A Year After Selma: Some Personal Reflections

By DONALD J. KULICK

I realize it is only a year ago but it seems like eons since we filled into the plane that was to take us over to another planet, the Deep South, Selma, Alabama, beforehand only a word read in the papers like Cyprus, or the Congo, or Selma—"problem" to be sure, goods in Vietnam, which we were very much detached.

As I said, we filled into the plane, unknown ever since. Every one of us doubtless and more than a little naive, I came home four days later a little less naive—unchanged, I don't doubt that I had been to Selma, and certainly a little more jaunty.

Yeah, we were real heroes, returned from battle, and we got the full treatment, newspaper features, admiring glances, and a full-blown assemblage of students and faculty (classes dismissed no less!) to which we recounted our gallantry (in a self-deprecatory style of course, an Injun Goya satin chief, for our "experience," and to make the useful out of the useless: contributions of money and spirit (well-received), I should add in all fairness.

I do think I'll ever forget the admiring, even envious, faces in the audience as they hung on our every word, it was as if we were the poets laureate or something.

Process of Elimination Department:
The Catholic TV show "Insight" had a program on the problem of "organized crime" in this world ruled by a benevolent Deity. In a staged interview, Raymond Massey played a priest who had been imprisoned in Communist China.

Interviewer: “No one believes in the devil any more—Isn't it any old-fashioned idea?”

Massey—priest: “It may be an old-fashioned idea, but I don’t see how we can account for the evil of the professional Marxist in any other way.”
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The opinions here are mine, not those of the United States government or its armed forces, I am a PFC in the Marine Corps, writing of men who have been to Vietnam, are going, or are there, writing with the knowledge that most historians and strategists won't go at all.

The tactical problem of combating the guerrilla on his own ground has often been discussed. It's a tough, face another set of troubles more subtle, no less important, and too often neglected. They must fight without the past's comforts and justifications—patriotism, hatred, and illusions of the past's comforts and justifications. They must fight without their war is all-important. In Vietnam: A PFC's View BY JIM THOMAS.

Vietnam

The soldiers I know, at least those who are morally involved, faced with what they must do and knowing that the nation isn't really behind their efforts, adopt an attitude of grim resolve. There is no other choice.
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The Merry-Go-Round

By ELLIOTT BORIN

A funny thing happened on the way home from the spring circus, I almost over­
der if it all was legal. Don’t mis­
understand, I knew the trial, all three of them, was an illusory proceeding, but I
wanted to know was whether the whole idea of students tampering with the Bill of Rights was legal.

So I looked it up,

discipline I Sec. 5 of the Michigan Constitution states; “Every person may freely speak, write, express and publish his views on all sub-
jects, being responsible for the abuse of such right, and no law shall be
enacted to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press.

The state fathers obviously reali­
zed that this would be the inevitable
claimed that the university is a pri-
ivate institution and exempt from con-
stitutional impositions. Because of this
many sections of the constitu-
tion include the paragraph:

“The power of the boards of higher
education provided in this constitution to supervise their respective insti-
tutions and control and direct the ex-
penditure of the institutions’ funds
shall be limited by this section.

There is no such paragraph in Ar-
ticle I. Thus, it is clearly indicated
that the framers of the constitution well
understood that the stifling of free speech is a pressing matter and should not
be within, the power of ad-
ministrative bureaucrats.

The legal opinion in 1955
the state Attorney General said; “In matters dealing exclusively with the uni-
versity and going no further than that, exclusive authority is
given to the State Board of Agri-
culture (now Board of Trustees) while
in matters in which GENERAL LAWS
and court decisions reaffirming the belief
that free distribution is necessary for the
guarantee of the assistance of the
community. Neither Michigan State
nor any branch of its student
organization of the right of freedom of
the press outside the city limits, to be
informed of the nature and cause
of the accusation, to be confronted
with the witnesses against him, to have
a speedy and public trial, by
any law which shall abridge the pri-

speech and a free press is not, and
ancient right to control distribution of the
newspaper, by state action . . .

Hughes mentions the Fourteenth
amendment."

The answer to all these questions
is no.

Where, I ask you, was the “im­
partial juridical” of the state of
Michigan?

