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we are the people of the world

We are the people of the World
this world
with a tear
and a church
and a god like soul
and a pagan laugh;
hyena laugh
to help you laugh
your laugh.

our pleasure is
to share with you
a drunken story
almost ambulatory
about a man and god:
a fallen heaven
and the ruin dead
a child and the fittest
and the fittest fed
and birth control
RAH! RAH!

and a seed that was split
to help man procreate
with guilt.
a toilet bowl of
no consequence
flushing down the
maintenance
of a drunken cartoon
world

an illusion farting world
where man and God
are synonymous
and salvation lies
in drunkenness
with opium dream
and an acid trip.
a television screen
and an eight hour twix;
a vitamin pill
and a bit of will
will help you not
fight it.
will keep you busy
avoiding:
THE joke WE HAVE
TO TELL.

HIP! HIP!

By MUNIR HANAFI
Is Your 'Noema' Essential?
Summer training program
morning journey

Grey ribbons.
Mountains and roads
winding down
from the heights
through billowing pillows
of pale gossamer—
guidelines of destiny.
——K. Estelle Cray

tokenism

Eyes from a balcony watch
bloated bellied babies
hoary haggard houses
static stilled schools
with crumbling foundations.

In despair the eyes look
towards the heavens for an answer
but the gods have been replaced
by impersonal neon lights that
wink
as if some joke were told
about keeping america clean
saving blue chip stamps
and joining the inflation
generation.
but the eyes can’t understand
and maintain a blank stare
In the land of the blind and the
free.

Two penetrated, raw pupils search
for a wool blanket to use as a
shroud,
‘though an oral prefrontal
lobotamy
or anti-deperspirant would
provide the sterility
that this country has sought to
attain.

But instead they see scratched on
the balcony
Like the writing on the wall
N-G-G-R
and the eyes look at the floor
with terrible guilt and terrible
shame
until a check is written
to that colored organization
the S.P.C.A.;
then the eyes look down from the
balcony
and feel quite relieved
and very much at ease.

By MUNIR HANAFI
At the end of the First Faculty Senate when Mr. Penalosa turned the chair over to me he provided a list of agenda items to be accomplished. Then the stars still seemed in the ascendent for the academic community. Since then, the non-academic political hacks have discovered once more that the academic community is vulnerable to attack because it is the nature of the academic profession to seek truth from all sides of an issue rather than to assert a politically effective, but myopic truth. This attack has caused confusion in academia because the academic was ill equipped to deal in the political arena. At first ostrich-like, he hid his head, hoping the politician would go away. Next he adopted the roles of the politician as he understood them when he did not really understand. With all its simple statements, politics is not simplistic, for the politician understands mass appeal. Even the AAUP, which is just now beginning to accept Madison Avenue techniques in membership recruiting and which was hesitant to react to the positions of certain governors, did at its recent national convention, react to implicit, or was it explicit, threats to higher education contained in statements from men of high position in the national administration. "Real" is the operative word here for the academic is still a babe in the politician's woods. A Herblock cartoon in this morning's LA Times pictures a tree labeled "American Colleges" being chopped down by "Attempted Legislative Intervention." In the tree scratching his head, is Herblock's little man with perplexed face, scratching his confused head and labeled "Faculties.

Four years ago when I arrived on this campus the Faculties' ogre was defined as the Department of Finance and everyone in the system was banded together to beat down the ogre. Since then the unsophisticated reaction of the Faculties to the politicians has resulted in the creation of a multiplicity of ill defined ogres. On some days, my colleagues, we joust at windmills. On some days we joust at dragons. Might I suggest that for faculties to be most effective they must avoid the windmills and identify their dragons with precision. Once identified, choose your weapons, but choose them well. There have been times when, as Chairman of the Senate, I have seen professors and administrators, or professors and professors choose different weapons. The result is internal bickering rather than decisive attack. Internal bickering is the best way of controlliing "belligerent" faculties. We must not defeat ourselves. Faculties must learn that consultation is not a process of informing of decisions made; it is a process of jointly weighing and judging evidence.

