

Oregon Summer 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.

PHIL SEMAS
Editor
ANNETTE BUCHANAN
Managing Editor

LOUIE ABRAMSON
Business Manager
WILBUR BISHOP JR.
Advertising Manager

University of Oregon, Eugene, Monday, June 20, 1966

Some Questions For Mr. Frye

We have a number of questions about the decision of Lane County District Attorney William Frye to subpoena four editors of this newspaper to find out about drug use on campus.

Why were those four the only persons subpoenaed? What about University officials who have been investigating drug use, especially LSD, for some time now? Why haven't any of them been called before the Grand Jury?

Why were none of the four students contacted informally by the police ahead of time? Isn't it normal to conduct a police investigation first to see if the information can be obtained without the glare of publicity and to use the subpoena only if the police couldn't get the information they wanted?

Why did Mr. Frye issue a press release and go to the trouble of sending somebody all the way to Portland with it? Is that normal for a Grand Jury proceeding, which is usually secret?

Why has Mr. Frye said that the investigation is not intended to be a criticism of the Emerald for printing the story and then turned around and criticized the story as an inaccurate picture of the drug situation and of student opinion at the University? Why were the four editors asked questions in the Grand Jury concerning the editorial policy of the Emerald, particularly about the degree of faculty and administration control of the paper? Is all this germane to a drug investigation?

Why does Mr. Frye keep insisting that the problem is small, saying that he has evidence but offering none of it? Why did he insist that the Grand Jury investigation was to allay public fears about the drug problem? Is that a normal reason to hold a Grand Jury investigation?

The other newspaper published in Eugene said last week it will make no comment on the case because that would constitute "trial by newspaper." We agree, to some extent. Any comment on the key question in the case—the right of a journalist to keep his sources secret—would certainly be out of order. We agree with the Register-Guard that Miss Buchanan will certainly get a fair hearing from Lane County judges. We would never question that.

But we do think there are some questions that need to be raised about the character of this investigation. And we feel Mr. Frye has a duty to give the public answers to these questions.

Summer Session

Starting today 5,000-6,000 students will descend on this campus for summer session. Going to summer session is becoming the thing to do. Portland State College reports that it expects 7,500 enrolled for its summer session. Of course figures are misleading because, unlike the regular academic year, some students are here for only a few weeks and then leave.

There is a different kind of student body here in the summer. We have a large number of teachers and others back to add a few extra hours toward getting that masters degree. But more and more students are making education a year-round business, going to school in the summer to finish sooner or to enable them to take a lighter load during the regular academic year.

The pace is slower in the summer, too. There are no big social or athletic events. Consequently the Student Union is finding it necessary to expand its programs and keep its building operating more during the summer than it has before.

Some people say that eventually college will be a year-round affair and summer school will be as lively as the regular sessions. The increasing number of students, especially regular University students who attend summer school here, bear that point out. But for now at least it's still very different.

Barry Barlow

Liberalism and Revolution

Editor's Note: Barry Barlow is a graduate student in political science at the University. This column is in part a reply to a column written by Jim O'Brien, a graduate student in business administration, which appeared in the Emerald spring term.

Speaking to the November 27, 1965, March on Washington to End the War in Viet Nam, Carl Oglesby, President of Students for a Democratic Society, commented that this country's actions in Viet Nam were the product of a government "that since 1932 has considered itself to be fundamentally liberal."

Oglesby continued, "The original commitment in Viet Nam was made by President Truman, a mainstream liberal. It was seconded by President Eisenhower, a moderate liberal. It was intensified by the late President Kennedy, a flaming liberal. Think of the men who now engineer that war—those who study the maps, give the commands, push the buttons, and tally the dead: Bundy, McNamara, Rusk, Lodge, Goldberg, the President himself.

"They are not moral monsters.

"They are all honorable men.

"They are all liberals."

"RIGHT WING FANATICS"

This quote is the appropriate reply to Jim O'Brien's contention that we protestors regard supporters of American policy in Viet Nam as "right-wing fanatics, sheep-like America-Firsters, or mixed up non-intellectuals." Next to the incredible loss of life and property that the Vietnamese War has entailed, the grimmest feature of that conflict has turned out to be the strained rationalizations that American liberals have offered in defense of American intervention in Viet Nam.

