

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 Melerjurgan  
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, Thursday, February 15, 1968

## Johnson's Interest Bolsters CHOICE '68

Anyone who thinks a national collegiate presidential primary election can't have impact in this nation had better think again.

If there could be any doubt about the effect of such an election it was dispelled this week by Lyndon Johnson. The President showed great interest in the idea by giving its backers the one thing he has the least of—time.

Johnson met with the Board of Directors of CHOICE '68, the national collegiate presidential primary, this week for over 75 minutes. Officials close to the White House called the meeting the longest one Johnson has had in over four years with any outside group other than the press.

Throughout the session it was apparent that the President is concerned with what the collegiate population is thinking and with what students will say when they vote on April 24.

Further concern was later voiced when the White House called the CHOICE '68 board to find out what George Wallace and Fred Halstead were doing on the ballot. Apparently those names had been mentioned during a meeting between the board and a group of White House fellows, and the word must have reached the top echelons of the White House rapidly.

Johnson's interest in the impact over CHOICE '68 will increase that impact. The immediate result was front page coverage of the White House meeting in newspapers serving Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Chicago and Baltimore.

The President's interest also caused an exceptionally large turnout for the CHOICE '68 press conference held the day after the White House meeting.

What this publicity means is that an already big primary election could become even bigger. Already well over 1,000 schools have agreed to participate in CHOICE '68 and hopes are that ultimately 2,000 will join.

Already a voter turnout of over two million is anticipated, and that number could climb. CHOICE '68 will probably be second only to the California primary in number of votes cast.

Obviously, a national collegiate presidential primary election can and will have impact.



The President's Analyst

## Secretary Rusk Censures Comments, Offers Nothing New in Interview

Walter Grant

**Editor's Note:** On Feb. 3, Walter Grant of CPS, Gordon Yale of the Colorado Daily, Dennis Wilen of the Daily Pennsylvanian, and Dan Okrent of the Michigan Daily had a special interview with Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Following is Walter Grant's account of the interview.

WASHINGTON (CPS)—When Secretary of State Dean Rusk talks about the war in Vietnam, he sounds like a college student who has memorized his professor's notes for feedback on an exam.

Rusk reiterates the words of his professor, Lyndon Johnson, and he offers nothing new. If he is asked a question for which he either does not know the answer, or does not want to give it, he again plays the game of the student; he beats around the bush and answers something else.

But Rusk has something going for him which the average student does not. He gets to edit his exam after the 50 minutes are up.

Rusk, in an interview last week with CPS and three college editors, discussed the war in Vietnam, the role of the United States in international affairs, the current conflict between the U.S. and North Korea, and how anti-war protests at home give encouragement to the enemy.

### No Direct Answers

He said nothing he has not said hundreds of times before. It was impossible to pin him down when he didn't answer a question directly, and if a question which he had ignored was repeated, he merely reiterated the same old clichés which members of the Johnson administration have been repeating for several years to justify the war.

Even so, Rusk reserved the right to censor the text of the interview before it was released to the public. He did edit his remarks, striking out the strongest statement he made.

The State Department took extreme precautions during the interview. A handful of department officials sat in the secretary's office, seemingly admiring every sentence he spoke. And the State Department, of course, recorded the interview, refusing to let other tape recorders in the room.

When the interview was over, Rusk's aides commented that it was wonderful. "He's an old pro," one said. "He sure knows how to handle himself." Another asked, "Isn't he just marvelous?"

Rusk is articulate and dedicated, as he would have to be to hold the office of Secretary of State for seven years. Com-

pletely sold on the present U.S. policies in Vietnam and elsewhere, which he certainly was instrumental in developing, Rusk seems to enjoy defending policies, but only as long as the questions are not too pointed.

Columnist Walter Lippmann has said Rusk's "education stopped about 1944." Many other experts also have said Rusk, as well as the entire Johnson administration, has a World War II view of how to fight aggression and win eternal peace for the world.

Rusk's comments support these analyses. The Vietnam war, he says, is caused by North Vietnam committing acts of aggression on South Vietnam, and the only way to stop this aggression is by military might. "If they're going to fight a war... we will be there to oppose them," he emphasizes.

### Nothing Left

And despite the fact that the United States is still bombing North Vietnam, Rusk insists that the Johnson administration has done all it can to encourage negotiations to end the war.

"We're willing to negotiate without any conditions whatever. We'll sit down with them, at sundown today, to talk about peace, without anybody doing anything, except sit down at the table and talk. Now they've rejected that," he said.

"Now, the point is that Hanoi has raised a major condition for negotiations," Rusk said. "They say there will be no talks until we stop the bombing—they usually say permanently, and unconditionally." He emphasizes that the United States did not originally propose any conditions, but since Hanoi did, the U.S. found it necessary to propose a counter condition—that North Vietnam not take advantage of the bombing pause.

