

Housing policy

The Housing Policy Committee has completed recommendations for next year's housing regulations...

Because the University overprojected enrollment and continued building architectural monstrosities to contain residents who never materialized...

Understandably the Committee was required to work under strict guidelines of the Regents policy. And the group did recommend that present dorm rates be retained...

The committee did not recommend, however, that junior women also be allowed to live off campus. So the disparity between women's and men's housing regulations still remains.

One of the members of the Housing Committee reasoned that not a large number of junior women would move off campus — so much better for the University's faulty finances if they didn't.

This disparity should be corrected before final action is taken on these recommendations as junior women at least should have the option to move off campus.

It is difficult to understand why financial problems must always preclude students' interests. And in the case of housing policy students' interests always finish second.

In short no student should be required to live in a dormitory if he does not so desire.

If vast improvement in the dormitory system were made, this statement would not be as unfeasible to the Regents as it is now.

If reforms were made fewer students would be clamoring to leave the dorms for financial, scholastic and personal reasons.

A residential college or strong IDA scholastic program, a no hour or key system for all women and a liberal visitation policy would greatly enhance the dormitories' appeal.

Until remodeling of Selleck Quadrangle or Women's Residence Hall occurs, lowered dorm rates for these halls warrants investigation.

Until the sterilized, impersonal atmosphere of the dormitories is humanized, tired residents will rebel every spring when they must accept the same housing policy which even the Housing Committee doesn't especially like.

Cheryl Tritt

Al Spangler Basis of power

Perhaps the next time George Wallace (husband of the Governor of Alabama) makes a trip to Nebraska he will be arrested by federal officials — the Senate just passed a civil rights bill that includes a provision to make crossing state lines to incite a riot a federal crime.

Watching George's harangue at the Omaha Civic Auditorium (via educational TV, which is sometimes truly educational, in spite of its pretensions), it was clear that the ex-Governor knows what he's about. He permitted the demonstrators to disturb the proceedings just long enough to turn his audience

Strange Days

into an angry mob, and then let the cops be turned loose, billy clubs whacking, aerosol cans of MACE spraying, forcing the small group of protestors to run a gauntlet of swinging metal chairs to the rear exit.

The anti-Wallace faction was down for the moment, but, like "Cool Hand Luke," not really off of it at all. They hadn't got their minds right.

Perhaps some day a scientist will invent a chemical spray called MIND RIGHT. One quick blast in the face, and the most militant of demonstrators would become a "reasonable dissenter." At the press of a finger on a plastic nozzle, H. Rap Brown would turn into Uncle Tom. Perhaps then, police tactics would become effective. Instead of making militants more militant, and turning liberals into radicals. Gestapo tactics would produce the desired effect.

MIND RIGHT could even be used to advantage in Vietnam, in place of napalm, and here at home against those who would protest its use of Vietnam. Secretary Rusk could take a can along with him to Senate Foreign Relations Committee meetings.

In the meantime, however, our Government officials will have to be content with MACE and napalm. We shall doubtless have to watch the genocide we are committing in Vietnam take hold here in the U.S.

We must also rest content with the conclusion of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders: white racism is responsible for black uprisings. On March 5, Vice President Humphrey stated that "we have known about these (ghetto) needs for some time. Why haven't we done something? The answer is that we have been doing something."

One is inclined to say "bullshit." And I use the asterisk advisedly, for Norman Mailer is right: "... the use of obscenity was indeed to be condemned, for the free use of it would wash away the nation — was America the first great power to be built on bullshit?"



Joseph Alsop

'E' for Rockefeller effort

Washington — After his New York meeting with a long list of Republican moderates on Sunday, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller is near certain to enter the Oregon primary against former Vice President Richard M. Nixon. As one of the Governors put the matter on Sunday:

"You may not win, but if you don't try, you cannot win."

