

# 'Who is this sonofabitch Buckley?'

By ROBERT C. NORDAHL

This is a response to William F. Buckley, Jr.'s commentary on Senator George McGovern and the recent nationwide story on him by New York Times Magazine interviewer Joe McGinniss.

Who is this sonofabitch William Buckley? For talking about a "perverse innocence" of George McGovern with what we have been finding about Nixon lately?

Simply because McGovern — and 40 per cent of Americans last November — felt his philosophy about reducing the scale of our military ventures made sense? Because of his belief in shifting the priorities of this nation from military embellishment to more attention to internal strengthening of this nation? Or because of his demonstrated conviction to shift the presidential conduct from what we are "getting used to" with that sonofabitch Nixon, to greater openness with ideas and intentions?

And who is this Buckley guy to state matter-of-factly of McGovern as "the American who knew least of all about his country"? I would say this character himself is pretty ignorant about everything to be treading on such dangerous grounds, in what is plainly character assassination and no more!

Perhaps what McGovern doesn't indeed realize so plainly — or, cannot

bring himself to realize so plainly — is how shitting slanted and stupid so many of this country's voters seem to be when it comes to national values and priorities. Indeed, they seem to eat up Nixon's remoteness, arrogance and insincerity! They also seem to think Nixon is better at international relations, when he can't even communicate with his own supporters or citizen audience, as McGovern did, very much, for the brief chance we let him have.

Then people talk about mistakes McGovern made . . . well read McGinniss' article yourself about how McGovern felt during the Democratic convention about choosing Eagleton. People, don't you know that any president can be just as human as any of us at times? Observe Nixon's recent expression of stupidity with Watergate!

Any presidential candidate is taking a chance, potentially susceptible to innumerable mistakes. It's a tricky business, especially with influences such as Watergate. If anyone, including the Nixon team, can promise they would not make any campaigning mistakes like McGovern did, let's really hear from them. I was sensitive enough to realize that this did not detract at all from the man, what I feel I do know about him.

I would like all potential voters who "didn't vote for either" last year to know I feel they could use some more knowledge about history and the course

of events. I would hope it is obvious that a national election, with two candidate adversaries dynamically different, at such a crucial time in history, is of extreme importance. This the election of '72 was. Sure, like many, I too was distressed and withdrawn from "politics" in general . . . from the same phenomenon of fading faith in governmental institutions which McGovern at least tried to bring to our attention. He was not being self-righteous in expressing this — but he was taking it upon himself to stand up for this idea and declare the need for getting some more faith and spirit back in America.

It became clear to me at least that as the elections approached I should vote for one or the other — one of them was going to get that office no matter how disillusioned I may have become. And it came through loud and clear to me that McGovern was the better man! And so, even though I might have felt McGovern was not my perfect choice . . .

he was my preference, so I registered to vote and gave him my overwhelming support, helping his campaign program here in Eugene-Springfield. I might have been a far left-wing liberal (which I am not) but I realized that as the campaign progressed, he had to modify some of his stated policies to a more conservative standpoint in order to stand a chance in this nationwide contest. It was everybody's duty to himself to vote for one or the other and

to those who didn't I say, may you learn your lesson ever since that dreary November day and henceforth for four wasted years.

I believe this country is in a sick condition, and it's going to get more sick as the current administration wears on. Observe, I don't mean America itself is sick, I mean America is falling sick. On a simple term, we are out waging unnecessary battles, bufferings and influences far away from home, while our home fields from which we are nourished are lying fallow and beginning to fill up with weeds. It's as simple as that.

The days of the colosseum are indeed here again, wrought with such escapades as vicious boos and "get outa here you sonofabitch" to such people as McGovern last August. Yes, have your drink and have your fill, while you can, my fellow Romans.

And I tell you, Buckley and his sympathizers on this issue are going to start getting some name-calling in colosseums, etc., back at them if they don't start working on their crude, primitive judgement of what this country needs now in this day and is not getting from ol' Nix. There's a hell of a lot of people sore with distress at Nixon's hellish way of running things.

Note: Mr. Nordahl is a freshman in history.

## Economic power--a common denominator

By DARRELL MURRAY

It is time, with the election of a new executive, to come to grips with several problems that confront the university. (1) The polarization of interest groups and the resulting bitterness between them poses a problem with two alternative resolutions. If we so choose we can continue fighting among ourselves over the incidental fee distribution and the entire year will again be subsumed by the bureaucratic chaos that has typified student and university politics for the past year. If this occurs the ASUO will not exist two years hence.

Pressures for the demise of the ASUO and the liberal atmosphere of the university in general are manifest in the state legislature, on the board of education, and in decisions such as that to reorganize minority programs. It is building rapidly toward the projected climax. But the ASUO is important to us for several reasons. When run efficiently and with majority support it can provide an excellent forum for student opinion. It can operate useful programs (SEARCH and ESCAPE to name but two) which provide alternatives for students. It can provide an extremely potent university lobby at the state legislature. It can give students the opportunity to explore and participate in decision-making processes on the university level. There are endless positive goals that we can accomplish. But without a relatively high degree of internal cohesion we are incapable of doing anything and this is what the public perceives presently.

Therefore I argue in favor of the second possible resolution. I propose that we stop our internal strife and instead treat each other with the respect that each person deserves. Each person is capable of contribution. Each person exhibits his potential in many forms. Some people do this subtly and it is difficult for some to perceive. Nevertheless we must search for each person's value (preferably with his help and openness) until we are satisfied that we have found it.

We cannot afford to become bitter and alienated from people due to our own failure to perceive the source of their own

integrity. I am not asking for a utopian wedding of interests (in the very near future) — only an understanding and an attempt to build a structure which will enable us to interact successfully on a common basis. It is with common success — and failure — that we learn to tolerate and appreciate one another regardless of the implications of narrow self-interest. In time we can build a new cognitive set for reference information when interacting with someone we might presently despise (See movie *Hell In The Pacific*).

(2) Students are generally class mobile persons. However, while attending the university they are usually restricted by tight budgets. With incidental fees and tuition on the move upward we see a less than systematic elimination of poor and middle class students and a trend toward an elite institution. It is a gradual and barely noticeable process but it is occurring partly due to the Nixonian philosophy of education funding. It is also partly due to taxpayer unwillingness to provide more revenues to finance higher education. We, the ASUO, are not the only ones to suffer from this phenomenon. Academic departments also suffer (of course as ultimate consumers we get it in the end) and they too would like to have more power to combat the onslaught against education.

In terms of the incidental fee the ASUO has two traditional alternatives. We can either cut program expenditures or we can increase incidental fees to support the inflationary cycle. In terms of the rises in tuition about the best alternative we have is to pray for divine guidance and a check in our mailbox.

This is not necessarily a tragic tale with a sad ending however. We still have a fighting chance to survive and in fact grow as a microculture. The key factor in building our just and fair society I believe is economic in nature. What causes interest groups to polarize and defuse student government? Money! What causes the public dissatisfaction with our structural problems? Their money! What causes administrations to fire super-star political science professors? Money! Dammit, dollars and cents! In terms of

philosophy dollars mean little but in terms of the other side of the coin they mean a whole lot of things that directly affect you and me — whether we like it or not.

Therefore I propose that former, present, and future student bureaucrats consider the possibilities of economic power. I propose that we do this on a university basis state-wide rather than merely a student basis. The students at this university spend millions of dollars in the community every year. We have many areas that could potentially shift that

balance of payments back in the direction of the students and the universities. With the coalition of students, faculty, and administration we can organize economic power so as to be effective politically and socially. If we find it so difficult to recognize humanity as the basic bond between us then let us at least recognize our common financial bondage.

Note: Mr. Murray, a political science junior, was a former ASUO presidential candidate.

