By Alex Makowski

Friday afternoon's three-way joust between SDS, the administration, and all those visiting Cornell professor Ulric Bronfenbrenner was certainly the highlight of the week—more noteworthy events, in items of numbers of people, to take place on campus. It offers an opportunity for comment on both news reporting and the SDS, casting light on some of the critical techniques inherent in the former and the inescapable bankruptcy of the latter.

Often an objective news story can prove a very frustrating vehicle for a reporter trying to present his observations. A number of his "facts" are often so personal that it is difficult to confirm of prove. Including them in a news story invites charges of slanted reporting, and since there has been no move to back up his story than his word and the opinions of other observers.
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