The prospective active candidacy of Rockefeller is a Republican development far transcending in importance any other to date, of course, including the New Hampshire primary. Furthermore, it is clear that Rockefeller is taking a very considerable gamble and not just because, or even mainly because, Nixon has been working so hard and long to secure delegate pledges.

The Rockefeller announcement will be deferred for a bit, because his decision is not yet absolutely final, and also because the governor wishes to stay out of Nebraska, and challenge Nixon only in Oregon. And although Rockefeller will have vigorous support from Oregon's able

governor, Tom McCall, even Oregon is not guaranteed plain sailing.

What is needed in Oregon is something more than topping Nixon in the polling. What is needed is a clear demonstration that the Republicans this year want a moderate candidate with a winning image. And besides Nixon, Rockefeller will also confront California Gov. Ronald Reagan, if and when he enters the Oregon contest.

A recent local poll gave 40 per cent of the Republican vote to Rockefeller, 36 per cent to Nixon and 10 per cent to Reagan, with the rest undecided. For the Oregon primary to have a major effect, the New York governor will have to wage a sufficiently successful campaign to better the foregoing figures.

Furthermore, a Rockefeller success in Oregon, great though its impact would be, could never have a truly decisive impact. The Nixon delegate search has been long, arduous and efficient. It is continuing and being intensified. If Rockefeller is to win at Miami, therefore, he must not merely succeed in Oregon. He

must also go on looking like a pretty sure winner against Lyndon B. Johnson in November, while Nixon goes on looking like a pretty sure loser.

The truth of the matter is that the New York governor's embryonic candidacy is more keyed to the public opinion polls, and will be more affected by the pollsters' fugitive findings, than any other candidacy in our recent political history. If the polls turn against Rockefeller, his chances will be pretty slender.

The polls can turn against Rockefeller in two ways, moreover. To begin with, deepening political trouble for President Johnson can cause the President to drop behind Nixon. That, in itself, should be enough to remove, or at least to blur, the former Vice President's loser image. And if that happens, Nixon's inherent delegate strength can put him over.

By the same token, Rockefeller could be greatly hurt by a change in the present polling pattern, which shows him with far more power to win votes than the former Vice President. A good though ex-

treme sample of the pattern was the Connecticut poll, already cited in this space, which showed Rockefeller taking 30 per cent of the Democratic votes to beat Mr. Johnson in a close race, while the President, in turn, absolutely snowed under Nixon.

Depending on the polls — and Rockefeller has no alternative — is obviously an immense gamble. The risks are all the greater, this year, because of the third-party candidacy of the racist former governor of Alabama, George Wallace. Any poll that leaves Wallace out will be worthless. And only an all-wise Providence knows how many votes for Wallace will be gained if there is bad trouble in the cities.

On present prospects, however, it seems most likely that the Republicans at Miami will have to choose between the moderate Rockefeller, with excellent prospects of winning the White House if they nominate him, and Nixon, with the backing of Barry Goldwater, but with fairly doubtful prospects of defeating President Johnson if nominated.

Test tube morality

... The Dissenting Academy

Editor's note: This is a CPS book review of The Dissenting Academy by Theodore Roszak.

Sometime between World War II and the demise of Sen. Joseph McCarthy, a general attitude that has been described as liberal anti-communism became the prevailing attitude of the American intellectual community.

The basic premises of liberal anti-communism were two: that the Government should be encouraged to pursue its policy of containing Communism abroad and that it should be prodded to cure whatever social ills might still be in existence at home.

At the time liberal anti-communism was blossoming, there is no doubt that many of its advocates believed they were taking a stand that was both idealistic and sensible. Stalin's repressive and cynical methods of ruling seemed to discredit Communism as a means of achieving social progress while the United States seemed to be taking a genuinely progressive role in the world with such programs as the Marshall Plan.

Whatever the validity of this view of the world, it permitted academics and intellectuals to go to work for the government, or at least to work on Government — sponsored projects, in good conscience. Criticism, if it was encouraged at all, was directed at particular programs or parts of programs rather than at the foreign policy or the society's structure as a whole.

