

# Important faculty issues

A late report and a crowded agenda have forced the vote on ROTC to be put ahead to the June faculty meeting. This is justifiable as as much time as possible should be scheduled for debate on this vitally important issue. There is still other important business at hand though.

A proposal has been made that the faculty vote to call for the total withdrawal of American troops from Southeast Asia by Dec. 31, 1971. This is a resolution that will be proposed again in Congress and, hopefully, at many other forums across the nation.

It should be passed, for obvious reasons.

Another proposal is that the faculty vote to support "peaceful expression of convictions" regarding the war. This is a very important issue.

Protest has escalated in recent years from sit-ins at lunch counters during the civil rights movement to massive marches as in the Moratorium and finally to the hideous practice of bombings. The number of marches has grown to what some critics would call epidemic proportions.

All this has caused many people to become angry just at the word "protest". They have forgotten that protest can be peaceful and can involve more people than just students and radicals. All too often these

people identify the word protest with violence and riots.

This proposal would help the university community lead the way in this area toward greater participation by all citizens in the performance of their right of non-violent protest.

This proposal can take some of the onus from the word protest. It will be a major step

in involving the entire community in protesting this horrible war.

By passing the resolution the faculty members can show their neighbors, people just like them, that the community can be involved in protest without being considered "radical."

A good proposal, a sound proposal and an important one.

## Postscript

someone holding an opposite viewpoint on that issue.

Spectators should not heckle speakers or interfere with the rights of a person to express his or her opinion.

The faculty needs to take more stands on issues of national importance. A demonstration would not only interfere with the member's right to speak out on the issues—whether pro or con—but it would also discourage such discussions in the future.

Just as the faculty's support of a person's right to "peaceful expression" would be a step forward for individual expression of convictions, an act of disruption or interference would be a step backwards.

The faculty's discussion of the right to peacefully protest and of the immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Southeast Asia will probably draw a large crowd of interested spectators.

This is good. It shows an interest in the University's decision-making body as well as an interest in the issues involved. It shows an encouragement of further discussion of national issues by the faculty.

However, the spectators who gather to watch Wednesday's faculty meeting must bear in mind the fact that faculty members have just as much right to hold a view on an issue and to speak out accordingly as

## Letters

### Hysterical

It is difficult to answer anyone as confused as Walter J. Wentz, but his column last Thursday was so hysterical that I thought perhaps someone should try to soothe him by pointing out that those who disagree with him may not all be so dangerously mad as he fears.

Evidently he is too busy exhorting the rest of us to straighten up, open our eyes, use our minds, etc., to notice the abundant evidence that U.S. motives for waging war in Southeast Asia might be more complex and less altruistic than he suspects. In fact, anyone who begins with the premise that we are really assisting Vietnam may be beyond rational help, especially when he goes on to assert that the war "will probably not even slow down" when the U.S. pulls out. Really? Aren't we spending something like 70 million dollars a day over there? And if we stop spending it, stop bombing, defoliating, shooting, the war won't even slow down? After such an astonishing display of illogic, it isn't surprising that he fails entirely to grasp the peace advocates' view of people—of all human beings—and that a good way to help protect their rights is to stop killing them. Indeed, much as I would like to reassure Walter, I fear that he is too far out of touch with reality. If only he'd stop getting so upset when the rest of us don't share his delusions.

**Paulette Thompson**  
Graduate, School of Librarianship

### Fund Cutback

In view of the anticipated cutback in funds for higher education in Oregon, it is strange and contradictory that the University of Oregon should give priority to recruiting high-priced basketball coaches and replacing high-priced deans and administrators when the real needs of the University—more classroom teachers, more teaching assistants, more books in the library, more work-study jobs, more scholarship money for students, and basic maintenance of classroom equipment and buildings—are being ignored.

To maintain the quality of education at the University of Oregon, cutbacks—if necessary—should be restricted to those services and positions not essential to the

process of teaching and learning. This means a reduction in all non-teaching, purely administrative positions before any other cuts should be considered.

As is true of many departments in the University, administrative duties can be divided among the existing teaching staff, by rotation, without creating a separate administrative class.

If the Legislature and the University are really concerned with graduate and undergraduate education, they should consider seriously this simple way of reducing costs and, at the same time, raising the quality of higher education in Oregon.

