

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.

RON EACHUS, Editor
RICH JERNSTEDT
Business Manager

University of Oregon, Eugene, Thursday, November 21, 1968

Let's Hear The Other Side

You read in the commercial newspapers and hear on the radio about student activism, student revolt, student power, and, yes, even student obscenity.

And what you read was said by the governor, or the chancellor, or a legislator, or maybe the president of one of the institutions. Sometimes, when the whim strikes the editors of the commercial papers, you may find—down in the last three inches of an article, below the statements of the governor, the chancellor, the university president, and the legislator—you may find some comments by a student.

What demonstrates how little power students actually hold is the fact that student opinion is held in such low regard that the press rarely bothers to report it.

How many times have you seen student comments leading off a story on a major student incident? How many times, in fact, have you seen students quoted regarding student issues?

During the Democratic Convention, few newspapers covering the street battles interviewed students involved in the demonstrations. The ideas and opinions of the students at Columbia and Berkeley received little room in the papers when student unrest prevailed at these institutions earlier this year.

And when all this fuss began over obscenity at the University, did the newspapers and radio stations come down to get the student side of things? Well, the Register-Guard did run a four page feature on the Emerald a month after the paper printed "offensive" words, even quoting the staff on the last page. Tuesday's Guard printed a story with ASUO President Dick Jones comment's on the issue, after it spent half the story writing about what University President Charles Johnson didn't say.

That of, course, is considerably more than other commercial media around the state have done. The journalistic creed of printing all sides of a question seems to have been amended to add, "unless one side represents student views."

So the readers and listeners of commercial newspapers and radio stations in this state, by and large, believe that their tax money is going to support "filth" at the University. Many readers, in addition, may believe Berkeley, Columbia, this University and others are overrun by radical students bent on destroying the institutions. And few people outside the academic community have any idea why students act the way they do.

We thus suggest that the next time someone issues a charge against the University, or students in it, the commercial media seek out statements by the accused parties and release both the charge and the defense at the same time. That's only fair.



"Durin' this transition period, the Yew-nited States will be speakin' with one voice . . . y'hear?"

J. L. Danielson Students Must Sell Movement To All Parts of Society

Editor's note: J. L. Danielson, a citizen of Eugene, in the following advises students to attack the establishment from all sides.

The youth of the nation have, as it were, a product to sell, their moral, legal, and political judgement. But they have been brainwashed by the middle class philosophy which deems it right to make only one attempt to sell a dissident point of view, and then to retire politely. Youth forgets, however, that a good salesman never considers the effort completed until he has exhausted all the means available. Youth groups approach their problems from only one or two directions and sell only to those who are ready to buy just this particular commodity—largely, to other young people.

A resistance group marches to the draft board and several members turn in or burn their Selective Service Cards. They do this once, twice, a thousand times but it makes no difference—they've been only convincing people that they (the youths) are sold on the value of their action, and that's all they achieve. People can easily write them off as "young and foolish," and forget the whole affair.

What the young could do, if they expect to have any effect, is to follow through, attack the dilemma from another side, to force the involvement of larger segments of the community, and remind them that such problems as an immoral conscription system are not just problems to long-haired youth, but also to crew-cut and conscripted youth, to foreign victims of our military machine, and to a desensitized, dehumanized, and sold-out society.

Why not, for example: (1) make public the names of the Vietnam war dead from the city, county, or state draft or (2) make public the names and occupations of the draft board members who selected (sentenced) these men for combat.

Neither list is secret, though it may take a real sleuth to gather some of the information. Perhaps this would bring it home to the citizenry that this product which youth is advertising — humaneness and conservation of human life — might be of some value. And perhaps people would like to know what sort of person acts on a draft board, what he sells, where he lives, etc.

With the public thus informed, the individual might be forced to face the consequences of his choice to serve the military machine. It would be brought home to such a person if his customers began to boycott his business, or if his dealings with other businesses became less congenial. He might be forced to remember his moral circumstance if his neighbors suddenly ceased to greet him—to smile and wave when they encountered him on the street. This would not be petty vengeance aimed at local draft boards, but rather, a fully legal move aimed at creating some friction and discomfort for these boards. Obviously, if the national conscription system does not function well on the local level—the individual level—it may not function at all.

This is an example of a possibly effective second step in this "sale" of moral judgement. One cannot, with a falsely British schoolboyish sense of fair play, make one attempt, or one kind of attempt to reform, and then retire quietly, accepting the slapped hand that society administrators. It is true that violence serves no purpose until everything else is exhausted, and he who first resorts to violence loses the argument.

But by forcing society to deal with its acts as the collective action of individual people, perhaps the awareness of personal responsibility for institutions' actions will help to bring about the changes needed in those institutions and in that society. As long as the purveyors of old and immoral institutions can hide their responsibility behind those institutions, we are stuck with such customs as the draft, et. al.

