

Two Choices: Little And None

Elections for student body positions as well as for various other offices are upon us and quite a few students have inquired as to whether we plan to endorse any of the candidates for these positions. Our answer is a simple no.

No is our answer because, first of all, we don't have much of a choice. Okay, so John Gaither and Larry Garner are fighting it out for president of the student body and Carol Haywood and Perry Moser are getting a little hot over the sophomore judge position. But what about the other offices. Just one person is running for each of them.

We hoped we'd finally see an election this spring in which all positions would be contested by at least two candidates. But we didn't, so, in a move somewhat similar to those associated with the Student Party recently, if we can't have the game go our way we won't play at all.

What's this about the Student Party? Well, it's that the Student Party is largely responsible for the fact that students will be forced to vote "Russian ballot" except for two exceptional cases.

You see, the SP thought John Gaither would run for president on its ticket. Gaither, however decided to go with the University Party. So the SP said it still supports Gaither because it thinks he is the best man for the office.

Alright, but what about its slate for vice president, secretary, treasurer of the student body or for student court or etc.? Does the SP agree with the selections of the UP for all these. We doubt it.

We have a strong hunch the SP feared it couldn't come up with many winning candidates and decided to abstain from the running rather than be defeated. In other words, the SP would rather die than get beat, literally.

But this is not the right attitude for any political party to adopt. The two-party system hinges on a vital out-of-power party, not a dead one.

The SP is not dead, although its leaders have convinced themselves otherwise. It has merely lapsed into a coma from which it will revive the moment it puts up a candidate.

It may not win every election but it certainly won't lose every one. A "not-so-good" candidate is better than none at all and a choice between a dynamic candidate and a "good-for-nothing" candidate is better than no choice at all.

If the SP begins in the very next election to put up possibilities for every office, it will remain very much alive and will sooner or later win an election due to voter dissatisfaction with the party in power if for no other reason. And to top it off, we'll feel much more like endorsing candidates.

THE CAROLINA JOURNAL

Published weekly on Wednesday except during holidays.

ELLISON CLARY, JR., Editor
 Frank Crooks, Business Manager
 Libby Holshouser, Feature Editor
 Donna Hughes, Sports Editor
 Geraldine Ledford, Cartoonist
 Fred Jordan, Photo Editor
 Nancy Kohler, Frank Coley, Photographers
 Staff: Sally Hagood, Paul Boswell, Earleen Mabry, Corny Stilwell, Frank Caton, Jan Ballard, Patrick McNeely, Bobbe Berry, Carol Haywood, John Lafferty, Gayle Watts, Kay Watson, Carol Durham, Louise Napolitano, Larry Keith, and Darlene Helms.

Officers Didn't Understand Little Love Goes Long Way

BY DARLENE HELMS

Youth of UNC-C! "Gather ye Rose-buds while ye may" and rally to the newest "in" of all--the Love-In!

On Easter Sunday, March 26, thousands of Californian Hippies gathered together in the sight of

God and policeman to partake of love, love, love in Los Angeles' Elysion Park. The purpose of this "Freakout", as defined by Hippies, was to "spread love" via the participants' mutual presentation of such gifts as peanuts, lilies, balloons and pebbles. In this manner,

the Hippies shared love and drew newspaper reporters.

The dress was way-out for this informal love fest and a variety of buttons adorned the Hippies' garb. One stated "This is not my bell button" and another asked, "Are we God's joke?"

But this nest of togetherness was not a "Down with God" affair. At Easter service was rendered in the form of a prayer recitation called "Seeking the Return of the Great Spirit" and one Love-Iner remarked, "Christ is with us here baby."

Policemen patrolled this bizarre of love and met with few difficulties as the day's festivities continued into the night. They watched, but, as in the words of one of the officers at hand, "I just don't understand this."

No, they didn't understand "this", for it is sometimes difficult for the older generation to understand many of the methods which the younger generation strive for expression and a common bond with something -- anything, in the world called today. But then, is their understanding really expected on our part?

