Letters to the editor

Symbol must be abolished

To the Editor:

The Civil War has been over for more than a hundred years. Reconstruction came and supposedly ended. The Constitution guaranteed Black men their freedom, and history proceeded, but apparently MTSU has not been notified that the Civil War is over, Nathan Bedford is dead, the tune Dixie is outdated, and the only useful function of the Confederate flag is to serve as kindling, since you persist in flaunting these symbols of oppression, degeneration, hatred, and ignorance before the Black students of this campus.

Symbols reverent?

To you, the White man, these symbols are seemingly reverent, reminding you of past glory, white supremacy, and they may even give you a faint glimmer of hope that someday "the South shall rise again." To the Black man, these symbols represent bondage, exploitation of the Black woman, the selling of their children, lynching, the KuKlux Klan, and the murder that still lurks in most of your hearts.

Nathan Bedford Forrest is dead. Yet, at MTSU, his memory lives on! Pictures of him are pasted, nailed, and sealed on practically every object pertaining to this university. This is the school mascot, the mascot which symbolizes our university, Forrest is the great white leader who headed the Ku Klux Klan in its first stages of development. The Klan is known for its notorious misdeeds against Black humanity.

Killing spirit

Forrest killed our Black ancestors, and now, in 1971, his spirit along with the white racists on this campus and in this community are conspiring to kill us again, not the physical kind of death that would be too kind, but the agonizing death which slowly seeps throughout the mind and eventually crushes and represses the Black man's dignity and pride.

We refuse to go

Some whites say this man is not offensive to them. But, let them remember old Nathan didn't get his kicks from terrorizing, burning, maiming and murdering White people. His crimes were committed against the Black man. . . .supposedly to keep him in his place. Perhaps, this is what the great white fathers of this university are trying to do now. But we refuse to go!

Black students are an integral part of this university. They come here to learn, to improve their lot, and hopefully to gain some knowledge of life. However, these learning experiences are clouded with bigotry and injustice. Unlike White freshmen who are traditionally presented with a "beanie" and little status, the Black freshman has a "badge of slavery" pinned to his chest and given no status.

Let it rest

It would seems as if the University, in using this symbol, is trying to exacerbate and create ill feeling against the Black students on this campus. We do not want to be reminded of the old south. We, as a race, are no longer a part of it, and neither should you be apart of a long dead relic. The old south is dead! Let it rest with the rotting bones of those fools who fought and wished to keep it so.

This symbol must be abolished. Its meaning and importance is ludicrous. I recommend that the Confederate soldiers on this campus stop fighting the Civil War and start looking for a purposeful cause!

Marcella Caldwell
Box 4777

Editor's Note:

The school mascot is Lord Byron, a St. Bernard acquired this year.

National Perspective

Agnew's defense: counter offensive

By Jim Leonhirth

Bill Brock's blasts at the networks, as reported last week, were preliminaries for a frontal assault by Spiro Agnew Thursday and Friday.

On Thursday, Agnew devoted a half-hour of a speech in Boston to a denunciation of "The Selling of the Pentagon" and other CBS documentaries. In his speech, he accused CBS of falsifying one incident in the documentary, "Hunger in America."

On Friday, the Vice-president charged CBS president Frank Stanton with "non-response" to his charges concerning the documentaries.

He further charged that "The Selling of the Pentagon" was "a clever propaganda attempt to discredit the defense establishment of the United States."

United Press International quoted Agnew as saying, "I believe the American public is entitled to have these serious accusations either admitted or denied by the network. They will not be satisfied with another non-response from Mr. Stanton."

Agnew's defensive manueverings against the content of "The Selling of the Pentagon" certainly raises questions not only of the documentary's veracity but also of the Vice-president's tactics.

In the documentary, the military establishment was indicted for its frequent use of funds to "sell" the American people on its programs.

The documentary cited case after case in which the Pentagon had utilized vast public relation operations to win public support.

Neither the Pentagon nor Agnew has done very much to in any way refute these charges. They have, with the help of Brock, set the scene for this counter-offensive.

Indeed, Brock's role in this whole escapade is interesting especially if there appears in two years to be a need in Washington for a southern-based, conservative, pro-Nixon Republican willing to endure the "slings and arrows" of a puppet's role.

Whatever Brock's role, however, if Stanton is guilty of "non-response," then certainly Agnew is guilty of recrimination, in avoiding charges with counter-charges.

To paraphrase Agnew himself, the American public is entitled to have these serious accusations either admitted or denied by the government. They will not be satisfied with another recrimination from Mr. Agnew.

Lynch is half right

To the Editor:

In Jim Lynch's interesting story on the Morehead freshman basketball team (SIDELINES, March 16, 1971), he writes that one could "question the worthiness of such teams as Somerset Community College (who?) or Alice Llyod (sic) College (sounds like a girl's school)." Well, Jim will be interested in hearing that he is half right (again!).

When I taught there, 1958-1960, Caney Junior College, now named after its found Mrs. Alice Spencer Ceddes Lloyd, it was a girls' school and a boys' school; the sexes were segregated (except for a few advanced sophomore classes such as Twentieth Century Europe).

