

LETTERS to the Editor

Dissertation On Bitchiness

Dear Editor,

After reading the three comments in this paper on the Buckley-Duffey debate I felt that, if law and order still prevailed in America, William F. Buckley should be lynched at sunrise. Imagine that bitched old warlock acting in such a fashion to the pure, just, humane Rev. Duffey! I made me think and as that happened I realized that I had, in fact, gone to a debate that very same night. After calling a local newspaper to confirm the fact that it was the same Duffey-Buckley debate at Trinity College I sat down and thought some more.

As I said, judging from those three comments, Rev. Duffey was considered Snow-White and Mr. Buckley a vile demon. Objectivity aside, I thought their style of presentation a bit one-sided or WARPED. I remember the famous words of a great American, our own Dean Sweeney, he said "the style is the man, even though in his case it is evidently vice versa." I feel as though both sides must be given so that no prejudiced, long-lasting impressions be made by these three inane articles. All three articles brought out the fact that WFB was brilliant and the victor of the debate. These facts were so obvious that even warping could not deny them. But all the articles failed to mention the Rev. Duffey's desperate attempts at "bitchiness", which, to quote the learned father of us all, "comports illy with the Thomistic philosophy of faith to which he so pretentiously adheres."

The first foolish attempt came when Duffey accused WFB of appealing to the pro-Joe McCarthy (Communist fears) feelings of the people. Mr. Buckley asked for a specific instance when he had called a person a Communist when he was not one. The Rev. Duffey recanted.

Then Duffey made the ridiculous statement that WFB, being born into a rich family, didn't want to give up his family wealth. Of course he doesn't want to give up that money, would you? But to think that Buckley needs his family's wealth is inane. WFB is an author, lecturer, columnist, has a weekly TV program and is the editor of NATIONAL REVIEW. WFB needs his family's wealth as much as Sen. Edward M. Kennedy needs a weekend vacation on Chappaquiddick Island. Even WFB found this statement too ridiculous to comment on but it was brought up in the question and answer period. Duffey defended himself with a lot of meaningless double-talk.

Duffey's last flaw was a bending of the rules. There was a pre-set schedule which was to open with Duffey and Buckley each making their opening remarks, then each would have ONE rebuttal. These were set down because the debate was being taped for educational television. After WFB's rebuttal, which, if the rules were followed, would have ended the televised portion Duffey asked for the remaining two or so minutes. His petition was granted and Duffey made an irrational, irrelevant plea to the emotions of the TV audience with a statement about Vietnam. About two seconds after this the moderator signed off for the TV tape. The debate continued but WFB's comment on Duffey's Theatrical plea to the audience was not on the TV tape. This, in my mind, was the zenith of BITCHINESS, but none of the three "involved liberal" writers mentioned this.

Richard High

FOOD COMMITTEE MEETING EVERY TUESDAY * ROOM E - 4:00 ALL ARE URGED TO COME

*(except next week when it will be Nov. 13 at 4:00 Room E)

Random Notes

Dear Jack of Tarts,

As an erstwhile tech sergeant in the USAF, in the good old days before Attorney General Mitchell took over the American government, I was seized with patriotic spasms of the most delicious variety last week, when a little note from William Adrian Keating, UoH '69 -- known on campus as the Bombardier of Bushnell Street -- arrived on my dissolute desk.

Wild Bill, who used to head the Forum Committee of the Board of Governors of the Gengras Campus Center of the Student-Faculty Association of the University of Hartford, or something, writes:

Hi Lou,

Just saying hello & that all is well here at Lackland AFB, (Editor's note: "AFB", to you draft dodgers, means "Air Force Base".) How is the fraternity doing. And how are you.

The food is good and the dorm is as good if not better than UoH. Please write.

Well, not much time. So good-bye for now, Fraternally,

Bill Keating
AB (Airman Basic -- very basic)
William A. Keating
AFO 42381998
CMR 6 Sq 3724 Flight 1690
Lackland AFB, Texas 78236

Well, Jackson, when I was shuttled in a cattle car to Fort Dix, N.J. on August 26, 1942 -- years before you began your constructive, conservative career in college journalism -- enlisted men's quarters were known as "barracks," not dormitories. The food wasn't bad; but if Bill says it's good down in Texas, then the Armed Services have come a long way since Peter Klaus Breit, Irving S. Starr, David D. Komisar and James J. Sullivan subsisted on S.O.S., as did yours truly.