Government, under pressure to keep up with the Soviets in the missile race, the space race, and in other races, threw off its traditional distrust of the intellectual community and began funding research programs to the universities.

While the amount of money that has gone out as research grants to universities is not small, it is nothing compared

to the indirect subsidies that universities have received in states where industries were getting fat on Government contracts.

In California, for example, the aerospace industries needed engineers and scientists, and therefore provided music of the political pressure that led to the massive growth at the University of California system.

The consequences of the post-war romance between universities and the Government are what most, though not all, of the eleven contributors to The Dissenting Academy talk about. Although it is clear that the war in Vietnam is the starting point for all of them, they do not write so much about where academics have failed in trying to end the war as about the larger failure of the universities to criticize a society that would get into such a war.

As described in this book, some of the failings of academics are almost incredible. Sumner Rosen, an economist writing about the deficiencies of economic work in this country, says that the impact of military spending in the economy has been all but ignored by professional economists. According to Rosen, "war and preparation for war" is the most important single force in the economy today. Why, then, has this area been neglected?

It's hard to avoid the conclusion that economists, the group that has come closest to the inner circles of power in this country (what other discipline boasts anything like the President's Council of Economic Advisors?), just plain don't want to point out how dependent our economy is on war-spending because it would spoil their cozy relationship with the Government.

Rosen suggests this in part of the problem, but he sees as less direct reason for it. As he explains it:

The scholars and teachers are not consciously avoiding or evading a duty which they know in their hearts must be faced. Rather, they are conforming to a point of view about the economy and about their own role and responsibility which they find both bearable and honorable. It is part of a more general view of scholarship which effectively molds all but a handful of men, and casts that handful into the role of peripheral figure, cranks, or monomaniacs. This is at root a historical, a technical or mechanical, a non-political view of what the economy is and how it works. It is seen as a system with stable structural characteristics, operating within parameters that will not change.

Economists, in other words, accept the structure of the economy, in the large, and address their criticism to limited technical aspects of it.

A similar criticism of anthropologists is made by Kathleen Gough. She says that anthropologists in general study primitive cultures, and sometimes even examine the impact of Western society on these cultures, without considering the largest question of Western imperialism, its origins and overall impact.

Miss Gough, who is on the faculty at Simon Fraser University in Canada (she has also taught at American institutions), suggests that the tradition of concentrating on out-of-the-way cultures has given anthropologists a means of evading the larger questions, which in turn has meant that they can take Government research grants without qualms about what their Government may be doing to non-Western people around the world.

Some of the contributors to the Dissenting Academy discuss the role, or non-role of professional associations in their respective disciplines with regard to taking public stands on issues.

Louis Kampf, an associate professor of Humanities at MIT, says the Modern Language Association is more a "trade association" than a professional association, a group whose "natural drift is toward the councils of the Chamber of Commerce."

He describes the total lack of concern with public issues, such as Vietnam, at a recent MLA convention as a consequence of the understanding by its membership that their affluence ultimately depends on the Cold War.

"The buffoonery at the MLS convention," writes Kampf, "is the visible sign of a competitive spirit, of an acquisitiveness, which is ready to cut throats; further, it pictures not only private feelings, but the structures of a society which is learning to exploit its men of learning."

Some of the contributors to the Dissenting Academy discuss the role, or non-role of professional associations in their respective disciplines with regard to taking public stands on issues.

Louis Kampf, an associate professor of Humanities at MIT, says the Modern Language Association is more a "trade association" than a professional association, a group whose "natural drift is toward the councils of the Chamber of Commerce."

He describes the total lack of concern with public issues, such as Vietnam, at a recent MLA convention as a consequence of the understanding by its membership that their affluence ultimately depends on the Cold War.

Mick Lowe Number seven only \$5.04

I helped organize a demonstration last week. Sixty people turned out, it lasted all day Friday, and surprisingly, it was a success. Best of all, it only cost \$5.04.

