

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

SCOTT GOODFELLOW, EDITOR

A Necessity

A referendum is vital. And not two months from now. We need to reach a campuswide conclusion on the Administration's Vietnam policy as soon as effective discussion can take us there.

Tonight Student Legislature will meet. Before it will be presented a resolution calling for the referendum. In the interests of campus unity and understanding, that resolution must pass. Student Body President Bob Powell is expected to ask Legislature to hold the referendum, perhaps in April after Spring Elections. Such a date would drag out a controversy which must be settled now. A March date would be best.

Another letter to the President is in the works. It is hoped by the group that this time the President himself will talk to them, since he ultimately determine policy.

A recent poll showed that there are a large percentage of UNC students who do not back the signers of the first Vietnam letter. It is important that these persons be able to indicate their feelings regarding future letters.

It is hardly our intention to try to prohibit Powell from expressing his views, even talking to the President. It is certainly his right.

But it is our intention to learn whether or not most of the campus is in accord with the position Powell held in the Washington meeting. From impressions gained by news service reports, most of the country believes that Powell is representing our feelings. He has been particularly singled out as an organizational head of the group.

A simple, immediate "Yes-No" vote of the campus is vastly insufficient to demonstrate our accord on a matter as complex as Vietnam policy. Thereby the referendum was suggested, with a date which would allow maximum discussion.

Powell must be given credit for supporting the referendum, for

even he admits that his cause may not poll the number of votes that the administration's will. His reasoning is that the situation is one which invites the most serious of appraisals, and that college students are in perhaps the best situation to make such appraisals.

The proposal for the referendum is far-reaching both in depth of study and in the effect which it will certainly have in stimulating thought and discussion far beyond Chapel Hill boundaries. It includes arrangements to invite speakers to UNC who have been vocal in their opposition or their support of Administration policies in Southeast Asia. The student leaders who signed the first letter to the President would be invited to come here to defend their stand. Administration officials would be asked to come to Chapel Hill with their views.

The only conflict which tends to disrupt these plans and a March conclusion of the Vietnam policy examination period is the date of Spring Elections.

As we say below, the only practical date for the election is March 21. And campaign periods usually last 3-4 weeks before the voting day. This would mean that a referendum would necessarily have to be held March 7 or 14.

These dates would allow time for visiting speakers to be notified. Vice President Humphrey is already scheduled to discuss Vietnam here early in March.

The campaigns of political candidates would not play as large a part as they often do until the last two weeks. But that is the time when most campaigning is done anyhow.

The referendum is a plan to spade up a wealth of ideas. It cannot avoid initiating a fervor which won't diminish with questions, but will continue seeking until satisfactory principles have been reached.



Hedgpeth, Students Blasted

To the Editor,

I find it more than a little pathetic to read the quotation attributed to Dr. Edward Hedgpeth in the DTH.

So Dr. Hedgpeth doesn't condemn... indiscriminate promiscuity. What giant steps backward have we taken when the director of the Student Health Service can stand-up and be so counted.

As the "new Morality" moves in on us (and isn't it really plain old immorality) I can't help but wonder how many young people are letting themselves in for a lifetime of regret. Many are the product of a permissive environment which have managed to stifle the voice of conscience for years.

The final touch of pathos comes when it is suggested that "parental permission should be a deciding factor" in the final decision to use oral contraceptives. So, when the new morality fails to solve young peoples problems, once again old Mother and Dad can be dragged up for blame.

Patricia Sullivan
106 Dickinson Court

To the Editor:
RICHMOND TIMES DISPATCH

Have you noticed all the space being devoted by the Richmond sports pages to North Carolina football here lately? Such topics as Dooley's recruiting in Virginia and Willard's determination to play on the East Coast are two of the favorite topics.

As far as recruiting is concerned, I can't see why any high school boy in the Commonwealth would want to go to Chapel Hill where students go to classes in sweat shirts, T shirts, and sneakers. Whenever Dooley makes an appearance in the Old Dominion we should make it known he is strictly persona non grata.

