

Students React to Humphrey's Speech

Perseverance Is Shortcoming

Emerald Editor:

Vice President Humphrey's speech last Wednesday brought forth a number of interesting points for discussion. In reviewing some of the main ideas presented, a certain number of faults can be found.

Humphrey's over-glorified policy of perseverance is perhaps one of the primary shortcomings of the policy presented by the Vice President. Actually, his use of the term "perseverance" sounds quite noble to some Americans who picture it as an intangible god-like inner strength.

In reality, our "perseverance" seems to be the continuation of a grubby little war for a number of years. From the text of Humphrey's speech, I cannot help but think that we will be displaying our "perseverance" in Viet Nam until the end of time or the end of all of Viet Nam, whichever happens to come first. "Perseverance" of this type has absolutely no place whatsoever in contemporary world politics.

Another mendacity concerns the mystical elections recently held in South Viet Nam. The results of which, although glorified by Humphrey, remain for the most part unknown and mysterious to the American people in general.

The Vice President stated that whatever their decision is, it is "our decision as well." If it is a "democracy," Humphrey has indicated that the United States will remain as a protective "umbrella" to ensure the safety of South Viet Nam from any further Communist advances.

I believe that in the light of our present military strategy, this protective "umbrella" would offer as much protection as Eve's leaves, now and well into the future.

I'm quite convinced that somewhere in our mighty arsenals of trained leaders and fantastic weapons we can find the wherewithal to defeat a band of brush-fighting terrorists in a reasonably short period of time.

We have committed ourselves to the battle in South Viet Nam and to leave without first fulfilling this commitment is sheer folly. A short decisive war is no more desirable than a long drawn out war.

However, I feel that a rapid victory is more prudent than the policy of "perseverance."

Humphrey stated, when speaking of world affairs, that "none of us can claim to know all the answers." The administration apparently doesn't know all of the answers but there is no basis for using this obvious fact as an excuse for the condition of our world policy.

The LBJ administration must find an answer because it is credited with the responsibility of doing so. However, from the text of Humphrey's speech, one can only gather that the administration is still looking for their answer, whatever that may be.

Because of our over-cautious and half-hearted "war effort," we have carried on an unpopular war for a number of years rather than neatly winning the conflict in a short time.

Due to the indecision of the administration, we have failed not only the Vietnamese but the citizens of the United States of America as well.

Jeff Allyn Reingold
Freshman, Pre-Dent

Fine Sounding Platitudes

Emerald Editor:

Humphrey's speech, in so far as it concerned Viet Nam, was a disappointment. One is left with the impression that the United States is merely helping a free people to resist aggression.

The truth is that most of the Viet Cong are still natives of the south and the war has many elements of a civil war. Ky and the ruling elite in Saigon still represent the least reform minded and most reactionary elements in the country. And, the "elections" notwithstanding (no doubt an election held in Viet Cong controlled territory would show the people solidly behind the National Liberation Front) the Saigon government is without popular support.

I do not believe that Humphrey's fine

sounding platitudes justify American involvement in Viet Nam. Even if it were a clear case of aggression there is no reason for the United States to take unilateral action; that role belongs to the UN.

I find it difficult to understand how such speeches as those recently made by Humphrey square with American statements in the UN that we are not fighting a "holy crusade" against Communism. I believe that Humphrey failed to justify our expansion of the war.

David H. Jackson
Graduate, Political Science

Dealt in Superficialities

Emerald Editor:

As a foreign student I was bitterly disappointed with two aspects of Vice President Humphrey's visit to the University of Oregon on Wednesday last; the nature of his speech and its reception by the student body which largely comprised the audience.

The speech was consistent in its professionalism, it was ably constructed and well delivered. The "old pro" in Humphrey emerged when he turned the fault in the public address equipment to his own advantage. His manner was relaxed and humor, albeit tinged with folksiness, appreciated.

Humphrey can be accused of dealing with superficialities, skirting controversy and playing the "old student." However the fact that the Vice President of the U.S. was allowed to issue meaningless platitudes for almost half an hour demonstrates that he had at least assessed his audience's lack of perception, apathy and general reluctance to be involved with major problems.

It was hard to believe that a major war is being fought in Viet Nam—a war which threatens global peace.

In a university one usually expects the left to be well represented; at least this is true in England. The true radical element is not the beatnik fringe but a genuine reactionary group attempting to pressurize the complacency of fence-sitting politicians.

At Hayward Field on Wednesday the so-called protest group was small and therefore ineffectual displaying its banality with posters like, "May napalm burn your fat face HHH." They barely deserved Humphrey's contemptuous description of a "side show."

I trust that this occasion was not truly representative of the political climate here in U. of O. and that the passivity demonstrated by the audience was a hangover from the long summer vacation.

