"In a sick country every step to health is an insult to those who live on its sickness.

The Fixer - Bernard Malamud

3 March 1970
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OUR PURPOSE

To create freedom, where it does not exist, for ourselves and others.

I am by nature a careful and deliberative person; it is not my inclination to make quick judgments, or to rally to any cause without fully determining its justice. When I undertook the defense of James McClung's good name and right to teach wherever he is qualified, I did so without research and preparation. I studied and investigated Mr. McClung's record and his actions, carefully reviewed any possible justification the administration might have had, queried the administration and faculty, and generally collected what I believe to be an outstanding body of evidence.

If at any point in this process, I had discovered that James McClung had acted wrongly or unethically in any way, I could not have continued to support him. My decision to write and work in his defense is founded on rational, informed thought rather than emotion or first impression. I work for the issue, not the man; I defend the man not because he is appealing, but because he is right.

The fact that James McClung will no longer teach at Madison is not nearly so tragic as the fact that the practice of dismissing teachers of his calibre is systematically moulding the faculty of this college into something other than what it should be. Professors who are unwilling to prostitute their beliefs and ideals have been forced to go elsewhere too often. Professors who have allowed themselves to be muted through cowardice have stayed too long. I defend Mr. McClung so that the administration will know that this moulding process cannot be accomplished with such arrogant ease next time.

Now Frank Humphreys tells me that I am being duped and that Mr. McClung is manipulating me for his own selfish ends. This is utter, unthinking nonsense. I don't mind stating that I resent being called a puppet by a puppet.

It is Mr. Humphreys himself who is being manipulated. It is another case of the proselytizing finger pointing back unmercifully at its owner. The ideas Mr. Humphreys expressed last week were not his own; even the phrases he used bespeak the identity of the puppet pulling his strings. The cowardly and unethical professor who is using Frank Humphreys does not even have the courage to speak for himself, as Mr. McClung has done. When the truth finally emerges, as it must, Mr. Humphreys will be shamed, not he.

WAKE UP, FRANK HUMPHREYS! It is long past time that YOU did a little investigating. When someone tells me something unpleasant about Mr. McClung, I don't accept his word as definitive nor do I accept that of Mr. McClung. I have to investigate the accusations and find out who the liars are.

Don't you owe your reputation the same consideration, Mr. Humphreys? Before you write an accusation, you owe it to yourself and to your "victim" to verify your sources. It is an unhappy fact that there are some people who simply cannot be trusted, and before long I think you will know what I mean. I only hope you will have the courage to admit it.

Lewis H. Sword
The service at the Madison College dining hall has never been of the sort that rates a large amount of praise, but the policies of the D-Hall since the beginning of second semester have become rather ridiculous. In the past few weeks several of my friends have been busted for things that can be conveniently categorized as a lot of bull-shit. For example, one group of freaks had their ID's taken when they were caught smoking in the dining hall. Two of these students attended Madison during the summer, when smoking was allowed during meals, but these people were not present at all. Since there is not one "No Smoking" sign in Gibbons they had no way of knowing that this act was against Madison College rules, yet they were given the third degree for something that should be allowed in the first place.

In another instance, a friend was busted for letting his brother use his ID card to get a meal. Everybody knows that no one at Madison College eats all three meals seven days a week. In other words, the D-Hall actually owes you food, so why not let a friend have one of the meals you didn't eat? Well, they took this guy's ID and as part of his punishment he was not allowed in the dining hall from Saturday lunch until the following Monday lunch. Is starving a student Madison's idea of justice?

Even those of us who haven't been physically thrown out of Gibbons have been subjected to a lot of harassment. There are nearly always two people, either of whom could easily pass as a professional wrestler, checking ID's at the door. Besides this you are given the once over every time you walk out the door to see if you're smuggling anything out that you shouldn't be. Next they'll frisk us when we go in and out to make sure we're clean. These tactics would be understandable if the dining hall was losing money, but they have been in the black ever since Mr. Griffin has been in charge. These Gestapo methods are not called for.