Faculties, and I use the term to mean administrators as well as professors, must come down from Herblock's tree and forge their weapons together. The reduced teaching load is one of the economic dragons we must face. Fullerton has faced the dragon with one effective weapon and that is the assumption that the "instructional budget will not be subject to a pre-audit nor to a post-audit on teaching units by the State Department of Finance." This assumption must be one of our weapons as we attack the problem. Moreover, if we are to teach effectively we can no longer be satisfied with remaining in the classroom. We must look at what the outside world is really like. This means the world not only outside the ivory tower, but also that outside the white ghetto. This is what our students are trying to tell us when they ask for relevant courses and when they ask for a voice in faculty governance. The dragon we have to fight is not our students, but our assumption that we can accommodate student desires within traditional frameworks. Frameworks change with changing societies and we must seek new frameworks for courses and governance. We must teach students to recognize and reject cliches; let us therefore, not speak to them in cliches.

As I step down from the chair, I do so appreciating a highly esteemed office. I do not recommend that it be held again for two terms in succession, nor should the Executive Committee serve without assigned time. My service, if not exactly eased, has been made possible this Academic Community. To that end I wish to thank the Associated Student Government and particularly retired President Rohen, and Celeste Bish and Nick Pencoff, both of whom played significant roles in the evolving student-faculty governance; to thank the staff for their support to the Senate and especially to Mrs. Ornitz who took over a very sensitive job at a hectic time and has learned to help us all; and to the Faculties, administrative and professorial, who have contributed to making the Senate a viable body. To single out one individual would be to overlook many other important individuals, and so I will recognize only the Executive Committee, Mr. Nelson and Mr. Crum this year and Mr. Van Marter and Mr. Crum last year, for their personal service in testing and guiding my judgment.

The Third Faculty Senate is dead, long live the Fourth Faculty Senate.

Dr. Ronald Barnes
Chairman, Third Faculty Senate

Those criticizing Trenam's "editorial blast" should remember that before the Committee on Student-Faculty Policy Making Relationships had even met, the selection of one of the student representatives was placed in question by one of the faculty representatives. Given the fact that students are seeking a role in the development of policy and that their early efforts at having representatives on the Senate and Curriculum Committee met with some rebuff, it seems only human that those students seeking a more effective role in the governance of this academic community view the questioning of one of their representatives as a "put-down." In this context, Trenam's blast was perfectly understandable, and those who raised peripheral questions such as the discontinuity caused by Pencoff's graduation failed to see levels of priority.

The situation has its obvious parallels in society. I cite particularly the efforts of the Blacks and Mexican-Americans to obtain a more effective role in the governance of their society. And wherever there is some doubt as to whether those who have traditionally held the major positions of power and influence will offer participation to those who have not, the latter have tended to view delays and the questioning of representatives as a refusal to discuss, and they have generally selected the most active and most experienced representatives to deal with the situation even if for a day. Thus, it would have been far better had the selection of Pencoff had not been questioned. The members named to the Committee should have met with a minimum of delay and proceeded to the task of deciding how governance of the academic community can best be fulfilled at this time in history. Finally, to accuse Trenam of "grotesquely overgeneralizing" and to suggest that he may be suffering from a "swollen head" is to misread his interest and commitment as well as those of other active students.

Dr. Jesse Hiroaka
Chairman, Fourth Faculty Senate
Young, insolent bum, 24, wishes to meet earthy, flesh-minded chick. I am ½ Danish, ½ potpourri, 6'3", 170 pounds, dirty blonde hair, with blood-shot, blue eyes. I drink and smoke all kinds of things. I have never yet been married, and never intend to be. I am making a career out of rabble-rousing and foul-mouthing the establishment. Some of my interests are chicks, poker, tennis, chicks, harmonica-playing, driving on the wrong side of the road at high speeds, and chicks. I do printing part time, and am interested in a theism. I can’t teach anyone anything, because I don’t pretend to know enough about myself yet. I am interested in meeting a girl with similar hang-ups. No right-wingers, uptights, science majors, D.A.R.’s, librarians, or teeny-boppers with foam rubber and hair spray. Please write to Mark Trenam, P-22 CSCSB. Send $25.00 for autographed photo. Absolutely no C.O.D.'s.
WHAT WAS THE “VANITY FAIR” fashion show doing with a lame duck? Perhaps by inclusion of one such animal, the already obvious beauty of the models is doubly enhanced. The label on his shoe reportedly read “U.S.D.A. Choice – Grade ‘1-A’.”

