

# PERFECTION

continued from page 2

Well, the discussion which followed seemed to end with one answer. The media has a very large and wide-ranging effect, and the effect of television is even larger and more wide-ranging. Television is the most dynamic form of the media and I feel I can safely say that it reaches more people than the written media. So what am I leading up to? It is this-- I can see where it is possible that out whole country could be led by controlling what is seen and heard on television, provided that the things being put forward are not too preposterous or too radical so as to be immediately identifiable as an attempt to draw the public. Now you might say that what I am proposing is nonsense and cannot happen in a free country. Hopefully this is true, but I fear it is not. In the past there have been executives of great papers who have been quoted as saying that their particular publication could make or break a person (usually a political candidate), could create a cause or a situation, could in effect lead the public. And if all this can be done with a less effective media than television, imagine what could be done through the use of television. Another example of the television media's dynamic power can be found in the field of politics. I remember reading or hearing about a particular election in which a one-time astronaut who had turned to politics was running against a well-to-do but not very well known businessman. Polls taken a while before the election showed a definite lead was held by the astronaut and yet in the end after a massive television campaign, the businessman won. He was sold to the public at 15, 30, and 60 second intervals much the same as soap, cars, and 18-hour girdles. I do not want to convey the impression that he was the wrong man for the job--I am not in a position to say. I preferred the other candidate---the election took place far from me and was related to me, perhaps to the detriment of my argument, by a form of the media. Still the

point I wish to make is that the public is too easily led. What I would like to see is a more aware, a more conscientious, a more objective public. "Well and nice," you say, "so would everybody else." I say not everybody, because almost everybody doesn't care. Have you ever walked into a person's house and found it with almost every item you've seen advertised on television? This has happened to me more than once and I have been appalled at the money that must have been wasted. While working at a supermarket in the past I have watched as the masses bear down upon the latest gimmick advertised even if its possible use was of questionable nature and not much later seen it lying upon the side of the road discarded. Now you might say "Why then hasn't the country gone down the drain if this gloomy picture I paint is true?" The reason, I feel, is this: Thankfully, most programming as put on television is of its own objective nature. I have found for the most part that the press holds an objective nature for the very reason that it realizes the power it has and as a matter of fact is very proud of its objectivity--and perhaps rightly so. I use the word press to describe those whose input makes the media, for I know of no other title and I use the word media basically in reference to television, without excluding all the other media.

Because the press is aware, conscientious and objective, it is not an excuse for us not to be. The other day a television announcer was attacking in a commentary certain increased spending policies of a very unpopular institution, the defense department. He stated that present spending on weapons was sufficient; no additional spending should be needed over and above last year's level. I would have agreed with him wholeheartedly but for one fact: the increased spending was not for weapons. Rather it was for veteran benefits. I became aware of this fact previous to this commentary in a newspaper which had done a study of budget spending in government.

What I am attempting to show

is that television is not infallible. It is an instrument of man and is only as perfect as the man or his argument. Television is not knowledgeable, is not aware, is not objective, it is only as good as the man/men behind it. So let's remember this: accept it for its benefits, but be aware of its limitations. This goes for all forms of the media, even that which is written here.

## ODE TO A STREAKER

by Maria Rovito

Out of the night, under stars  
bright,  
Dashes the streaker, quick  
footed and light.  
Dancing and laughing, full of  
gay mirth,  
Wearing the clothes of the day  
of his birth.

Seeing his fans, he slows and  
he waves  
Like an old master, greeting  
his slaves.  
He runs and leaps, whirling in  
air  
Doing his ballet without a care.

Circling the dorm, he runs  
around twice  
A true phenomenon, fearing  
men nor mice.  
But alas, he realizes, it's  
time to go  
For security is coming, and the  
wind's begun to blow.

He turns to the crowd, and with  
a brave smile  
Seems to be saying, "I'll be  
back in a while."  
Security has arrived, and it's  
he that they'll get  
So the brave little streaker  
streaks into sunset.

Farewell to thee, my streaker  
friend,  
You have my love until the end.  
Until the sun has ceased to shine  
Then, only, then, will you  
cease to be mine.

**NEW  
HORIZONS**

**ON SALE NOW  
COLLEGIAN OFF.  
50¢**