In response to the suggestion that the United States stop the bombing without any conditions to test Hanoi's sincerity, Rusk said, "It's wholly irrational." He said stopping the bombing without conditions could endanger the lives of thousands of American soldiers.

### Remarks Deleted

In the interview, Rusk commented further on the "irrational" suggestion, but these remarks were deleted from the text, and the reporters, who had agreed to abide by the edited transcript, were unable to use it.

The secretary offers little hope that the United States will initiate more moves toward peace. "Now, if everybody assumes that when Hanoi says no, that's the end of the matter, therefore the United States must move again, that we must somehow take some new posi-

tion, the end of that trail is simply that we abandon South Vietnam. We're not going to do that."

Rusk indicated that the role of the United States in "protecting" other countries could be almost unlimited. "We have formal alliances with more than 40 countries," he said. "I would say that, if we are needed for the defense of those countries, we're available, and we'll make good on our commitments to those countries." But he added, "We're not the world's policemen."

Asked if the Vietnam situation will be a pattern for U.S. involvement in other countries, Rusk said, "You'll have to ask the Communist world, various parts of it, whether they're going to launch this kind of attack against those with whom we are allies. If they do, I would think the answer is yes, we will. If they don't, then we'll have peace, but the answer to that lies with somebody else, not with us."

Rusk referred to the North Korea seizure of the Pueblo as "an outrageous violation of the standard international practice." Even if the vessel had not been in international waters—and Rusk insists that it was—North Korea did not have the right to seize it, he said. (Two days after the interview Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara admitted that the Administration could not be sure whether or not the Pueblo violated North Korea's waters.)

### Invasion Doubtful

The secretary said the Administration does not see "direct indications that the North Koreans have in mind a large-scale invasion of South Korea."

On the question of dissent at home against the Johnson administration's policies, Rusk says he has "no problem" with free speech and free assembly, but he emphasizes that the "form of dissent which tries to silence other people is something to which I object very strongly indeed."

Rusk also emphasizes that Hanoi watches the debate in the United States very closely, and "there is no doubt that they are encouraged by the dissent in this country—no doubt about it. Now, that doesn't mean that you forget the First Amendment and that you try to stop dissent, but those who are expressing dissent ought to be aware of that."

He said he wishes anti-war protesters "would at least try to make it clear what it is they want Hanoi to do to make peace. If they will say that we want Washington to do the following, and we want Hanoi to do the following, that might help."

## Emerald Editor:

### Mockery of Justice

Emerald Editor:

Although some may mistakenly accuse us of "white racism" for having the temerity to speak out, we nevertheless feel impelled to do so.

We were very disturbed about a University dean being assaulted, as reported in Friday's Emerald, by one of the defenders who participated in the Feb. 7 evening hearing involving a member of the Black Student Union. Such an action must be condemned by all responsible human beings.

This entire situation makes a mockery of justice, particularly justice under the Student Conduct System. The apparent lack of order at the hearing, and the relatively light sentence imposed on the offender began this trend.

But the worst came when the dean was assaulted by one of this student's friends. The action is completely indefensible. It was not only a violation of

law, it demonstrated a complete lack of intelligence and restraint.

We would strongly urge the dean involved to initiate legal proceedings against the student. It must be demonstrated now that violent and illegal means must not be condoned or deemed acceptable procedure to gain questionable ends.

Certain spokesmen for the Black Students have said that "Black Power" means economic freedom and power. But apparently to some who profess belief in "Black Power," the term means physical force and violence.

Society—particularly a society of an intellectual nature such as the University—must show that it will not tolerate violence by anyone, regardless of race, to obtain his desires.

Ellwood Cushman, Jr.  
Sophomore  
Music—Law  
Richard C. Adamson  
Senior, Sociology

### Prayer For Rain

Emerald Editor:

Cringing through The Oregon Daily Enemy (the particular day has mattered little), I joyfully encountered what I would not:

Campus Happenings  
Ali Akbar Khan, famed Indian sarod(ist), Tuesday at 8:00 p.m.

The Beers Family, 'traditional folk singers', Wednesday at 8:00 p.m.

Buckminster Fuller, erstwhile jack-of-all-trades, Friday at 8:00 p.m.

—while wistfully seeking what I would:

Campus Happenings  
Nada, or Academia, intense work-study, tonight(s) at 7:00 p.m. (Meals, 5-7), for all those interested. Place: confines of your own abode.

—And this (to indicate the strength of the illusion) on one sunblue day, prime exemplar of a sadistic week.

Robert E. Emmons, Jr.  
Graduate, English