

Moratorium:

A chance to be heard

"Ending the war in Vietnam is the most important task facing the American nation. Over the last few years, millions of Americans have campaigned, protested and demonstrated against the war. Few now defend the war, yet it continues. Death and destruction are unabated; bombs and fire continue to devastate South Vietnam. Billions of dollars are spent on a war while the urgent domestic problems of this country remain unattended. More over, the war has had a corrupting influence on every aspect of American life, and much of the national discontent can be traced to its influence."

So begins the Call for a Vietnam Moratorium.

The aim of the Moratorium is peaceful protest for the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Vietnam. However the real thrust of the day depends on the individuals that will participate this Wednesday.

The planned activities on this campus include memorial services at McArthur Court, a procession to Eugene City Hall, community teach-ins and a mass meeting featuring former Sen. Wayne Morse.

Many will not want to participate in the planned activities but we urge everyone to reflect on the war which has killed 40,000 Americans and wounded a quarter of a million more. It is an opportunity to register your personal protest by stopping "business as usual" for a few minutes, or the entire day.

The Moratorium comes at a time when opposition to the war has grown until the most recent polls indicate sixty percent of the American people feel our involvement in Vietnam is a mistake. It is time to mobilize this public opinion; the Moratorium represents an effective way to cast a vote against the war.

While the University is not a politically neutral institution we agree with The New Republic that it should not normally be organized to function as a political institution. "But the times are abnormal. It is the principal custodians of the public interest—the politicians—who are most responsible for that, not the custodians of enlightenment. The academy has been left no choice but to engage itself in the democratic process, to demonstrate the power of knowledge, to provide a model of rational discourse and persuasion."

We call upon everyone in our community to support the moratorium.

Join us.

Readers respond to Clark editorials:

'Been bad again'

Dear "Cowards, Communists and Yellow Journalists" of the Emerald:

Mother tells me you've been being bad again. You've been saying naughty things about that Nice Mister Clark, even though he smiles in all your pictures. He's just doing his job. It's those Hippies who are causing trouble. I bet they don't study or take baths and stay up late at night and smoke things. But that Nice Mister Clark knows what's best. He knows that they should study Greek and calculus and U.S. history and things that matter so they can be good citizens in our democracy.

Those troublemakers know we have a democracy. Then why are they trying to change things?

I love my country, even if they don't. Mom, apple pie, the flag, and nice Mister Clark.

Robert Ousterhout
Sophomore, Conservative Arts.

Sophistical edits

Emerald Editor:

This reader cannot recall any editorial in any newspaper more sophistical than the Emerald's editorials of Oct. 9.

Pres. Clark is pronounced cowardly and naive for saying that the University should stay out of the public question of Vietnam

even though the University itself is involved in public issues by its very existence.

Have the editorial writers never observed that any governmental institution normally limits its public positions to those with which it is directly concerned?

The Department of Justice is an arm of the same federal government whose activities include welfare, but it would surprise me if Atty. Gen. Mitchell demanded less welfare spending and the Emerald did not tell him to mind his own business.

To say that it does not take backbone to stand up to "a powerless group" of students is to have too short a memory to recall that a group of students on this campus had enough physical power to drive Navy recruits out of the EMU.

At Columbia University, such power even kept the president from entering his office.

By keeping classes in session, Pres. Clark is permitting students to take their stands by attending classes or by absenting themselves. Missing one class can hardly ruin a student academically.

Much is said about Pres. Clark's apparent inability to make decisions with which his advisers would disagree, but the point is never specifically developed. Neither is the point that he was wrong to disbelieve "that the



"Face-Saving Device"

housing office was buying grapes in larger numbers as the grape boycott grew in strength."

The purchase of grapes, impresses me as an opportunity for students to take their stands. Those who support Mr. Chavez do not have to eat the grapes.

The Oct. 9 editorials, then, suggest incompetence on the part of the editorial staff. However, it may be too much to expect the Emerald to find clearer-thinking editorial writers when it cannot even find a cartoonist who can spell moratorium.

