

# 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.

KENNETH M. FOBES  
Business Manager  
MAXINE ELLIOTT  
News Editor

CHUCK BEGGS, Editor  
BOB CARL  
Managing Editor  
PHIL SEMAS  
Associate Editor

LOUIE ABRAMSON  
Advertising Manager  
ALLEN BAILEY  
Associate Editor

Page 6

University of Oregon, Eugene, Monday, October 25, 1965

## Why We Endorse

In tomorrow's Emerald we will endorse candidates for the ASUO spring term elections. And we're sure that there'll be the usual objections by some people about those endorsements. In past years many have questioned our right to endorse and many more have wondered why we endorse.

It has been said that as the only newspaper in the University community, it is our duty to present both sides and that therefore we shouldn't endorse one candidate over another.

That argument, of course, can be extended to conclude that we shouldn't take stands on anything. We feel that not to present our viewpoint would be to vacate our responsibility as a newspaper, monopoly or not. Most American newspapers are monopoly newspapers. But that doesn't stop them from taking editorial stands and endorsing candidates.

We also make an effort to present both sides. We always allow candidates to have platform statements printed in the Emerald. And our letters columns are always open to any student who wishes to endorse any candidate, and to the candidates themselves.

Another argument usually advanced, especially in the fall, is that our endorsements carry more weight than they should with the freshman voters. Freshmen, it is reasoned, haven't been in the University long enough to be able to make voting decisions and take the Emerald's word on whom to vote for.

We are not, of course, the only group that endorses candidates. Until it disbanded last week, the Off-Campus Council always endorsed candidates. This fall the University's Young Republican group will endorse. And endorsement by individuals is common. We often see the names of student leaders, who criticize us for endorsing candidates, listed on posters and signs backing some candidate.

But we would be the last to dispute that the Emerald's endorsements carry more weight, since we've been doing it for a long time and our endorsements receive wider circulation than those of others.

If we may indulge in a moment of self-praise, that's the way we think it should be. We doubt if there's a campus group better qualified to endorse candidates than our editorial board. We have representatives of almost all groups, in addition to our editors, whose job it is to keep on top of campus news. In other words, we think these people have a better understanding of campus issues than any other group here.

If freshmen are going to base their votes strictly on somebody's endorsements (and we doubt if they do), we'd rather have them listen to our editorial board than anybody else. We feel that endorsements are a service, that we are presenting the views of experts on campus issues in order to have a better-informed electorate.

And so we will continue to endorse, because we feel it is our responsibility.



"IT'S NOT THE DANGER, MAN — IT'S THE HAIRCUT."

## Letters to the Editor

### No Right to Water Fight

Emerald Editor:

I have observed the campaign of Mr. Fred Long for water fight rights (and senator-at-large) with displeasure. It seems a wave of emotional furor has been developing amongst the campus Greeks over recent Emerald editorials. Heroically, Mr. Long has decided to place his hastily-constructed water fight platform at the crest of this wave, and ride it to an election victory.

Mr. Long seems to think that the Emerald editorial staff has no facts to back up its recent accusations that certain Greek organizations have been violating the Student Conduct Code. If the Emerald has no such facts, allow me to contribute a few:

About a week ago, while driv-

ing home from the university, I had the misfortune to pass a fraternity house where a water fight was in progress. I should have kept my windows rolled up. Weaving my way through about six or eight rowdies, trying to keep from hitting them, I was suddenly and deliberately struck in the face with a blast from a water compressor. Under any other circumstances I might have laughed this off. Under these circumstances I temporarily lost control of my car and swerved to the side of the road. A car traveling behind me almost hit the rowdies and almost rear-ended me. The words I use to describe this incident are much better chosen than those I used at its occurrence.

If Mr. Long thinks this is an isolated instance, it is not. Greeks, with whom I have spoken, have testified to the fact that other fraternity houses have been the sources of water balloons tossed indiscriminately at passing automobiles.

If someone were now to mention the word "Greek" to me, I could not possibly envision water fighters in the company of Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle. The Emerald is entirely right: the IFC has simply got to do something to improve the image of Greek organizations.

In closing, a word of advice for student voters: A vote for a candidate who campaigns seriously on a platform of water fight rights is not a vote. It is a water balloon tossed at the Student Senate. As for Mr. Long, I sincerely hope he is headed for a wipeout.

R. Gaines Smith  
Junior,  
Journalism-English

### Squirring

Emerald Editor:

O.K.—We give up. Here is the letter you have been fishing for with the editorials on the Greeks and the lovely front page articles on how we are all dying. Ask the I.M. program how dead we are, looking at the grades, ad infinitum.

If you want to see some squirring from the Greeks, I'm doing by best, but after three years of the same old story it's getting darn hard to make it look convincing.