(Note: in this article I am using the term "liberal" in reference to the English liberal tradition which largely shaped the American political culture rather than to the current liberal-conservative debate in American politics.)

"CONSPIRACY"

Look, for example, at Mr. O'Brien's discussion of the "international communist conspiracy."

While conceding that this "conspiracy" is not united by formal organizational ties, he nonetheless submits that they are united by a common belief, namely that a communist system should be established in every country and by any available methods.

Of these, he cites wars of liberation and national liberation fronts covertly controlled by communists as examples.

One can question, first of all, the assumption that there is "a" communist system. In fact, important differences exist among the political, economic, and social systems of communist nations.

Therefore, it is hardly inevitable that a communist state like the Soviet Union would prefer to see another country adopt a communist system based on the Chinese model rather than remain non-communist.

But even if this assumption is incorrect, adherence to one central idea is hardly proof of the existence of a conspiracy; there must be action to implement the idea.

For O'Brien and the American liberal "establishment" this action takes place in the form of wars of national liberation "directed and/or supported from the outside." Doubters of this argument are referred frequently to Chinese Defense Minister Lin Piao's recent tract on the world revolution.

I would answer that a careful analysis of Lin Piao's arguments offers quite a different picture of the Chinese concept of revolution than that commonly envisaged in this country.

REVOLUTION

Lin Piao forecast revolutions in the agrarian third world against their capitalist overlords; he likened the latter to the cities in a guerrilla revolution which are the last bastions of the old order.

It is little more than a modern version of the Leninist doctrine which predicts that revolution will erupt first in the colonies of imperialist nations and finally in the mother country itself.

The critical point is the Lin Piao and the other Chinese leaders have never claimed, or demonstrated, the ability to instigate a guerrilla movement or national liberation movement in another country.

ON THEIR OWN

Further, Lin Piao specifically warns the revolutionaries of the underdeveloped world that they are largely on their own for supplies and can expect minimal material help from China. Certainly Chinese aid to the Vietnamese has been minimal in comparison to what the U.S. has poured into the country to perpetuate the rule of their Saigon generals and landlords.

In Viet Nam the resistance movement resulted from the war that Saigon has waged against the population of South Viet Nam since the creation by the U.S. of the Diem regime in 1954-55.

The reactionary and brutal nature of this government accounts for the success of the NLF's policy of eliminating unpopular Saigon-appointed officials.

NO NEED

If the Saigon regime were popular and representative, there would be no need for Saigon's innumerable "pacification" programs. The populace would regard the Saigon army as their liberators and work with them eagerly against the NLF. There was no need for "pacification" in previously occupied Europe and Asia after the military defeat of the Nazis and Japan.

Finally, if we left Southeast Asia alone, the governments there would be more representative in the sense that these countries would have an opportunity to dispose of the various "free world" governmental monstrosities that we have been inflicting on them; this through the same avenue of national revolution that this country took in 1776 and that Viet Nam is taking in 1966.

FREEDOM

No one can say whether "higher living standards" and "maximum individual freedom" would thereupon emerge. The point is that these peoples have the right to revolt to acquire these or any other goals.

But throughout the third world the U.S. devotes much of its efforts to denying this right.

The American liberal has forgotten his own revolutionary heritage. To him a Marxist-Leninist liberation movement is by definition somehow "instigated" from outside. It is inconceivable to him that anyone could take up arms eagerly under a banner the liberal despises.

It is from this smugness, born of isolation and affluence, that American liberals can rationalize away the villages they burn; villages whose people fight for the right of revolution that American liberalism long ago supported.

Letters Policy

All letters to the editor must be typewritten and double-spaced.

Letters not over 300 words in length and those dealing with one subject will be given preference for publication. All letters must be signed in ink and give the class and major of the writer, if he is a student; his rank and field, if he is a faculty member; or his address, if he is not a member of the University community.

The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters for style, grammar, and punctuation.

We attempt to print all letters we receive which meet these criteria.



"REMARKABLE HOW A LITTLE SNAKE CAN SWALLOW A BIG JACKASS."