Regarding Willard, I'm sure many of us couldn't care less whether he plays in California, Baltimore, or in Timbuktu. Too bad he couldn't have felt such loyalty to colleges in his own state.

Shelley Rolfe seems to be obsessed with everything about North Carolina. I would not be surprised if he were one of the natives.

William D. Hart, Jr.
Richmond, Va.

To the Editor

Apparently a large number of people feel that somehow it is more "moral" for a girl to bear an illegitimate child, or for a couple to rush into a forced marriage (at a time when one marriage in three ends in divorce) than to try to avoid these evils by making the "pill" easily available to unmarried women.

People who think this way (Dr. Hedgpeth seems to be one of them) automatically assume that the pill will lead to promiscuity. In fact, very few women are promiscuous and those who are inclined to be so are unlikely to be stopped because the Health Service isn't prescribing the pill for them. But, of course, it would be more "moral" for such an emotionally unstable girl to become the mother of a child or to be forced into a marriage which almost certainly would end in disaster. What world are these people living in?

Yours truly,
Thomas A. Cabarga
207 Church Street
Chapel Hill

Time Troubles

Last Thursday the Elections Board asked Student Legislature to approve its recommendation to set spring elections for March 21. Although there are certainly political reasons to the contrary, this date is by far the most feasible.

The recommended date was set by consideration of time needed for conventioning, campaigning, voting, and even the time necessary for study near the end of the semester. It included allowances of run-offs.

According to Election Laws, the spring election must fall between the third Tuesday in March and the third Tuesday in April. The untimely date of Easter eliminates from consideration all Tuesdays except March 21 and April 18.

April is the desired date for those who want a short campaign period (Easter vacation ends on April 2). But proponents of this date neglect many practicalities.

Tradition has set March as election month. (March 22, 1966; March 23, 1965) It would always seem advantageous to hold the election before the spring recess rather than following it.

Furthermore, an April 18 election would place students in the position that it might easily be well into May before new officers were inaugurated. And then only two weeks would remain for the formation of an administration and the ensuing Legislature appointments.

A run-off election at that time would surely burden academically all persons involved, since May is the busiest month of the spring semester.

Tonight Student Legislature will likely once again consider the date of the election. Certainly political motives are not synonymous with bad motives, but solely political motivation for the April 18 date is faulty and should be reevaluated.

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Scott Goodfellow, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Bill Amlong, Managing Editor

John Askew Ad. Mgr.

Peter Harris Associate Ed.

Don Campbell News Editor

Kerry Sipe Feature Ed.

Sandy Treadwell Sports Editor

Bill Hass Asst. Sports Ed.

Jock Lauterer Photo Editor

David Garvin Night Editor

Mike McGowan Photographer

STAFF WRITERS

Lytt Stamps, Ernest Robl, Steve Knowlton, Carol Wonsavage, Diane Ellis, Karen Freeman, Hunter George, Drummond Bell, Owen Davis, Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders.

CARTOONISTS

Bruce Strauch, Jeff MacNelly

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

Crowd Yells Bravo!

By CAMPBELL READ

The performance of "Don Giovanni" in Hill Hall was a triumph for Dr. Wilton Mason and the team of performers, orchestra and technicians who put it together.

The legend of Don Juan is a blend of comic and tragic drama, and the performance of the opera in English gave the audience the chance to enjoy much of the humor which would be missed in Italian. Although there is much talk of his amorous escapades, the Don is seen throughout the evening to be notoriously unsuccessful in their pursuit. There is at times a confusion in the action which no producer finds easy to clear up, and as the story goes that old Casanova himself, writing his memoirs in a castle in Bohemia, had a hand in revising da Ponte's libretto.

