

In Our Opinion...

Letters To The Editor

WBT Editorial Presents Unfair University Image

We were quite displeased to learn of the editorial entitled "Student Activists" which was broadcast over WBT Radio and WBTV, Charlotte, yesterday.

Alan Newcomb, editorial voice of the Jefferson Standard Broadcasting Company stations, began the verbal presentation with a nostalgic "The halls of ivy are humming again..."

He went on to note some assessments of today's college student made by leaders in education. First he cited Kingman Brewster of Yale and Clark Kerr of the University of California, who voiced their opinion that the modern student is more aware of national and world affairs than any previous generation has been. They agreed that the young collegian is more articulate about his viewpoints than ever before.

Then Newcomb referred to Princeton University President Robert Goheen's advice to his school's entering freshman class against too much political preoccupation which might cause them to miss the mark. This brief remnant of Goheen's address was taken out of context, and the only direct quote used was "student activist." The editorial was kind enough to interpret:

But when Dr. Goheen warned against the role of "student activism" he was not referring to the serious student trying to understand the times in which he lives. He meant the bearded 'beatnik' types, the professional students of thirty or more, and the pseudo-intellectuals who settle for shallow existentialism. Serious study and calm discussion of public affairs is one thing; lawless demonstration engineered and led by off-campus agitators is another.

Many of those faculty members who join sit-ins, teach-ins, and unruly demonstrations concerning questions in which they are poorly versed encourage a disrespect for orderly civilization, which should be one of the prime areas of defense for academic people. Students and professors have the same right as everyone else to assemble peaceably and petition for redress of grievances. But those who make a career of civil disobedience and disruption are not contributing to education, only to social ferment.

Although the editorial never mentioned UNC specifically, the station's listeners probably had no trouble identifying such terms as "bearded beatnik," "lawless demonstration," and "faculty members who join sit-ins, teach-ins and unruly demonstrations" with the University at Chapel Hill. After all, it was scarcely more than a year ago that this situation came out in support of the Speaker Ban Law.

One who is a part of the University, one who knows the University, might be amused by the philosophy that the bad guys all wear beards. One might get a hearty laugh at the use of such an undefinable concept as "shallow existentialism." One might not think it worth the effort to blink at the sensational reference to "lawless demonstrations engineered and led by off-campus agitators."

The people in Chapel Hill might not think much of it. But the sad fact is that the people who hear such broadcasts have no reason not to believe them in the perspective in which they are presented. They believe the ridiculous charge that faculty members who participate in social reform activities are "poorly versed" on such matters. They believe that all demonstrations are "unruly" and that they "encourage a disrespect for orderly civilization."

One of the University's greatest problems is that of projecting a favorable image of itself and its function to the people of North Carolina — the people whose tax

dollars pay a large portion of the University's operating budget. When state citizens hear displeasing reports on the University, they complain. In turn, their representatives to the General assembly complain. The burden is passed down through the Board of Trustees to the administration, and, in the end, it is the students who suffer.

It is unfortunate that the opinions of WBT and WBTV are such as would hinder the progress of needed improvements in many areas of our society. But it is even more unfortunate that, in pursuit of its doctrine, the station finds it necessary to paint a black picture of "student activism" within the University.

WBT, WBTV is one of the state's oldest broadcasting companies in one of the state's leading cities. The University could well use its help, and could well do without its opposition, in accomplishing its mission.

Granville's Position Not Fairly Explained

A point of clarification is in order concerning an article which appeared on the front page of *The Daily Tar Heel* Tuesday, entitled "NAACP Accuses Granville of Bias."

In the hurry-scurry meet-the-deadline process of putting a newspaper together every afternoon, even the most seasoned veteran of desk work is sometimes guilty of having his eye caught by one specific point within a news story—a novel human interest point or maybe an element of an issue which in previous coverage has not been specifically mentioned.

The latter example is what occurred Monday afternoon. In prior stories concerning the NAACP and housing discrimination, Granville Towers had not been singled out as one of those campus housing units in which racial discrimination allegedly is practiced. So Granville crept into the lead paragraph and into the head on the story.

