

### Editorial Comment

## Flat on their faces

Student government failed last Wednesday, and failed miserably. While the student government budget of \$52,000 can easily support Butch buttons (\$250), cheerleading, foreign films, dances, music, special events and other on-campus activities; funds apparently cannot be found to help send one WSU Student to South Vietnam on a fact-finding tour.

The one student chosen by ASWSU to participate in this People-to-People program during the month of August will be asked to spend approximately \$1400 of his own money for the tour. At the same time student government proposes "using" the student when he returns in the fall to give lectures, show slides, and publicly tell others of his experiences. Student government has undertaken the "weighty" responsibility of choosing the appropriate student to go on the tour--at his own expense. The number of students who can afford to spend \$1400 to tour Southeast Asia is undoubtedly small; the most qualified persons, who may be in financial straits, will not even

be able to apply.

Yet the worth of the program is tremendous. Imagine that in this isolated area, where hot controversy over Vietnam has continued on the academic level, that a chance has been found to send one WSU student to gain some first-hand experience in the area! Imagine that student government, here to serve student interests, has chosen by a vote of 9 to 3 not to support this program--although willing to "sponsor" it at no cost to themselves!

Is not the Vietnam situation of prime interest to most students? Is not student government here theoretically to serve student interests? The self-centered attitude of student government and of some students, hopefully a small percentage of the student body, was well illustrated and well served Wednesday. Let us turn our attention here to the important things of life--street dances, music for the juke box, financing Butch buttons, and frittering time away in BOC meetings where paperwork seems more important than action!

C. Bushman



### Letters ...

Since the petition leaves the impression that it was an all-faculty-staff project, the haphazard method of contacting faculty on the matter is inexcusable.

Philip Anast  
Dept. of Communications  
**347 plus 3**

To the Editor:

I wish that more of us had known about the "Statement in Support of American Policy in Vietnam" on page 12 of the May 23rd issue of the Evergreen, so that we could have had the opportunity to "stand and be counted" also.

Marge Hoisington  
College of Agriculture

### 'Escalation'

To the Editor:

Believing that the time has come to speak out, I hereby state my general support of the institution of marriage. Within this context I reject both the spread of free love and the position that all extra-marital sex is bad. I intend to further

clarify my position regarding homosexuality and prostitution just as soon as some of the faculty and staff members who have endorsed the recent statement on foreign policy clarify their stand.

Their petition should be followed by an escalation of the dialogue, for it is important to understand what is meant by honorable terms for ending the conflict. Perhaps what appears to be an extreme position today will become more moderate in the future. Perhaps we will have no alternative in the future but to calmly and unemotionally invade and occupy the North and perhaps attack China also.

In brief my first reaction to the statement of support was to ask for a clarification, so that the specific alternatives proposed can be evaluated. As well as being informed of their consensus, I would also be interested, for example, in learning if and why they favor increased bombings.

Ralph Toporoff  
Washington Square

### Earned approval

To the Editor:

It was with a feeling of dismay that I read the ad. supporting the present policy in Vietnam and signed by members of the faculty and staff of WSU. My disillusion arises not from the fact that the people involved supported government policy, which may be defensible, but from the implication that, for the majority of the academic community, the debate is over. The students of the university,

(Continued on Page 3)

WSU Daily

## EVERGREEN

Published by the Associated Students of Washington State University Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday except during scheduled vacation and examination weeks of the regular school year.

Office: Room B34, Compton Union Building, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, 99163. Printed by the News-Review Publishing Co., Inc. Second class postage paid at Pullman, Washington. Mail subscription \$5.00 per year.

Represented for national advertising by National Educational Advertising Service, 18 East 50th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022. Advertising material presented herein does not necessarily imply endorsement by this newspaper.

## Letters to the editor

### 347 plus 1

To the Editor:

The Evergreen (Tuesday, May 23, 1967) contained a well worded and extensively signed "Statement in Support of American Policy in Vietnam."

I hope it is distinctly understood that those whose names do not appear as supporters of the

statement are not necessarily non-supporters. Hundreds of faculty and staff members apparently had no opportunity to sign the statement. How many of these would have signed, I don't know, but I, for one, would have.

George W. Fischer  
College of Agriculture

### 347 plus 2

To the Editor:  
The petition in which the staff

had an opportunity to express itself on Vietnam is commendable. It is regrettable, however, that the entire faculty was not contacted and given a chance to express itself on the matter. I was not, and I know of several others who were not.

Omission of a name could imply opposition to the war effort and advocacy of extremism, neither of which is outside the scope of freedom of expression.

### World War III

4. President Johnson has revealed that in ordering the bombing of Hanoi he was prepared "to go down in history as having started World War III," and the Arabs are apparently willing to keep him company in that same Hall of Fame. In each case, "vital interests" are determined and provocative actions are ordered without prior resort to the international institutions that we have created and pledged to support for purposes of determining the existence of "threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression." (UN Charter, Ch. VII.) No international institution has yet made such findings regarding the alleged "aggression" of North Vietnam, although the Arabs can cite at least eight instances of UN General Assembly and Security Council condemnations of Israeli aggression.

Although the last UN "censure" of Israel came in 1966, there have been no subsequent incidents of sufficient gravity, in objective terms, to warrant Arab threats of massive violence. Syrian leaders, however, assert that current mobilization is "not only to repel Israeli aggression but to start the liberation operation itself and blow up the Zionist (Israeli) presence in the Arab nation of Palestine." The Arabs thus follow the American example in deciding, on their own terms, the existence of "aggression" and the measures to be taken in countering the threats from the "enemy."

### Peace under law

In sum, the goal of creating a stable world order, not to mention "world peace under world law," is being vitiated by unilateral determinations concerning threats to the peace and acts of aggression. American leadership has been so compromised by its own resort to violence in recent years that its ability to influence the peaceful settlement of disputes in the Middle East, in Hong Kong, or elsewhere is much impaired. The need for a renaissance in American foreign policy is clear and present.

## Renaissance in foreign policy called for

(The following statement by H. Paul Castleberry of the Department of Political Science appears in the Evergreen as a guest editorial. - Editor)

By H. Paul Castleberry

Department of Political Science

For almost two decades the United States has been providing technical assistance in the Middle East and the "natives" seem to have learned their lessons well. At a time when the war in Vietnam vastly complicates America's ability to honor its 1950 pledge and subsequent commitments regarding the defense of Israel from external attack and the threat of annihilation, the Arabs are applying certain American-approved defense techniques in a manner that threatens the peace of the Middle East:

1. The Syrian air force commander candidly admits that Syrian aircraft have repeatedly violated Israeli airspace during essential reconnaissance missions. The American example was provided during long years of U-2 flights over the USSR, and the United States continues to engage in aerial surveillance of Cuba, Red China, and other sensitive areas.

2. Egypt is threatening to blockade an Israeli port on the Red Sea. This interference with "freedom of the sea" has a recent precedent in the American "quarantine" of Cuban ports during the "missile crisis" of 1962. In fact, the first ship halted by the United States during that crisis was of Lebanese (Arab) nationality.

### 'Self-defense'

3. In the interest of "self-defense" and "national security," the Arabs have downgraded their obligation under Article 2 of the UN Charter, which provides that

All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state . . .

Instead, the Arab states must rest their case on Article 51: