

On the right

The dilemma: 'Oh what a tangle. . .'

By WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.

Concerning the deteriorating situation, a few observations.

1. It is unlikely that the support for Mr. Nixon in the Gallup Poll will go much lower. Probably the figure, in the mid-twenties, is at bedrock. It is down to inertial support, and probably would not reduce if Archibald Cox leaked the information to Senator Kennedy that Richard Nixon was the man hiding behind the Grassy Knoll on November 22, 1963.

Under the circumstances, it will not prove very much if in the days ahead Gallup reports that Mr. Nixon's strength is not decreasing. If it stays at its present level, the indices for Mr. Nixon are bad. The regenerative powers of the Presidency are so enormous as to bring great kinetic forces to bear on his popularity. If the rating stays at the present low, it suggests a strategic sullenness on the part of the public which will not be distracted by a speech or a press conference or a conciliatory gesture by the Soviet Union.

2. No one knows exactly what is meant by the can't phrase that President Nixon "cannot govern." That observation needs to be examined at several levels. The first is in foreign policy. Anybody who can call for a nuclear alert, can "govern;" and Richard Nixon just finished one of those. At a less obvious level, however, it is — let's face it — inconceivable that the President could reply with force to an offensive by North Vietnam in violation of the Peace With Honor Treaty of last January. Whether a brand new President would feel free to do so is problematic. Put it conservatively that he would feel freer to do so than the beleaguered incumbent.

3. As regards domestic matters, those who say that Mr. Nixon cannot govern are once again talking about different levels of Mr. Nixon's responsibility. It is true that Mr. Nixon's diminished prestige causes individual Congressmen and senators to defy him sometimes even for the sake of doing so. Some legislators no doubt feel that they can only communicate to their

constituents their sympathy with the anti-Nixon mood by being clearly obstructive. Mr. Nixon undoubtedly could nominate for high public office someone who a year or two ago would have breezed by the Senate. Today such a nomination would be held up, for protracted investigation, bickering, and naysaying.

At a level once removed, it is true that Mr. Nixon is not now in a position to get from the public the kind of heat necessary to kindle Congress into a concern for its duties. There is entrenched irrationality here, but not much that one can readily do about it. Even a move transparently directed to the public interest meets now with presumptive opposition — the delay over the confirmation of Gerald Ford being a case in point. In this sense, the loss of the people's confidence translates into a palpable loss of presidential power. It is an exaggeration to say that Mr. Nixon can't govern. It is not an exaggeration to say that he cannot govern as effectively as once he could.

4. Is Mr. Nixon so constituted that he

will not resign, not under any circumstances? That he would need to be hoisted out of the White House as forcibly as Sewell Avery out of his office at Montgomery Ward by Mr. Roosevelt's Marines? In this case, responsible people will be asking themselves: what is to be served by augmenting the clamor for Mr. Nixon's resignation? If the resignation of the President were to result automatically from a clamor that reached a specified decibel-level, then those who feel the republic would be better off with Mr. Nixon retired could proceed to add their voices to those that have already been heard. But in the absence of any confidence in the marginal efficacy of the incremental voice, other considerations figure. They are not conclusively aligned in favor of keeping silent. Some will reason that rectitude demands speaking out against Mr. Nixon irrespective of whether doing so would merely result in increasing his ineffectiveness, while leaving him unbudged as President. Oh what a tangle, and how difficult it is, and how great are the stakes.

Letters

Disparity of Aid

If you are a new freshman or an old senior you may have already experienced the mental agony and constant frustration of being eligible for financial aid.

The amount of time and energy it takes to get any amount of financial aid is probably equivalent to a 3-credit hour class. So plan ahead. Roll up your sleeves and choose your words selectively because you are embarking on a mission that will take you at least weeks and often months. I'm sure most of us expect by now the mandatory signing of forms for money, loans, grants and scholarships. But the number of these forms seems to be increasing along with the length of the waiting period.

The secretaries in the Office of Financial Aid have for the most part a pleasant attitude toward students' needs. However, the secretarial hierarchy seems to grow taut the further back in the office you look. Given that they are an astute set, they carry a tough defense between you and your much needed funds.

Watch out that you don't become trapped in the infamous run-around. Trace your agony! Where is it coming from? Who produced it? Where is your application for funds now? Have the secretaries call through the system and save your steps. Some Civil Service secretaries only work part-time. If your revision was given to a part-time worker, you may be told that your credit cards will be ready in 48 hours from the time you sign your award letter. However, it's been 168 hours and I still haven't received my credit cards. The part-time secretary can't make any predictions since she isn't there to type these forms every day.

