

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

24 Percent Inveterate Cheaters, Liars? Hardly!

When we first learned the results of our poll on Honor Code violations, we saw visions of the Code going up in flames. But when we considered it further, it was obvious that such was far from the case.

It was not the Honor System itself which was being criticized; the poll did not indicate rampant disregard for integrity, nor did it point to an increase in disrespect for imposed controls.

What it revealed was more important.

The poll showed a developing attitude of pressure — pressure that I have to do well on this one test! — pressure not to turn someone in "because an honor council conviction could ruin his chances of success for years." These pressures all boil down to an attitude which must be recognized.

Students feel that everytime they are faced with any decision, it is an extremely important one.

This is the attitude which has become a vital issue on our campus. This is the attitude which educational reform is trying to ease. This is the attitude which is eroding not the Honor Code, but those who try to live under it.

There are some steps which may be taken within the Honor System itself which would ease tensions. First, we must assume that every one has a sense of honor initially — the Code is something

to guide, not to teach. Second, we must be aware that one cannot walk up to 13,000 students and proclaim, "We trust every one of you." But the Code has nevertheless proved very meaningful to many people, and its effectiveness is something in which Carolina takes pride.

What we would suggest to you is that the reasons why most of these persons cheat or lie (in an academic course) are not reasons which brand them as evil. We would suggest also to you that suspension and expulsion punishments for cheating are incompatible with many reasons for the offenses.

We would suggest that the punishment for breaking the Honor Code for cheating and lying be an automatic "F" grade in the related course, or in some other way affecting University standing. Many professors presently do this without bringing charges against the offender. Such action is wrong because it should be a student conviction; but the punishment is more proper.

The strength of our Honor Code is its idealism. As such, it can never be rendered ineffective because it will always be a restraining force. Tensions in university life today have clouded its meaning. Some of this cloudiness can be reduced by lessening the burden upon those who feel strongly obligated to uphold our Honor Code.

Compact Refrigerators, Washers Come At Last

One of our many long lost causes seems to have found a successful solution.

It was far from our expectations to hear yesterday that washing machines and compact refrigerators are awaiting approval for use in men's residence halls. The project was one which has been discussed by "promise" candidates in elections for years—and nothing was done.

We were incredulous. Wasn't there some trustee regulation against it? No. Wasn't there some administrative official who wanted to block it? No. Then why hadn't it been done before? Nobody knew. In fact, everyone was asking these same questions.

The only apparent hold-up for the washing machines has been a general lack of space to put them in, but this seems to be an obstacle which needs only a small effort to clear up. And the only hold-up for the compact refrigerators is that the county board of health must have means of assuring itself that health standards are not lowered in residence hall rooms because of the machines. This problem is fielded by adopting strict sanitary regulations, the flaunting of which would mean refrigerator forfeiture.

The washing machines are clearly an item of necessity on South Campus, where many students walk great distances to machine launder their clothes. The refrigerators are just as clearly an item of luxury, but nevertheless one which would improve life on our campus if properly directed.

Today's Thought

We just happened to notice the location of the new Davie Hall building yesterday. From a fourth floor window, you can scan every inch of the Arboretum!

A CIA plot?

Teddy O'Toole

Does CIA Run Foreign Policy?

(Fifth in a series of articles about the NSA-CIA relationship.)

We began our investigation. It consisted mainly of calling in any past officers, staff members, or journalists who were in positions to furnish us with facts about the NSA-CIA relationship. Getting those facts was not as easy as we had imagined. The CIA lives on secrecy, moves one step closer to death with each column inch of publicity, and fights pretty hard when threatened.

Nevertheless, the NSB investigation did manage to unearth most of the particulars of the NSA-CIA relationship, at the same time discovering skeletons in the closets of a large number of other "independent" organizations ranging from the labor movement to the international press. But first, we learned the amazing truth about what the CIA is and what it does.

Like the rest of the American public, our only impres-

sion of the CIA had been gained through reading spy stories and seeing cloak-and-dagger movies. We therefore saw CIA activities as confined to one level of activity — espionage. How wrong we were.

The CIA functions on at least three levels. True, one of these is espionage. It works as an international spy ring gathering information deemed to be of importance for United States national security. On this level, the CIA's rules for operating are simple and conform to the old jungle saying: "No holds barred."

A second level of functioning by the CIA is in what I would call "normal intelligence gathering." It is different from espionage in that it doesn't involve counting airplanes, stealing chemical formulas from foreign laboratories, or taking U-2 photographs. It involves the gathering and computerizing of information about political developments abroad that one

might read about in the newspaper if one were there. It involves getting personality descriptions and dossiers on rising new leaders abroad and collecting up-to-date information on impending coups and political upheavals. It was on this level of functioning that the CIA used NSA.

The third realm of CIA functioning is the one which startles the average citizen, and startled us.

The third realm of CIA activity is in the formation and implementation of foreign policy. The CIA actually plans operations such as the notorious Bay of Pigs invasion. It supports or helps crush coups in Latin and South America. It negotiates with groups in foreign countries to sell them weapons, or, we were told by one witness, even to sell a fleet of obsolete United States bombers in one case.

Why does the CIA, supposedly an intelligence gathering group, engage in this type of activity? It is either because

our government has asked them to take that power, or they have just taken the power. At any rate, one thing is certain: When the CIA plans one of its third-realm projects, it is in the position of both making recommendations to the president and furnishing the information to back up those recommendations. That is called conflict of interest, put mildly. I have wondered what John F. Kennedy called it when, after the Bay of Pigs fiasco, he tearfully moaned that he was fully responsible for the entire nightmare, but because of his last minute turn — about in calling back the air cover, but simply because he, as president, had allowed an illegitimate autonomous agency to exercise the power of forming foreign policy.

When the NSB made the discovery of this third level of functioning by the CIA, it threw our entire investigation into another light. It was a very sobering experience.

For the moment, we forgot the immediate question before us, that of the moral implications of the CIA infiltrating independent national organizations. We even forgot temporarily the question of the destructiveness of secrecy in a free society.

In short, each of us in his own mind was beginning to feel the unspeakable dread associated with the thought that the United States government might be run by someone or something besides the President and the Congress. We thought about the recent book, *The Invisible Government*. We thought about the war in Vietnam, undeclared by Congress, uncritically accepted by the President, mysteriously begun sometime in 1963 unbeknownst to the general American public.

The question still plagues my mind. Who makes American foreign policy, the President, the Congress, or the CIA? Can we as citizens tolerate it if the answer to that question is the CIA?

'Studying nothing! I'm preparing for tomorrow's exam.'



The Credibility Gap Re-Opened By HHH

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Scott Goodfellow, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Sandy Treadwell, Manag. Ed.

John Askew, Ad. Mgr.

Peter Harris, Associate Ed.

Don Campbell, News Editor

Donna Reifsnider, Feature Ed.

Jeff MacNelly, Sports Editor

Owen Davis, Asst. Spts. Ed.

Jock Lauterer, Photo Editor

David Garvin, Night Editor

Mike McGowan, Photographer

Wayne Hurder, Copy Editor

Ernest Robl, Steve Knowlton,

Carol Wonsavage, Diane Ellis,

Karen Freeman, Hunter George,

Drummond Bell, Owen Davis,

Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders,

Joe Saunders, Penny Raynor,

Jim Fields, Donna Reifsnider,

Joe Coltrane, Julie Parker

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.

By ERNEST YANARELLA
Amid the hosannas and hal-lu-lu-lu's voiced in praise of Hubert Humphrey's recent visit to Chapel Hill, I feel compelled to add a sobering note to his thoroughly intoxicating performance.

In his otherwise admirable response defending the right to dissent, Mr. Humphrey concluded by remarking that "it does no good to believe, to make believe, to make other people believe, that the Government is trying to deceive the American people." Call me dissenter of the "Great Society"; call me opponent of the Administration's Grand World Design. Call me what you will. I must challenge this statement.

At a time when the credibility gap grows ever wider, it would be laboring the obvious to catalog the innumerable lies, half-truths, and fabrications advanced by the Johnson Administration respecting our Vietnam policy. So, instead, I propose to enumerate two acts of deception put forth by the Vice-President in his own presentation at UNC.

The first, and by far the most specious, involved the logic of our refusal to halt unconditionally the bombing of North Vietnam. In order to defend our position, Mr. Humphrey drew this analogy. He asked, how would Ho Chi Minh react if, turning the tables, the U.S. asserted that

she would refuse to negotiate unless North Vietnam ceased infiltrating men and material into South Vietnam, while the United States continued unabated bombing the North and giving logistical support and manpower in the South?

The analogy, however, is spurious. The proper analogue to North Vietnam's demand is the following. Assume that, by some quirk of fate, North Vietnam was bombing strategic American cities endeavoring, let us assume, to uplift the ebbing morale of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars fighting in the South, and for other vague reasons. Suppose further that Hanoi demanded "just any step" by Washington to indicate her sincerity in wishing to negotiate.

The analogy could be fleshed out to make it parallel even more closely Hanoi's present predicament. The point is: in this light, would it be reasonable to believe that President Johnson would — could — make any compromising gesture while American cities and transportation lines were being systematically decimated, however moderately and with however much restraint? Would he, too, not demand unconditional cessation of the bombing before considering to engage in negotiations? Surely, viewed in this fashion, Hanoi's intransigence on

this matter becomes comprehensible.

A second glaring act of deception perpetrated by Mr. Humphrey against his audience was manifested in his criticism of Hanoi's, use of the recent truce for the purposes of replenishing her arms supply in the South and moving her men to other locales.

Of course, these actions are undeniable. But, what is also irrefutable is the fact that we, too, took advantage of the military respite to transfer soldiers and to move supplies to strategic areas.

My point, again, is a simple one. It is surely improper to attach an onus to the North Vietnamese build-up during the truce-period when we and our South Vietnamese "allies" were substantially doing the same thing.

To close, writing in 1962 in the "New Republic," the then Senator Humphrey stated: "Unless we tell the truth and state the facts . . . we betray our liberal tradition and associate ourselves with a false bill of goods that some people have tried to sell the American people."

That astute observation is no less relevant today. For, in a democracy, if we cannot put our ultimate faith in the responsible judgment of the American populace and its capacity to confront harsh realities, who can we trust? If not now, when?

Thomas Cabarga

Forbidden Fruit Frightens Co-ed

I'm convinced that the Tar Heel must be printing only the kooky letters it gets about the "pill": the majority of students at this school just can't be as simple-minded as some of these letter-writers seem to be. As I recall, the editors suggested that the infirmity should prescribe the pill for unmarried coeds, and this led to a discussion of whether or not pre-marital sex should be considered morally acceptable.

Before one can decide whether or not an act is moral, he must first know exactly what the act is. Pre-marital sex (for the benefit of A. S. of Detroit and A. B. of Ft. Lauderdale) is *not* adultery, which is defined as, "voluntary sexual intercourse by a married man with another than his wife or by a married woman with another than her husband." The subject under discussion is fornication, which is, "illicit sexual intercourse on the part of an unmarried person."

The place to look in the Bible for condemnations of fornication is in the New Testament, especially in I Corinthians. The Ten Commandments won't help.

Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible is useful for finding the pertinent passages, and one must use the King James Bible because the Revised Standard Version uses "immorality" in most of the places the KJV says "fornication." The word used by St. Paul can be found in the dictionary of New Testament Greek in the back of the Concordance by looking up the number at the end of each cited passage (with one exception, either 4202 or 4203). Word No. 4202 is "porneia," meaning "harlotry," which comes from word 4203, "porneuo," "to act the harlot, i.e., (lit.) indulge unlawful lust (of either sex)."

It is apparent, then, that what the Bible condemns is "unlawful lust." The next problem is to determine just what is meant by "lust." The definition of Webster's Third seems fair enough: "sexual desire especially of violent self-indulgent character." There is a world of difference between the flat condemnation of "illicit sexual intercourse on the part of an unmarried person," and the Biblical condemnation of violent, self-indulgent sexual desire.

It seems reasonable to suggest that pre-marital sex should be considered morally acceptable, provided that those engaging in it approach each other with love and respect. It is highly improbable that one who was promiscuous could meet these conditions in most of his sexual encounters, if in any of them at all. It should also be pointed out that the Church has always recognized the fact that one can approach his spouse lustfully, i.e., in a violent, selfish way, and has always condemned such actions. In other words, there is no magic in the marriage ceremony which will transform a lustful person into one who is loving.

Morality based on fear is immorality. If a woman's only reason for not fornicating is that she fears pregnancy, or fears what people might say, she has not recognized one of the most basic facts about the spiritual life: *evils* is not a "good" which we are forbidden to enjoy. Evil is bad in and of itself, regardless of whether or not any church or any law forbids one to commit it. A woman who is not promiscuous simply because she can't have the pill and fears pregnancy is not a bit more moral because she refrains from having intercourse!

In short, the sin is in the attitude, not in the act. It is doubtful that widespread use of the pill would result in an increase in immorality, or even in promiscuity, for that matter. One need not have intercourse to exploit another person sexually. If all of those who are presently exploiting each other were to begin having intercourse, morality would remain completely unaffected.