

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.

MIKE FANCHER, Editor

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Ron Eachus
Rick Fitch
Gil Johnson

Linda Meierjungen
Cliff Sanderlin
John Sasaki

Ron Saylor
Jean Snider
Jaqi Thompson

WILBUR BISHOP JR.
Business Manager

RICH JERNSTEDT
Advertising Manager

BARBARA STONE
National Advertising Manager

University of Oregon, Eugene, Tuesday, January 30, 1968

Tolstoy's Advice— Resist the Draft

"It is not only Christians but all just men who must refuse to become soldiers—that is, to be ready on another's command (for this is what a soldier's duty actually consists of) to kill all those one is ordered to kill."

Those words could have gotten Leo Tolstoy thrown in jail if he lived in contemporary American society. If Tolstoy gave this same advice today he would face the same punishment that now threatens such distinguished men as Dr. Benjamin Spock and Chaplain of Yale University William Sloan Coffin.

Tolstoy's advice urging all men to resist military conscription are published in the February issue of The Atlantic. The advice is part of a previously unpublished manuscript by the Russian writer.

In light of today's dilemma over conscription in America, the following advice by Tolstoy is exceedingly pertinent:

"If I, finding myself in a crowd of running people, run with the crowd without knowing where, it is obvious that I have given myself up to mass hysteria; but if by chance I should push my way to the front, or be gifted with sharper sight than the others, or receive information that this crowd was racing to attack human beings and toward its own corruption, would I really not stop and tell the people what might rescue them? Would I go on running and do these things which I knew to be bad and corrupt? This is the situation of every individual called up for military service."

Interestingly, Tolstoy took this strong stand against military conscription despite the fact that the penalty for evading conscription was death.

Evidently the author thought it would be better to sacrifice one's life than to allow one's self to become a tool for murder in the hands of the state.

The American Dilemma

"When you say that you agree to a thing in principle, you mean that you have not the slightest intention of carrying it out in practice."

—Bismark



"It could be much worse, Mr. President . . . The Pueblo could have sunk off Greenland and the North Koreans could have hijacked the H-bombs!"

Editor's Note: Steve D'Arazien is the College Press Services' correspondent in Saigon. This is the first of four parts on how the Vietnam war is going and how it can be expected to continue.

SAIGON (CPS)—"1968 Will See Success of Allied Arms," or, at least so proclaims a banner hung over Dai Lo Tran Hung Dao, a major Saigon boulevard.

For a moment I thought it must be an attempt at black humor. It isn't that, but it is blatantly sadistic to promise peace in a country that has seen 20 years of continual war, when there are indications of an end to the slaughter.

General William Westmoreland, who commands U.S. forces in Vietnam, recently intimated (in the noncommittal fashion characteristic of administration statements on the war, especially about ending it) that we might expect to begin reducing this size of our forces here in two years. The American public should be wary.

Show Job Ahead

Remember when, on Oct. 2, 1963, Secretary of State Robert Strange McNamara predicted the war would be over by 1965? And, of course, the President himself promised to leave the fighting to Asian boys.

The war is a grave political liability in an election year and something must be done to offset its grim reality. Be prepared for a mammoth snow job.

Ten years being a nice round number, is a frequently cited figure by U.S. field officers for the amount of time necessary to "secure" South Vietnam. And it can't be done with the present troop levels. General Westmoreland is well known to want more men.

Because the tour of duty for American forces in Vietnam is one year, a majority of experienced soldiers here now will soon be home. Their replacements will be green and their lack of combat experience can only be compensated with additional numbers.

20 Years for Control

The Rand Corporation's Gerald Hickey, a student of Vietnamese sociology for many years, stated in a recent circulated report that it will take 20 years to establish firm control of most of South Vietnam. He doubted whether certain areas, effectively governed by the National Liberation Front (NLF) for the same length of time, could ever be won over by the Saigon government.

Two years ago time had run out for the Saigon government. If the United States had not moved into the South in force, Saigon would be under NLF control today. If we had left then, the slaughter would be over. Instead of withdrawing when the Saigon government had proved its lack of ability to win support, we doubled our troop strength and then doubled that.

The balance of power is difficult to assess exactly. There are 470,000 American forces here. Our clients have provided an additional 58,000 men and the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN), including the militia, is about 700,000 strong. Holding this well-over-a-million men at bay are 378,000 NLF and North Vietnamese guerillas and main force troops.

Who controls what is difficult to determine. Figures show America controlling about 40 per cent of the territory and perhaps 60 per cent of the population. I say America controls it, because it is still clear that if America left, the Saigon government would collapse.

Control Drops

According to I. F. Stone, the U.S. government claims only 600,000, or less than eight per cent of the population, as friendly. The rest are only controlled.