Mike Marsh

I'd like to congratulate the staff of the Breeze for their cartoon concerning "hippies" in their last issue. For once the cartoon was as funny as the rest of the paper.
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"Our purpose is to restore the military profession to its historic and honored role. The armed services were meant to be the servants and not the makers of national policy."

John Kenneth Galbraith

Protect your freedoms. They are being taken away, gradually perhaps, but they are being taken away nevertheless. The anti-riot law under which the Chicago Seven were prosecuted is one example of suppression. The law is so vague that a person could be prosecuted under it if he gave almost any kind of speech. The law prosecutes those who the government believes "intended" to incite a riot whether or not the riot actually materializes. A riot is defined as a disturbance of three or more people. This definition of a riot could cover almost any disturbance "caused" by a speech. There are many state laws against riots. They are enforced. A federal law is unnecessary and its only purpose can be that of suppressing freedom of speech.

Now before Congress is an organized Crime Bill. This bill should be offensive to all freedom loving individuals. Some of the provisions of this bill include:

1. denial of the privilege against self-incrimination while permitting prosecution for crimes which the compelled testimony may reveal.
2. power given to courts to imprison witnesses who refuse to testify for up to 36 months, without a jury trial,
3. power given to federal grand juries to publish criticism of public employees when there is insufficient evidence to support indictment,
4. right of the government to appeal a sentence and have it reversed.

It is easy to see some of the provisions are in direct conflict with the Constitution. The Supreme Court is the interpreter of the Constitution. It has the final say on what is constitutional. How long will the Supreme Court remain liberal? It depends very much on the next appointment to the Court.

The recent decisions protecting our liberties may well be reversed. Now is the time for commitment. As he slowly counts his tears, I know it's useless talking to people deaf and blind. But if we do not act now, We'll be too far behind our ancestors.

Judy Reed

The head lamps of carriages are banned—against the law. And the town constable is blind. He doesn't see them at all. My mind pukes out its hatred in waves of words unheard. And the man shouts out his warning in a language that is slurred. And my feet walk down the trails of happiness in the sky. As the jailer counts his keys and the lonely people die. The streets breathe out their breath of metallic blood unstained for the country's fighting a human war.

As my mind pukes out its hatred, The shadows grab out toward me. In waves of words unheard. I feel an empty hollowness. And quickly loses his life. While my companion stabs out at me with a purple studded knife.

As the jailer counts his keys, The streets breathe out their breath of metallic blood unstained. For the country's fighting a human war. And the man shouts out his warning in a language that is slurred. And my feet walk down the trails of happiness in the sky. As the jailer counts his keys and the lonely people die. The streets breathe out their breath of metallic blood unstained for the country's fighting a human war.

As she slowly drains her blood, And quickly loses his life. While my companion stabs out at me with a purple studded knife.
It was with amazement that I read a recent issue of the "Fix'r" which presented a picture of the plight of three Madison English professors. The close-mindedness of the ultra-conservative Madison administrators is indeed shocking. Having just transferred from Madison to a school in Florida this past semester, I feel I can make a very revealing comparison between Madison College and my present school, which I am sure would be considered "radically liberal" by the Madison administration's terms.

I think Alfred North Whitehead's statement on the value of a true institution of learning is very pertinent: "The justification for a university," said Whitehead, "is that it preserves the connection between knowledge and the zest of life, by uniting the young and old in the imaginative consideration of learning. This atmosphere of excitement, arising from imaginative consideration, transforms knowledge. A fact is no longer a bare fact; it is invested with all its possibilities. It is no longer a burden on the memory; it is energising as the poet of our purposes."

In formulation, purposes, one must weigh values and plan courses of action, I am encouraged that hopefully, the student body at Madison, or at least a group of concerned, enlightened individuals, is moving toward this goal of awareness. I am fortunate that my present college is flexible enough to allow room for the individual—to be imaginative, to be daring, to be thoughtful, to be concerned, to be questioning! God help the Madison administrators and faculty members with absolute, superficial attitudes and standards, limited in scope and biased in nature. The stifling of open, curious students and professors is a rigid practice which has no place in any phase of education. The best of luck in all your endeavours to give Madison College a needed breath of fresh air and ideas!