John G. Cocking
Senior, Physical Education

Foreign Student Views

Emerald Editor:

For someone who is not a citizen of the United States, attending Hubert Humphrey's speech was a fascinating experience—not primarily because of what the Vice President said, but to watch the reactions of intelligent Americans to one of their leaders in government.

There is no doubt about Humphrey's ability to speak in front of an audience and to speak under conditions that were at times, adverse. He is a clever politician—if not a clever diplomat. He can deliver a speech, the contents of which, when analyzed, mean very little, and at the same time emerge having stimulated favorable reactions from his audience.

As a University student, I was disappointed in the content of his speech. Having opened by flattering the University of Oregon and by giving himself a mental pat on the back, he went on to say little more than that what he stood for was good and what we stood for was good, so together we would make a great partnership.

Did you notice that halfway through the speech he began to pound the rostrum? An old oratorical trick whereby the methodical, deliberate blows created an almost hypnotic stimulus which no one consciously perceived. The pitch of his voice was perfect. Anyone who has heard the compliant speeches of American diplomats overseas will recognize the same pleasant tone and measured use of emotional material.

From what I could gather before the actual speech, there was a comparatively large section of the crowd who were not supporters of the Vice President or of his policies. I am not referring to the bedraggled minority who made a half-hearted attempt to demonstrate, but to persons who had come to decisions about the Vice President beforehand.

Yet, after the opening half of the speech, HHH could be said to have had his audience "in the palm of his hand." The faces in the stands took on the appearance of happy, trusting children,

looking up to some paternal figure with eager, shining eyes, listening to his kind reassurance that everything will work out well.

Do not misunderstand me at this stage. Personally, I am neither for nor against the government's Viet Nam policy. In fact, it means little to me one way or another. What does concern me—as a citizen of a small country which is closely allied to the U.S.—is the readiness with which Americans—and highly intelligent Americans—can be deceived by an orator who is not even sure of what he is saying, but who aims at one thing: to leave the platform knowing that he has won his audience.

Humphrey had calculated his appearance at the University of Oregon to be a success. It had to be, coming at such a precarious time, right after the demonstrations in Portland.

This visit, if successful, would certainly be a feather in his cap. He put all his faculties into it and won.

Let me close with a word of congratulations for the Vice President of the United States. Never before has so long been taken to say so little to so many with such good results.

Heather H. Royes
Graduate, Journalism

Humphrey Was Sideshow

Emerald Editor:

Vice President Humphrey said that those of us who protested his appearance here were a "sideshow." I think his speech illustrated how completely he and his liberal friends are the sideshow on the world stage.

Clearly, they understand not at all the revolutionary fervor in such countries as Viet Nam and the Dominican Republic. To the end they will doubtless be able to convince themselves that guerrillas fighting to rid their countries of U.S. occupation troops are "aggressors" and that the Kys of their "Free World" are the bearers of "free elections" and "social reform."

To the world this brand of "democracy" is symbolized by napalm and crop defoliants. Who needs it?

B. H. Barlow
Graduate, Political Science

Disgusted at Enthusiasm

Emerald Editor:

I was not so much disappointed by Mr. Humphrey's meaningless, hollow-sounding words as I was by the enthusiastic reaction of the several thousand spectators. The Vice President's exhortations of peaceful intentions, support of national self-determination, indefatigable efforts of the U.S. to seek a peace settlement, and repeated canting about repelling of "outside aggressors" are all belied by the facts.

However, in a society where public opinion and chauvinistic proseletyzing are valued above the more complex tenets of reason and morality, Mr. Humphrey's empty words, echoed locally by the administration yes-man Robert Duncan and, apparently Charles Porter, are not too surprising.

But does that excuse the rest of us? We don't need to turn to the foreign press or the liberal or left-wing periodicals to get a true understanding of the crimes the U.S. is perpetrating in Viet Nam; our mass media publications gloat about them every day.

The man in the street glows righteously when he reads of further steps taken by the U.S. to carry out the destruction of the culture, topography, and population of a nearly defenseless, bleeding, agrarian country.

At the best Mr. Humphrey is a liar, at the worst a criminal and a murderer. But how about the rest of us? What righteous platitudes do we hide behind to close our eyes and ears to our rape of Viet Nam.

The Nuremberg Court refused to expiate Germans on the grounds that they could do nothing. The point was that the Germans knew about the crimes and by doing nothing, were guilty. The fact that their leaders told them what was right was not a factor. What's the difference between the Germans' submissiveness and ours? I don't see it.

Buzz Willits
VISTA Instructor

FOCUS



"WE'RE CONSIDERING DECIDING ON PLANNING TO THINK OF IMPLEMENTING PROJECTED DESIGNS IN THAT DIRECTION..."