

CADET SLOUCH by Jim Earle



"What became of that super conference that TU was going to organize last year so they could have competition?"

Our Viet Nam Commitment

Special to The Battalion
EDITOR'S NOTE: The following address was delivered by Secretary of State Dean Rusk at the United Press International Editors' meeting last month in Washington. This is another of a series of articles designed to acquaint students with background information for SCONA XI. Another will appear soon.

One finds year by year that there develops among foreign ministers a certain corporatese of responsibility which has, I think, on the whole a moderating and wholesome influence on policy.

Discussions with foreign ministers have led me to the conclusion that there is now a general recognition around the world that the problem of peace in Southeast Asia is not in Washington; that the obstacle to peace is not the United States; that we have not only joined in efforts made by others, individually and in various groups, such as the commonwealth or the 17 non aligned nations, but that

we as a nation acting in our own unilateral capacity, have made it clear that we would be in Geneva tonight, tomorrow afternoon, if there were anyone there to talk to about peace in Southeast Asia, and that the obstacle to peace lies in Hanoi and Peking.

I think we say quite accurately that the central issue of peace in this postwar period has been the underlying crisis between those who wish to build the kind of world set forth in the United Nations charter and those who are trying to recast that world in terms of what they call their "world revolution." That is the contest between a world of law, a world of independent nations, a world of peaceful settlement and a world of Communist organization.

At the present time, the latter breaks itself up into several components.

I think that at the present moment one would say that the overhanging problem of peace is the policy of Peking.

It is Peking that has announced its policy to world revolution, with a militancy which has caused very great issues within the Communist world, quite apart from the issues that it causes for the free world.

It is Peking that, through its defense minister, indicated in early September that they thought that the revisionists — meaning the Russians — took too gloomy a view of war. We, ourselves, are not revisionists, but we, I must say, take a very gloomy view of war, and we think that the rest of the human race had better do the same thing.

Peking expressed some of the violence of its approach in its doctrine through the extraordinary four-hour conference by Mr. Chen Yi (foreign minister), a press conference that made a profound impression upon the membership of the United Nations not only because it attacked almost everyone else in the world except North Korea and North Viet Nam, but also attacked the United Nations, attacked the

SCONA XI In Perspective

basis of the Afro-Asian conference, and made it very clear that the rest of the world has a major problem in the policy of Peking.

I can tell you quite frankly that we feel that it is Peking that stands across the path of peaceful settlement of the Southeast Asian problem; that it is Peking that is charging even the Soviet Union with assisting Hanoi in order to sell out Hanoi to the United States; that it is Peking that calls the British Prime Minister a nitwit when he organizes a committee of the Commonwealth trying to explore the possibilities of peace in Southeast Asia.

And so the great question we have in front of us in the years ahead within this next decade is the question as to whether Peking is going to pursue a policy of militancy with every means at its disposal or whether somehow it can be brought to realize that it is on the wrong track and that it must — by force, if not by commitment, through necessity, if not by persuasion — try to find its way back toward something called peaceful coexistence and give some real content to that particular approach to the rest of the world.

As far as we are concerned the most dangerous issues continue to be the situation in Viet Nam. The essential fact is that there are tens of thousands of infiltrators sent from North Viet Nam to South Viet Nam to take over that country by force.

If you have any doubts about that, they can be readily ascertained by both governmental and independent means.

We have a commitment to South Viet Nam, a commitment that has existed for many years, through many forms, through the actions of many presidents, the actions of the Congress, the treaty power, the public de-

claration is of our purpose and our intentions over a long number of years.

However one wants to parse the exact character of that commitment, we know we have it and the Communists know we have it and the rest of the world knows we have it.

That means, therefore, that we had better look to the integrity of that commitment, because, as I have indicated many times before, the integrity of the American commitment and these arrangements in different parts of the world is a principal pillar of peace in this present world situation.

And if the other side should discover that commitment is not worth very much — then we and others would be subjected to danger that we have not yet begun to dream of.

And so we have that commitment and we are going to meet it.

But it is also true that we are prepared to bring that matter to a peaceful conclusion just as quickly as possible.

We have somewhat more men there than ever before. They are men who could come home literally tomorrow if the North would quit doing what they are trying to do to the South and if the South Vietnamese would be permitted to work out their own future themselves, to work it out without having that future imposed upon them by force from the outside.

And so we have tried to use the machinery of the Geneva Conference, the machinery of the United Nations, and the assistance of the 17 nonaligned nations, or the proposals of the President of India, or the Commonwealth Committee, and of various intermediaries, some known publicly, some not known, who have attempted to establish contact to find out the basis on which peace could be established.

In the process, we have made it clear that we have no special national purpose in Southeast Asia in terms of bases or permanent military

position, but what we want is peace. And we believe that peace can only be built if smaller nations have a chance to live in safety and independence, even though they are within the reach of the great powers.

And so that is the problem, tragic as it is, in the 1960's, that we face once again after two decades of similar efforts since 1945 — once more a crisis caused by the application of force for aggressive purposes, once more a situation calling upon us to bear some burdens and to pay some prices and call upon our young men to cold blood to face dangers in the interest of preserving the peace.

