on the stability of society concern questions of paternity. Since the advent of reliable contraceptives has severed the (bio)logical connection between sex and paternity, the prevention of premarital sex can no longer be the justifiable object of any public body.

5. (Even if the preceding four are insufficient;) "The university has no choice but to establish closing hours, since it must obey the dictates of the legislature that state universities act 'in loco parentis'." This sly pass-

ing of the buck utterly fails to show why the rules MUST be as they are.

A) There is no LOGICAL connection between "in loco" and closing hours--U. of M. is a state university and has none.

B) The university in fact on this issue is NOT acting "in loco parentis": a) It has never polled the parents of Michigan as to whether they desire their daughters to be locked up each night. b) The university assumes, with its standardized rules, that all parents think alike, which is plainly false. True "in loco parentis" would require different dorms with different sets of rules, so that each parent could send his girl to housing that most specifically followed his wishes--strict or liberal. (An attack on the inherent immorality of "in loco" itself I leave to a later issue.)

I conclude that closing hours are ineffective, and that even if they were effective, they cannot be justified. Most coeds appear willing to inject at this point, "If they are ineffective, why worry about them? They don't prevent anything 18 hours a day, and what with fake signing out and not signing out, they don't prevent anything anytime."

But such an attitude is morally even less attractive than that of the administration. It betrays a callousness toward the few that get caught and suspended each term; it does nothing to alleviate the fears that one MIGHT get caught (which, I expect, has ruined many a pleasant night); it indicates a hypocritical disconcern with the principles of things, a willingness to put up with no end of nonsense and injustice just so long as the present miserable muddle is barely tolerable.

Such I consider to be the same attitudes as those of slaves, of those who lack the sense and will to rise up together to call for changes that simple reason demands.

EDP -- The Pioneer Land-Grant Philosophy

By CHAR JOLLES

This is the first of several articles Miss Jolles is planning on educational developments at MSU.--The Editors.

Significantly, the quotation from Machiavelli's "The Prince" that appears on this page is embroidered on a wall-hanging in the office of John E. Dietrich, assistant provost.

Dietrich could be likened to Machiavelli's "reformer," for he, too, is initiating a new order of things--namely, radical educational changes at MSU.

These changes--which range from more technological self-teaching devices to course revisions to more closed circuit TV lectures--are part of the Educational Development Program (EDP), a program designed to cope with the problem of too many students, too few teachers, and "the explosion of knowledge."

Dietrich is the director of EDP. The analogy between Dietrich and Machiavelli's prince ends, however, with their common role as initiators, for Machiavelli goes on to say, in the same chapter, that the initiator must use force to create a new system: "And so it is best to have matters ordered in such a way that when people no longer believe in the innovation they can be compelled to believe by force."


Indeed, EDP personnel have been accused of imposing a "master plot" on the faculty. In February of 1963, when EDP was first introduced, faculty skepticism culminated in the resignation of six prominent faculty members. One of them Bernard Duffey, an English professor who had been with MSU for 15 years, said his resignation was "immediately motivated" by EDP. (State News, Feb. 28, 1963)

Others, who claimed other reasons for leaving MSU, nevertheless acknowledged faculty concern over EDP. Joseph La Palombara, chairman of the political science department before he resigned, said that faculty unrest over EDP was "an obvious fact." "Much of the unrest would have been unnecessary if the project had been introduced in a different manner," he said. "If the faculty had been consulted from the beginning, the attitude might be quite different today." (State News, Mar. 28, 1963)

Apparently, 31 curricular guidelines had been distributed to the academic departments under the title EDP. According to an EDP Report (Oct. 1964), these guidelines were distributed "for discussion purposes."

Yet, "this program created great faculty concern," the report says. "Many faculty members expressed fear that a 'master design' was being imposed upon the curriculum. These fears were unfounded. Nevertheless, organized study of the guidelines was dropped."

EDP became known from then on as "Project X."



The 31 curricular guidelines that triggered faculty criticism were based on what was called the "Seven-Point Program" as enumerated in President Hannah's speech to the faculty in March, 1961.

En somme, the Seven-Point Program called for the following:

1. More student responsibility for learning;
2. A more concrete and specific definition of educational goals to aid independent learning;
3. A redefinition of the responsibilities of faculty members;
4. An application of learning theory, which means increased use of closed-circuit television, film, teaching machines, programmed studies and other aids;
5. Greater academic use of residence halls;
6. Designing a model for the university combining the advantages of bigness with smallness;
7. An allocation of financial resources towards these aims.

This is the alleged "master plot" of Project X.

There is no evidence, however, that Dietrich, EDP or whatever has been secretly taking over MSU. He said, in an interview last October, that the more than 40 projects encouraged and coordinated by EDP had begun to materialize into "faculty - approved, sweeping university changes."

In addition, there is nothing secret about the expanded use of closed circuit television, or about common final exams in mass undergraduate courses, or larger blocks of credit hours (those five-credit English and political science courses), or increased use of graduate assistants, or programmed learnings, or plans for more technological self-teaching devices.

EDP has directed innumerable changes here, and all seem to be "generally accepted," according to the EDP Report.

It is precisely this general acceptance, however, that must be challenged. Skepticism does exist, if only

at small dinner parties or over vegetable soup in the drugstore. Yet the changes effected by EDP are radical ones, and they imply a set of values that could easily be called perverted.

For example, the mass courses like Psychology 151 or the basics have so many students that the problem becomes teaching the most people in the least amount of time, as Dietrich said in the October interview. Education, then, becomes a question of efficiency, of efficient dissemination of information. That kind of question is easily solved by a television set.

The problem of testing is easily solved by machine-graded, multiple-choice exams, administered to all sections at the same time, in the same place. These are only two examples of how some of the radical changes effected by EDP can lead to the priority of efficiency.

We are aware of the problem of too many students, limited financial and teaching resources, and the "explosion of knowledge." But the prob-

lem posed by President Hannah (State News, Dec. 4, 1962) of improving the condition of society and raising "the general level of understanding and action" is too grave for us to accept placidly the cheapest, most efficient solutions.

There is no evidence that EDP is our only alternative. The organized study that was cut off in 1963 in the midst of discontent should be renewed. We must return to fundamentals and ask such significant questions as these:

What characteristics of our democratic community commit an institution like MSU to take a large number of students? What is education? What is the difference between learning theory and education? What is the function of a teacher? What motivates the human being to learn? Is it possible for efficient education to be high quality, too?

Only good can come from a re-examination of basic principles in an open, honest dialogue between students, faculty, administrators and the community. We must discover whether EDP's practical programs are consistent with the aims of education, even land-grant education.

SNAFU

Continued from Page 2

all, "Batman" can't last forever.) Heroes who have just rescued babies from burning buildings will tell the interviewers, "No, actually I'm a situationist." Intellectuals will develop situation commitment and situation metaphysics. The President will say, "We must look at the problem situationistically," and do what he's always done.

And when the craze has passed, popularized ethics will pass on to new frontiers. But no one need be worried about what these frontiers might be. Rest assured, we will be warned in Time.

LOVERS

JIM THOMAS

Kind is the silence, tender the stillness
Of our desire. Now are we kin
To the fictions and fond memories
Of men's dignity and dearth on sight
Of death and childlike falseness
Toward close and closeted sin.

We have lived apart knowing the leas
Of sunlight and laughter, night winds
And hope. So shall we love--without pattern,
Plan or recompense, and be to ourselves alone,
Dreaming the dreams of childhood's end.

The author, a former MSU student, is now in the Marine Corps.--The Editors.

The American Mind, Vol. III




Photo by Elliot Borin