Guerrillas Attack

WHERE IS THIS LABYRINTH?

LIVE BAND TODAY!!

Relevant Issues

Why Priests Leave

Field Credit
kulture too...
homeostasis man

By MUNIR HANAFI

PROLOGUE

I

Under a glass, rose-stained dome
before the present, before
knowledge
when all is one, and all was aware
of transcendental green and
golden being
there was a queer fellow named
Homo
and a Stone.

All was finite and lacked mystery,
with no time and no fine
distinctions
between
living and non-living matter

There was only the lush, the sensual
present (which was unlike the
present
as we know it now) and

Homeostasis
which was the Stone
and was the Sun
and was the Father,

Which was the Rock
where all was
but wasn’t
larger than
a pebble.

II

STR OBO SCO FICA LLY* and filtered
by
soft
silver
sand
a bit of a bit of starlight
from a distant darkling star
summoned Homo to arise.

Quite flat on his head he stood
rolling his mind’s eye around
and around until he uttered
the cracking cry of a neonate
and gave birth
to a sharp and sudden pain.

III

It was grumbling in his stomach;
It was murmuring in his mind;
It was knowledge that he’d first
gained
(a feeling that brought strife).

and the Darkling disappeared
leaving
Homo mystified;
and with an emergent urge to
defecate
It was wisdom that had taught
him
to be cognizant of life.

Walking on his hands
and whimpering wild with fear
as though searching for a
place to taste
a state
now disappeared:
He stumbled on a mineral, and
falling to a stone
found erupting from his anus
a woman and a man.

And looking
at his waste
he found
a very strange
resemblance.
Howard Ruttenberg
Asst. Prof. Philosophy

There was a time when one could, with apparent justification, speak of civilized nations, capable of self-government and democracy, in contrast with nations whose greatest benefit would be the guidance of the former, i.e., a benevolent dictatorship aimed at the maturation of the nation. The same distinctions were made about individual men — male vs. female, white vs. black, brown, and red, teacher vs. student. It is an outdated distinction. It can be found in Marx as well as Mill, but it is wrong now, if it ever was right. But its lingering shadow weakens and sometimes poisons our discussion of power, participation, and responsibility.

Recent cases in point: the Vice-President of our college has asserted that students cannot be responsible members of decision-making councils in the college because they are not responsible to anyone, such as the Chancellor, the State Legislature, the people of California. Another faculty person has argued for the right of natural science students to participate in the councils on the ground their point of view and interests should be represented. In both cases people already deeply involved in running the institution have made pronouncements regarding the right, extent, and interest of student participation in governing the college. I am arguing that students should participate. I am unimpressed by the articulation of representation along the same subject matter lines that choked off possibilities of liberal education in American colleges.

Students are a part of the college community. I know, because I have heard the leaders of those communities beseech them to act responsibly. My point is that responsibility cannot any longer mean doing things the way someone else had decided is right. It must be active, not passive, rational, not merely obedient; a framework of communication, not just a chain of command.

Some will wonder of Marx and Mill were not right. Can students, eg, really plan the courses that will, hopefully educate them? But please notice how rigid dichotomies slip in to our thinking. Is it simply the case that we are educated and they need it? How then could they possibly learn, if they had no powers of discernment? And why are we so often wrong?

Of course, students are not here as long as we are. Perhaps that fact and many others should affect our consideration of their role in the community. But shouldn't they be brought into that process of consideration, too? Isn't our first task to foster the democratic instincts of our students and create a college where all paternalism and all condescension are dead?

revolution in America

An open letter to
Pres. Richard M. Nixon

The specter of revolution is haunting America — a specter which is nurtured by a society advance economically, by a society possessing a ruling class that has lost faith in its ability to rule, by a society with increasing class antagonisms, by a society attempting to absorb a disaffected body of intellectuals.