Steve D'Arazien

End Not in Sight for Viet War Control Policy Creates Refugees

Of course, control is a matter of semantics. Territorially it means nothing more than an unescorted (but armed) jeep can travel from point A to point B without being fired upon. Control everywhere drops to almost nothing at night. The ARVN's and the Americans retreat to fortified bunkers as night falls. The snipers come out to control the roads and most traffic ceases.

In Quang Ngai I was told that a year ago it was possible to make the 50-mile trip to Da Nang. Now that trip is impossible. On the other hand, in Di An, about 10 miles from Saigon, I passed over roads that were not open six months ago.

NLF Advantage

In Tinh Bien, in the Delta, I was told there were no North Vietnamese regulars South of Saigon. On Jan. 1 it was announced that there were at least 63.

None of this can be considered as anything more than proof that the situation is highly unstable, which means the NLF has the advantage.

U.S. policy is to consolidate areas around cities and American bases and to use sweep operations to convert the population of rural South Vietnam—most of the country—into "refugees." In this way the U.S. creates free-fire zones in which anything that moves is considered hostile.

There are 2 million "refugees" in South Vietnam; 300,000 created as a result of this year's operations and an additional category of 2 million "displaced persons," according to Nguyen Phus Que, the Government's Commissioner of Refugees.

He says thousands in the remote Northern provinces are threatened with starvation because they are only accessible by helicopter and so far no helicopters are being made available.

Commissioner Que says the U.S. estimate of one quarter of the 17 million population as uprooted is too low. Many are not registered.

The Refugee

Actually "refugee" is a misnomer. These people are forced to move. Often they are considered to have moved voluntarily because their chief has been told "they move or else."

The "or else" means that by refusing to leave their ancestor-

al homes (the greatest shared religious characteristics of Vietnam is ancestor worship which dictates that the people must be near the tombs of their kin) they will be considered "VC sympathizers" and the bombs will rain upon them. So, the chief gives the OK to move them.

A Vietnamese hamlet is not a very elaborate affair. The houses are usually made of straw matting or of mud and the roofs are of thatch or, sometimes, tin. A refugee camp is constructed of the same materials.

But, whereas the hamlet consists of several detached houses facing every-which-way the direction is determined by fortune-tellers when they are built—a refugee camp consists of row after row of attached huts all facing in one direction Levittown-style.

A Vietnamese village is a series of scattered hamlets and everyone has room to breathe. A refugee camp frequently crams 20,000 people or more into a few acres. And whereas the vegetation in a Vietnamese village is lush, the hastily constructed refugee camps are barren. There is nowhere to get out of the sun.

Like Ghetto

I asked a Red Cross man how the people feel about being "refugees." He said, "Oh, they are all right. A bit apathetic and fatalistic though." Just like U.S. ghettos. They can only sit around and wait until they can return to their ancestral homes. In spite of the dangers of the free-fire zones, some escape and go back. No one knows how many wander about in the ruins of these no-man's-lands.

Population are concentrated in the camps so they can be controlled. But it is impossible for such a policy to win actual support from the people because it is a violation of traditional Vietnamese living patterns and it is as profoundly a disorienting experience for them as it would be for us.

Even if you support the political value system which puts the United States in Vietnam, the creation of these "refugees" is self-defeating politically. It is the logical product of a policy that relies almost completely on military means.

It is absurd to believe these prisoners will ever support the government which has moved them.

Emerald Editor:

Basic Education

Emerald Editor:

Your editorial stated Mr. Kunkle is ahead of his time in his "classroom flexibility." Years ago many tried it supposedly following Dewey's teachings—it resulted in a lot of kids not getting basic education.

1. Should teachers be required to stick to prescribed curriculum? How do you feel when you finish a class that is background for a second course and you feel you haven't been taught a thing?

2. What about classroom discipline and neighboring classes? Isn't it comparable to the noisy party night after night at your neighbor's home that keeps you from getting a decent night's sleep?

3. How do all of his students feel about his teaching? They certainly wouldn't tell him any more than you or I would tell a professor who was about to grade us how we liked his teaching.

4. Care should be taken not to confuse creativity with "being different." Creative thinking can be done within standard curriculum under quiet and disciplined conditions if you try.

Our educational system would
(Continued on page 11)

Somebody Tell Us

Emerald Editor:

I wish Dean Walter Creese would please tell us—has Mr. Wilkinson been reappointed as Chairman of the Fine Arts Department? Many students, like myself, think very highly of Mr. Wilkinson, and we think it our right to know whether he has been retained or replaced.

The Emerald pursued these and other questions, including the additions to Lawrence Hall, much to our enlightenment last year.

Why the silence this year?

Dave McCloskey
Senior, Sociology