When has Student Judiciary allowed
the accused to be confronted with the
witnesses against him? Not
only do they have no “compulsory
process” for obtaining witnesses in
their favor, they don’t even allow the
accused to produce such witnesses as
will come forth voluntarily. As for the
use of any available means of
obtaining control of large sums of
money and potential liability for libel,
for example, it is recommended that the Board of Student Publications be

continued on page 8
MILL OR McCARTHYISM:  
An Examination Of Dissent In America

By RICHARD A. OGAR

The United States is purportedly a nation which has thrived on dissent. Just last January 14, for example, I read in Life magazine that Norman Thomas, the great tradition of American protest which, from the beginning, has shaped our society and abhorred any complicity.

But if dissent has had its impact on American history, it is certainly not because there has ever been a similarly great tradition of tolerance for those who have dissent; on the contrary, protest has generally been met with ridicule, violence and, on more occasions than most people prefer to recall, death. Nor can we say that this traditional intolerance has abated in any significant degree at the present time; in fact, if the cases of Julian Bond, David Miller, Cassius Clay, Robert Stockton Lyons, Thomas Hayden, and the University of Michigan Selective Service sit-ins are any index, it would appear that it has increased to the point where dissent may be actively persecuted without alarming a significant portion of the general public.

Political and ideological persecution, like all processes, waxes and wanes with the times, and it was generally felt that after McCarthy died and formally resolved to leave the Senate, the press of those who protest were singled out as "kooks," "beats", "VIETNAM." Or, what is perhaps the most hideous appellation, if we consider its implications, "peace activists" are labeled by night club and television comedians, magazine cartoonists and comic strips, and blasted in editorial pages. Life service is paid to what are called "dissidents" and, in fact, the same people who are usually deemed those whose opinions are voiced but not acted upon, or, if for nothing, done so imperfectly.

True, few people—with the possible exception of the questionable men of the ultra-right—would actually be seen to abandon our so-called constitutional liberties, for to do so would be a blasphemy against the American way of life. Still, many people are greatly perplexed whenever the liberties which they seek to preserve for themselves provide equal aid and comfort to those with whom they don't like to associate, and consequently seek some means or other by which these benefits may be withheld from those whose opinions prove themselves unworthy to receive them. The technique which has been found most effective is to approve the form while denying the content of the freedom in question, as in the idea that Negroes have a right to demonstrate to obtain their civil liberties, so long as they don't violate any laws in the process; now, if there are laws against demonstrating—as there usually are—then Negroes have been denied his right by the very hand that ostensibly affirmed them.

HIGHER GOOD

A similar process has obtained in regard to the question of dissent against the war in Vietnam. Beginning with the old saw which holds the freedom of speech does not guarantee the right to yell "Fire!" in a crowded theatre, the opponents of dissent have argued thus: since there are situations in which, as the maxim suggests, the freedom of speech may be employed in order to effect a higher good, there are no doubt OTHER situations to which the principle applies as well, of which this one is. Once this position has been reached, the only thing left to do is to produce a sufficient number of "higher goods" with which to justify suppressing the unpopular opinion.

So it is that we hear that dissent has no effect beyond that of annoying the naysayers, and causing them to be so preoccupied with their human weakness that they can only parrot the doctrine that its use is therefore nothing but pointless irritation to the body politic; the higher good, of course, is domestic tranquility—or, more exactly, that sedative atmosphere which allows the mind to disengage itself and run in whatever idle circles it chooses. Or we may take the freedom from choice to be a positive good, and say that dissent ought not to be allowed because it raises questions which cannot be answered for lack of proper information.

For the authoritarian, dissent is undesirable because it impugns the supposed infallibility of the Presidency and imposes an intolerable responsibility (that of detecting or correcting) which they don't like to bear. Or we may assume that victory is one of the highest goods, and deny dissent because it is too likely to increase the enemy and thereby prolong the war. To the sentimental, loyalty to the men on the battlefield may require us to view dissent as an abrogation of the limitless love and fidelity to which "our boys" are entitled. Or, what is perhaps the hardest of all, we may cite the national interest as the highest good, and suppress dissent in its name, without ever being required to state exactly what the "national interest" is.

That this mistrust of dissent should be so prevalent in America is not at all remarkable when we consider that most of our elected officials, from the White House on down, Johnson himself, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in particular, for having dared to question the wisdom of his decisions.

Of course, we must realize that it is in Johnson's best interests to quell his opposition; he has yet another election to win, and, having defrauded the electorate in 1964 by posing as a man of peace, he might have a more difficult time of it in 1968 (despite the fact that it seems to be almost an axiom of American politics that the most effective way for a bad President to insure his re-election is to become a worse one and start a war).