This has been a process in which we have spent a hundred sixty thousand casualties since 1945. It is a process that has kept many a small country from being overwhelmed by force, and it has also kept the world from moving toward the certainty of a great catastrophe which the world could not possibly survive in any real sense of the term.

But in meeting these various attempts at aggression since 1945, we have tried to act with caution and prudence as well as firmness, because we recognize that we have an obligation along with others to stay away from the slippery slope that leads to World War III. And so we have not escalated, as the present expression is, as rapidly as some would like.

We used an airlift in Berlin without engaging major ground forces to reopen Berlin in the 1940's.

We had a nuclear monopoly at the time of the Korean War and did not use nuclear weapons in that theater.

President Kennedy handled the Cuban missile crisis with the greatest care in order to leave open the doors of peaceful settlement of that problem.

We have waited more than four years after northern infiltration into South Viet Nam before we resorted to strikes against the north.

And if there are those among you who feel there has been too much patience and too much restraint, let me close with a very simple fact which you ought to have deeply in your hearts if you are to understand the world in which we live.

We came out of World War II trying to draw the lessons from it and wrote the charter of the United Nations along with many other governments. That charter represents the lessons we learned.

We had paid a very heavy price for those lessons.

But, gentlemen, we shall not have that chance again.

We shall not have a chance to draw the lessons from World War III and try to build again. So we had better cherish those we have already found in the charter of the United Nations and learn to live with restraint and learn to solve our problems by peaceful means and learn not to permit courses of aggression to gather momentum and try to find a way to build steadily the rule of law and to reach accommodation in cooperation with the nations of the world.

Because we are at a point quite literally and Pope Paul reminded us of President Kennedy's words in that respect that if we do not succeed in mastering war, that war will destroy us all.

So that is the purpose of our exercise. That is the purpose of our effort, the purpose of our policy.

'Yes' Vote Urged For Political Clubs

Political clubs hit the campus at least briefly Thursday night when club representatives bring the issue before Student Senate.

Craig Buck of the Young Democrats will submit a resolution to the senators asking the Board of Directors to reverse their ruling which bans political clubs from meeting on campus.

Several other students are scheduled to participate in a discussion of the long-debated topic, and Dean of Student James P. Hannigan will explain the administration policy.

Political clubs are barred from campus by an Executive Committee interpretation of House Bill 86, Article 5, Section 2 of the 58th Texas Legislature which says, "None of the money appropriated by . . . this act shall be used for influencing the outcome of any election or the passage or defeat of any legislative measure."

The committee also points to Administrative Order 3 of the A&M System that "no property under the control of the Texas A&M System will be used for political campaigns, meetings, speeches or in the furtherance of any political campaign nor used in any way for any political office."

These interpretations, rather broadly construed, are in conflict with most other state-supported schools' policies which allow the political organizations campus meeting places.

Buck's resolution proposes that the university sanction political clubs and also suggests various restrictions for such campus groups.

He and other supporters of the resolution urge that the groups be required to meet the same regulations that govern other campus activities.

The Battalion asks that these sensible, responsible requests be favorably reviewed by the Student Senate and a resolution supporting campus political clubs be given the Board of Directors.

Knowledge and experience of politics are very vital to a well-rounded education, and an institution like Texas A&M with its sights set on excellence should recognize these values.

Tommy DeFrank Political Clubs Reviewed

The value of activities designed to promote and stimulate increased interest in the complexities of the American system of government can hardly be questioned.

Yet political clubs, which by their very nature contribute toward a clearer understanding of government, are banned from the campus of Texas A&M University.

Basis for the administration's case against political clubs is Article 5, Section 2 of Bill 86 of the 58th State Legislature.

That bill states that "None of the money appropriated by . . . this act, regardless of their source of character, shall be used for influencing the outcome of any election or the passage or defeat of any legislative measure."

The A&M administration has construed this clause as prohibiting political clubs to function on the campuses of state-supported institutions.

However, this most generous interpretation of state law is shared by only two of Texas' other 21 state senior colleges.

Nineteen schools, including Tarleton State College, a member of the A&M University System, have sanctioned on-campus clubs.

And the University of Houston permits five political organizations to meet and operate on campus.

Why, then, do these schools hold little stock with the bill upon which A&M centers its contentions against on-campus political groups?

University of Texas Assistant Dean of Students Edward Price has said the bill is not applicable to political clubs.

North Texas State and University of Houston officials have held that political clubs on campus are legal because state funds are not involved. Lamar Tech administrators concur, holding that revenues of the clubs are from private sources and not derived from state appropriations.

But Texas A&M persists in maintaining that the bill forbids political clubs being allowed on campus.

This policy is outmoded and inconsistent with the positions of other state schools, and it should be discontinued.

Political clubs should be accorded equal rights of other campus organizations. However, some limitations should be imposed upon them.

The clubs must be affiliated with an established parent group with a definite policy charter. They must not hold campus rallies in support of a candidate for political office.

They must not schedule a speaker who is a candidate for political office at the time of his address, nor should they be permitted to endorse individual candidates in primary elections.