Anyway, Wild Bill was a hard-working member of Upsilon Xi, which has since been absorbed into Phi Sigma Kappa -- so I hope all his buddies, and that goes for other fraternity men (even Lambda Phi Alpha) will write him at Lackland. It gets very lonesome during basic training, when a fellow has nothing to do but swill 3.2 beer -- and in Texas, yet.

Incidentally, Jackson, congratulations on your Oct. 29 issue of "UH NEWS," which looked a helluva lot more professional. Under your leadership, it may yet be liberated from puerile pornographics and sophomoric sideshows.

Knock wood.
Hate and ir retrievable hostility to all,

Sad Sam

U.H. Put-On

53 Boxwood Rd.
Yonkers, N.Y.
October 21, 1969

The Editor,
The Liberated Press,
U. of Hartford

Dear Mr. Hardy,

Unfortunately, we had voices raised in hate, spewing forth uncontrolled threats and no solutions. They have been splashed before the world through the media and then disappeared, leaving only fear. They have type-cast all Black leaders for years to come as hysterical and ranting, capable only of spasmodic violence. This picture has set the liberation of all Black men back fifty years. Sometimes I fear this is the ultimate Establishment purpose."

The above quote is from The New York Times of August 31, 1969. The author is Harry Dolan, the Negro writer from Watts.

I was reminded of Mr. Dolan's words when I read the violent prose in your Black section of the first two issues of The Liberated Press.

In my work I come in daily contact with Negroes of diverse economic and educational backgrounds. I am on the executive board of a political organization whose chairman is a Negro. I have dealings with the militant Black student organization of a nearby University whose members have volunteered their time as tutors. Almost without exception, I find these Negroes to be intelligent, dignified, concerned and rational unlike the monstrous images you have drawn in the columns of the Liberated Press.

It is the current myth to believe that there is an immediate, mysterious bond of intimacy and understanding between all Negroes. This is sheer nonsense. There is as much diversity in personalities and life styles among Blacks as there is in the White community. Anyone who claims to speak for all Negroes is either a demagogue or a fool.

I submit to you that these articles are either a put-on or the work of a paranoid -- I suspect the former. Your middle-class White editors view it as they would some spectator sport -- like the thrill of teasing a caged gorilla. Unfortunately life imitates Art all too often and young, impressionistic Black U of H students will accept this distortion as a guide to forming their life styles. Meanwhile the White readers will have their prejudiced stereotype of the vicious Black animal reinforced.

It is about time that your newspaper, which has a monopoly position on the campus, showed some sense of responsibility toward the Black community. In the first two issues you libeled and defamed our Black brothers. This, not dirty words, is a newspaper's ultimate obscenity.

Sincerely,
Coleman Mishkoff
(father of UH student)

Not-Love

Toby (not dear):
Are they all like you, the ones that go over?
Do they think like you in the Nam? Then maybe we're foolish to mourn all the losses;
Maybe to march was wrong.

What'll you do if the war is over? Where will you point your flaming gun?
Love like yours you can stuff up a barrel
And point it inwards.

And beg it to come
(not love) Alice Therrien

Views

Dear Mr. Pellegatto and Mr. Bresnick,

Your letters hit home and make me want to share my concerns about the draft system with you. I feel compelled, however, to make a few remarks in that I don't agree with all of your reasonings.

Mr. Pellegatto, the church, through its institutional voice declares that it is moral for a man to kill another man under the direction of his country. But I believe that this is a case similar to that of those who asked Christ if Moses was justified in allowing his people to divorce their wives. Christ justified Moses by saying that he, "by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but it was not so from the beginning." The Church as an institution, because of the hardness of heart of its people declares legalized killing moral, but surely as a Spiritual body, as individuals imitating Christ, it believes that the killing of man for any reason is contrary to God's teaching.

