

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.

LOUIE ABRAMSON
Business Manager
LARRY LANGE
News Editor

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

WILBUR BISHOP, JR.
Advertising Manager
MAXINE ELLIOTT
Associate Editor

Page 6

University of Oregon, Eugene, Thursday, April 7, 1966

Try the Festival

The International Festival, which is probably the most successful student-run activity at the University in recent years, will celebrate its third anniversary next week. In the three years since Anant Chavan, University student from India, conceived of the idea, the Festival has grown into an event that has drawn widespread applause from the highest officials, both nationally and internationally.

The Festival, involving students from over 90 nations, is run entirely by the students with no professional assistance. It is the largest event of its kind in the United States. It has been commended by President Johnson, U.N. Secretary General U Thant, the U.S. Information Agency and a multitude of civic service groups. The USIA has distributed printed material overseas on the Festival and portions of last year's Festival were aired on Voice of America broadcasts. R. Sargent Shriver, until recently director of the Peace Corps and presently director of the federal War on Poverty, will be this year's honored guest.

It is a bit surprising that the Festival has been so widely received in Oregon, which has some reputation as being slightly provincial in its attitudes. But last year, of the more than 10,000 persons who watched Festival shows in person, only 10 per cent were University students. Busloads of adults and children came from all parts of the state to see the event.

But the 10 per cent figure is also surprising. It would seem that students would be most interested in this type of event. The Festival, above and beyond any financial aspects, has as its main purpose the furthering of good will and understanding between peoples of the world, especially young peo-

ple. In these times of rapidly expanding communications, and of international conflicts, such a goal is both commendable and priceless. It is to Mr. Chavan's credit that he has been able to do so much in contributing to this effort. About 90 per cent of the students are missing a good chance to aid the cause and learn something besides.

Don Duncan

One of the most noteworthy speakers of the year will lecture tonight in the Student Union Ballroom. His name is Don Duncan, former sergeant and member of the elite Special Forces of the U.S. Army.

Mr. Duncan served 18 months active combat duty in Viet Nam. He has been behind many enemy lines and has an impressive string of awards for his service. But his most unique distinction is that, in the light of a promotion offer, he quit the Armed Services and, in doing so, voiced his disgust with the way the war in that Southeast Asian nation is being run.

Duncan may be said to be an exception to the rule, and it is possible that there are other reasons for his resigning from the Army besides his dissatisfaction with the war effort. Nevertheless, he speaks from direct experience in the combat zone, a distinction few persons can claim. And he apparently possesses a great deal of courage to challenge the operation of an institution in which he spent 10 years. It is likely that anyone who attends his Thursday speech will benefit from the insights of a man who has been in direct contact with the most debated and controversial military effort this country has pledged itself to.



Yes... it does make your hygiene book more interesting, ... but are you sure we could sell it at the Co-op?

Gale Brock

Why We Should Make Our Voices Heard

Editor's Note: This column was written by Gale Brock, a graduate student in interdisciplinary studies at the University. Brock has traveled in Europe several times and has been to Russia once.

Big business is making fortunes from the Viet Nam war, obvious even without the effect of the "peace scares" on the stock market, and businessmen seldom consider it their obligation to support any view harmful to their interests.

This is understandable.

Military leaders, as a result of selection, training, and ego involvement, take a narrow, one-sided militaristic stance.

This is understandable.

Politicians, from the lowest to the highest level, see advantages in a medium-sized, distant war—it stimulates industry, cuts unemployment, and, most important, provides a rallying point around which the hates and fears of a nation can be mobilized to insure support.

Few politicians have the courage of Senators Fulbright, Gruening, McCarthy, Morse, and Young to resist the fever—to dare, perhaps, to think that our "defense" department can do other than defend, that the line is slim between what may be called treason at a moment of heat, and what is truly loyalty to American ideals of two centuries.

This is understandable.

VOICE OF PEOPLE

But where are the voices of the American people, of the millions more knowledgeable, more educated, more sophisticated than ever before in the history of any one nation?

What do we think of the "International Communist Conspiracy"? Do we still believe that Russia, China, Poland, Cuba, Yugoslavia, and North Viet Nam are one great monster, about to destroy us?

Can they look as menacing to us as we look to any of them, with our ring of nuclear bases around them, our nuclear subs off their coasts, and our planes flying around the world day and night, each apparently carrying four nuclear bombs?

What do we think of Communist underdeveloped countries? Admittedly they provide few markets for our surpluses and no bases for our planes.