After attending three colleges, I believe that state universities are the most difficult to attain funds from. If you want funds, these are some things you ought to consider:

- (1) Where are your funds coming from?
- (2) How long does each system take to negotiate?
- (3) Raise questions! Don't be satisfied with the "try again tomorrow's."
- (4) Before you run around—call around.
- (5) Who has your application now? The counselor, back, secretary or who?
- (6) Know your given time periods! Follow-up the 48 hour predictions.
- (7) Understand that financial aid officers change areas of responsibility often.
- (8) Do something if you're dissatisfied

with the service you're getting. Know the chain of command!

Duane Willhite
Stubborn Senior, CSPA

Reactionary Siegel

I think commentaries serve a useful purpose, but I also think they should be written factually, and a little less emotionally than Lee Siegel's piece on Dr. Timothy Leary.

As I read the commentary, I got the feeling Siegel had no real reason for disagreeing with Leary's philosophies and theories other than that he thought Leary had gone off his rocker. Siegel leans heavily on loaded words and emotional phrases such as "my god," "horseshit," and "lies," which tend to make Siegel sound utterly reactionary, rather than responsible.

But the real injustice done to Leary by Siegel was his inaccuracy in quoting, and lack of research for supportive facts. Siegel wrote, "Dr. Leary, prominent psychologist is a philosopher, and all philosophers, worth their salt, he (Leary) says, belong in jail." If Siegel had remembered the film interview, or read the script available for reading at the Oregon Prisoner's Coalition office, he would have discovered Leary didn't say "belong" at all. As a matter of fact, Leary said it's not a hopeful society that keeps its philosophers locked up.

Siegel then goes on to describe Leary's ideas in terms of "Jesus Freak's plaintive cries," and as a "Space Fantasy." Siegel couldn't possibly have read Leary's books *Neurologic* or *Starseed*, also available at OPC, since Mr. Siegel doesn't seem to be fully aware of Leary's philosophies or theories...or at least he doesn't mention them.

And as for saying Leary lied when he claimed he never advocated the use of LSD, I'd be interested in seeing Siegel produce a quote, something factual, to prove Leary was lying. Many of the other generalizations in Siegel's commentary would have been more believable and potent had they been backed up with concrete evidence. But, of course, that would mean Siegel would have had to read something Leary had actually written.

I don't believe a responsible journalist would try to influence public opinion without knowing what he/she was talking about. As for Lee Siegel's responsibility, it

Gremlin Village

THANKYOU FOR ATTENDING THIS UNSCHEDULED NEWS CONFERENCE AS YOU KNOW, WATERGATE HAS GENERATED WHAT'S KNOWN AS AN "UPPER LEVEL MANAGEMENT CRISIS..."



ONE OF THE MANY ACHIEVEMENTS OF MY ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN AN UNPRECEDENTED LEVEL OF DÉTENTE (WHICH YOU GENTLEMEN CHOOSE TO IGNORE.) WELL, AS A RESULT OF THIS RAPPROCHEMENT, I AM PROUD TO ANNOUNCE...



THE PRESIDENT CAN HANDLE IT, LET THERE BE NO MISTAKE ABOUT THAT! HOWEVER, IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF AMERICA, IT IS TIME TO ACT DECISIVELY IN THIS MATTER.



THE MERGER OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION! MY FRIEND MR. BREZHNEV WILL BE THE NEW WATERGATE PROSECUTOR!



may be best to do one's own research, rather than be swayed by Siegel's shallow emotional reactions.

Paula Morey

LSAT rip-off

Many students completing their senior year are looking at the alternatives for the future. One of those alternatives may be law school.

Law school is a highly exclusive institution. Only a few of those who apply may go.

At Oregon all applicants are required to take the Law School Admission Test (LSAT). This seems fair enough but at least one aspect of the process involved seems completely out of line. I am speaking of the LSAT seminar. This is a two-day course offered by professionals in the legal profession to persons who are going to take the LSAT. The intent of the course is to give the participant a preview of the test and its methodology. The assumption for anyone who takes the course is that they will have some advantage over other persons when the LSAT

is administered. The course costs \$85 or \$60 if you can show a lack of financial resources. The course is being offered in Portland this year prior to the Dec. LSAT administration. This is an additional \$10 for the round trip. Add to this the regular fees for LSAT and Law School Data Assembly Service and the whole cost for the hopeful applicant is a basic \$22 plus a possible \$70 to \$95 if he wishes to have the advantage of the seminar on LSAT.

Apparently the legal profession is willing to practice discrimination against the lower and middle income students through allowance of this course offering. How many normal students can afford \$60 to \$85 for a two-day seminar? Not many. On the other hand there are quite a few wealthy parents willing to shell out the bucks to see that their boy or girl gets in to law school. These people should not be denied the right to their wealth. But they should be denied the built in social advantages that their wealth breeds. ABA are you listening?

Darrel Murray
Senior—Political Science
686-8298