

# OREGON DAILY EMERALD

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the Emerald and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the ASUO or the University. Opinions expressed in signed columns are those of the writer.

CHUCK BEGGS, Editor

KENNETH M. FOBES  
Business Manager

BOB CARL  
Managing Editor

LOUIE ABRAMSON  
Advertising Manager

JOE FRAZIER  
News Editor

PHIL SEMAS  
Associate Editor

ALLEN BAILEY  
Associate Editor

Page 10

University of Oregon, Eugene, Thursday, October 21, 1965

## Insufficient Funds

*People Who Write Bad Checks at the Co-op or Student Union  
Should Be Prosecuted Under the Conduct Code*

When a student steals a book from another student, he may be sanctioned by student courts under the Student Conduct Code. But when a student steals a book from the Co-op Bookstore, or writes a bad check at the Student Union, present policy is that his case should be handled in Eugene courts, since the Co-op is not owned by the University.

That would be fine if the Co-op didn't have very many bad checks or very many books stolen. But last year the Co-op lost \$680 in bad checks and had a large number of books stolen. The Student Union lost \$125 in bad checks. Most of these are checks of small amounts and prosecuting a large number of small checks is not practical for either the SU or the Co-op.

The reason such cases are kept out of student courts is a bit of rather poor logic, which maintains that "since the Co-op is not University-owned, it shouldn't have recourse to the Student Conduct Program." A similar theory is held for the Student Union, which is considered not part of the University when it comes to bad checks. This policy was set by University President Arthur S. Flemming, not by the Student Conduct Committee.

The whole point hinges on a section in the "philosophy" part of the Conduct Code, which says that when a student violates a law in the "wider community" he should be prosecuted by civil authorities. Since the Co-op and Student Union are defined as not University-related when it comes to bad checks, they are part of the "wider community" and must use the civil courts.

What's wrong with this piece of logic is that it's stretching things to say that the Co-op and the SU aren't part of the University.

This argument overlooks the fact that the Co-op is owned entirely by students. It seems logical to us that stealing from the Co-op, which is owned by students, is the same as stealing from individual students and should be punished through the student court system.

And the Student Union is financed out of student fees and is run, at least in part by a student board and staff.

Both the Student Union Board and the Co-op plan to go before the Conduct Committee in the near future to request that their cases be handled through the student court system. We recommend that the Conduct Committee approve their request.



"MY GRANDDAD SAYS THIS SEWER USED TO BE A RIVER."

## Letters to the Editor

### No Coverage

Emerald Editor:

I am shocked that the Emerald Wednesday gave absolutely no coverage to the open forum which took place on Viet Nam in room 150 Science following Mr. Johnson's speeches in the SU. There was also no mention of the question and answer period immediately following Mr. Johnson's first speech. These items are at least as newsworthy as his speech and, to some of us, even more so. Again, the Emerald has just plain failed in one of its functions. It certainly makes no attempt to give all the campus news, but evidently picks and chooses according to unknown criteria.

The question and answer period following Mr. Johnson's speech consisted of members of the audience writing their

questions on slips of paper provided and faculty member Scott Nobles selecting those to be read to Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson replied to these and the audience sat in courteous silence for another 45 minutes. There was, in reality, no communication between the speaker and the University audience.

The forum sponsored by the Faculty-Student Committee to End the War in Viet Nam lasted about one hour and contained just that ingredient lacking at the formal session—back and forth communication. (Mr. Johnson, of course, was too tired to attend.) After a few brief statements from three members of our faculty, the floor was open to the audience and the audience responded! I was surprised to see that over 100 people from

(Continued on page 11)

Phil Brandt

## We Must Look at the 'Wider Picture' in Viet Nam

**Editor's note:** This column is a reply to a group of three letters which appeared on this page Oct. 14. The letters were submitted by Jim O'Brien, a graduate student in finance at the University. The letters involved an exchange between O'Brien and Lt. Col. Leon Utter of the Second Battalion of the Second Marines stationed in Viet Nam.

O'Brien wrote Utter's company, complimenting them on their "use of guerrilla warfare tactics and public reconstruction activities" in ending Viet Cong influence and reassuring them that all U.S. college students are not opposed to the war in Viet Nam. O'Brien had read about this in a news story. Utter replied, thanking O'Brien for the letter and told telling how it lifted morale in his battalion.

I read Mr. O'Brien's comments with surprise and with some disbelief at his unfortunate uniformed state. I think he neglects several important aspects of the war in Viet Nam and the men in the war.

Incidental to this is the unanswerable question of the amount of censuring done to his original "news story" source as well as that done by the military to Lt. Col. Utter's letter.

Whether we like it or not, the public is given material that expresses the optimum image of "how - well - we - are - doing" concerning the war in Viet Nam.

