

Opinion

The fact is, it is the young who have in their own amateurish, even grotesque way, gotten dissent off the adult drawing board. They have torn it out of the books and journals an older generation of radicals authored, and they have fashioned it into a style of life. They have turned the hypotheses of disgruntled elders into experiments, though often without the willingness to admit that one may have to concede failure at the end of any true experiment.

When all is said and done, however, one cannot help being ambivalent toward this compensatory dynamism of the young. For it is, at last, symptomatic of a thoroughly diseased state of affairs. It is not ideal, it is probably not even good that the young should bear so great a responsibility for inventing or initiating for their society as a whole. It is too big a job for them to do successfully. It is indeed tragic that in a crisis that demands the tact and wisdom of maturity, everything that looks most hopeful in our culture should be building from scratch—as must be the case when the builders are absolute beginners.

—Theodore Roszak. *The Making of a Counter Culture, Reflections on the technocratic society and its youthful opposition*



Letters

Emphatic disassociation

The Arab Student Association held an unscheduled meeting Thursday, Jan. 13, in connection with implicating its name in the Emerald, on the previous day with the proposed "People's Trial," organized by the Jan. 14 Coalition. The organization adopted a resolution to this effect:

The Arab Student Association wishes to emphatically disassociate itself from all activities organized and conducted by the Jan. 14 Coalition.

The Association calls upon the Emerald to print a correction concerning linking the organization's name with the Jan. 14 Coalition in Monday's paper. We understand and wish it known that the Emerald's reporting staff made a mistake in including the association's name among the groups supporting and organizing the Jan. 14 Coalition. The Arab Student Association had no intention of lending such support. Any participation by Arab Students in the trial was on an individual basis and should be so regarded.

Abdel Halim
President

ROTC confronted

The other day, out of mere curiosity, I decided to attend an ROTC class. I'd refuse to be a part of any force like our Army but I wanted to know what kind of education these possible officers receive.

I was politely received in James McDaniel's class on Jan. 15, though I was told that next time I was to have permission prior to attending the class.

The lecture of the day concerned military courtesies such as the use of sir in addressing a senior officer, the use of the salute and some supposedly logical explanation for a junior officer opening and closing doors for his senior! The logic being that the senior has more work to do, so he must get to his job faster through doors opened by his junior.

I asked a few questions concerning the psychological consequences of siring and the salute but McDaniel seemed to deny that there could be any detrimental effects upon soldiers.

I could have argued every militarily sided point McDaniel made, however, when the group of anti-ROTC people approached the buildings, he dismissed the class as he said he would, earlier. The majority of those in the class left, looking like fourth graders, pleased to get out of class due to a fire drill.

While the marchers shouted outside locked classroom doors, I attempted to argue my anti-war stance with those remaining, in-

cluding McDaniel. Although I got the same old arguments and falsehoods about the war in Vietnam, a couple of boys I talked to seemed concerned and somewhat frightened that their justifications for enrolling didn't stand upon sound foundations.

People, my point is that we can confront these enrollees on a one to one basis in class, raising questions as to the validity and morality of their acceptance of indoctrination. If these boys are confronted by a large group of people in their small classrooms, certainly they will get paranoid and start to reason in military lines. If we could turn on a few at a time to the possible consequences of their future actions perhaps they will not enroll in ROTC, therefore ROTC will cease to exist. I think it is worth a try.

David Parker
Junior, Liberal Arts

Established channels

A group of students with no discernable program of interest to the bulk of the members of the University community has just forced the adjournment of the monthly meeting of the general faculty (Jan. 14).

I suppose they felt it worth while to demonstrate that a small group can disrupt the orderly procedure of a large unarmed assembly. Was there any question in their minds about that before?

The cost to the general University community was delay in discussing and possibly passing legislation to reduce the nine-hour English Composition requirement to six hours and possibly asking the President to establish a committee to review the contracts under which ROTC courses are presently taught here, among other things.

None of the items on the agenda for the general faculty meeting was particularly earth-shaking, but with regard to those two at least I should have thought rational students would have regarded them as somewhat more urgent than the fun and games that took their place.

Does anybody seriously imagine that in a "politicized" and "polarized" atmosphere the left wing and poor people will find their lot improved? Why should rational people prefer irresponsible hysteria to mere smugness. Seeing in our University there are channels for achieving changes in course content, administrative structure below the State Board level and, I think (but would be happy to know facts to the contrary if I am uninformed) any other aspects of the organization and operation of the University, it is difficult to understand why any proposal that can stand pub-

lic scrutiny is not presented through established channels.

Is it thought that the University community, the legislature of Oregon or the public-at-large will be more kindly disposed to demands presented to the accompaniment of riot? Or that changes can be wrought by riot that the University community, the legislature of Oregon or the public-at-large do not want? Or is it pretended that merely shutting down the orderly operation of the University will somehow benefit somebody?