This issue strikes me as similar to another volatile issue, that of birth control. The Church, in this case, has handled the situation quite differently. Birth control is also contrary to God's teaching, especially His teaching that man is to live by faith. In this case, however, the Church has not made birth control moral in order to allow for the hardness of heart of its members, their lack of faith that God will adequately care for the number of children that He, in His love, gives to them. Naturally, I've greatly simplified both issues in my comparison, but I think the comparison is still of value in helping to understand the Church's duplicity of role, that of an institutional voice, and that of a Spiritual body. Somehow, both of these two roles must be present in an individuals' Spiritual life. Both roles have to be considered and weighed within his conscience. A sincere consideration of the two is what God is ultimately looking for, but he must observe with suspicion those who dwell in either extreme.

You are perfectly justified if you feel that the U.S. government should not force you, who because of your religious training and belief cannot conscientiously serve in the armed forces as a combat member, to go and kill your brothers overseas. But for you to maintain that moral beliefs alone are sufficient for being exempt from combat service, is for you to miss an important point. God is the author of true morals. A purely humanitarian love for others is natural to practically everyone because it is this that in us is a reflection of God. But a purely humanitarian love of others is at its best, at its highest ideal, merely an opinion, and nothing more, if this love does not recognize the author of love, who is God. Were the U.S. government to allow you to escape from armed service merely on the basis of your opinions, it would be doing the rest of the citizens an injustice; that is, allowing you to escape the responsibility of fighting for your country when everyone else is forced to accept this responsibility in one form or another.

Mr. Bresnick, you are absolutely right in saying that by obtaining a CO classification you would be cooperating with the draft program. You would, I admit that I have, and have received as I-A-O classification in addition to a 2-S student deferment. I don't agree with the set-up either. But when the question came up, I looked to God for a decision and He gave me one. I decided that if I have to live in such a society, where if someone attacks me, a policeman can run up and shoot him dead (whether I like it or not), a society that makes little allowance for the protecting grace of God, then I will follow whatever way out that the government will allow me. But perhaps you are right. Maybe there is more hope in bucking the Selective Service System than in asking city hall to abolish the local police force.

Sincerely yours,
Stephen Duolos

My Hopes For America's Future

Dear Editor:

I hope that future generations of Americans will pay more respect to our Founding Fathers, who established our constitutional republic and gave us a noble Bill of Rights. I hope they will appreciate the courage of the men who founded a republic on the belief in God . . . that the God who gave Moses the Ten Commandments on Mount Sinai is the very same Divine Creator that Jefferson insisted endows man with certain inalienable rights to life, liberty and happiness (property).

I hope future generations remember that it is the Laws of God which give us the right to be free and out of the house of bondage, and that it is only the laws or evil men which can hold us in.

I hope that future generations of Americans will remember that in 1776 the Colonies put the Laws of God above the laws of man and a miracle happened; a ragtag army of patriots routed the King's best of the battlefield. . . . That in 1781 a mighty Constitutional Republic was born which liberated millions of mankind from mechanical drudgery and chattel slavery.

I hope that future American statesmen will look back and learn from the mistakes we make today. As I write these words from Phu Bai, Vietnam I pray that future American administrations will never commit their fellow Americans to battle in an undeclared war. I beg them never to commit American soldiers to an Asian land war with no strategy whatsoever to WIN And a foreign policy which grants sanctuary to the enemy on and off the battlefield; and a domestic policy which encourages seditious pornographers and anarchists to demonstrate public adoration for the communist butchers of American servicemen. I hope that future inquisitive patriots will ask why had the Department of State insisted on subsidizing and promoting the building of economic bridges of trade directly to the communist arsenals in Central Europe all during this "war."

I hope that future presidential administrations will endeavor to see that a free economy does not need artificially, purposely prolonged wars as an excuse to raise taxes, or stimulate an inflated currency.

I hope that in the future, Americans will come to define the word patriotism as President Theodore Roosevelt did. "Patriotism means to stand by the Country. It does not mean to stand by the president or any other public official except to that degree which he himself stands by the country. It is always unpatriotic not to tell the truth . . ."

I know that my hopes for America's future depend on the accomplishments of my generation, now. We are heirs to the ages and it is our duty to pass on to the next generation our rights, privileges and responsibilities with whatever little technological improvements that we might stumble upon.

My hopes for America's future are simply that my children and yours will recognize and have the same God-given rights to life, liberty and happiness that I had. I hope that the generations of all Americans, linked one to another, will continue the never ending struggle to liberate mankind from