THE NATIONAL INTEREST

But however much it might be to Johnson's political advantage to suppress his critics, it is not in the best interests of the nation to allow him to do so, nor is it wise to allow the force of public opinion to do the job for him. At present, it is in the latter interest that such views are expressed by most of our elected officials, from the White House on down, Johnson himself, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in particular, for having dared to question the wisdom of his decisions.
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Improvement Reading: Where Is The Mark?

By CHAR JOLLES

Off on an innocuous assignment for journalism class, I acciden-
tially into what seems to be the vast wasteland of the philosophy of education program. It was to write a feature on MSU's reading improve-
ment program for students in "aca-
demic trouble" and freshmen who score significantly low on the en-
trance reading test, but I seem to have
posed to the combination reading and
speed reading program, and as op­
posed to the reading improvement ser-
course in the English preparatory course by the De-
partment of American Thought and Lan-
guage, Van Roekel is the director.

Depending on one's sources, the number of students enrolled in the 55 section reading improvement program at MSU during the fall term was either 150-160, four out of five of whatever the total are freshmen, more than a hundred are transfer-
students, a few hundred are foreign students, and a teeny tiny bit are graduate students.

Van Roekel says he tries to dis-
courage graduate students from en-
rolling. He figures that if they've
gotten as far as grad school, they don't need his program, and usually re-
fers them to the speed reading pro-
gram offered by the Evening Col-
eges.

Freshmen who score significantly low on the MSU Reading Test (with its scale based on the MSU norm) are "strongly urged," but not required to take the reading improvement ser-
course. A study concludes spring term, 1965, revealed an apparent "correlation between the high school reading test and the college texts."

Freshmen who take and pass the reading improvement ser-
course in their first year either continue in the program or are placed in the "regular college reading test." They have master-
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the high school graduates, the students are not necessarily far enough above the high school average
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THEATRE:

Death Of A Sailor

By Laurence Tate

More nonsense has probably been written about Herman Melville's "Moby Dick" than about any other book of comparable length. Its ambiguity has made it almost anybody with a theory to push can go to it and find some justification for arguing that it means what it thinks it ought to mean.

Most of these theory-pushers just write scholarly papers to be dutifully presented at the professional meetings of their respective academic disciplines; they lack not only heart and substance ("Goldfinger" got along without those quite nicely) but any attempt to deal with the film as an art form. "The sea" is on Vero's side all the way. They forget Melville freely to provide Vere with doubts, scruples, and the purée of motives.

Their problem is that Vere hangs Billy, and that his action must be recognized as unjust, injustice can be excused (if ever) only in the explicit service of higher justice, but the authors seem unaware of this. They make, in terms of the higher justice of their concern, the perfunctory effort to justify Vere's action; in fact, they introduce, as if to overbalance, an argument against Vere; that the hanging is not only unjust but also very foolish. The latter is certainly a part of the service of any higher justice. They then proceed to justify it on the grounds that human justice—embodied in the law—is necessarily less just than life itself, in which men are consecrated to obey wartime laws regardless of their sense of justice.

Of course, besides being downright silly, it is morally abhorrent; it is Eichmann's argument, yet it is one that should, if anything, be allowed to swallow whole. (Melville, of course, is much, much more complex.)

I could have collected facts, figures and a lot of talk about the "incompleteness" of Billy and Claggart, with the implication that this destroys absolute good and absolute evil. Well, perhaps the world is, but I don't see that the play has anything much to say about the matter. ("I'm not convinced the book does either, but it at least gives you more to talk about.

We see an extraordinarily evil man try to destroy an extraordinarily good one, and quite fortuitously be destroyed in the process. We then see the good man quite arbitrarily killed for no reason but to kill the evil man. Pardon me if I think the subject is a good deal more complex than these events.

At any rate, on top of their other problems, the playwrights write dreadful dialogue, and seem to have only two major purposes: one, to show all the possibilities of characterization and construction, and two, that the play tends to lack interest entirely.

The current production is theatrically successful in only one sense, that of getting most of the broadest sentiments, and even to make Vere's sincerity and torment believable even while his dialogue is run through the world; and that it is uncompromisingly bleak and dingy throughout.

The picture doesn't have any falsification or misplaced flamboyance; it doesn't have much imagination either.