Revolution, not evolution, is now in vogue. Campus militants want change NOW. If the System is unable to adapt . . . if it cannot respond appropriately to the demands made of it, revolution is then inevitable. Professional revolutionaries have provided the intelligents and the indigent alike with a vision of a brave, new albeit ambiguous social order — an order in which human rather than material values are emphasized, an order which can be achieved only through the death of that social bastard . . . Capitalism.

Revolution? Revolution? Revolution! the revolutionaries and their lackeys chant, passing briefly to explain that the Fascist Pigs who control the means of production seek to suppress the Good.

Those in power, the revolutionaries argue, must oppose social change because they derive their political power from a continued maintenance of the status quo.

Contending that the System no longer represents the people, the revolutionaries conclude that they (the people) have the Constitutional right to abolish the System and initiate a new regime.

The concerned masses listen to the emotional cries of the revolutionaries, but are quiescent — the victims of bourgeois ideology, and a square-toed set of politically moral principles. Clearly, revolution is not their bag.

To combat the bourgeois nature of the masses, the revolutionaries have adopted a more subtle policy of “division and confrontation.” And although the lackeys still call themselves a “revolutionary,” the professional revolutionary modestly refers to himself as a “radical organizer.”

Divide and Confront! A simple policy: to wit, (1) find a problem, (2) apply violence to create public concern, (3) accept the support of members, (4) condemn the opposition, (5) refuse all settlements in any way favorable to the opposition, (6) press for a physical confrontation, (7) look for a new problem, and (8) move to the new problem before the old one is solved. The ultimate goal: the polarization of the nation so that for every action (L.) there is an equal, but opposite reaction (R.).

The “radical organizer” smiles contentedly. His policy is working.

Each day the Conservatives become more conservative as the Liberals become more liberal, and vice versa. Ultimately, the political backlash of one will result in the revolt of the other, neither group understanding the goals of the other.

There is still hope for the System. However, such hope is contingent upon the System’s ability to adapt . . . to respond appropriately unification — unification allowing for an agreement of goals, and a common sense of direction. Thus, the political traveler must stop, then carefully decide in which direction he wishes to go: to the left in Dante’s Inferno; to the right, Huxley’s Brave New World; straight ahead, avoidance of either extreme.

Only by moving straight ahead, only by adopting a policy of politically progressive pragmatism can revolution be avoided. The infinite resignation must be made. To survive, the System must concentrate its economic and intellectual resources on interior rather than exterior reforms. A 50% reduction in defense spending, a logarithmic increase in urban and educational development, greater distribution of the national wealth through more realistic Welfare and Social Security benefits, elimination of the spoils system, extirpation of entrenched bureaucratic practices, dumping of the pork barrel, et al, are mandatory reforms.

The System can work, given time and appropriate legislation. Politically unified, it can provide a social order that allows for complete, unambiguous realization of collective as well as individual potentials. Divided, it can only provide revolution.

Revolution or evolution? The choice is a simple one. Depending upon the extent of political unity, and the number of social reforms made, the Nation will experience one or the other within the next 15 years. Indeed, 1984 may be witness to the creation of a radically new regime.

By DON LANNON
DAISY DAY, VALENTINE'S DAY, LOVE DAY... they're all the same. To daisy's the day when color and spirit confront gray and rigidity. To interpret the black and white reproduction, envision a daisy of administration yellow on BS orange.

Photo by Terry Nichols
EDITORIAL:

Student CENSORED Art
... if we leave our students frustrated, antagonized, and hostile, we are inviting continued agitation, for these students, be they black, brown, or white, will not shed such feelings upon graduation, as rulers in other countries have discovered."