Herbert Swett
Journalism

Unsigned editorials

Emerald editor:

To rebut the remarks on Thursday's (Oct. 9) Emerald editorial page would be wasting a reasonable explanation of ethics, judgment, and responsibility.

Among the petulant and puerile allegations on that page was the contention that U of O President Robert Clark displayed "cowardice."

There is a certain kind of cowardice in printing unsigned editorial attacks of this kind, and in declining to identify their author(s).

Kenneth L. Warren
Graduate Student
715 E. 16th, Eugene

Editor's note: The Emerald has not had the policy of signing editorials since 1956. It might also be pointed out that the New York Times, The Oregonian and the Eugene Register-Guard and many other newspapers do not sign their editorials.

Emerald merriment

Emerald editor:

As you may know, the Emerald is a source of merriment to many of us in the University community. Editorials such as the sophomoric attacks on President Clark in Oct. 9 issue provide a few chuckles and an occasional guffaw to accompany morning coffee.

Would it be asking too much to have the authors of your editorials sign their products? There would, I am sure, be much more enjoyment in looking "to see what old so-and-so has to say" than in just observing the output of a faceless group.

C.R.B. Wright
Assoc. Prof., Mathematics

Professor replies

Emerald editor:

I am bemused by the logic in the letter of several of my distinguished colleagues (Emerald, October 10) who argue that President Clark was quite correct in not closing the University on Moratorium Day, since this would force individuals "to participate in an expression of political views," at the same time that they themselves plan not to conduct classes or laboratory sessions on that day.

Are they not forcing students who might actually prefer to attend class, and express their sentiments about the Vietnam war in some other way, or at some other time, to participate just as effectively as President Clark would have done had he closed down the school?

Rather than cancellation of classes, which involves no self-sacrifice or evidence of devotion to a cause, would it not be better for each person with profound convictions on this matter to set this day aside as a day of fasting and (if religious) prayer? We could do worse than follow in the footsteps of Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King.

E. Novitski
Prof. of Biology

Part of a family

Emerald editor:

The honeymoon is over? But the wedding was with 15,000 students, 3500 staff members and over two million Oregonians. You are a part of the family, but he really isn't expected to get into bed with you.

Barbara M. Jensen
UO staff member

One-sided appraisal

To the editors:

Before I begin this letter I would like to state that I am by no means a "hawk" or in any way against the moratorium or its purpose.

However, I do feel compelled to criticize the Emerald editors for their unjust and obvious one-sided appraisal of Robert Clark. Not saying I completely agree with this man or his views but rather, that he has been harshly slashed by a paper well known to side with the radical right wing; interested not in positive

change but change for the benefit of their own interests.

Pres. Clark's stand on the moratorium is completely valid and is the only possible means of maintaining a neutral free choice environment. The editors feel the University should cancel all classes to remain neutral; this however, is a stand in itself, implying all students are in favor of the moratorium.

This should be expressed individually as one of Clark's "no-sequiters" states . . . which I believe completely true . . . "The moratorium will have more effect on the general public if it is done on an individual commitment basis as it demonstrates individual concern and not just a one day vacation."

The article also points out that there is no "middle ground" on this issue. You are either for the war or against it and if you are against it you are for the moratorium and cancelling classes Wednesday! This is wrong. There must always be room for debate on any issue . . . if there isn't how could we, as students, question any function of the University?

I am personally in favor of the moratorium and will participate and will encourage all other students to participate, but it is not my right or the University's to force anyone else to become involved.

Cancelling classes is doing just that, and it is no more right than cancelling classes for a pro Vietnam rally.

I hope my feelings are clear: I am opposed to the war in Vietnam but also opposed to child-like, one-sided outbursts which only act to the detriment of the majority.

Chris Lamen
Architecture

Moratorium opinions

Those who wish to have their opinions on the moratorium published will have an opportunity to do so in the Special Emerald Moratorium issue to be published Wednesday. We ask only that letters be kept to a reasonable length, 300 words or shorter, be typed and triple spaced. Letters are due by noon on Tuesday.