

Connecticut Daily Campus

Serving Storrs Since 1896

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

Letter

Dan Riley forgot the "other" purpose

Dan Riley, the incumbent candidate for the Editor's job on the CAULDRON of the University of Hartford, was not re-elected. The controversial Riley was shunned in favor of Edward Butler Jr., a more moderate selection by the U of H Publications Commission. He was not dismissed under unusual circumstances, but merely not re-elected because of his past actions. What were these actions? Read the story on page one.

We cannot agree with the attitude taken by Riley in his revamping of the CALLBOARD to the CAULDRON. We feel he was misguided and without cause in his actions. To strongly believe that a college newspaper is not to contain news, but to almost solely contain student opinion and in-depth study of problems such as abortion and birth control is a gross misconception of just what the role of a college newspaper is. Contrary to what Dan Riley might think the role of a college newspaper is to inform both the students and faculty and staff of what is going on on the campus. Granted it is also a media for opinion and study of contemporary problems, but this is in ADDITION to this first purpose. A college newspaper is a "callboard" as well as a "cauldron", but neither should play the over-dominant role such as Dan Riley's CAULDRON did. To make the statement that "no news on campus was worth front page coverage" was selling his newspaper for more than it was. It is a media for students to read and be informed of what is going on on campus. Dan Riley forgot this role.

We cannot agree with the type of journalism practiced by Riley and his colleagues at Boston University, Ray Mungo. We believe they have a narrow view of the college

To the Editor:

I am a faculty wife who has just read the editorial about the April 15th Peace March in your May 1st issue. I don't know who writes your editorials, but he doesn't know what he's talking about on this issue. I would like to answer three points that were made:

1-The U.S. is fighting to prevent communist domination by force.

This is not true. The Geneva Accords, signed after the defeat of the French by the Ho Chi Minh forces in 1954, and agreed to, although not signed by the U.S., called for an internationally supervised election to be held in 1956 to determine the government under which North and South Vietnam would be re-united. The United States, behind the Diem regime, prevented this election from being held because, in Pres. Eisenhower's words, at least 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh if given the chance. We never gave them the chance.

2.- The dehumanization resulting from a communist dominated government would be greater than the dehumanization which the U.S. is presently causing.

The record of the Ho Chi Minh government is not one of dehumanization. From 1945 until our escalation in 1965, Vietminh cadres have gone into the villages of Vietnam and taught simple hygiene and sanitation, reading and writing, carried out land reform, returned village government to locally elected officials (the French and Americans stopped this and substituted Saigon officials), raised the status of women to equality, and dignity. Why else do you suppose these people continue fighting, against such terrible odds?

3.- The Peace Marchers offered no alternative to our present course of action.

The Peace Marchers did offer an alternative to the present atrocity in Vietnam, the same one applicable to any evil act: STOP IT. We have ships and planes on which the soldiers could be brought home, and the International Control Commission instituted by the Geneva Accords could supervise an election like the one we scuttled in 1956. The French managed to get out of Algeria.

Most of the above information can be read in any one of a half-dozen books currently in the book stores, one of them written for the American Friends Service Committee. The record of the Ho Chi Minh regime is harder to come by. I got some information from an article in the Sept. 1966 "New Yorker" and some from the publication

vidu
secl
pen
the
ledg
cle:
sen
tha
sta
lati
vid
hen
pou
enc
sm
lnt
Th
sta
acc
de:
ed,
the
he
M:
ter
is
re
ti
m
w
fi
be
sa
vc
m
it
ev
the
Ye
the
lik
Pc
co
cl:
thi
su
gla
As
an
bu
ity
iti

to
we
to
ga
ke
an
in
er
me
te
on
is

Dan Riley forgot the "other" purpose

Dan Riley, the incumbent candidate for the Editor's job on the CAULDRON of the University of Hartford, was not re-elected. The controversial Riley was shunned in favor of Edward Butler Jr., a more moderate selection by the U of H Publications Commission. He was not dismissed under unusual circumstances, but merely not re-elected because of his past actions. What were these actions? Read the story on page one.

We cannot agree with the attitude taken by Riley in his revamping of the CALLBOARD to the CAULDRON. We feel he was misguided and without cause in his actions. To strongly believe that a college newspaper is not to contain news, but to almost solely contain student opinion and in-depth study of problems such as abortion and birth control is a gross misconception of just what the role of a college newspaper is. Contrary to what Dan Riley might think the role of a college newspaper is to inform both the students and faculty and staff of what is going on on the campus. Granted it is also a media for opinion and study of contemporary problems, but this is in ADDITION to this first purpose. A college newspaper is a "callboard" as well as a "cauldron", but neither should play the over-dominant role such as Dan Riley's CAULDRON did. To make the statement that "no news on campus was worth front page coverage" was selling his newspaper for more than it was. It is a media for students to read and be informed of what is going on on campus. Dan Riley forgot this role.

We cannot agree with the type of journalism practiced by Riley and his colleagues at Boston University, Ray Mungo. We believe they have a narrow view of the college press and its purpose on a college campus. We support the action taken by the Publications Commission at Hartford and hope that similar action will be taken at Boston University. These are not examples of good college journalism.

To the Editor:

I am a faculty wife who has just read the editorial about the April 15th Peace March in your May 1st issue. I don't know who writes your editorials, but he doesn't know what he's talking about on this issue. I would like to answer three points that were made:

1-The U.S. is fighting to prevent communist domination by force.

This is not true. The Geneva Accords, signed after the defeat of the French by the Ho Chi Minh forces in 1954, and agreed to, although not signed by the U.S., called for an internationally supervised election to be held in 1956 to determine the government under which North and South Vietnam would be re-united. The United States, behind the Diem regime, prevented this election from being held because, in Pres. Eisenhower's words, at least 80% of the people would have voted for Ho Chi Minh if given the chance. We never gave them the chance.

2.- The dehumanization resulting from a communist dominated government would be greater than the dehumanization which the U.S. is presently causing.

The record of the Ho Chi Minh government is not one of dehumanization. From 1945 until our escalation in 1965, Vietminh cadres have gone into the villages of Vietnam and taught simple hygiene and sanitation, reading and writing, carried out land reform, returned village government to locally elected officials (the French and Americans stopped this and substituted Saigon officials), raised the status of women to equality, and dignity. Why else do you suppose these people continue fighting, against such terrible odds?

3.- The Peace Marchers offered no alternative to our present course of action.

The Peace Marchers did offer an alternative to the present atrocity in Vietnam, the same one applicable to any evil act: STOP IT. We have ships and planes on which the soldiers could be brought home, and the International Control Commission instituted by the Geneva Accords could supervise an election like the one we scuttled in 1956. The French managed to get out of Algeria.

Most of the above information can be read in any one of a half-dozen books currently in the book stores, one of them written for the American Friends Service Committee. The record of the Ho Chi Minh regime is harder to come by. I got some information from an article in the Sept. 1966 "New Yorker" and some from the publication "Viet Report". If you kids are too busy studying to read about the origins and issues of this war, that's regrettable, but don't pontificate about it in editorials. The world is in enough trouble.

Sincerely,
Lorraine Roth

vidu
sect
pen
the
ledg
cle:
sen
tha
sta
lati
vid
hen
pou
enc
sm
int
Th
sta
acc
de:
ed,
the
he
M:
ter
is
re
th
m
w:
fi
be
sa
vc
m
it
ev
the
on
Ye
th
lik
Pc
co
cl:
th
su
giv
As
an
bu
ity
iti
to
w:
to
ga
ke
an
in
er
m:
te
on
is