The Hippies had a good thing going with the creation of that which is called a Love-In. A little love can go a long way and there seems to be no surplus of it in present day society. Perhaps that is what these young people were protesting, if one must surmise that they were protesting anything at all.

LITTLE MAN ON CAMPUS



"I KNEW YOU'D BE STUDYIN' FOR THAT MID-TERM, NANCY— AND IT THOUGHT JUST OCCURRED TO ME THAT YOU MIGHT LIKE TO DRIVE OUT FOR A COFFEE BREAK."

Campus Attitudes Toward Draft Lottery Are Aired

BY FRANK COLEY

Question: What comments do you have concerning the Draft Lottery Proposition as presented by President Johnson?

Coble Fonville, student: "I have my discharge and this doesn't seem exactly fair. Deferments are fine (college and high school) as long as classifications change upon graduation. I don't think that anyone should be penalized for his inability to attend college for, say, financial reasons, or others. I say this because I feel that

everyone has an obligation to serve his country. Freedom is the responsibility of all, not just a few."

Daniel Shaver, student: "This same system has been used and abandoned for the present system. It seems that the present system was judged more satisfactory than the lottery. It seems that it (the present draft system) would still function better and the present system of college deferment is much better than the lottery. The fact that one's draft status automatically changes upon graduation is good. The present system is the better system."

Mack Robertson, student: "If Congress passes the two main provisions that Johnson asks: to begin a lottery system and start drafting 19 year olds first and end all deferments for parenthood (3-A), this will mean that I could possibly be drafted before any college student who is not married and who does not have children. Because Johnson wants to consider further the deferments for college students, I think he should wait until all the considerations are proposed, and then start a new system."

William Browner, student: "I don't go along with the draft system at all. I think that one should not be eligible for the draft until he is eligible to vote. No vote, then no service."

Rodney Person, student: "I go along with universal draft rather than any form of lottery. This disregards mental impairments as well as physical impairments. Quite naturally, anyone who is so physically retarded or mentally retarded that the defect is noticeable, would automatically be deferred. There is something that everyone can do. I really don't see the advantage of the draft by lottery system. Upon graduation from high school, the individual should not be left hanging, he should not have to wonder about "When am I going to be drafted." This within itself is a type of psychological battle."

Joe McCorkle, student: "Doesn't make a damn to me as long as they continue the college deferment system."

Lowell Cook: "I just want to keep my deferment and get a little rest. I'll be drafted after graduation anyway."

Fernando Orti, student: "It doesn't matter with me, I'm not an American citizen and therefore will not be affected by the draft."

Loren Haus: "I think it's just as fair as anything. There's a place in the army for everybody. Taking the 19 year old is much better, he makes a better soldier. He's not as set in his ways, he's easier to train. More physical fit. The records (especially those of World War II) show that the young soldiers did their jobs very well. If I had to train a soldier, I'd prefer a 19 year old soldier. If I had a military obligation to fulfill, I'd rather do it between 19 and 21 rather than 21-23."

Gordon Kay: "It has its advantages and its drawbacks. For instance, after graduation from high school, many people haven't decided upon what they plan or want to do. After service, they will be more able to concentrate upon what they want to do. There are numerous disadvantages and I don't care to comment on those."

Vicki Stilwell: "They've waited too long. I guess more rich kids are going to school anyway and this cuts some of the discrimination against the poor. I think the system is pretty fair."

Lane Hurley: "This (an Army ring), that (a wedding band), and this (a picture of his daughter) keeps me from the army."

Cheryle Leatherbury, student: "There is too great a chance of worthwhile students getting drafted, while some grubs will be exempted for

no worthwhile reasons."

Sandra Smith, student: "Nineteen is too young and I feel that these persons are being exempted because they have friends at draft boards. Nineteen is just too young."

Ken Braswell, student: "I hadn't really thought about it, but I guess that would be as fair as it is now. It's O.K. as long as they don't start drafting people who are in college. I hope they get Cassius Clay."