

# Moratorium: minds were not changed



The "day in October" is over—  
you can come out now.

In his Wednesday evening speech at McArthur Court, former Senator Wayne Morse outlined the history of American involvement in Asia.

Morse made it clear the war in Vietnam increased substantially in 1953 when Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles formulated the so-called "military containment policy."

Morse claims, and not without overpowering evidence, that the containment policy is

still in effect, and constitutes the underlying motive behind the present conflict in Southeast Asia.

A policy which has dictated American foreign policy for 17 years is not changed in a day, as Morse will readily admit.

And though the first day of the Vietnam Moratorium involved hundreds of thousands of citizens across the country, the immediate affect on the powers that be, was at best, vague.

Indeed, the protests were met with displays of indifference from the President, and contempt from the likes of Spiro Agnew and Ronald Reagan.

Agnew, speaking at a Washington dinner the other night, decried the Moratorium, and asserted that the policy of the government could not be determined by demonstrations led by "young punks and middle-aged malcontents."

Agnew's comment elicited a standing ovation from his audience.

Reagan, addressing a dinner with Nixon as the chief guest, echoed Agnew's feelings, and charged that the Moratorium was treasonous.

Nixon, played dead, and hid in the White House during the day-long protest.

The point of it all, is simply that the Moratorium accomplished little more than mobilizing the nation's anti-war feeling.

Minds were not changed, and the protest originally billed as a day of dialogue, offered little in the way of open debate.

Moratorium leaders, of course, say their fight has just begun, that the protest will continue in November, January and until the United States withdraws completely from South Vietnam.

Their task will be greater now than ever before. It will be difficult to duplicate, much less surpass the emotional commitment prompted by Wednesday's Moratorium observance.

And by expanding the protest to two days next month, some of the impact may be lost.

After all, it took 17 years to mobilize 4,000 people for a march in downtown Eugene. It will be most difficult to duplicate that march in just another month.

Unfortunately, to be measured a success, the Moratorium must continue to grow.

Some random comments on the local Moratorium observances.

- The Eugene march was tremendously effective, due primarily to extensive local planning and a meticulous timetable. The lack of organized chanting, singing and what not, only added to the feeling that the crowd was committed to peace rather than disturbance.

- Local news coverage, with the exception of the Eugene Register-Guard, was disappointing and scratchy. Radio and television stations seem to miss the point of such protests, and tend to lend credence to minor and incomplete points. Their dependence on incomplete wire service reports is disturbing. One TV station gave a march figure of 2,500, nearly half the official participation figure.

- Throughout the day, in Eugene, Salem and Portland, a surprising number of older persons, housewives with children, teachers, businessmen and others, participated in Moratorium activities. The Moratorium was not just a student protest.

- John Dellenback, Fourth District Congressman, had better pay attention to Wayne Morse. In his speech Wednesday night, Morse proved that age is no barrier to political activity. The former "tiger of the Senate" is still a tiger, and despite the fact that he had spoken four times previously that day, and was scheduled to speak a sixth time in Corvallis, he attacked the war and Nixon with all the vigor of a youthful legislator.

It will be a warm day in the Arctic when the present Fourth District Congressman can match Morse for sheer force of personality, brilliance and knowledge.

## Letters

### Endorse protest

**Emerald editor:**

Those of us who participated in the Vietnam Moratorium activities will be asked to do so with escalated dedication in November; those not participating will be asked to join us. In December an escalation of effort will be asked for again; and in January, February . . . until the troops come home. One need not look far into the future to find issues which will be "bringing it all back home."

In the winter or spring students will be asked to boycott classes for a week, not merely for a day; and faculty members to join them by cancelling classes. I cannot help but wonder what the reaction of a "neutral" University will be to such an escalation: its reaction may in fact reveal and define a political commitment.

And how binding is the commitment to peace of individuals who marched on Wednesday? How many who marched on one day will not march on five days in succession? How warm will be the welcome of our mayor, who offered City Hall as the proper terminal for a protest march, if we ask for his cooperation not for one day, but for one week? Bringing it all back home.

It is the very genius of the plan to escalate protest that it brings the issues back home. We shall learn much about ourselves and our community in the months ahead: whether to march in protest of the war is to petition for peace, and unequivocally, or whether it serves to assuage a guilty (white) conscience with

mystical rites about which Michael Harrington has written; whether neutrality is possible if the struggle is one of life against death; whether we are fighting our institutions or what has been done to them; whether we are fighting (power) politics itself; whether the Vietnam war is our enemy or the enemy's most heinous embodiment; and whether that enemy has been sleeping with our own mistress of knowledge; and with ourselves.

We shall learn much. And this, in my view, is reason enough to endorse the escalation of protest, for presumably to learn is the purpose of our presence here.

**Charles Deemer, Graduate Fellow  
Department of English**

### Honorable peace

**Emerald Editor:**

As an Army veteran (without combat experience) who favors the continuation of classes as an opportunity for students to take their stands by attending classes or by absenting themselves, I submit the following as my personal opinions of our involvement in Vietnam:

1. A 1968 resolution of the American Bar Association, one distinguishing war from police action by the matter of invasion, convinces me of the legality of our policies.
2. As the leader of the so-called Free World, the United States should take whatever action is necessary—but no more—to assist other nations in repelling aggressors.
3. While the United States should firmly insist that an invaded nation do as

much of her own fighting as possible, the United States should also insist that other allies (e.g., South Korea, the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia) provide their share of support as long as outside support is needed. Perhaps their over-reliance on our power, rather than a disbelief in the "Domino Theory," has been the reason for their providing only token support.

4. The apparent failure of gradualism, combined with the remarks of military experts, suggests to me that enemy supply lines should be heavily bombed with non-nuclear weapons. However, South Vietnam should do as much of this as possible—under American diplomatic pressure, if necessary.

5. All of the above should, of course, be subject to the success of honorable diplomatic negotiations between the opposing powers.

**Herbert Swett  
Post-graduate senior,  
Journalism**

### Three dog night

**Emerald editor:**

The following opposes your rendition of the Three Dog Night, pop recording artists, and their recent performance in Mac Court which appeared in your Oct. 13 issue. Let me state I am not a prejudiced fan of the band, but am merely an appreciator of pop music who felt an injustice was made in your evaluation of the Three Dog Night.

The showing of the Three Dog Night was certainly more than "a moderately entertaining sham" as stated in your re-

view. Why else would the 6,000 spectators give an overwhelmingly enthusiastic standing ovation to the band at the end of the night, pleading for this "sham" to continue?

Furthermore, I conclude little logic in your labelling the Three Dog Night as a "decidedly second-rate rock group." The extreme success of their records, their local appearance (of which even you admitted the audience "flipped" over), and appearances throughout the country all seem to indicate a very different and superior status.

Northwest music fans will remember a rock concert a year ago in which it was unanimously agreed the Three Dog Night had upstaged Steppenwolf, an established first rate rock group. Today, a top-billing band themselves, it is doubtful if many rate the Three Dog Night second as hastily as did the Emerald.

Thirdly, you criticize the band as having "obvious vocal and instrumental limitations" which produce "no variation." Quite contrarily, it is the band's wide musical ability and versatility which sells records and tickets to their performances. The Three Dog Night prefer not to write their own material, therefore their repertoire is full of material written by various others. This definitely enlightens their show and adds constant variation to their style.

True, technical difficulties proved some electrical devices weren't so great last Friday night, but the Three Dog Night was.

**Paul Keller,  
Sophomore, Journalism**