Sincerely,
Jane Lauberdi
Sophomore, Fla. Presbyterian College
(1968-Jan, 1970 Madison student)

This writer was touched more deeply by one sight above all others at the demonstration Wednesday—the dark, empty home of our President. All around, people stood and questioned, awaited an honest answer. Hillcrest was silent and our President spoke to the news media in general, vague terms.

For over twenty years, this man has served Madison, often quite well. However, silence when his decisions are questioned is a disservice to the very integrity of the college administration. This writer is sick, tired, weary bored and still uninformed after periodic release of the same old tired anemic conglomeration of words that refer to this action as being nothing unusual, but this time an explanation has been asked and Hillcrest's resident was silent. An explanation was demanded and Hillcrest's resident was silent. How long will this silence continue? Why will this man not frankly clarify the whole issue and permit it to be solved and passed on?

Our President deserves respect because of his service; but his student "constituents" are no less deserving of honest explanations. How many times have we heard the term 'Open Door Policy'? Let's hear it again! Mr. President, open your door, open your mind. Do not permit your twenty year legacy of progress to be overshadowed by obstinacy. Mr. President, the students at Madison—it seems to the writer—bear no personal malice and you need neither fear nor distrust them seek a
SOUTH KOREAN REGIME SPONSORS MODERN SLAVE TRADE

PYONGYANG, North Korea (LMS) Living conditions are so bad in South Korea, "a horrible hell on earth unfit for human habitability," according to the Pyongyang-based Korean Central News Agency—that many people want to leave.

The South Korean government takes advantage of this yearning of many people to seek greener pastures by cooperating with various immigration schemes of the other capitalist countries. Emigration from South Korea is encouraged because it eases social pressure at home and brings foreign currency into South Korea (when South Koreans abroad buy supplies from Korean firms or when they send gifts or support money to relatives).

During an eight-month period in 1969, some 3580 South Koreans left their homeland in an attempt to find something better. They went to West Germany, South Vietnam and South America to work as miners, nurses and farmers.

The North Korean press agency, in condemnation of the emigration policy, called it a "slave trade of modern version, selling hungry-chicken people to foreign rapacious plunderers using them as a direct source of foreign currency." The South Korean regime expects $74 million in foreign currency from the emigration program. The bulk of this comes from foreign governments and firms, who pay the emigrants so they can finance travel out of Korea.

EVERYONE PAYS THE PENALTY

Again, it becomes glaringly obvious that Madison needs a drama man. At present, the Drama Department seems to be floundering due to a complete lack of direction and goal. This uncertainty and confusion distorted the recent production of the Stratford Players.

The Madwoman of Chaillot was a huge disappointment to me, and I never thought I would say that about any Madison production. To begin, the play itself was an unbelievable bad choice because its theme is dated and meaningless for a modern audience. Fairy tales lack a pressing relevance in a time characterized by an ugly reality. Unfortunately, evil does not just vanish as the Madwoman claimed. This harsh fact put an irrevocable strain on the play's central tone. I couldn't even submerge myself in the fantasy because the basic premise of stark absolutes was so ludicrously faulty.

Using such material, the actors managed to perform adequately. However, they appeared hesitant and totally unsure of what was going on. Perhaps, the actors needed additional time to practice. Perhaps, but I don't think that the focus of the problem was the time factor. These actors seemed to have difficulty delving into their roles, due to the script and to the directing of the play. It was distressing and painful to see potential talent flailing into mere strain; the actors were trying to portray characters that had no concreteness. The stage seemed fogged over by a noticeable uncertainty.

Why should any production be weakened because its cast doesn't have confidence? This type of situation is inexcusable and should be corrected by a competent professional. The actors deserve the finest possible direction in order to give their finest performances. They do not deserve to be penalized for something they cannot change. And, incidentally, neither do you. Madison needs a drama man NOW.

Debbie Darr

page 5
It is obvious that there are people in the administration of Madison College who can liquidate faculty members with all the finesse of a staff of skilled academic surgeons. Their proficiency is such that they have been able to unjustifyably administer the kiss-off to three fine professors without even incurring the necessity of a legal hearing. The issue, unfortunately, has no precedent thus far; it is a moral question.

since we have no legal recourse, the hearing must be instituted on the pages of this newspaper. This is the only true forum remaining for our professors. I am beginning this week the testimony and the evidence in the case for the defense of Mr. James McClung.