A whole bunch of giant cotton-candy extravaganzas descended on Lansing; there were two big comedies and one big musical, all among the most expensive films ever made and all more-or-less not worth the effort.

"The Sound of Music," which I saw last Easter for reasons that had nothing to do with artistic expectations, has finally arrived here, and will probably stay a good while, seeing it is like having a candied apple rubbed in your face for two-and-a-half hours. The film, Variety reports, will probably be the biggest moneymaker in movie history. Also, it marks a decisive point in the precipitous decline and fall of Julie Andrews, who, as Stanley Kauffman puts it, is "rapidly becoming the most revoltingly refreshng actress in films."

"The Great Race," a "Car and Driver In Their Flying Machines" was a slapstick comedy about an old-time airplane race; "The Great Race," still playing, is a slapstick comedy about an old-time auto race. Both are more long; both have pedestrian romances; both have lots of good gags and lots of bad ones. "The Great Race" is better because it has Jack Lemmon used to his full genius before he made all those bad comedy and who isn't bad, kiddo, either. "My Fair Lady" came and went, for people who like that sort of thing.

"The Umbrellas of Cherbourg" was once again a musical with no music, a genuine, one of the great sentimental musicals, somewhere above the "West Side Story" level of pure middle- brow. All its dialogue was sung, and it was done up in bright, poster-ish, deliberately artificial colors—it had, in other words, an air of the purely artificial about it. However, the hint of a tang quick­ ness—of a pure cream-centered soap opera that managed to be finally tolerable only because the film did have, at bottom, something good and real to say about the transiency of love, its resemblance to Joshua Logan's "Pappy" has probably been noted somewhere else.

"Inside Daisy Clover" was a long low-key, elegiac little picture; it worked from several preposterous premises, e.g., that Natalie Wood could pass for fifteen, that she could sing and act well enough to be credible as a young Judy Garland type promoted to instant Hollywood star­ dom; and nothing managed to cohere in the film. But, the film did have a vision of sorts, of Hollywood as a lovely desolate place whose inhab­ itants wander among huge bizarre constructions doing bizarre things as a matter of course, never quite in touch with reality. It was a good picture, although it may have been a bad good picture.

somewhat missed "That Dark Cat," "Do Not Disturb" of the "Kev­ enes of Telemark," and "Never Too Late," I want to keep the public informed of the performances of the three other actors involved—enough so to see how it is said, with the picture and the momentary excitement it otherwise lacks.

For the rest, the production is no improvement over its source, even manages to make it seem worse than it is.

J. Michael Bloom, who in better days has been a superb comic ac­ tor, looks like something out of a bizarre (almost Fu Manchu) make-up, he never manages to seem much more than passable, and he is not himself; that is, he is a specter; he is simply suf­ fers from a total lack of conviction. Vernon Eagle, on the other hand, plays Billy quite self-consciously, seems ill-at-ease on stage, and is an up as a cross between Peter O'Toole and Peter Pan. He seems saccharine and almost dainty, but in fairness, he is young; the role is very tricky; he seems to have been poorly dir­ ected, and he is fitted out in an in­ credibly fruity-looking pair of white bell-bottom trousers.

Of the large all-male cast, only David Karsten stands out, in the minor role of an office. He manages to make a fairly hackneyed comedy scene seem fresh, and maintains a consistent hon­ est and straightforwardness in his playing.

Most of the other cast members are required to keep up a deadly serious tone, and the majority of them barefoot, pusefooters as if they were afraid of splinters.

The set itself is a striking piece of work, but it apparently requires the scene of Claggart's killing to be played on deck instead of in Vere's room. The decision to do the scene as it is done, in any event, is disastrous.
The poem in its entirety:

"IN GRATEFUL MEMORY OF THE 133 WOODBRIDGE MEN WHO MADE THE SUPREME SACRIFICE IN THE GREAT WAR"

The guns in France felled England's rose,
All her cutting-gardens died;
Roses ever fought for tombs.

All her cutting-gardens died;
Roses ever fought for tombs.

The poem ends here, as was announced in his review. To call Mary Hardwick and Marianne Lukkin who in one evening "carried the show" I think one might think a bit of a sophism.

Only there is some hope for "The Paper" to return to the high standard it had when Prof. George Hough was its chief. For then it was reaching towards the sublime! But now? "The Paper" has no chance of being rated a "journalist" on the News. I doubt that we will ever become newspapermen. I think I might think one might think a bit of a sophism.

