

★★★Heavenly Maxwell★★★

By JOHN LYNCH

Last week's edition of the Outlook presented Webster Trammell's (the Director of Student Activities) account of the infamous Maxwell Taylor affair. I participated in the matter and feel obligated to differ with several points made in the report and offer some pertinent observations that might facilitate a larger and more objective view.

But before that, I must state unequivocally that I am a civil libertarian and fully uphold the Constitutional right of Maxwell Taylor to speak anywhere he desires. Of course, I, like many others present, wanted him to finish his speech because we came prepared to bring him to account for his atrocities as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the question and answer period that was scheduled to follow. However, I still think that the format he was to use reflected poor judgement on the part of those responsible for the arrangements and that if unaborted, it would have represented a clearly unbalanced event. The fact that it was Earth Day only heightened emotions and dramatized the onesidedness of the affair. Nevertheless, I believe in the First Amendment so completely that I would have been perfectly willing to extend this same tolerance to Joseph Stalin, Eric Eichman, General Ky or any other of history's numerous butchers. I feel this way despite the fact that I disagree with most of what General Taylor stands for and that the war policy he helped formulate is directly responsible for the deaths of over forty thousand of our youth and the violation of our most fundamental Constitutional rights via an illegal war and unjust draft.

The First Amendment is an indispensable right and is prerequisite to every other form of freedom provided for by the Constitution. Without it little remains and the distinction between democracy and dictatorship blurs.

First of all, General Taylor's Constitutional rights were not violated. True, he was heckled (especially after a particularly tasteless remark that he opened with). Yes, there were at least two incidents of individuals vigorously protesting both what the General represented and the basic format of the program. It

is also true that a large segment of the audience was hostile and that they gave every indication of making him earn his fee. But the fact of the matter remains that the General left the podium of his own volition and could well have continued with his remarks. Nobody attempted to stop him from speaking and most of the actual commotion on the state was a, before the speech and b, peripheral to his actual act of speaking and the crux of it centered on the Administration's obstinate refusal to reconsider the controversial format.

The General is a seasoned speaker and if he had really wanted to talk, it is hard to imagine that he would not have. Personally, I think that General Taylor was so outraged by the spectacle of rebellious and undisciplined long-hairs that he felt insecure and had to muster all of his emotional reserves in order to project the tranquil cool that he ressonated. Most of the young people that the General has had contact with had crew-cuts and combat fatigues, and he was able to order them around: Pollak Hall, that night, shot down his ego.

Frankly, to speak of Free Speech at Monmouth College is to deal in an abstraction. It does not exist. You don't believe me? Try starting an organization that differs with the status quo or the Establishment. Try distributing leftist literature. Try writing an uncensored newspaper. Try holding a protest meeting or organizing an "unapproved" event. Do so and you will quickly reach the conclusion that most of your First Amendment rights stop at the gates of Monmouth College. What rights do exist are doled out by the Administration to all the good little boys and girls who don't rock the boat. Consequently, it dispenses this "privilege" to military recruiters and organizations like YAF and the Young Republicans but does not deem it in the "best interests of Monmouth College" to extend it further.

Thirdly, the fact that the event received "bad press" (as one Administrator put it to me) was solely due to the fact that most of the newspapers used the report issued by the Asbury Park Press. The report was clearly biased and inflammatory, and several of us wrote letters to the

editors protesting the thoroughly unprofessional coverage. It was probably a waste of paper because the Asbury Pig Press competes with the Daily News for reactionary distorting of events. Read its coverage of last summer's riots, the spring strike at Monmouth, or the recent disturbances at the local high schools. The editorial page is an accurate gauge of where the paper is at.

Lastly, no violence was planned by any of the activist groups on campus. In fact, if anything was planned, it was mindlessly formulated by the Administration through its collective arbitrariness and stubborn repression. Moral: when you treat people like children, fail to adapt to just demands or changing conditions and then confront these same students with a symbol of everything evil and wicked in this society, the results are explosive.

What happens in the future will depend largely on the Monmouth College Administration. If it continues to hide its head in the sand of the past and fails to change with the times, the Maxwell Taylor incident will be but a harbinger of things to come.