

# 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. However, the Emerald does present on this page columnists and letter writers whose opinions reflect those of our diverse readership and not those of the Emerald itself.

PHIL SEMAS, Editor

WILBUR BISHOP JR. Business and Advertising Manager  
ANNETTE BUCHANAN Managing Editor  
MIKE FANCHER News Editor

CLIFF SANDERLIN Editorial Page Editor  
NOMI BORENSTEIN Associate Editor

University of Oregon, Eugene, Thursday, March 9, 1967

## 'Drug Problem' Is Only Part

From all over the Pacific Northwest college administrators flocked to Portland last weekend.

The administrators, mostly deans of men and women and heads of counseling services, wanted to find out all they could about drug use. Most of them were more than curious. They were anxious. They sat for hours at panel sessions and speeches and zealously asked questions afterwards. Students on their campuses have been using drugs and they, as administrators, admittedly don't know enough about drug use to cope with the situation.

In short, they were aware of the allegation that college administrators are the last people on campus to find out what's going on, and they wanted to do something about it.

While at the conference, they were presented a well-balanced program of speakers and panels delving into the social, legal, and medical aspects of drug use. The moral decisions—the value judgments—were left for them to decide for themselves on the basis of the facts.

Hopefully, now that it is over, the administrators will follow the pattern, set at the Portland conference, on their own campuses. Hopefully they will approach the "drug problem" from an educational angle, as the University's Office of Student Affairs has been doing this year.

They would be wise to follow the recommendation of the University's dean of men, Robert Bowlin, who cautioned against "indoctrination" and suggested, instead, providing students with a balanced program of speakers, "so they will have as many facts as possible for when they are put into a position of making a decision."

We especially hope they heed the warning of Arthur Pearl, professor of education at the University. The articulate "fighter" told the administrators that drug abuse is a symptom of a much more serious problem—a problem brought about by a lack of educational options at the University level, and by the impersonal pressure-cooker atmosphere caused by universities' acquiescence to outside pressures for specialized, credential-carrying automatons.

In all, we feel the administrators were sincere in their desire to learn about drug use.

But we hope they keep in mind that just knowing about drugs is not going to solve the problem. They have the immediate problem of educating their students about drugs. But more important they have the long-range duty of changing the conditions at their colleges so students won't find it "necessary" to use LSD to "expand their minds." They need to work with faculty and students to provide an educational experience adequate to satisfy and stimulate students who will otherwise seek creative motivation through repeated use of drugs.

No doubt about it, the administrators have a job on their hands. We hope they can handle it.

## Still a Chance For the Greeks

Members of fraternities and sororities at the University generally look on the Emerald as a harsh critic of their system. And we do often criticize them, for there is much to criticize.

But there is also much to praise, especially in this year's leadership. Last week's Greek Focus Week is a good example. It included solid discussions of three of the major issues of the day—discrimination, pollution, and the student voice in higher education. There was also a panel which criticized fraternities, something unusual in a Greek-run program.

The fraternity system has a long way to go on this campus. It faces many problems, particularly discrimination and its relation to the Conduct Code. But with leadership like that of IFC President Warren Houston, it has a chance to solve those problems and play a meaningful role in the University community.

## Emerald Editor:

All letters to the editor must be typewritten and double spaced. Letters must not exceed 300 words and must be signed in ink, giving the class and major of the writer. Those dealing with one subject and pertaining to the University or Eugene community will be given preference. The Emerald reserves the right to edit letters for style, grammar, punctuation, and potentially libelous content. Letters not meeting these criteria and those which are mimeographed or otherwise obvious duplicates will be returned.

**Editor's Note:** Most of the letters received this week, due to space limitations, will appear at the first of next term.

### Aberle Disclaimer

**Emerald Editor:**

The Emerald's account of my talk at the Free Speech Platform on March 1 (Emerald, March 2, page 8, columns 1 and 2) is substantially incorrect. I accept no responsibility for any portion of the Emerald's version of what I said. Every section is seriously inaccurate, and one paragraph is unintelligible to me. I shall be glad to supply the Emerald with a full copy of the text from which I spoke.

David F. Aberle  
Professor of Anthropology

**Editor's Note:** Mr. Aberle has given the Emerald the full text of his speech, which will be used early next term to correct the errors in the story.

### Gregory's Message

**Emerald Editor:**

Mr. Gregory's indictment of man's inhumanity to man as manifested by the white community's treatment of the black was humorous, forceful, and sincere.

But the significance of the presentation, for me, was not contained in Mr. Gregory's speech, but in our response to it.

We rewarded his presentation with a standing ovation—an appropriate reaction for people who feel emotionally touched and stimulated, but hardly appropriate for people who are deeply shocked by an exposure of their own character; an appropriate response for people who have experienced psychological gratification and excitement from an opportunity to exalt right and condemn wrong, but hardly appropriate for people who really, in their guts as well as their minds, identify themselves with the evil they so enthusiastically condemn.