Mr. Please, Mr. President, if is willing, may we reorganize the already redesignated News and have Professor Hough back? As a serious scholar I want the students to overcome the difficulties and achieve great things to be born.

Carroll Hawkins (PAP) Department of Political Science
Intellectual Climate And Student Unrest

By PAUL A. VARG

Editor's Note: Paul A. Varg, dean of the College of Arts and Letters, Laurel, Delaware, delivered the speech from which excerpts are here presented as part of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges meeting at the University of Minnesota. In the first part of his address, Dean Varg speaks of the great world problems and "minor uncertainties as to what in worthy and what is unworthy of our dedication" that made us increasingly pessimistic. He suggests the roots of the present situation to recent trends in literature, science, sociology, psychology, and philosophy, particularly existentialism, with its call to political conscience.

Looking at today's intellectual climate we find that the roots to the past are absent from the realm of immediate awareness. There is neither a sense of continuity with the past nor a degree of historical perspicacity strong enough to make any real mark on our thinking. There are more history courses, more history books, and paradoxically less historical mindedness.

A John Adams and a James Madison found it natural to approach the problems facing them as high officers in the government by way of the history of other problems. When the question of drafting a constitution for a republic stared them in the face, they studied the history of the Greek Assemblies and all succeeding ones, notwithstanding the fact that they would learn much from previous experiments, and as Secretary of State, James Madison, furthers the course of government, made with Great Britain, wrote a noteworthy history of international law and neutral rights.

The major cause of this ignoring of the past appears to be that the dizzying speed of political, economic, and social change has hurtled us into such a turmoil of crises and problems that there is no more inclination to consult the past than a soldier in a foxhole. The effects of this lack of appreciation of yesterday's contributions and the prevalence of the notion that the human predicament began in 1945. Consequently, we confront the paradoxes of our day, the problems to which there are no solutions, in a state of agitation. We lack the poise that has its being in an awareness of the tragedies and the noble achievements of the past. We seek too impatiently to quiet the gales that blow rather than learning how to live meaningfully lives on a stormy sea. And, as Santayana said, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

It may be said that the intellectual climate provides few bearings for young people seeking to find meaning and direction for their lives. Many students seek commitment to some cause greater than themselves. A university cannot readily satisfy this craving, for its highest purpose is to develop an open-mindedness, a spirit of searching inquiry, and a dedication to reason. Ideally, it welcomes no points of view and seeks to keep society's avenues of discussion completely open.

Confronting the human predicament of today, a university should be doubly anxious to maintain a free traffic in ideas, infarso that the university achieves these ideals and keeps them before the students, it fulfills its role.

However, the challenge today is not to be met simply by encouraging a free exchange of ideas. The mood of many students can be more accurately described as akin to the fervor of those revolutionaries who have a blind faith in an idea, in the name of realism they find only irrationality, status-seeking, and expediency. Some of them take the view that only a frank facing of the horrible reality will enable us to cope better with the world.

This spirit of the students of the restless persuasion is evident in what appears to be the newly emerging reality of campus demonstrations in the actual cleansing quality of demonstrating than in the cause espoused, in the case as such as there are on campuses from simple formulas, and in an apparent desire to convert the campus into a version of the world they say they want to change.

The problem, therefore, our universities threaten to become houses divided. The university should not feel qualified to solve these problems. The university should rather be an example of the kind of world they want, and the university should be hospitable to differing points of view and seek to keep so many students can be more accurately described as akin to the fervor of those revolutionaries who have a blind faith in an idea, in the name of realism they find only irrationality, status-seeking, and expediency. Some of them take the view that only a frank facing of the horrible reality will enable us to cope better with the world.

The university should be doubly anxious to maintain a free traffic in ideas, infarso that the university achieves these ideals and keeps them before the students, it fulfills its role.

However, the challenge today is not to be met simply by encouraging a free exchange of ideas. The mood of many students can be more accurately described as akin to the fervor of those revolutionaries who have a blind faith in an idea, in the name of realism they find only irrationality, status-seeking, and expediency. Some of them take the view that only a frank facing of the horrible reality will enable us to cope better with the world.
thought and individuality of character, a perpetual and standing opposition to the will of the majority ("pient-tham."). Moreover, he said, "If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind.