**Albert Leong**  
Asst. Prof. of Slavic Languages

### Understanding gap

I do not understand Walter J. Wentz's commentary, "Let's Abandon South Vietnam," in the April 29th issue of the Emerald.

First, I do not understand why he does not share the opinion of 73 per cent of Americans who now feel that the U.S. must stop killing the Indochinese in order to save them. He says, "Let us start being honest for once, about the war, and this May Day business designed to 'Stop the War.'" I can certainly agree about the need to start being honest about the war. I honestly believe that some of the people in the U.S. do not care about some of the people in Indochina to the extent that they are willing to kill most of the Indochinese and quite a few of the Americans to prove this point. I certainly can agree with Mr. Wentz on this point, and the facts—"to shovel our way out from under ten year's worth of rationalizations"—make it abundantly clear that our government considers the world divided into "people" and "non-people." The facts also show who falls into these human and non-human categories; those with white skins are people and those with non-white skins are non-people. Some white people, notably "hippie-types," student radicals, poor whites, welfare mothers, and other "special" groups don't care enough about their white skins so they, unfortunately, become non-people too.

Secondly, I do not understand why Mr. Wentz is so upset about the People's Peace Treaty. I have examined it. I examined it

at the Vancouver Women's Conference, and I examined it at a Student Union meeting, and I examined it during six showings of the movie, "Time is Running Out." And I am examining it again at this moment. Mr. Wentz, explain further, point by point, what it is you object to. . . .

**D'Averil Ibbotson**  
4200 Bailey Hill Rd.

### I.D. card again

The recent controversy and confusion over the development of a new student body card has me somewhat stymied, but I would like to apologize to the student body for the neglect of our ASUO office to maintain solid student input throughout the creation of the "new" photo ID card.

It is clear, I think that many students have always resented the University keeping a photo of each individual in its files. The new card alters this previous practice leaving no photograph in the file, and a record of identification (the photo) on the card.

The versatility of the card should serve the individual student more efficiently, as well as providing him more safety in the event of his card being lost or stolen. The use of the social security number, which has been challenged by many, is logical in the sense that this particular number is now a requisite for opening a bank savings account, getting a loan, or to hold a job, which should leave few students without their social security number already on record. In terms of "personalization" anything is probably an improvement of the punched computer card as the visible record of affiliation with the University of Oregon.

It appears that the issues being associated with the new card are contrived, or at least a last second reaction to a change that ought to stand on its own merits, and not necessarily the policies of Polaroid, etc.

**Mike Kment**  
ASUO Vice-President

### Not strong enough

I think Mr. More is quite correct in analyzing the moneys given to athletics by the ASUO. However, his argument is not strong enough, not fundamental enough. He hints at it, but evidently he is not

willing to make the abstraction necessary to see the fundamental issue.

The fundamental issue is this: Should or should not a student be forced to support any activity, organization or value which is not of interest to him? I say no, he should not have to support things which are not of interest to him.

The alternative is for the governing body to protect the rights, the individuality, of the individuals governed—to see to it that some individuals do not gain at the expense of others. By doing this, the burden is on the individuals and groups to show other groups and individuals why they are worthy of support. The athletic programs would have to demonstrate that they are good, rather than just be. OSPIRG would have to give evidence that its activities will be worthwhile. These organizations would need to engage each of us as men who have the capacity for choice, not bypass us by going to a selected few. **Steven C. Butterbaugh**  
Grad. Architecture

### 16th Century mentality

According to George Haggard (Emerald, April 30), "America has a 16th-century mentality with 20th-century technology." Just what a 16th-century mentality is, and why a 20th-century mentality would necessarily be better, is not quite as obvious as he seems to think. Perhaps someone can tell us which century we are to blame for the mentality that announces an "Anti-Imperialism Symposium" and presents instead a series of speakers protesting American policies in S.E. Asia and Palestine. Not that there is any objection to such a series, but it should be billed for what it is; no symposium on imperialism that overlooks the largest existing imperialist systems can be taken seriously. According to last year's census, the Soviet Russian empire includes 113 million non-Russian colonial subjects in the USSR alone, not including the satellites. No one seems to know how many non-Chinese are enjoying Chairman Mao's rule, but there are tens of millions of them. If the sort of hypocritical selectivity that pretends to oppose oppression and imperialism and ignores the worst cases of it typifies the 20th-century, a 16th-century mentality might not be so bad after all.

**Stephen C. Reynolds**  
Dept. of Religious Studies