In retrospect, we feel it was unfair to single out one living unit in this fashion. We offer our apologies to the management of Granville and to the women living there. While it is our determination to pursue the issue of racial discrimination in housing until we are satisfied that it is settled, we do not intend our coverage to be in the form of individual attacks on residence halls who only share in any guilt that exists.

S. L. Must Lead

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:
Last Thursday, Student Legislature passed a resolution by a vote of 32 to 7 in support of the plaintiffs in the pending court case against the speaker ban laws (the plural is to include the original proclamation of insanity, and its amended successor).

In my mind the vote was sullied by two thoughts which I think are felt beyond the halls of the legislature, and which I would now like to discuss:

It was expressed that we must not as legislators take into our hands such an important issue until our decision had in fact been dictated to us by the student body via referendum.

It was also said, as debate ended, that we could now, with a sigh of relief, dismiss the whole matter and move on to "more important topics."

The first of these observations is based on the whole question of leadership; should an elected official lead, or should he represent the avowed interests of his constituents. The answer, of course, is that when possible he should do both.

Unfortunately, there are times when it is not possible to consult for opinion every student on this campus (which is in fact the reason that the Legislature exists in the first place). Then the representative must assume the characteristic which warranted his election: leadership.

The legislature preempted nothing last Thursday. It did serve as proof to any who would doubt that when this student body elects a man to be its president, the student body expects him to be capable of

action, and sometimes without the comfort of referendum.

The nature of the office brings him closer to issues, and we want him to guide us.

In short, we as students gave Bob Powell that vote of confidence last Spring; Thursday we as the representatives of the students reaffirmed it.

Now a warning about the second observation. While the glamour of the Speaker Ban issue may have departed, its important finale is about to unfold.

In the next few weeks, or months, all of the efforts of the last three years will culminate. We will be told shortly whether or not we will be rewarded free speech. (Somebody silly thought that we were granted that right by the framers of the Constitution.)

If mistakes have been made in the fight for this restoration, then let them be known, and let us never make them again.

But, let it also be known that my fellow students and I, through our legislature and through our president, are reaffirming our position in favor of free speech; and are equally as loud in rejecting the use of unlawful means in favor of a much more responsible alternative.

I plead, then, with the student body: never let the legislature forget that it must lead as well as represent, and never let it forget for "more important topics" what is the lifeblood of this or any university, your right to learn!

John E. Dietz (SP)
Legislator, M.D. VII

LSD Dangerous

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:

There has been a great deal of discussion on campus

about LSD and similar compounds. These discussions have generally been characterized more by opinion and feeling than by information.

These drugs have been called "hallucinogens" meaning producing hallucinations or "psychotomimetics", i.e. mimicking a psychosis, an extremely severe mental illness. They have also been called "psychedelic" or "consciousness expanding" compounds.

By any name these drugs are perhaps the most biologically potent compounds known to man. Minute quantities have profound effects on the chemistry of the brain and the nature of these effects are as yet quite unclear. It is not known how these compounds act, or what is disrupted, or what long lasting or permanent changes occur.

The major effect is to produce disorganization of the usual brain mechanisms and mental process. Serious side effects often requiring hospitalization have been noted as long as six months after a single dose and it has not been possible so far to predict who would be susceptible to what kinds of reactions.

These are the dangers of the drug. What are its benefits? Despite much partisan promotion it is becoming increasingly evident that there is no intrinsic benefit accruing from the use of the drug per se.

The structuring of the drug-induced disorganization has led some people to feel more knowledgeable of themselves, to have "mystical experiences", and LSD has been used under medical supervision in an attempt to evaluate its use in psychotherapy. Here too, the presence of an experienced therapist in structuring the situation has been crucial to any "benefits".

There is no evidence that

these "benefits" cannot be obtained by other means. With the use of psychotomimetic drugs there is evidence that the potential risks may well outweigh the potential "benefits". The risks are severe and they have been documented.