Therefore, consider us squirring.

Yours on behalf of a student body that usually manages to take the Emerald or leave it.

Fred Ehlers  
Jr., Business Admin.

## Two Views of the Viet Nam Demonstrations

### Protests May Lengthen the War

Editor's Note: Scott Bartlett is a former college editor now a University student. In this column he comments on the Viet Nam demonstrations held last weekend.

By SCOTT BARTLETT

Very few individuals could fail to be moved by the often senseless carnage that has been characteristic of the war in Viet Nam.

The attempts to malign the protest movement with the indiscriminate brand of "Communist" must be considered unfortunate because they obscure the issues and strive to make illegitimate an irrefutably legitimate exercise of the Constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech.

Further, the decision of the Utah draft boards to "take a hard look" at any student draft deferments given to anti-Viet Nam demonstrators clearly shows their blatant disrespect for this freedom.

Still, no one could conceivably say that the most recent protests were representative of the public or university majority. Hardly.

Judging numerically, including Berkeley and Ann Arbor, and from the co-existent and equally vehement counter-protestants, the protests represented a decided, but vocal, minority, while misrepresenting the majority.

Tass's printing that "the mass action of Americans against the United States aggression in Viet Nam seems to have seriously worried official Washington," is a simple distortion of overall American sentiment.

### Hanoi Misled

Far more seriously, as James Reston has pointed out, Communist officials in Hanoi have been led to feel that anti-war demonstrations in the U.S. will force a vacillating Johnson to withdraw American forces.

Reston points out also that Hanoi may draw a parallel between the current crisis and the French conflict during the early 1950's. Ho Chi Minh and other leaders were encouraged by the internal anti-war opposition within France, and this Hanoi propaganda victory led to the French defeats from 1950 to 1953 and ultimately to the Dien Bien Phu disaster.

### Unmoving

Yet, the possibilities of Johnson's pulling out of Viet Nam as a result of internal pressure are non-existent. His April speech at Johns Hopkins, the lack of any affect on policy caused by the teach-ins, the military acceleration, and this week's expressed contempt for the lack of wisdom in the Viet Nam protests, hardly portray a vacillating figure.

(Continued on page 7)

### A Viet Nam Protester Writes to the President

Editor's Note: The following is a letter written by Mary Hamilton, a resident assistant in psychology at the University, to President Johnson concerning the Oct. 16-17 demonstrations against the war in Viet Nam.

President Johnson:

Last Saturday I participated in a protest demonstration against your policies in Viet Nam. There at Salem, Oregon, I saw the faces of those who support you. I heard them "catcall" former Congressman Charles Porter, and I watched them as they tried to shout down our speakers, and us, with cries of "Treason!"—"Drop the bomb!"—"A million troops in Viet Nam!" and "Hooray, hooray for the U.S.A.!" I saw, too, the hatred that these people felt towards me and my colleagues because we exercised our rights of free speech and free assembly. I saw, too, the signs of the Y.A.F. (Young Americans for Freedom) and those of the Young Republicans—the very groups who vehemently opposed your election while I and others like me were working hard for your defeat of Goldwater and everything he stood for.

Today I learned that you, too, feel that some kind of "treason," of "exploitation by Communists," or of "misunderstanding" motivates me and others who oppose you. You have aligned yourself with those who fought your election and you have betrayed the vote that others like myself once gave you. You will never have that vote again.

If I cannot vote my objections to my country's actions; if I must face cries of "treason" and "Communist" when I speak to ratify my conscience with and by my behavior; if I must fear violence from my fellows and investigation by my country's judiciary bodies because I utilize my right to dissent, then I am not free. And, then too, I must mourn the loss of my own freedom as much as I mourn the loss of freedom and self-determination being suffered by the Vietnamese people by the dictates of my country.

I tell you now, Mr. Johnson, I am no traitor. I am no Communist nor Communist "dupe." I am, however, an American who fears very much for her country and the world. I do not want it said of me in twenty years (as it is now said of the "silent German") that I failed to oppose my country as it carried out crimes against humanity or that I did not speak out against the fascist elements which grew stronger in the name of necessary "patriotism."

Twenty years ago, Adolf Hitler talked of the "international Jewish conspiracy." His people remained silent while the "Hitler Youth" suppressed all opposition to the Nazi goals and while the S.S. perpetrated their gross crimes against mankind. Today, it is

(Continued on page 7)

### Oregon Daily Emerald

Connie Halverson,  
Assistant Advertising Manager  
Rande Wilmarth, Sports Editor  
Vivian Wilson,  
Assistant Managing Editor  
Larry Lange, Assistant News Editor  
Ralph Krumdieck, Associate News Editor  
Dave Butler, Feature Editor