Gossip also had it that Mozart had love affairs with all three of the leading ladies in the first production in Prague in 1787, but such facts always get inflated, and there are always those who never believe an artist capable of creating a dramatic figure without having personally gone through its experiences. Be that as it may, the opera was written and staged in the space of ten months, and may be counted one of the greatest operas of all time.

The first impression in Hill Hall was that of enjoyment; the energy and depth of Mozart's music, reflecting humor and tragedy in turn, was realized with precision and verve in the orchestra (conducted by Dr. Mason), and sung by a cast clearly trained to show character as well as vocal ability. Dr. Mason seems to have concentrated on the comedy, although this was at times mixed with serious elements

in the plot; for example, Leporello trembling under the table in the presence of the statue with the force of some dreadful fate — was the intended overall effect to be comic or otherwise?

Leporello was played by Robert Porco, who established an immediate rapport with the audience, in a performance with many comic asides (Why, its just like a novel!), an entertaining conspirator in the Don's adventures. He has an excellent lyrical voice — one might have looked for more power, perhaps in some of his arias.

Joel Adams did very well as Don Ottavio. It is not an easy part; a young nobleman who comforts his betrothed, but without much dramatic opportunity to develop character. His "Dalla Sua Pace" was a deserved success, being very difficult to sing, although a softer tone, or more variety in tone, would help him here. Jeff Ishee not only executed an extremely pleasing set, but gave us a sympathetic interpretation of Masetto, the stupid but well-meaning servant who twice almost loses his Zerlina.

For the female performers one can only have praise. Marilyn Burriss has recently won a national award, and as expected, her singing as Zerlina was one of the highlights of the evening, Mozart at its best. The same goes for Rebecca Barnes, who played the stony-hearted Donna Anna with fiery spirit. Both of these gave a good account of themselves last year in "La Boheme" as Mimì and Musetta, and we were lucky to have them again in this production. Both have operatic voices, as has Martha Hill, in the role of Donna Elvira, the damsel in distress. This part was played with great spirit, and sung with

power and accomplishment.

But the opera depends more than anything on the Don, and here full credit goes to Kenneth Smith. He has developed vocally since "La Boheme," and even further since he played the pompous buffon Poh-Bah in "The Mikado", a bass part. His voice is now placed in the upper register, under training from Dr. Mason, and was in good shape for so demanding a role, with its difficult runs in some of his solo parts. Vocally, one might pick out the duet with Zerlina as one of the events of the evening. Dramatically, we could not have asked for more. He has considerable experience, and gave us a Don full of character, scheming, ambitious and profligate, but with no illwill towards anybody unfortunate enough to cross his path; always dominating the scene while on-stage, and in the end carried off to hell by four demons in a scene making dramatic use of flashing glaring lights.

The ensembles were balanced very well. This is no small achievement, since Mozart gives every part a vocal line in keeping with the character played. It was not always easy to hear, when the singers were backstage, and this is a drawback to Hill Hall acoustics.

Apart from the above, my only complaint is that the Don's serenade and Ottavio's aria in the second act were cut from this production. Why not cut his first aria instead, which Mozart wrote in 1788 as an afterthought, to please the leading tenor, a man who thought that he deserved to have another aria to sing? Otherwise, a good time was had by all, and that in the end is what counts.

LSD, Leary And Love

(Editor's Note: This article originally appeared in the Oklahoma Daily.)

By DAVID WISE

"Come into my world." Timothy Leary gestured at me from the stage of a Greenwich Village theater.

During winter vacation I sat in a gathering of people of all sizes, shapes, ages and economic positions and listened with an urgent sense of curiosity, sometime intermingled with flashes of whole-hearted agreement and-or deep-rooted cynicism, to the words of this modern-day phenomenon, who could already be on the way "out" after less than a year of notoriety.

As I listened, the reasons for the commotion he has stirred up, both with the law and with his followers, and the reasons for his becoming "passe," were quite obvious.

