

Editorial

Trial result no cause for celebration

We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, drawing their just powers from the consent of the governed—That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government . . .

. . . when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen United States of America—July 4, 1776

The five month long conspiracy trial in Chicago is ended, five men have been convicted of crossing state lines to promote rioting.

That all seven defendants have been acquitted of conspiracy, and the two charged with teaching the use of incendiary devices have also been acquitted is no cause for celebration. David Dellinger, Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman, Tom Hay-

den, and Rennie Davis face a maximum sentence of five years in jail and \$10,000 fines, and all the defendants are in jail on contempt sentences ranging from two and a half months to two and a half years.

What effect the convictions and contempt sentences will have on every citizen in this nation must now be given the greatest consideration, and each of us must examine his political beliefs and ideals to see how extensive the damage is.

Beyond that, the convictions, and the fact that the trial actually took place, calls for a larger, more personal response than public witness; although non-violent demonstrations are certainly in order.

They call for a review of what has transpired in Chicago in relation to our Constitution, and what manner of responsibility has been placed on the shoulders of each individual as a result.

For an ugly and terrifying stain has been put on the Constitution by the convictions and contempt sentences, and it will not be removed by reversing the convictions or the setting aside of the contempt sentences.

The stain will not be removed even if the President and his Attorney General never again seek indictments for violations of the law the seven were tried under. Nor will it be removed

in the event that law is repealed by the Congress or struck down by the Supreme Court. Although these actions would go part of the way towards avoiding future wrongs, they are not sufficient.

The stain can only be erased by an alarmed and vigilant people, fully conscious of their duty to never let it happen again, to never again allow such wholesale dereliction of duty and disregard for the Constitution on the part of their elected and appointed servants.

For it is the duty of the people, the ultimate repository of power in a democracy, to resist the Congress should it try to pass another law so inimical to the right of association and speech. It is the duty of the people to resist should a president and his attorney general flagrantly disregard their sworn oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution by seeking indictments under so dangerous a law.

It is the people's duty to resist a judge and prosecutor should they perpetrate such a travesty of justice by conducting a trial like the one just concluded in Chicago.

And if in the future the people fail in the resistance to such clear abuses of delegated power; if in the future the people fail in the resistance to such usurpations of authority, than it is their duty to throw off such government, and provide "new guards" for their security.

Letters

Appealing idea

It is an appealing idea that Prof. Sheppard sells regarding preschool education.

It is also somewhat fashionable to portray educators and their efforts as less than speedy. As a member of the "establishment" I'd like to comment.

Historically, psychologists have had a lot of fun with educators ranging from psychologizing their curricula to condemning their efforts.

This has been almost as much fun as their main game — verbal hippy-hop.

Miss Routson seems to have been able to combine both themes in her report of the never never land of Educational Environment.

Before rushing to sign a contract for your progeny with E.E., it might be fair to ask what does it mean to "actively combine advanced cognitive behaviors, sophisticated artistic and creative behaviors, well-developed perceptual-motor behaviors, and mature social behaviors in the child; while maintaining a balance between the spontaneity and initiative which characterize the growing organism and formalized structured behavior necessary for meeting society's demands?"

Or, please explain "by the time they're eight, the children will have acquired all the basic educational skills."

This happy promise appears so readily attainable that it really should be shared with educators.

Of course educators are so non-creative it may not be possible.

Henry Dizney
Assoc. Professor,
Educational Psychology

Defends Clark

Recent editorials and letters to the editor published in your columns contain serious distortion of University President Clark's statement to the faculty of Wednesday, Feb. 4, in which he explained the principles governing handling of the "Weyerhaeuser disruption" and the steps that would be taken. It seems to me that careful attention to the text of the president's statement, published in the Emerald on Feb. 6, would have made much of this critical reaction unnecessary.

First, the president made it

clear that his stand on the Weyerhaeuser occurrence was based on exactly the same principles used on earlier occasions to defend the appearance of controversial speakers on campus, to protect the press freedom of the Emerald and other campus publications, and to protect freedom of dissent by student groups.

"Basic to the character of the University is its open campus tradition," the president said, "set forth in a classic statement on the right of inquiry, free discourse, and respect for privacy.

"These traditions . . . are too well established and widely understood to warrant further elucidation at this time."

The president may have spoken too confidently. It is open to question if the tradition of the University as an open forum is "widely understood" in certain sectors of the campus. Nevertheless, the same principles underlie the president's Feb. 4 statement as having guided presidents and the faculty for many years in protecting the open character of this University, usually against attacks from off-campus.