But are their governments no more oppressive to their people and ultimately dangerous than the governments of Franco, Salazar, Batista, Chiang Kai-shek, Diem, or Ky, supported by the money and armed might of the United States?

GENEVA AGREEMENT

Can we allow an underdeveloped country without education or tradition for democracy, in accordance with a Geneva agreement approved by us, to decide through a supervised election to adopt a communist system if 80 per cent (according to Eisenhower) of its voters wish it?

Was our fighting in Viet Nam instigated and begun surreptitiously and enlarged as response to public relations measures permitted?

Are we supporting a dictatorial government we created of refugees, landlords, and hangers-on of the French, against the wishes of the vast majority of the people?

Are we solidifying world opinion against us by herding villagers into concentration camps, bombing, destroying crops, unleashing the inhuman weapons of the laboratory and the vast resources of the United States against a primitive people?

Are we killing and dying in a war which antagonizes our allies, frightens neutrals, and strengthens the resolve of our enemies?

MUST WE NEGOTIATE

If we sincerely want peace must we negotiate with our principal opponent, the NLF, and agree to respect the Geneva agreements and withdraw, regardless of adverse election results?

If we believe that the answer to all, or even some, of these and similar questions is yes, can we find our voices to protest? If we believe that our vote, one of millions, counts, does not our letter, one in thousands, count as well?

Let us show our friends and our legislators that our interests are not trivial and facetious, our education is not in vain, and our intelligence and perception do not permit our captivity by the worn-out phrases of militarism and reaction.

Letters to the Editor

Hill Replies

Emerald Editor:

There are many things I would like to say in answer to Mr. Camp's "open letter" to me (April 4), but most of them would not be printable. But there are a few things I would like to set straight here and now.

(1) I am not a segregationist. I do happen to believe that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is unconstitutional and I do believe that the South should be allowed to solve its own racial problems. This does not qualify me as a segregationist.

(2) Young Americans for Freedom has nothing to do with my proposed anti-vigil. Individual members may join, but the organization is not backing me in any way.

(3) The purpose of the anti-vigil is to demonstrate to the faculty that some students still feel that a faculty member still has some rights in the classroom. Personally, I don't think that it is such a terrible thing to say "yes sir, professor."

Let me say that this is the first time I have ever been called an "Uncle Tom." That may be so. Perhaps in this day of "student freedom" it is wrong to respect faculty members as people who have knowledge which, if I am observant, they may impart to me. No faculty member has ever treated me as a child, only as a student. To me, it is shocking to realize that someone of Mr. Camp's intelligence

(Yes, Virginia, there are intelligent people from Mississippi) would put our faculty on the same level as a bunch of racists. Long live Uncle Tom!

Jim Hill

Freshman, Pol. Sci.

Don Duncan

Emerald Editor:

Who is Premier Nguyen Ky? Who and what does he represent? What is the meaning of the current student and Buddhist demonstrations in Da Nang and in Saigon? Why are these demonstrations anti-government and anti-American? Why are Marines and Army personnel trudging through the swamps, getting killed, and having to kill men, women and children indiscriminately? Why do Navy and Air Force jets bomb, strafe and napalm villages and jungles in a kind of terrorism unmatched by the most atrocious Viet Cong deeds?

What are the implications for the several hundreds of thousands of college students who are facing an increasing draft call and are being told of their "obligation" to American ideals of freedom abroad and to the freedom of the Vietnamese people?

How many of these students have an understanding of social revolution, of unequal social conditions, or even of freedom here at home or anywhere in the world? What repercussion is the current form of American foreign policy having on

the exercising of freedom here at home and on the observance of sacred constitutional rights of citizens to question, to dissent, to determine their own "wars"? Why are students, protesters, and pacifists beaten, jeered, and jailed almost daily by intemperate U.S. citizenry?

What do you as potential draftees, as ROTC personnel, as conscientious believers in American ideals, or as pacifists face? What do you face in this homicidal war in Viet Nam?

Every student of draft age should be sincerely asking himself these questions and should not be content with accepting the answers given out by the State Department or the mass news media. Democracy and freedom is much more than this. Every student should be examining his "obligation" to his country, his "obligation" to himself, through a self-sought study and analysis. Not to do so is the misuse of the word "democracy."

Don Duncan, a retired-by-choice master sergeant in the U.S. Special Forces "Green Beret" service, who spent 18 months in Viet Nam fighting in that revolution will be brought to the University campus April 7. What he has to say is of the upmost concern to each and every male of draft age. I sincerely hope that students will turn out en masse to hear this man speak.

Philip Brandt
Junior, Anth.