Mill did not argue his principles out of anything as vague as a notion of natural human self-evidence; rather, he saw them as being an essential element in the process of civilization. For to suppress the opinion of even one man, is, in itself, an abuse of human freedom—of that opportunity for advancing the state of its knowledge. Only by allowing the greatest latitude for the expression of ideas, argued Mill, can man improve himself and his condition.

TO ERR IS... Perhaps the most obvious argument against the suppression of opinion is the simple one: to err, in fact, the right one, and the popular opinion wrong. Surely, no reasonable person would entertain the supposition that such unsupported beliefs or presuppositions, of the opinion, and could not make a favorable defense of it against the most superficial objections. This demand that all opinion be given the same weight, Mill argued, makes an elevation into the world of universal values of what is essentially a philosopher's personal predilection; rather, it derives from the observation that such unsupported beliefs or presuppositions, from which all living idea has vanished, and thus have little or no actual effect upon the actions of the person professing to hold them.

MAJORITY WILL? New ideas, when they arise, are dynamic, and serve as inspiration, both to their initiators and disciples, but once an idea has reached its due perfection and has either become the majority opinion, or has gained the territory that it is possible for it to gain, it loses its power over the mind; the spirit flags, the doctrine steadily leaks all meaning, and action becomes more and more independent of belief. "Both leaders and learners," says Mill, "go to sleep at their post, as soon as there is no enemy in the field."

It is constantly faced with opposition, so that its adherents are kept on their toes to defend it. In lieu of such opposition, men ought to provide it for themselves, each man acting as the devil's advocate of his own opinions. Such a situation, of course, but a poor substitute for the heat of actual combat, more shadowy, more remote in respect to life in the prize-ring itself.

Therefore, says Mill, "If there are any persons who contest a received opinion, or who will do so if law or opinion will let them, let us thank them for it, open our minds to listen, and rejoice that there is someone to do for us what we otherwise ought... to do with much greater interest for ourselves."

Thus far it has been established that dissenting opinion, whether true or false, should have precedence over all mankind minus one, were of one race of an opportunity for advancing the state of its knowledge. Only by allowing the greatest latitude for the expression of ideas, argued Mill, can man improve himself and his condition.

There Are Makers Of War... I remember when the apples were green it seems long ago that first time when we talked of snow flakes falling and it saddens me that I have never known you in late spring

There are makers of war pursuing us after the flowers have fallen and the leaves are new

They want to kill us all with their determined fierceness and the question is not whether they can or will but will they only wait until we can meet

When the apples are green again

ELAINE CAHILL

Publications...

reconstituted by the Board of Trustees as a committee by delegation of all questions, including that of the war in Vietnam. Far from viewing dissent as a threat to itself, Mill notes that "the minority opinion, for that is the opinion which, for the time being, represents the neglected interests, the side of human well-being which is in danger of obtaining less than its share."

THE CHALLENGE

At the present time there have been, indeed, a number of serious challenges made to the American way of life. Some of these new ideas are no doubt sound; others of them, strangely enough, are actually new ideas at all, but attempts at revitalizing the more time-worn aspects of the American creed which appear new only by dint of being, after so long a lapse, put into practice once again.

Unfortunately, the tendency of most Americans these days has been to assume their own infallibility. The infallibility of America as a whole, and consequently, to call for the suppression of the interfering beliefs, but if America is to survive as a nation, it is necessarily that exactly the opposite road be taken; we must accept, even encourage, opposition to all questions, or of life, that is the minority opinion, for that is the side of human well-being which is in danger of obtaining less than its share.

There are two ways to interpret this resolution. The first is that it intended this "new" committee to control only those publications which the university owns, operates, manages the finances of, and/or is legally responsible for. The second interpretation says that this resolution is meant to give the Board of Student Publications authority over every publication sold on campus, or at least every student publication.

If this second interpretation is true, the Board of Trustees is guilty of delegating authority which, under both state and federal law, it does not have. If this is true, the Board of Student Publications, dare I say this out loud, is an illegally constituted organization and must disband or be faced with the embarrassment of having a court perform the task.

Moral Choice

Since I have come to MSU I have been plagued by a sense of ascendance and I am ashamed of it. I am also bothered me considerably; Why do the chairman of a cause or organization characterize the clerical members of the CLERGY to represent the MORAL aspect in discussions concerning current social problems?