I cannot therefore interpret his statement as a "get tough policy," a "hard line stand," or an unusual exercise of "power," as we have read in the press. The policy is what it always has been.

A related issue has become muddled and confused through implications, in editorials and letters, that the president would institute special disciplinary procedures if he were not satisfied with the severity of the sentences imposed on the defendants.

Again, reference to the president's written text is needed. "I am told by many in the University community that the Student Conduct Code is ineffective and cannot deal with the problem . . . I want to give them procedures every chance to prove themselves . . . (but) we cannot . . . allow this incident to go unnoticed if, indeed the student courts or the Conduct Committee fail to function, or if the code does not cover the disruptive incidents or if persons involved are not subject to the code."

Every reference to the code was in terms of its applicability, coverage, and procedural ability to cope with the problems, not in terms of the nature of penalties that might be imposed.

I am not asking to "trust Bob

Clark." All I suggest is that you read what the man said.

Editorial attacks on the president stretch back almost to the date he arrived on campus. That campaign has marred an otherwise pretty good year of news reporting, columns and photography. There are no winners in this kind of "cold war." We all lose.

J. N. Tattersall
Prof. of Economics

Performer insulted

I have always been impressed and pleased with the caliber of entertainment we have had at the University in the past few years.

It is too bad that the school and the students have to pay a large sum of money to see a great artist come here and compete with the various failings of our sound system in McArthur Court.

This is an open invitation to anyone who can answer me why we cannot have a sound system that will enable the great entertainment that we get to perform to the best of their ability.

As I understand it, Blood, Sweat and Tears will be here spring term; I would hate to see them insulated as was John Mayall.

Rob Lowe
Junior
Political Science

Childish letter

Mr. Goldstein's (Prof of Economics) "reply" to the Jan. 14 Coalition was so childish, selfish and myopic that I really could not resist responding. Rather than engage in an academic debate (which his column could hardly initiate anyway), I will reply in kind with the following items.

First: ri. unions, scabs and Goldstein's laissez-faire philosophy. I suggest we remove his own tenure and the protection of the AAUP and allow him to compete for his job every year, or month. In view of the onsetting "recession" I suspect that desperate "scab" economists will substantially underbid him, soon ridding us of his philosophy and saving the taxpayers many thousands of dollars and give some poor unemployed Ph.D a job (for about \$3,000/yr), thus alleviating a bit of the real hard-core poverty.

Second: I would not advocate abolishing the use and manufacture of toilet paper. I would advocate diverting the profits derived from its sale into cleaning up some of the crap in the air resulting from its manufacture. Weyerhaeuser boasts a 75 per cent increase in profits for '69, now how about a 75 per cent reduction in pollution for '70?

Third: Let's follow his laissez-faire policy overseas. Let the people (not governments, which are known corrupt and under the sway of our State Dept. and Military and Economic missions) renegotiate the terms of our "investments." With no more marines, coup d'etats, etc., the terms would certainly change, and living conditions for 95 per cent of the people could not get any worse.

Fourth: Mr. Goldstein's suggestion that all the peoples outside

God's own White America would be but cavemen were it not for our corporate beneficence, smacks strongly of a brand of racism rather unpopular in the Third World today, and I would highly recommend that he does not travel abroad for some time to come.

They may act like savages, being unaware of his Ph.D and what it confers.

Russell Husted
Grad., Anthro.

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.

Credibility gap; where it begins

From the Oregon Journal, Tuesday, Feb. 17, under the banner headline, "Students Hamper Firemen: U of O Fire Destroys ROTC Office, Records."

. . . "It took nearly three hours to control the blaze because students climbed on firefighting equipment and clogged the area in an effort to hamper the firemen. Police finally cleared the area."

From the Chicago Daily News, Tuesday, Feb. 17, under the headline "Students help ROTC blaze."

"EUGENE, Ore.—A fire in the physical education building at the University of Oregon Monday night destroyed the ROTC offices and other facilities, including irreplaceable records.

It took nearly three hours to control the blaze because students climbed on firefighting equipment and clogged the area to hamper the firemen. Police finally cleared the area.

Battalion Fire Chief David Boggs said he did not know how the fire started but the possibility of arson would be investigated."

"When a false report is made in this climate of fear and apprehension of students, it spreads. You can never catch up with it."

—Robert Clark Feb. 18