Club aid funds must not be made available to them.

They should be made subject to all disciplinary regulations applicable to other campus organizations.

Dean of Student James P. Hannigan has said that political clubs were formerly recognized at A&M but were later prohibited because the groups became too interested in vigorous campaigning on campus.

Nevertheless, past blunders by the clubs should not preclude them from being recognized at the present time.

Political clubs contribute toward equipping members with a broader and more comprehensive grasp of American politics, and they have been supported by many legislators, including College State Rep. David Haines and U. S. Senator John Tower.

They deserve a place on the campus of a progressive university such as Texas A&M.

Movie Reviewer Reviewed By Battalion Colleague

Herky Killingsworth

Now I've never been one to complain about anyone or anything, especially a friend, but I feel that one of my fellow Batt staffers needs to be exposed for the fake or flunk he is.

I prefer to keep this on a friendly basis because I have to half-way associate with this guy every day, but I do feel that you, the public, need know the truth.

Lani Presswood, your Amusements editor, is a fake. Who is this self-appointed critic of the entertainment world? What makes his opinion valid and used as a guide for the movie world? Is it just because he spends all of his time at the movie instead of studying? Or is he secretly Cecil B. DeMille's long lost son?

I realize you are wondering why this sudden attack on a friend, this Benedict Arnold story of a fellow worker. Well I'll tell you why.

I, too, saw the movie "Agent 8%" but I liked it. It's the story of a suave, sophisticated bum (not Bond) who turns spy and in the true James Bond fashion narrowly escapes the clutches of the Communist Secret Society. What more could you ask? My only complaint would be the lack of girls, unlike 007. In this movie

only two women are involved and we have no mad scientist.

Mr. Presswood (from now on I have picked up handles) stated it was a "shallow, witless superficiality which succeeds only in satirizing spy movie satires." I saw no more satire in this movie than a Herky Killingsworth, uh . . . James Bond Thriller. At least it plays on Communist stupidity—propaganda no doubt—rather than super-human brains. I do admit I've read all of the James Bond books but that only made me enjoy "Agent 8%" more. I'm throwing that last sentence in so no one will approach me with a "you crazy or something — not liking James Bond." I do, I do.

But I'm not a movie critic, so I'll not tell you anymore about the plot, which Mr. Presswood doubted its presence in the movie. I've come to bury Presswood, most definitely not to praise him.

For you who do not know Mr. Presswood may I offer a bit of advise. Analyze him. Notice how he mainly reviews the for-

eign art films, commonly known as SEX movies. "Darling," "Circle of Love," "The Hill" and now "Agent 8%"—see the connection. Girls. Only a raving Aggie-maniac would write of such topics.

Also notice the path his reviews have followed. At first he liked all of the movies. Then he found out how much fun it was to cut a movie and since that time . . . I realize that school problems could be the basis of this bitter cynicism — I just happen to know that he made a zero on a pop quiz the morning of the movie — but a good movie critic should not let personal incidents enter into his public service.

If you still have doubts of his criticizing ability, look at him in his past role in the Aggie Player production of "Death of a Salesman." You call that acting? Anybody can play a character role, and his was the role of a stinker. And he stunk . . . how could anyone fire good, old Willy and drive him to a premature happy hunting ground. Positive proof of his qualifications.

Well I feel it is time to stop this foolishness going on around here (Presswood wise). Write your friendly Battalion editor and denounce this critic of critics.

THE BATTALION

Opinions expressed in The Battalion are those of the student writers only. The Battalion is a non tax-supported non-profit, self-supporting educational enterprise edited and operated by students at a university and community newspaper.

Members of the Student Publications Board are: Joe Buser, chairman; Dr. David Bowers, College of Liberal Arts; Dr. Robert A. Clark, College of Geosciences; Dr. Frank A. McDonald, College of Science; Dr. J. G. McGuire, College of Engineering; Dr. Robert S. Titus, College of Veterinary Medicine; and Dr. A. B. Wooten, College of Agriculture.

The Battalion, a student newspaper at Texas A&M is published in College Station, Texas daily except Saturday, Sunday, and Monday, and holiday periods, September through May, and once a week during summer school.

The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in the paper and local news of spontaneous origin published herein. Rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

Second-Class postage paid at College Station, Texas.

MEMBER

The Associated Press, Texas Press Association

Represented nationally by National Advertising Service, Inc., New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco.

News contributions may be made by telephoning 846-6618 or 846-4910 or at the editorial office, Room 4, YMCA Building. For advertising or delivery call 846-6415.

Mail subscriptions are \$3.50 per semester; \$6 per school year; \$6.00 per full year. All subscriptions subject to 2% sales tax. Advertising rate furnished on request. Address: The Battalion, Room 4, YMCA Building, College Station, Texas.

EDITOR GLENN DROMGOOLE
Managing Editor Gerald Garcia
Sports Editor Larry Jorden
News Editor Tommy DeFrank
Photographer Herky Killingsworth
Amusements Editor Lani Presswood

PEANUTS



By Charles M. Schulz