Jim might also like to know that the school was founded during World War I as a private self-help project for Appalachia long before the Federal Government invented any of its projects, and has prospered ever since.

The school's location is interesting, Jim: it is located in Pippa Passes, Kentucky, and I hope you remember Browning's poem. Perhaps Alice Lloyd College is not famous, but when I coached intramural basketball there we had some fine players; I've seen worse games in a local gym.

Frederic Crawford
Associate Professor
Box 142

Aseltine fiction: what is--is right

To the Editor:

Beneath Professor Aseltine's analysis of the "AAUP/YSA imbroglio" lies a logic and rationale both fragmented and ter rifying. His argument proceeds from an observation on the nature of communication, a process or act composed of fact: "what is stated"; the medium; "how it is said, the context in which it is said"; and the imagination/fiction: "what may be left unsaid."

Apparently Professor Aseltine has placed credence in "what may be left unsaid", for he has studiously avoided the stated fact. The fact ("what is stated") is the right of a group to express its ideas in an open forum; supposedly, a university is an open forum where ideas or facts can be bandied about.

The problem with the Professor's analysis is that it does not address itself to a definition of academic freedom, nor does it come to grips with the function of the university in relation to academic freedom. To be sure, he states that the university is an extension of "the larger public," and it is from this assumption that the fiction springs, a fiction bred of necessity and of the premise: what is--is right.

Out of such a static concept grows the dictum that the in-group should and shall prevail. What one has then is a neatly conceptualized program for in-group supremacy, a supremacy not to be challenged by ideas inimical to the in-group, and a program santified in the name of "the larger public."

The terrifying aspect of such a rationale is that it will, in the end, isolate the out-group. The purpose, then, of Constitutionally guaranteed rights (and derivative rights such as academic freedom) is to provide a means of integration of out-group ideas into the in-group schema, and thus lessen the likelihood of isolation and its concomitant violence.

The fiction of Professor Aseltine's analysis lies in its divorce from the actual humanistic framework of legal and individual rights.

C. A. Martin
Box 2984

Our Man Hoppe

President Farquahar shares democracy

By Arthur Hoppe

A new era in American foreign relations dawned with the overwhelming election in 1972 of Hiram Farquahar to the White House.

Farquahar was by far and away the most honest and patriotic Presidential candidate the Nation had ever seen. But what endeared him to all factions was his shining love of Democracy. No President had ever loved democracy more.

It thus came as no surprise that in his Inaugural Address, President Farquaher, like his predecessors, pledged to keep boming the smithereens out of Vietnam.

"As every President in the past decade has made clear," he said, "the sole reason we are in Vietnam is to insure that the Vietnamese people are able to choose their own leaders in free and democratic elections. As one who worships democracy, they have my promise that they'll get it -- if we have to go on bombing them for another 50 years."

The very next day, the South Vietnamese Ambassador, Wone Gho Hoam, called on the new President.

* * *

"Sir," he said nervously, "I wish to express the gratitude of my peoples for all the bombs you are lavishing on us to bring us democracy. But we feel we are being selfish."

"Selfish?" said the President, surprised.

Arthur Hoppe is a syndicated columnist whose column is featured in the SIDELINES editorial pages. "Our Man Hoppe" is copyrighted by Chronicle Features Syndicate.

"There are so many nations, big and small, that don't have democracy these days," said the Ambassador with a hopeful smile. "Why pick on us?"

"By George, you're right!" cried the President. And he called a meeting of his National Security Council. "Gentlemen," he said, "which countries have democracy and which countries need it?"

"Well, sir," said the Secretary of State, "Greece is ruled by a junta, Spain by the Falangists, Haiti by Papa Doc. . ."

"Greece, the ancient seat of democracy, doesn't have it?" said the President, aghast. "Spain, the land of Goya and Hemingway? Our lovable Haitian neighbors? How could we have forsaken these beloved Free World allies?"

"Well, sir," said the Defense Secretary, frowning, "what with the in Vietnam. . ."

"What's good for the Vietnamese is certainly good for the Greeks, the Spaniards and the Haitians," snapped the President. And he ordered three new invasions forthwith.

The public, which had approved of fighting for democracy in Vietnam, naturally approved of fighting for it in Greece, Spain and Haiti. All might have gone well had not a White House aide (some suspect he was a Communist agent) slipped the President a list of other allies who were undemocratic.

U.S. invasions of Portugal, Iran, Taiwan and 13 African nations followed. As for South America, the problem there seemed so monumental, the President finally decided it could be solved only with 27 thermonuclear bombs.

* * *

World War III appeared imminent. For the President had discovered Soviet Russia wasn't a true democracy. "Dispatch all remaining troops and aircraft to attack Moscow," he ordered grimly.

All remaining troops, both of them, were warming up their Piper cub when Mrs. Farquahar said, "But, dear, the Russians are our enemies. Isn't democracy too good for them?" And, fortunately, the invasion was called off.

The Free World, however, was a shambles. Martial law prevailed for decades everywhere until democracy one again blossomed forth, as it usually does, of its own accord.

President Farquahar, disgraced, was succeeded by President Mark Hawkins, who wisely pledged to "preserve democracy at home and fight for it abroad only in those nations we don't like."