While Captain and Mates Squabble, UA Ship Set Adrift

COLUMN BY ANDERS HOVE

"What we were elected to do, we are going to do, and let others squawk in Watergate," asserted Assistant Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication, summer of 1973. That was long before the "smoking gun" tape had become public knowledge. Compare Nixon's remarks with those of Undergraduate Association President Hans C. Godfrey and Treasurer Shubham Chitaley, who were enmeshed in the finfall controversy, end of the UA, accomplished two things: They eerily raised the life of Finboard Chair Dr. James G. Kessler '94, and they destroyed what credibility the Still had as a forum for student issues.

Like many Americans with Nixon just after Watergate, I was inclined to give Godfrey and the UA the benefit of the doubt on this one. True, there was no reason to keep the Bush fund secret, but Godfrey said as much in his interview with The Tech. Nor did I object to the way Godfrey spent his money. What's more, Kessler's tactics in releasing emails may have been private information and not lamenlable. Nevertheless, Kessler is a human being.

He believed that keeping public the details of the Bush fund would serve the public interest. He made a noble attempt, he admitted it, he has apologized, and now he has resigned.

This having been said, it is hardly difficult to understand why Kessler chose the course he took. Kessler and Chitaley detest each other. Members of Finboard found deals with the UA difficult. Kessler felt he had the duty and the authority to release what information he had. Consultations with Chitaley probably seemed counter-productive. For his part, Chitaley could not release the damage was done. The Bush fund controversy should have been water under the bridge.

Instead two public UA meetings were dominated by vituperative shouting matches between Kessler and Chitaley. Godfrey had contended that the storm would not blow over until he saw the Kessler's resignation. Chitaley wanted to go further by suspending Kessler. Chitaley also claimed that Kessler's actions were illegal, and thus wanted to take a case involving the FCC in the late 70's, the Supreme Court ruled that it was constitu-

tional to subject to governmental censorship, broadcast and, "in the public interest of the content of television and movies. Unlike the Supreme Court, firmly believe that there should be regulation of content in television programs and movies. If nothing else, Godfrey entertains the notion that such controls on the entertainment industry constitute "a blatant act of censorship and a violation of First Amendment freedom of speech and the press." Apparently, Stevenson feels that censorship is not absolute. The Supreme Court, however, thinks otherwise.
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