By DR. ELLIOTT BARKAN

Harvard; Columbia; CCNY; Queens College; Cornell; Duke; Howard; Chicago; Berkeley; San Francisco State; Stanford. Now they are more than merely names of colleges and universities. At once they summon forth images of occupation, confrontation, conciliation, and, on occasion, capitulation. Few of us are unaware of the impact which student demonstrations on these and other campuses have wrought, but too few have carefully considered their implications. Confusion reigns on many levels: among those, on the one hand, who feel that the escalation of tactics is fully justified in terms of the protests, and on the other, who, hand, who fear the long range repercussions of indiscriminate pressure; among the mass of students, who are torn by their own preoccupations, support of legitimate movements, and abhorrence of violence; among administrators, who fear the dissidents, fear the legislators, fear the public and, it seems, not infrequently fear themselves; among the people at large, who see the visible manifestations of unrest and resistance but not the frustrations and long festering grievances that provoked many of the demonstrations; and finally, among the faculty, many of whom wish to appear sympathetic, others who are in fact sympathetic, others oblivious or hostile, and still those so confused they cannot decide where they do stand or ought to stand.

There are not clearcut answers, and I dismiss the pseudo—intellectual bullies who glibly toss about catchy phrases that barely disguise the emptiness of their thought. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and change both far more frequently than they do their clothes. I abhor the shallow, selfish political leaders who have attempted to make capital out of the student unrest, proving to the disillusioned and the skeptical their unreliability and meehocrity. I feel sorry for the many people who have not bothered to distinguish the legitimate protesters from the mindless, violent ones and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I gloat over those administrators who formerly ruled their campuses like fieldfords and are now getting their come—uppance; while I sympathize with those simple, committed leaders who have been hit by the pil~s~ cross—fire, and outraged by the out—sider, I deplore those co~nscientious and out—siders. Finally, I lament the position which so many of my colleagues have taken—hiding behind their doors, their books, their precious lecture notes. From Cambridge and Queens to Stanford and San Francisco, I have seen too few faculty speaking out and providing leadership. I have seen too few willing to stand behind the fair demands and, at the same time, resist intimidation and denounce the vicious, blind minority who have exploited their initiative through the use of totally unjustified and unwarranted measures of violence and coercion.

Not only must teachers speak out forthrightly but we must tirelessly strive to clarify the issues and separate the sense from the nonsense, the valid from the violent, the grievances from the grotesque. We must develop —we must encourage—clarity of thought and purpose. We must bring to the consciousness of the student the realization that the violence and the threat of violence are the only means by which some of our leaders and administrators have attempted to bring about meaningful change. I recognize that the control and direction of masses of students, or even small cliques, are substantially complicated when, at the outset, those people with power turn either deliberately or in a panic to intimidation, punitive measures, and troops of police. This is especially the case when, as has been repeatedly demonstrated, the latter are more and more frequently resorting, without provocation, to brutality. In such instances, it almost follows that violence will bring forth only more violence, just such self—fulfilling prophecies when students are the initiators. Yet, even there I believe that by curbing both frustration and the impulse to lash back, calculatedly non-violent (that is, particularly but not exclusively non-destructive) methods, on the part of students, would be more successful, all things considered. I wish to make it clear, though, that I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent. I deplore the agitated young men and women who have made the extreme means their ends and have once again displayed the propensity of so many Americans towards simplistic analyses of complex questions and intolerance of dissent.
transition

wintertime, and bears hibernate
far in shrouded caves
all shiny with salmon-oil fur
dipped from nature's pot.
depressed snows
frozen tides
cold groves and creeps across the
wood.
melting and swollen streams
sliding mud with new
awakenings
one eye replaces sleep with a
flutter.
springing buds
short green grass
young mushrooms push through
humid earth
children grow
it's time to leave cold arms
for the warmth of spring.

footprints

Footprints on silent sands naked
beneath a withered moon of
fossil bone
Step by measured step dogged by
ferric shadows.
Though they laugh, I hear them
not.
Cougar-cry and coyote-howl warm
the shivering
stream of blood as shadows
cower and tremble.
His rusty cage the snail leaves
behind;
From his faded cocoon the
winged butterfly crawls;
By daybreak I shall have crossed
the nameless desert.