Before exploring Dr. Leary himself, one must first have an inkling what this "psychedelic revolution" is all about. The most available source is the recent Playboy interview with Leary, an ex-Harvard professor who is presently facing possible prison sentences as a result of his yearning to form a psychedelic community.

LSD is a drug that gives the user hallucinations and makes him withdraw and see things that his mind has never before perceived. Use, possession, sale, or transportation of the drug is illegal and offenders are apt to be subjected to strict punishments.

Allow me first to set the mood.

Upon a darkened stage that usually bears the weight of New York's Borscht Belt entertainers sat a man playing Indian Rage music on a sitar, a mandolin-like instrument. After 20 minutes of this relaxing music, Dr. Timothy Leary, clad in sport shirt and jeans, entered and began to speak in a low, smooth voice, explaining his League and the religion he had recently formed in order to make these meetings legal (in New York State, it takes six believers, a list of concepts and a lawyer to start a new religion).

As a large screen was filled with colorful images, Leary directed his audience to concentrate on the center of each. These images ranged from pictures of Buddha to what one might see looking at a microscope. He instructed us to sit with our hands in our lap, the right hand resting in the palm of the left. We were to concentrate on the center of the screen.

The idea of all this was to let us experience the preliminaries of an LSD trip without benefit of the drug. To my surprise, I found myself floating upwards in response to the soothing voice and almost blinding colors, only to be brought back down by the giggling of two rather skeptical boys sitting to my right.

The contrast between the escapism advocated by Leary and the bustling streets outside was obvious throughout, and this brings me to Leary's first concept... the one I will dispute, and the one that I think is the basic weakness of Leary's cult.

The slogan for LSD-takers is "Turn on, tune in, drop out." In other words, involve yourself so deeply in the taking of LSD that your are not effected or affected by the rest of the world.

This displeased me, as it seems that a person with Leary's obviously superior intellect would be more helpful commenting on the insidiousness of our society rather than withdrawing from it completely. I feel that the basic idea of a force (in this case LSD; that can help one discover previously unrealized truths about himself could be a valuable asset to our society if handled properly—that is, by making it accessible to any person who could benefit by it. The world would therefore be improved because people would be given the opportunity to understand themselves. But if the only end that is reached is for these people to withdraw completely, where will we be?

The impression that was strongest inside of me throughout the lecture was the feeling of love and understanding among men that Leary seemingly was taking great pains to put across. This, I believe, is the greatest asset of the psychedelic revolution. According to Dr. Leary, a man on an LSD trip is quite tranquil and docile and wishes harm to come to no one. An influence such as this would be invaluable today in this world of pestilence and hate, where love is lacking.

The concept of Leary's that I wholeheartedly agree with is one that ties in with the aforementioned idea.

The idea is simply this: that there is Buddha, or God, in every man. Each person is seeing the world with his own mind, from his own viewpoint, and therefore, what he sees, he creates.

There was one more thing that particularly disturbed me about both Leary and the psychedelic revolution: it runs into considerable expense to be fully cognizant of it. The Leary lecture itself cost \$3. Inner-space, the magazine of the psychedelic community on sale outside, cost 50 cents. Also on sale at various places in the Village are Timothy Leary albums, books, pamphlets, mandalas (pictures of Buddha, gaily colored, to use as a point of concentration), and other assorted paraphernalia, all of which costs money.

Of course it is true that Dr. Leary does have to pay court costs to fight the charges against him (he has been arrested several times for possession of marijuana, a charge he still faces; contributing to the delinquency of a minor, of which he has been acquitted, and possibly one or two others), and it is true that he has to get the money somewhere. But this leaves the psychedelic revolution to those who can afford it, which eliminates the so-called "lower class" which could benefit most from it.

The question of where things will go from here is one that only time can answer, but the only way that LSD can be put to beneficial use is if the facts about it are made known through impartial studies that give the facts honestly, and let the people decide what is best.