It all started when we discovered that the Dow Chemical Company was returning to campus. They were here last semester, you may recall, and there was a demonstration at that time, too.

That was the first time that I had ever participated in a picket line, and I discovered that even

I Was There



holding a sign for an hour and being sneered at is an excellent way to relieve one's conscience.

So we decided to go around again. We started by "obtaining" scraps of wood for our signs at a local construction sight. Imagine—we can say that our demonstration had the material support of Peter Kiewit.

Then we wrote a letter exhorting everyone to mass action. It was later pointed out that my phraseology in the letter, in certain passages at least, was open to several interpretations.

For instance, the phrase, "the war is not a dead issue, as a look at any outlet of the mass media will demonstrate." You can't win them all.

Then we trooped into the men's dorms to distribute our letters. We felt like Rap Brown leading an anti-Wallace rally at Ole Miss.

Part of it was my own fault. I was wearing blue jeans and a black sweater, looking like the issue of an unhappy cross between Che Guevara and a Viet Cong nurse.

That, I think, was one reason that SDS has been a failure at the University. The past leaders have been, almost without exception, graduate students, Easterners, wearing long hair and mustaches, then coming on with new and completely strange ideas.

They are shot down before they ever get a chance to open their mouths. University students are not hopelessly stupid, but it takes tact and a certain amount of understanding to succeed with persuasion.

At any rate, the demonstration itself made for an interesting Friday morning. People came and went as people will, at University demonstrations on school days, but we managed to get the rough count of sixty participants, thirty of whom had never participated in a demonstration before.

There was, happily, a wide variety of participants, ranging from members of Greek houses to a single black power advocate.

I asked him if he had ever participated in a demonstration before.

"No," he replied, and then smiled a bit sheepishly. "Well, not a peaceful one, anyway."

It developed that he had been accepted at an Ivy League school, (he was a senior at a local high school), and would attend on a scholarship, no less.

"Athletic?" I asked. "No," he replied simply, "it's a get-a-Negro-for-your-college-scholarship." Soul brother.

The hecklers were fun to listen to, and after a while a group of pro-war picketers appeared, the "anti-anti's."

I noticed members of our line were inconspicuously infiltrating among them. They all seemed to be getting along amicably until Alan Bennett, the manager of the Union sensibly ordered that we stay apart and glance at each other. It was right out of El Cid — and I could see drawn battle lines charging another, spilling blood on the Union carpets.

But we stared at each other's groups so long that we actually became rather friendly. At least, I think we all felt, we were better than the people who were simply watching, and doing very little, at all.

Finally, it was all over. The response of the news media was gratifying — (I, personally feel that demonstrations prove little except for the publicity and emotional catharsis that inevitably follows.)

About three o'clock both groups agreed to call it a draw, shake hands, and go drink beer. And at three thirty all of the signs were gone, the marchers had gone home, the observers had dispersed.

But there was, I noticed, one small crudely written sign tacked onto a Union booth. "The anti-anti's," it read, "have gone to Myron's." So, I suspect, did the "anti's."

I was feeling pretty cocky about the whole day until I stopped at a booth where a pair of immaculately made-up, and manicured sorority chicks were collecting votes for "Sports Queen."

Still in the heat of commitment, I paid my nickel and voted, feeling that I had just been raped and paid a nickel for the experience.

I asked them how many people had actually paid five cents to go along with all of this.

"Oh, we had about three hundred this morn'g," chortled one of the girls. My satisfaction withered. Three hundred people had paid money to vote for a Sports Queen while seventy had demonstrated, one way or another, concerning Vietnam.

Irony piled upon irony a bit later when Craig Dreesen recently-announced candidate for ASUN president and a principal in our demonstration, refused to vote because he thought it was "silly."

"Apathetic," I heard one of the girls mutter as we walked away.

Oh well, what can you expect for five dollars and four cents?