Mr. McClung is a man well-schooled in the art of teaching; his career as a student was brilliant. He holds a B.A. from Washington and Lee University and an M.A. from Tulane University. He has about halfway completed his doctoral work; he could obtain his Ph.D. within one calendar year without great difficulty. He graduated from college with honors, was a Fulbright Scholar and held a Graduate Fellowship.

His teaching experience is varied and extensive for a still-young man. He taught for a year at Wilson Memorial High School and, after obtaining his Master's, taught for three years—including summer sessions—at Louisiana State University in New Orleans. After being accepted in the capacity of Assistant Professor at Madison in 1968, he spent the summer prior to beginning here teaching high school again. It was his objective to apply the techniques he had learned at L.S.U. to remedial high school classes—a practically unprecedented idea, and one which met with great success. His use of college-oriented teaching and curriculum noticeably improved the general English capacity and particularly the composition of even those remedial students.

In the coming weeks I hope to be able to present extensive testimony and more specific information concerning Mr. McClung's education, experience, and native teaching talent. Even this general outline, however, causes one to realize WHY Dr. Louis G. Locke was so impressed with Mr. McClung's qualifications when he came here to teach. Now Dr. Locke has changed his mind. He has decided that perhaps Mr. McClung's qualifications are no longer enough; Mr. McClung's second successful year of teaching at Madison will be his last.

We are asking only one question concerning this decision, and we will continue to ask it until it is answered truthfully.

WHY?

LATE REPORT ON THE DRAFT ROULETTE:
NO SAFE BIRTHDAYS AT ALL

WASHINGTON (LNS) - There are only 366 lottery numbers in the draft roulette and the first 30 will be spent on January alone. The January call of 12,500 is only two-thirds of what Laird's estimate of 225,000 draftees in 1970 is going to be achieved.

Rough calculations lead to the conclusion that not only are people in the bottom third of the call-up order very likely to get a notice from their draft board, but Selective Service will have to invent 180 new birthdays and also fill vast numbers of undiscovered Americans to stock them. This solution would call for all the months of 1970 to be expanded to about 45 days each, with young men being assigned to the previously non-existent days by a random procedure.

It is unlikely that such an emergency plan will be adopted since, as one Washington observer pointed out, the Vietnamese forces resisting U.S. occupation will be fighting on the basis of a standard year-sized 1970 while the time-allotted U.S. Army plans to defeat many hard-nosed Washington officials have privately given up hope that the press will be sufficiently censored by late 1970 to put across a big lie and they are already seeking ways to insure that they themselves will not be sacrificed to the wolves when the lottery hoax comes to life.

There is no misery in not being loved, only in not loving.

Rod McKuen
I'm sorry about the film on L.S.D. chosen to precede the panel on drugs last Wednesday night. The program itself was needed, constructive and further evidence that Madison students can effectively work together to present a discussion of relevance and importance.

That film, however, was bad. I realize every attempt had been made to obtain the other documentary on marijuana, and that shipping problems thwarted those efforts. It's just unfortunate, however, that the film on L.S.D. had to be shown at all. The audience was there and waiting, so actually the coordinators had very little choice but to go ahead. However, they, any objections must be raised against the production and choice of that particular film.

Any one feels compelled to create such horror movies I don't know. I went to learn, not to be frightened or appalled. The techniques used in making this film were biased and intolerant. Almost any good film demonstrates a prejudice but it can also view other opinions with compassion and control. The producers of this film seemed incapable of such fairness, presenting such viewpoints only to mock or deride them in the commentary. Certainly the facts of the LSD experience should be known but facts can scarcely be evaluated by a film that closes with facts of the LSD experience should be known but facts can scarcely be evaluated by a film that closes with hallucinogens (not hallucinogens).

The guiding thought behind the film's success was that the horribly burned actor speaking of his personal experience while under the influence of LSD. Such an ending serves to dehumanize and downplay any contribution the film might have made rather than the practice of using LSD.

