Take a chance

It appears an Ill wind blew up from Washington. University President John F. Johnson seems to have opened the doors on a new college of education.

Whatever one's personal view of conservatism and military service, there is little doubt that the Selective Service Act, due to expire in June is a hodge podge of inequities warmed by a quirky quail of deferments. The need for a re-evaluation of the entire system has been painfully evident since Vietnam flared up.

Some of the proposed changes have obvious merit: Drafting from the younger age groups, particularly those 16 and 17, is certainly desirable; at progressively higher age levels responsibilities, commitments, and final pain greater. Logic should be replaced by a more homogenously centrally directed bureau to insure a more uniform policy.

The principle concern of most students now in school has been left hanging—the question of student undergraduate deferments. With that is the merit of a strict lottery system designed to eliminate many of the present injustices by creating a "fair and impartial random" (FAIR) selection of all eligible men. However, a lottery could not only blind Just and right as well. As the Ripon Society's report on the draft has pointed out, a lottery merely substitutively impose injustices for human injustices.

This system itself is not an inherently bad device, but it needs to be tempered by a workable scale in deciding just who is eligible for the pool. Of the one and a half million men who reach draft age every year, you might as well call it. There is room for a limited deferment policy on both an underground and an academic basis.

We do not believe that all students should be drafted. Not every college student is a student. But, an army is raised, and maintained to promote the general defense. That welfare needs a body of educators is also a fact. Whatever one's personal view of conscription, the draft stated: (The lottery) "would merely create a 'fair and impartial random' system with the same amount of bias as the present system."

I have heard the comment that there are nine people energetic enough to write letters to the editor. I am enclosing a fax reply to Mr. Rehm's comments. For the last time, I say that our cheerleaders are definitely superior -- and that is a fact. However, I was not impressed by certain other portions of that letter. I refer specifically to your literary and dramatic reviews. The second through sixteenth paragraphs of your review of "Lucky William" were a plot summary. "Lucky William" is not, and was not to be tolerated by a respectable literary and dramatic reviews. The first act to be badly lacking. At the end of the third act I sensed that it is almost to the limit of the control intelligence. Mr. Humphries was the problem in hearing what was said. I sat in the fourth row, so I don't think that this problem can wholly be laid to the distance from the stage.

Also, when the Malamudists are seeing their greatest scene, they are split in two, each half going opposite of the other. Perhaps Mr. Humphries intended to have a larger number of people, although I am not sure how the audience was to be aware of the situation as it seemed to be only a definite echo effect.

Let us be better in the future. George D. J. Phillips Jr.

Review of review:

I would like to voice a disagreement with your Miss O showing on your review of Tech show. I do not know if you have been largely invalid, but did not extend far enough. I found the major part of the first act to be badly lacking. At the end of the third act I sensed that it is almost to the limit of the control intelligence. Mr. Humphries was the problem in hearing what was said. I sat in the fourth row, so I don't think that this problem can wholly be laid to the distance from the stage.

Also, when the Malamudists are seeing their greatest scene, they are split in two, each half going opposite of the other. Perhaps Mr. Humphries intended to have a larger number of people, although I am not sure how the audience was to be aware of the situation as it seemed to be only a definite echo effect.

Let us be better in the future. George D. J. Phillips Jr.