Any individual contemplating usage of these drugs for any reason is well advised to consider the risks and alternatives carefully before doing so.

Clifford B. Reifler, M.D.
Associate Physician
in charge of Psychiatry
Student Health Service

U. S. Illogical

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:
In the DTH of October 5 the possibility and feasibility of using nuclear weapons in Viet Nam and of bombing some of the irrigation dams north of Hanoi was discussed. The article, I believe, was inspired by some recent statements made by former president Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This article horrified me because it so clearly revealed how power consciousness can corrupt the human mind.

Where are we going? Is the state of civilization so downgraded by now, is morality in the minds of some leaders so completely replaced by brute force - mindedness that these same leaders are really contemplating the use of the above means for ending the war?

If ever such desperate means are employed by the mightiest country in the world towards a small economically and technologically underdeveloped country like North Viet Nam, then I might say that the rest of the world has every reason to feel terrified at having such a member in the family of nations.

If the U. S. is not going to contain itself how can it ever expect to win respect or acclaim of its ambitions to contain some other nation? To bomb some of the irrigation dams in North Viet Nam would lead to the drowning of thousands of people if my information is correct.

Whether we term our fellow-man temporarily friend or foe, he is still our fellow-man and moreover, he might be even more convinced of his obligation to defend his country against some overseas enemy than Washington can be to fight communism.

What future will mankind be heading for is a superpower like the U. S. has articulate and influential leaders who advocate "not automatically excluding anything" to win a war that is said to involve American security in a remote spot of the world? By the same logic Russia may claim that her security is placed in jeopardy should an insurrection against the regime on Cuba take place.

What would the same hawkish American leaders do and feel if Russia in such a case sent troops to Cuba to help Castro defeat the insurgents? Would they agree that Russian security was involved? If not, how can they suppose that China and Russia will agree that American security

is jeopardized in Viet Nam?
Sven Ludstedt

UNC-CH Thanked

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:
This past weekend, I had the pleasure of visiting your campus for a week - end escorting one of our candidates for Miss Consolidated University.

The warm friendliness and cordiality extended to myself and our other representatives was truly in the southern tradition. Everywhere we went, we were welcomed with a smile and a hearty handshake.

Our excellent seats at the football game with N.C. State were appreciated, and be assured, we will be on hand for the rest of your home games pulling for additional victories.

It is my pleasure to extend a cordial invitation to the student body of UNC at Chapel Hill to visit our campus at any time. Your student I. D. cards will be honored for free admission to any of our Student Government - sponsored events. We don't have a football team as yet, but have an excellent social calendar planned for the coming year.

Again, it was a pleasure visiting your campus.
Tim Britton
President of the UNC-CH Student Body, UNC-CH

Yack-DTH Feud

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:

It seems a shame that the Tar Heel and the Yack can't get on better terms. Last year the Yack printed unkind remarks about the paper and now it is all too obvious that the Tar Heel has forgotten to print notices about picture-taking dates.

What sophomore or freshman is going to remember the day he is to go have his picture made when the last schedule was printed weeks ago?

So, in the end the student suffers from a silly publication rift.

We hope the Yack will be more careful next year in their choice of studios. Both organization and courtesy were missing this time.

And only one mirror in the waiting room? Honestly, we're more vain than that.
Richard A. Klein

Poor Planning

Editor, *The Daily Tar Heel*:

It has recently come to my attention that the UNC-Virginia football game is scheduled for November 26, Thanksgiving weekend, when no one will be present on campus.

This seemingly insignificant fact simply means that UNC students will be guaranteed the maximum in home football games—i. e., four (count them, four).

Would you believe another sterling example of administrative planning? No? Well, how about coming back to campus on the day after New Year's (classes start Monday morning January 2), thus holidaying itself.

Sorry about that, Chief!
Robert E. Dornbush

U.S. Peace Effort Seems Insincere

FROM THE MINNESOTA DAILY

The Johnson Administration continued to raise doubts about the sincerity of its own proposals for a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam war in several ways this week.