It is regrettable, then, that this movie had to be shown without its companion but also that it was chosen at all. This film was not indicative of the word and preparation that produced the drug program. I only hope that those people with the most interest and the greatest need were not so turned off by the film that they left what was an otherwise well

Los Angeles, Calif.--Texaco, Inc., has decided to stop advertising in college papers which "engage in rabble rousing and attempt to foster anarchy," according to W.V. Linn, Texaco advertising and sales promotion manager.

Linn said the action has been taken against several papers across the country, after Texaco reviewed their content. Texaco would disclose the name of only one paper, the new University at the University of California at Irvine.

Texaco had received complaints about the paper which contained a story on the arrest of a local bookstore owner for allegedly publishing an underground newspaper which urged readers to shoplift. It also carried an ad for Texaco.

A letter to a person who complained about Texaco advertising in the paper, Linn stated that Texaco had assumed "that the publication maintained a good moral policy in its editorial and news reporting activities. Naturally we are quite shocked to find that such is not the case here."

Such action by Texaco was not a violation of free speech, Linn said, "if we don't like what's in there, we don't have to advertise with papers like that," he said.

The students of Madison College last week saw what was probably the first honest attempt to educate them to the actual consequences of the use of drugs. The first program in a proposed series, concentrated on the use of marijuana and other hallucinogens (not hallucinogens). The presentation was mainly student controlled with a good deal of advisory assistance from the Counseling Center and the Wesley Foundation and some financial assistance from the Harrisonburg Klwanis Club. The choice of the speakers and the format of the program was completely in student control; however, the choice of the movie is still a bit of an enigma, at least to myself.

The guiding thought behind the establishment of a drug information center was that the use of drugs is fast becoming, if it is not already, a prominent aspect of American society and in order for the individual

(cont. page 8)
The Fixer would like to think the person responsible for the anonymous contribution of ten dollars.

"Ignorance never settles a question."

Benjamin Disraeli

The staff of The Fixer would like to thank the person responsible for the anonymous contribution of ten dollars.

"...with a little help from our friends..."

Some of the workers on The Fixer are Carl Bailey, Judy Reed, Dean Brown, Martha Cassidy, Debbie Jurr, Mary Donohue, Dee Dee Ehlertson, Les Glenn, Bruce King, Dave Morin, Joanne Melvilltord, Joy & Tina Malone, Jo, Chris Vukston, Kaye Fulchans, Karen Mathews, Mike Marshall, Sarah Schaffner, Nancy Cox, Pat Ferguson, Hatfield Stephens, Dennis Heffery, A no Lodge, Mark Eldman, James Leo-Cas, Marilyn Miller, Nancy Durrroughs, Sharon Hughes, Kathy Little, Cliff Wyse, Laine Walden, Mary Lueks, Mike Cornick, Lynne Johnson, Kathy Smull, Carolyn Bailey, Lee Johnson, Dev Coley, Faith Harbeck, Barbara Fletcher, Pegy Green, Smiling Jack, John Estett, Lewis L. My Alien, Morda, ace Glady, Rick Bob Ch., Steve Rochelle, on Nomison, Dave Kasler, Stuart Shipe, Aaron Patterson, Lisa, and Funk, Diane Fisher, and Frankie Fisher.

The Fixer would like...
Dear Frank,

Every time you write to us, you manage to bury yourself deeper in inaccuracies and inconsistency. This time, however, you have outdone yourself. Your latest diatribe is a monumental heap of confusion that chokes itself to death with vague and incomprehensible rhetoric.

I wish I had the space to review the first four paragraphs, but I have already begun a weekly series and I do not wish to begin another one. I would, however, like to award you an honorary degree in Obscurity.

In paragraph number five, your rhetoric finally dissipates enough for me to discover the petty gripe that prompted you to write us again. You claim that "editorial responsibility was cast completely by the wayside in favor of an attempt to support a narrow view," I suppose this is an example of your characteristic rhetorical hyperbole, but it still appears to be a fairly potent accusation. If it were true, I do not think we would have printed your letter at all.