The latter, of course, was the message Mr. Gregory was trying to get across. It is our responsibility. We cannot, as he said, "pass the buck." Either we failed to understand what he was trying to say or we ably demonstrated the unique and amazing capacity of the human mind to tolerate contradiction by having the gall to enthusiastically applaud, indeed, give a standing ovation in response to a devastating indictment of the very same despicable behavior we will, most assuredly, practice tomorrow.

With respect to Mr. Gregory's presentation, I think it represents another in a long series of admirable but futile attempts to stimulate meaningful awareness of injustice by appealing to conscience through a mere statement of the problem. To say something in an attempt to stimulate awareness, let alone ac-

### Oregon Daily Emerald

Ron Eachus, Sports Editor  
Maxine Elliott, Feature Editor  
Tom Thompson, Photo Editor  
Paul Polsky, Associate Sports Editor  
Chris Hogle, Entertainment Editor  
Lee O'Conner, Women's Affairs Editor  
Jaql Thompson, Political Affairs Editor

Editorial Board: Phil Semas, Cliff Sanderlin, Annette Buchanan, Nomi Borenstein, Bob Holmes, Robin Tuttle, Gary Barnes, Chuck Pruitt, Tom Nash, Dave McCloskey, Roger Leo, Spencer Block, Jean Snider, Mike Fancher, Sandra Watts, Robert Carl, Krin De Jonge

tion, regarding man's inhumanity to man as embodied in the complex, controversial, and emotionally charged civil rights issue—and have the white power structure respond in unanimous agreement and support: is to come dangerously close to saying nothing of significance regarding the real issue, which, of course, is not that there is injustice in the world, but how to deal with it.

Why is it that as long as the problem of man's inhumanity to man is dealt with on a high plane generalization, involving only the condemnation of reality and offering to strategy for implementing change, we give unwavering and undivided support, while at the same time our response to virtually every active attempt to change that reality is, at best, passive?

Dan Dodd  
Graduate, Remedial Education

### Two Cultures

**Emerald Editor:**

Due to the large number of scientists I have known who have taken an active interest in the fine arts and humanities, I have always presumed that the "two cultures" were more artifact than real. Certain events and conversations in the last weeks have led me to drastically alter these opinions.

The first event was the appearance on our campus of Jacob Bronowski, whose lectures were not well received by some members of our scientific community. Professional scientists, and even eminent ones, accused Bronowski of being a "fake," or expressed their "resentment" of his oversimplifications. They evidently tried to listen to a philosopher of science in the same manner that they would critically hear a professional seminar speaker in their own fields. The result was that there was, in many cases, no communication. I submit that such scientists are so "over-professional" that they have become incapable of communicating on certain other meaningful levels.

Secondly, discussion with several Honors College students, the presumed intellectual elite of our University, has shown an almost manic resentment of the requirement that they donate 12 or 15 of their 186 term hours to becoming exposed to topics in contemporary science; topics which, like it or not, are in large part responsible for shaping their individual worlds.

Both groups of people mentioned above are the results of the failure to attain our professed educational objectives: the opening of new channels of thought in an attempt to understand and to some degree synthesize all aspects of human thought and endeavor. Instead,

our education seems to consist of the progressive closing of doors, either to maintain a high GPA, or to gain status in a professional discipline.

Is it any wonder that a professional scientist has difficulty communicating with an adamantly arts-oriented student in the classroom?

James C. Hickman  
Graduate, Biology

### No Sense

**Emerald Editor:**

I have read and reread Mr. Desmond Jolly's Emerald article of February 27, and I must confess that most of it makes no sense at all to me. I understand all of the words used by Jolly, but I do not understand most of the statements composed by him. They are ambiguous.

If Jolly had been required to validate his observations and to specify exactly and exemplarily carried by his statements, I am sure that his article would have been written differently. I doubt that Jolly has definitive grounds for most of the statements made in his article.

J. A. Nylander  
Graduate, Educational Psychology

### Stop Now

**Emerald Editor:**

Barbara Deming, one of four American women who recently went to North Viet Nam, spoke here on campus the other day, and I made myself go and hear her. I know it would be dreadful (it was) and that I would have to listen to what I do not want to hear: it makes me feel very guilty to live at ease and in security, while, in my name as an American, a small country is being brutally destroyed.

That is what it amounts to: the brutal destruction of a small country and the terrorizing of its people by a foreign invader (yes, that's us; we are the only foreigners in Viet Nam).

During her talk Miss Deming answered some questions which she has, no doubt, frequently been asked:

"Are we not using restraint?" Well, yes, she says. We have the power literally to destroy everybody in the world, and we haven't done it, so we are using restraint, in a way.

"Are we aiming at military targets and only killing and maiming women, children, the old and the helpless, by accident?" She had a lot to say about that, including the fact that some of the weapons we are using, such as napalm and the so-called "lazy dog" bomb are not effective against steel and concrete but devastating for humans ("anti-personnel bombs" the military is pleased to call them). Napalm melts the limbs

(Continued on page 11)



"TALL OAKS FROM LITTLE ACORNS GROW." (David Everett)