First, U. N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg made quite clear the opposition of the United States to bringing Red China, often called a party to the war, into the United Nations where peace could be negotiated. Then he made public peace offers designed to bring North Vietnam to the bargaining table. A few hours later, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara sent to Congress an order for additional Navy bombers to be used over Vietnam, and held a press conference to announce the request.

There was immediate speculation in Washington that the timing was deliberate, and intended to warn Hanoi of the consequences of ignoring Goldberg's offer. It appears, however, that the timing was "coincidental."

The coincidence remains intriguing because President Johnson must have approved both policy statements. Why did he permit McNamara to accidentally undercut Goldberg?

One possibility is that while the substance of both policies was approved, Johnson was unaware of the timing. The Defense Dept. might have been unaware too, but there is also the disturbing possibility the department undercut the peace move deliberately but without approval. Such action has not been totally unknown in American government.

The more likely possibility, however, is that the Johnson Administration was not sincere in proposing negotiations. A new stand on Red China, in which the United States would have taken a neutral stand on how other countries voted on admission, would have been one inexpensive sign of sincerity.

The move would have been significant too, because there is new evidence that Peking is trying to prevent possible negotiations. China has nothing to lose by opposing peace now, but it might have if it were in the U. N. and subject to the sensure of world opinion.

Indeed, it seems odd that the Johnson Administration bothers to make any peace overtures. If total U. S. policy is not coordinated to make "peace offensives" credible, we wonder why the gestures are made at all.

WBT Image Of The University



Air Pollution Must Be Stopped

By NIC GOEVES

Scientists are saying we aren't getting our money's worth of air anymore; that is, air pollution is reducing the amount of fresh air we breathe each day.

Nationally, at various conferences and institutes, those in the know have stressed the damage that polluted air can do to man and his environment. Wherever combustion occurs, they say, the air is polluted. As tons and tons of carbon dioxide are dumped into the atmosphere, the population is faced with more respiratory ailments, noxious smells, dizziness, and a dozen other effects.

It does not appear that the scientists are exaggerating the problem; if anything, too little has been said or done about it. What has been accomplished so far is the in-

vention of devices to treat pollutants before they reach the atmosphere so that most of the waste is filtered out. Also, some scientists have thought that different mixtures of fuel would produce a cleaner waste from automobiles and industry.

However, it seems more reasonable to shift emphasis from the mere treatment of pollution to the elimination of the type of fuel that produces it. By replacing coal, oil, or gas as the primary fuels of industry and transportation with power sources that do not emit carbon dioxide, treatment devices would be unnecessary. Some industries and the Federal Government have experimented with various types of substitutive power sources such as batteries, fuel cells and atomic energy, which do not let off pollutants.

The government is apparently going to get into the act and business and industry will probably follow. The financing of air pollution combatants will have to be shared by everyone, including the taxpayer.

For too long the power and use of the sun and atom have been known; however, relatively little research has been directed at making these power sources practical for business and the people.

The rapid pace at which the United States and the world are industrializing and populations are expanding will call for an endless supply of pollution control devices. But instead of inventing a proliferation of these devices, more far-reaching effects could be achieved by eliminating the sources of the pollution.

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Fred Thomas, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Scott Goodfellow, Managing Ed.

John Greenbacker, Assoc. Ed.

Kerry Sipe, Feature Editor

Bill Amlong, News Editor

Ernest Robl, Asst. News Editor

Sandy Treadwell, Sports Editor

Bob Orr, Asst. Sports Editor

Jock Lauterer, Photo Editor

Chuck Benner, Night Editor

Steve Bennett, Lytt Stamps,

Lynn Harvel, Judy Sipe, Don

Campbell, Cindy Borden,

Staff Writers

Drummond Bell, Owen Davis,

Bill Hass, Joey Leigh,

Sports Writers

Jeff MacNelly, Sports Cartoonist

Bruce Strauch, Ed. Cartoonist

John Askew, Ad. Mgr.

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.