Suppose a real issue should arise and a demonstration might be felt to be helpful; would today's activities increase its chances of being noticed sympathetically?

In short, I am not only confused about the motives of today's demonstrators, but am also suspicious that some may have lost contact with reality.

Alfred Rubin
Associate Professor of Law

Abdicating reason

I have noticed in the aftermath of last Wednesday's kangaroo court that no one has got the essential point about that "trial" or about the radicals' "demands" on this or any other occasion.

President Clark declined to play along with the radicals, beyond the point of pretending with them that they actually had something to say, on nothing but the contention that the trial verdict was predetermined and hence, "art" rather than dialog, or whatever the jargon calls it these days.

That he in particular failed to make the one right reply to the contemptible arrogance of these hoodlums—namely, that the administrative policies and educational program of the University are not subject to their whims or anybody else's in the student body—reflects on his value to the people of Oregon as an administrator of their university.

The University is public property, which means that it is owned by and operated for the benefit of the people of Oregon—who pay the bills. The University's administration is employed by the people of the state to ensure efficient operation of the facility, for the purposes intended by the people of the state.

The faculty are employees of the University and the students are customers of the services provided by the University.

There is nothing sacred or mystical about either role: no special rights or privileges accrue to students and faculty of a school qua students and faculty.

In their respective roles as cus-

tomers and employees, students and faculty have no more right to determine administrative policies than post office patrons and postal clerks have to determine the price of postage stamps or the subject matter of commemorative stamps.

The University is not a political agent: it is an educational service supported by taxpayers. The University is not a social action center: there are large numbers of us who do not care about the personal problems of people we do not know, and regard any demands to the controversy as unwarranted interference. That students and faculty should run the University to suit their own purposes, which will change moment to moment according to whether left wing or right wing or moderate thugs seize control of the machinery of command, is an arbitrary and contemptible abrogation of the property rights of the people who own the University—Oregon taxpayers.

For President Clark or anybody else to reject the demands of the Jan. 14 Coalition or any other pressure group of whatever political stripe, on any grounds whatever, except that it is none of their damn business, is to abdicate reason and justice, not to mention relevance. For an administrator in President Clark's position it is worse—it is disloyalty to his employers and ought to be treated as such.

John Keim
Sophomore, Slav. Lang.

Intellectual suicide?

The SDS says "the University is an integral part of the military-industrial-educational complex," noting that it benefits from federal grants, maintains financial relationships with huge corporations, and has board members involved in big business.

Granted. Is the University thereby guilty of perpetuating the war and our other assorted afflictions?

I find this hard to buy. Nor am I clear about their remedies other than blood and confusion.

Federal money supports faculty research, graduate training, and the library. Should we decline such support and commit intellectual suicide?

State Board members are involved in big business. So are most successful Oregonians. Governors appoint such people to state boards.

The University does deal with big corporations. They sell us things we need: cars, typewriters, computers, paper towels. . . . It could liquidate its corporate investments, but what would it then invest in? Government bonds? Mom-and-Pop grocery stores? Why snub marketable as-

sets that yield a favorable return?

The Marxist tenets of the SDS are simply wrong. On balance, "big business" and "high finance" have lost, not gained, from war. Nor are they proponents of racism, pollution, or slums. Space forbids elaboration, but on the war-profiteering charge let me quote from a recent New Republic (Dec. 20, p. 15):

"Although America's munition makers are thought to be reaping a financial bonanza from the Vietnam war, the facts indicate otherwise. In 1965 the top five defense contractors were General Dynamics, Lockheed, General Electric and United Aircraft. By the beginning of 1969, one of the big five, Douglas has been squeezed out of existence; a second one, Lockheed, was in trouble. Of the three remaining, two were under severe financial pressure. For many war contractors, Vietnam has been a headache; for others it has been disaster."

Henry Goldstein
Assoc. Prof. of Economics

Disheartening task

The University community might like to share an example of frustration and resultant humor that occurred in my Anthropology 101 class on Thursday, January 15, 1970. When I arrived at 10:30, a student whose picture appeared on the front page of the Emerald, Friday, January 16 (bottom picture, fourth person from the left) asked to speak for a few minutes. I complied.

After discussing the Moratorium, the Vietnam War, and other matters for three or four minutes, he asked for questions. A student asked him if he would please leave since he was paying money to attend scheduled classes and hear scheduled lecturers, not political lectures. If he wanted to listen to a political lecture he could go to one of the rallies.

The lecturing student replied (undoubtedly without thinking) that that was the problem: when they held rallies no one went to them. At this point the students in the audience (perhaps two-thirds to three-fourths of normal attendance) began to laugh and heckle the student so that he was forced to leave the hall.

I could not help but reflect on the poor fellow's plight: when you cannot even succeed in radicalizing the students, how can you expect to succeed with the general populace? It certainly is a disheartening and frustrating task being a student revolutionary.

Philip Grant
Asst. Prof., Anthro.