Emerald Editor:

All letters to the editor must be typewritten and triple 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.

Gruesome Growers

Emerald Editor:
Isn't youthful enthusiasm wonderful? Just think: all of those fine young people going to such lengths to right the beastly wrongs perpetrated by the Grape Growers (oh, fie!).

The boycotters (huzzah!) have indeed at least come up with an invincible plan to smite the fiendish conspiracy of those Gruesome Grape Growers. You see, if the small farmers are driven out of existence, no problem will exist, because no jobs will exist. That way welfare takes over, and the taxpayer—pardon, the state will pay their wages. Too, they will get to know their earstwhile employers better, since they also will be forming the same lines. Now isn't that the most logical plan of attack? (Besides which, of course, it needs no facts.) Oh rah, you Benevolent Boycotters. I am astounded that such glorious and righteous ingenuity has arisen from the ranks of the humble.

But lo! a problem: what about those other nasty grapers—the big producers who sell to the wineries—yet untouched by the hand of right. Ah, the logical solution: boycott the wicked wineries! Buy not of California wine! That should go over big on campus.

Oh, press on, you gallant boycotters! Perhaps some day you will find your raisin d'etre (sic). Maybe then you can strike a blow against the perverted peach people.

Mike Grube
Junior, Math.

'Financial Suicide'

Emerald Editor:
For those ambitious demonstrators who actually feel they are going to be doing a great good by presenting their uneaten grapes to Dick Romm on Friday, it would be wise to consider that action.

Let us say that a small California farmer made the mistake of deciding to attempt grape production on twenty acres of new land. Grapes take from five to ten years to reach productivity, and such land rarely costs less than \$2000 per acre. So, with \$40,000 tied up in the land, and a nominal \$1100 per acre per year to cover planting, fertilizing, spraying, cultivating, irrigation, pruning, property taxes, and hopefully few other things if he is lucky, we can assume that the farmer has only invested \$140,000 by the time his first crop is ready for harvest. But.

The big production farmers, who rarely have trouble getting their grapes picked, sold their grapes to the wineries before they even existed—at a comfortable profit. The small farmer then turns to the open market, but boycotters have made grape prices so low and picking wages so high (pickers in California now make at least 35c per hour more than many workers in Oregon) that it would be financial suicide to attempt harvest and sale of the grapes. The farmer may do one of two things. He may let the grapes rot, or pull up the vineyards.

Thus occurs the demise of many a vineyard. The big producers don't get hurt and the small farmer is eliminated. Isn't it wonderful that the boycott does so much good, by eliminating the jobs for the pickers (and the small farmers).

No need to worry about higher wages at all, because the jobs won't exist. That way, they can turn to welfare and unemployment. Won't that be groovy? Then you and I and the state can all pay their wages.

Jim Dodge
Senior, General Science

Re C--- P---

Emerald Editor:

Re: Mr. Charles Potterf
I'm glad to see that someone gives a d--- about all the c--- going on at the University. I, however, feel that in spite of the radical elements, "sh--heads", and the "g--d-- state of affairs", I am receiving an education of which I can be proud. I also feel that radiator service owners are overpaid.

Robert Ousterhout
Freshman
Liberal Arts

Followed Advice

Emerald Editor:

I followed your advice and called the Register-Guard to find out what the Wizard of ID said. Some editor down there said, "As I've said to about a dozen other people this morning, we didn't take the words out to tell you over the telephone. We took them out to take them out."

Please, would someone come through for me and tell me what sort of "filth" and "smut" is in common use out there in the real world?

Ronald Stenkamp
Junior, Chemistry

Hiding Behind Rights

Emerald Editor:

The University has been receiving threats that unless something is done about the distribution of publications containing filth and obscenity on the campus, the State Legislature may sanction and place restrictions on the University.

It has been argued that if these restrictions are placed on the University, the rights concerning freedom of speech and the press will be violated. This could or could not be true depending upon the meaning of freedom of press and speech.

If freedom of speech and press means the freedom to speak and print criticisms, expressions, or grievances that an individual might have, then these proposed restrictions would not violate free speech or press.

Gov. Tom McCall has stated that if restrictions were placed on the University, the Ohio State type restrictions would be followed. The Ohio restriction states: "... these regulations are not intended in any way to discourage or restrict freedom of speech, including criticism, expression or grievances or petition for redress of wrong, real or fancied . . ." This does not prohibit the freedom of expression of ones ideas and grievances.

If however, one defines freedom of speech and press as being able to say or print anything including obscene and vulgar words and illustrations, then yes, the freedom of speech and press would be violated. That however, won't cause tears in my eyes!

If someone has an idea he
(Continued on page 7)