I challenge us to justify our status as a "free" press and accuse us of suppressing and ridiculing articles which are not in complete agreement with our own opinions. This is simply not true, and you know it. We ARE a free press; we are apparently the only one on campus.

Since you have issued this challenge, allow me to refresh your memory as to the facts of the matter. In issues three through nine, "The Fixer" printed no fewer than twelve letters and articles criticizing our own paper, its articles and positions. I wrote one of them myself. In our own paper, people have been allowed to call us "so-called radicals" and "naive of human nature." In our own paper, people have been allowed to make the following attacks on our statements and principles:

"Your paper...is nonenlightening. The poems and articles in your publication seem to have been written by students with very closed minds."

"...the paper is mainly bent on criticizing, indeed tearing down the high standards of the college."

"I am thoroughly disappointed...you have chosen to print a paper full of cynicism, unsupported and unnecessarily defamatory criticism and poor taste."

"It sounds dangerously akin...to the amorphous phrase-mongering of the Cold war 50's..."

"I would like to comment on...your poorly written paper."

Because we are young, we tend to have an idealistic outlook on life. Most have not had much experience in anything, save a one-to-one relationship dealing equally with our peers. Thus, when we are placed in a situation where we must deal with others outside of our little world, we frequently encounter seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

While it is not always advisable to hold firmly to the adage that "experience is the best teacher," one would be wiser were he at least to weigh the various possibilities of any given situation. In this process, one should limit his considerations to factual evidence, placing no stock in emotional facets of the problem.

In paragraph number five, your rhetoric finally dissipates enough for me to discover the petty gripe that prompted you to write us again. You claim that "editorial responsibility was cast completely by the wayside in favor of an attempt to support a narrow view," I suppose this is an example of your characteristic rhetorical hyperbole, but it still appears to be a fairly potent accusation. If it were true, I do not think we would have printed your letter at all.

I challenge us to justify our status as a "free" press and accuse us of suppressing and ridiculing articles which are not in complete agreement with our own opinions. This is simply not true, and you know it. We ARE a free press; we are apparently the only one on campus.

Since you have issued this challenge, allow me to refresh your memory as to the facts of the matter. In issues three through nine, "The Fixer" printed no fewer than twelve letters and articles criticizing our own paper, its articles and positions. I wrote one of them myself. In our own paper, people have been allowed to call us "so-called radicals" and "naive of human nature." In our own paper, people have been allowed to make the following attacks on our statements and principles:

"Your paper...is nonenlightening. The poems and articles in your publication seem to have been written by students with very closed minds."

"...the paper is mainly bent on criticizing, indeed tearing down the high standards of the college."

"I am thoroughly disappointed...you have chosen to print a paper full of cynicism, unsupported and unnecessarily defamatory criticism and poor taste."

"It sounds dangerously akin...to the amorphous phrase-mongering of the Cold war 50's..."

"I would like to comment on...your poorly written paper."

Because we are young, we tend to have an idealistic outlook on life. Most have not had much experience in anything, save a one-to-one relationship dealing equally with our peers. Thus, when we are placed in a situation where we must deal with others outside of our little world, we frequently encounter seemingly insurmountable obstacles.

While it is not always advisable to hold firmly to the adage that "experience is the best teacher," one would be wiser were he at least to weigh the various possibilities of any given situation. In this process, one should limit his considerations to factual evidence, placing no stock in emotional facets of the problem.

As incongruity is one of the bases of contention between the youth and the elder, so it quite often happens that those crying "foul" actually bear the same narrow-minded edginess as those against whom they protest. Unfortunately, this lack of consistency can be pointed out in both sides of any given position.

Taking our present environment as a case in point, evidence is boundless of gross inconsistency wherever one cares to look. Far too many actions take place, not as logical actions toward an achievable goal, but rather as emotional reactions against another's goals. Often the need arises for just such reactions, but heads are turned when this is the sole emission of a given force for any continued period.