My main points are, first, that having recently returned from a two-year tour of duty in Southeast Asia as a member of the U.S. Peace Corps and having made a special personal pro-

ject of informally interviewing a number of people on the subject of the war in Viet Nam, the articles presented are not compatible with my personal findings.

### Wider Concept"

Second, Mr. O'Brien has failed to consider the "wider concept" of this war in relation to American foreign policy in Southeast Asia.

This latter point is too complex to deal with in this column, but I should like to note that for the past few months a "War of Liberation" has been declared in the country of Thailand by an organization similar to the National Liberation Front of South Viet Nam.

Currently, the U.S. has perhaps a thousand "advisors" and troops stationed in Thailand plus there are two or three crucial "SEATO" defense air-bases, manned by U.S. and British personnel and equipment. It is a known fact in Thailand that these bases serve as initiating points for fighter-bomber raids into Viet Nam, both North and South. This has its clear implications.

### In Viet Nam

But to deal with the first point. A friend and I visited Laos and Viet Nam briefly and spent time in Thailand. I talked to people who expressed both pro and con points of view concerning the war.

One group, the cons, were members of the International Voluntary Service. The other, the pros, were G.I.'s on leave U.S./AID officials from Laos and Viet Nam.

Let me explain the International Voluntary Service or IVS. This is an organization

structured as the Peace Corps but differing in that it is a privately sponsored institution. This means simply that its Volunteers may be sent into areas where Peace Corps cannot go, such as Viet Nam and Laos. Currently, there are perhaps 60 to 100 Volunteers in the two countries.

It is a proven fact, and I have proof, that none of these Volunteers has ever been molested by the Viet Cong or the Pathet Lao, although Volunteers work in areas under dominion by these forces.

### Special Precautions

In fact, the Viet Cong take special precautions not to involve these Volunteers in any battle or fighting that may be taking place in a Volunteer's area. This is because "we know that these Volunteers are working for the good of the people," a quote from an article in a newspaper put out in Viet Nam.

Briefly, an IVS Volunteer's role is seen as a white man who eats, sleeps, works, talks, and involves himself with the native people. He speaks fluently in the native language, has a technical competence in a variety of fields, has learned about the culture of the area in which he works and knows his role, or how the people with whom he works view him. This is because he communicates to them.

His job is to help stimulate village projects and programs of change, of technological benefit, within the village structure. He does not sponsor a village project but attempts to stimulate the villagers to sponsor it. This takes time and much negotiation among the

ancient, established village leaders and institutions. It also takes sensitivity.

### Enduring Landmark

Once a project is accomplished it presents an enduring landmark in the village's eyes, a matter for history and legends.

Unfortunately the men of Utter's battalion cannot work in this way. It is an irrefutable argument that the Marines do not speak fluent Vietnamese, much less are they fluent or even slightly versed in any of a hundred local dialects. It is also irrefutable that they do not live, eat and sleep among the villagers. They must have their own mess, tents, and liquor supply.

What is true is that a big smile, pieces of bubble gum and bundles of cloth, and wads of money, especially on big, white men, do interest people in Asia.

Unfortunately, it is almost standard now that this image, put into uniform (of which most people of Viet Nam are fearful in a colloquial way) sets the individual up for a swift swindle. Giving away money, toys, etc., to ragged-looking kids and grownups, of which there are 500 million in Southeast Asia alone, excluding China, is no assurance of loyalty.

### Typical Project

A typical "reconstruction" project of Utter's consists of dozens of marine descending upon a pre-selected village early one morning complete with the latest in technological tools and pre-fab building materials and, presto, almost overnight, a shiny school of cemented-well appears.

This presents a startling contrast to the IVS way in which dozens of natives, using cruder

implements and a longer period of time, produce a small earth and stone structure.

This is the native way. The other is the alien way, an uninvited way, and a resent-building way of 'development' by meddling in the colloquial way of life. There is no communication in an alien way. There is merely a chaotic, undisciplined showpiece.

Perhaps I appear too strongly in favor of the IVS method; however, this other way of development has been tried by the Americans for years without success. One is proven, one is not.

### Range of Comment

A truer picture of G.I. activity in these countries can be more easily understood very obviously, I think, by examining the intelligent "range" of comments of Utter's men quoted to us by Utter. Also, the more typical image of the G.I. in Asia, land of pleasure, is to be found in such places as the bars of Saigon, Bangkok and various, more unpublicized towns, and in such papers as the Bangkok World.

This is of a whoring, drunken, free-spending white man, a "frrong," derogatory, seen fighting in a bar over Vietnamese "prostitute."

Unfortunately it is not their fault, they have not been college-trained, but are merely the mercenaries of "Men-in-the-Pentagon."

They are mercenaries. Most G.I.s are difficult to speak to intelligently for they have been benumbed by the incessant droe of military life. Many are not aware that political issues have two sides.