By DAVE BROWN

By Josh
The basic premise upon which this attitude rests is this: Intrinsically in the process of achieving our demands is the non-violent destruction of the Establishment. Our goals and objectives are a function of our value system; therefore, when these goals are realized, our values will have been internalized into the socio-academic structure.

One might ask why so much importance is being placed in the arena of educational change when his revolution is in fact impregnated in the total society? The explanation is to be found in the fact that any educational structure is fluid; its members are not bound to the institution, but come and go in constant turnover. A student is only a student (in the official sense) while he is using the particular educational institution to achieve his own ends, and then he emerges and disappears into a larger society. Therefore, if effective change is achieved in the educational system, you will have indirectly integrated the new value system into the larger society.

Contrary to impressions left in much of the public's mind by sensationalistic news media, "Student Power" is not a dirty word. It is neither synonymous with rioting and chaos, nor exclusively propounded by Communist paid anarchists of unknown parentage, nor is it something you step in walking across a horse pasture. Student Power is a positive value sought by a generation confronted by value change. It seeks only equality, advocates only reality. As a social phenomenon, Student Power exists as one out of hundreds of symptoms of a society emersed in the turmoil, assessment and adjustment of cultural transition.

Student Power is a here-and-now reality... it can be cursed, it can be praised, but it won't go away by ignoring it. It represents a search by students for an identity in an academic environment which is not meeting the values of the generation. What has happened here during the last quarter that many students have awakened to the discrepancy between the establishment's academic policies and the changing student interest and status.
our representatives' view of berkeley

Inspite of their addiction to the visual pablum of television, the adherence to mommy's apron strings, and the prevalence of the belief that the good ol' U. S. A. and its plastic, fantastic culture is God's gift to mankind, even the most reactionary and conservative of college students today cannot escape the minimal awareness that we are now submerged in a cultural revolution. Student's live in a vortile petri dish which breeds change. The neophyte student, upon his initiation into the collegiate life, is smothered by slogans demanding his participation in the process of furthering student freedom and power. But lost somewhere in this amoebic indoctrination of the mass student mentality is an essential element necessary for total awareness: Where do our values conflict with those of our parents' generation?

Whatever the definition of our value system, it is obviously not that of the Establishment. A society functions successfully by offering the means of fulfilling the needs of its members. Our society is presently meeting the needs of our parents' values, but what happens when we're the establishment? Where do we find our own individual sense of identity and uniqueness?

Obviously, the inheritance of the malignancy of the Established Society would be a grossly deficient legacy. Those red white and blue geniuses who paste "Love America or Leave It" stickers on their General Motors monstrosities represent a mentality steeped in ignorance and boiled to perfection in a Betsy Ross brain wash. There has got to be something more to being American than watching John Wayne win WWII single handed, or seeing the great, white WASP Tarzan swing his pure and virtuous masculinity like a giant panacea through the African jungle (some day, he'll castrate himself on a pigny outhouse). Whatever the by-line — alternate society, hippies, yippies, new left, or war babies — we remain different social animals than those of the society which begat us.

If we fail to identify the discrepancy in our society, then Bob Dylan has us pegged: "You know something's happening, but you don't know what it is, do you Mr. Jones."

What is this thing called the "new value system?" How does it differ from the Establishment's? These questions must be asked and answered by every student who feels this intangible sense of frustration and anxiety but who cannot readily articulate the source of his conflicts.
our newspapers love us . . .

Tyranny Still Threatens, Sir

It Tolls for Thee

our policy: to report the truth

SIDeways thinking is the art of never quite getting right to the heart of a matter as facts have a tendency to rather obscure the actual problem and we must prefer to rather confuse the issue thereby saving a certain concrete obstacle which might tend — or if not actually tend, seem to tend — to overcomplicate a matter which, looked at sideways, may often work out quite well by the simple expedient of an objective re-evaluation aimed at bringing into focus the cloudier issues, or facets, so often ignored in the usual newspaper which never actually gives a clear-cut column but only seems to, or appears to, whereupon factual columns are our stock-in-trade and we stand behind every word.”

John Keasler
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