One of the most important things most often overlooked in exercising one's rights is the responsibility inherent upon their use. In the previous issue of "The Fixer," editorial responsibility was cast completely by the wayside in favor of an attempt to support a narrow view. Hence, I herein submit a challenge to justify your position as being "free" press. It is my contention that you are truly "free" only when submitted articles are in complete agreement with your own, and that you do not hesitate to ridicule that which is in opposition.

Direct reference here is made to the work submitted by me for the previous issue. Views therein stated were intended for publication and with full disclosure of the writer's identity. I submitted those views in the good faith that they (cont. page 10 "outside" column)
The Fixer

It was expressed; we printed it. And ten of those twelve adverse letters were printed with no rebuttal at all! How in the world can any one come to the conclusion that we "support a narrow view?" I challenge "The Breeze" to compare its own record to ours.

As for your own article, you did indeed single out James Mclloung by name, linking that name to your purposely vague concern concerning "selfish motives" and "unconscionable actions." I do not believe that a man should have to remain silent for a week before replying to such a vicious and unsubstantiated slur. You "prove" prejudice on our part by pointing out that we chose to have your victim reply to your charges. I don't call prejudice a narrow view; the practice of presenting both sides of an issue happens to be called objectivity. If you do not care to make the difference, perhaps you have been writing for "The Breeze" too long.

You also contend that you were really decrying the emotionalism controlling the protest movement in your letter. You are misquoting yourself. Only one paragraph in your letter concerned itself with emotionalism. Even in this paragraph, you were not complaining about the emotionalism per se; you were accusing people of "playing on" the emotions of others. I don't care to make the difference. Once again, there is a difference.

You say that it is a "proven fact" that the outside column of a page attracts the eye of the reader and therefore your letter was "buried." That is simple hogwash. Perhaps you are accustomed to reading from right to left, but I assure you that most of us do it the other way around. Wouldn't it have been rather absurd if we had printed the reply first and the accusations second?

Your next claim is that the artwork above your letter was "blatantly obscene." In my opinion, it was rather crude and unwarranted and had I any part in its insertion, I would apologize. However, it was by no means "blatantly obscene"; it certainly didn't appeal to my prurient interests. Perhaps your statement is just another instance of thoughtless hyperbole. I would like to try to impress upon you the necessity of exercising your freedom of speech responsibly and knowledgeably. Perhaps it would be efficacious to close with one of the few coherent and meaningful statements heard from Frank Humphreys lately: "Just continue to bear in mind that, at all times, you, as a journalist, hold the responsibility of presenting your material in an impartial, unbiased manner." Perhaps if you listened to your own advice, you would learn something.

Lewis R. Sword

(Humphreys cont.)

would be printed first, with any later rebuttal, and not offered to someone other than an editor of staff who would then get preferential treatment in airing his rebuttal.

Through a certain narrowness of thought, it seemed to be decided that one person had been singled out and certain "charges" leveled against him. If the time had been taken to read the entire article, it would have been discovered that this, in fact, was not the case. What the article actually pointed to was the emotionalism now virtually controls the protest movement. To substantiate further the prejudice in placement of my article, it is a proven fact that the right-hand, or the outside, column of a page is the place to which eyes are immediately attracted. By burying mine inside, the reader was drawn to the rebuttal first, and the original case later, if at all. This is saying nothing of the blatantly obscene artwork immediately above my article, which could have been construed to relate directly to the material below.

As I have said, you are misled; and will continue to hold to that position, I fully support your right to print "The Fixer." Furthermore, by comparison with other underground papers, "The Fixer" acquits itself very favorably. Just continue to bear in mind that, at all times, you, as a journalist, hold the responsibility of presenting your material in an impartial, unbiased manner.

Frank Humphreys

The following letter was received in response to the correspondence sent to the Governor, signed by both students and faculty, concerning the appointment of educators to Madison's Board of Visitors.

The letter also mentioned the appropriate type of replacement for President Miller. Anyone interested in working on a committee to send Board recommendations to Governor Holton, contact Jay Rainey, box 2213.

Dear Mr. Rainey:

Thank you for your thoughtful letter of January fifteenth concerning the Board of Visitors of Madison College.

I hope you will forward any future Board recommendations you may have to me, or to Mr. Provo, who is on my staff.

Cordially,

Linwood Holton