

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Harry Bryan, Editor
Thursday, October 21, 1971

People awaiting grid investigation

The controversy centering on the UNC football program has not subsided, and if anything it is growing across the state. The state press has taken an interest in the issue, and The Greensboro Daily News editorialized on the necessity of a study of the program in an editorial reprinted in The Daily Tar Heel. UNC alumni, too, are becoming concerned.

So, as we said last week, it is apparent that the investigation must be done.

Some students, faculty and alumni seem to think a study is not necessary, that it will only draw bad publicity for the school and its athletic programs.

However, questions have been brought out that are badly in need of answers. If the University appears too frightened to carry on an investigation, then people will only think it has something to hide. And they will have a right to think so.

The Daily Tar Heel is not out to kill the football program on this campus, and neither is the vast

majority of those who wish to see a study done. Granted, there are some students and faculty who would probably like to see the program eliminated completely, but their numbers are much smaller than those who want to ignore any problems that might exist.

UNC Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson should immediately set the groundwork for an investigation, giving the Faculty Council the authority to appoint several faculty members to the study committee and allowing Student Government to appoint the same number of students.

The Chancellor cannot deny that a study is needed after both the Faculty Athletic Committee report and the Committee for Concerned Athletes have pointed to the necessity of further investigation of the program.

If a credible study is done and finds nothing wrong, fine. And if problems are uncovered, then they can be corrected. Either way, the University will be the better because of it.

Scott could regret momentous decision

North Carolina Gov. Bob Scott, in a high-level administration decision, Tuesday declared Saturday, Oct. 30, to be Halloween night across the state.

According to unimpeachable inside sources close to the Governor (and a story on the front page of the Raleigh News and Observer), the reasoning behind Scott's decision was that Oct. 31 falls on a Sunday this year, and "it is not proper for ghouls, ghosties and goblins to be flitting about on the Sabbath, and besides that, the next day is a school day."

Now certainly, the Governor was faced with a problem of monstrous proportions, but it seems he went a bit too far in taking a national problem into his own hands and arbitrarily declaring Saturday to be Halloween.

If his precedent sticks, governors in the future could do the same with other holidays and then where would we be?

Somebody, sooner or later, would declare state's rights (as Scott did in this momentous decision) and declare Jan. 31 to be New Year's Day because he enjoyed partying on Saturday nights, for example. Calendars would be in confusion and civil war would begin.

Think about it, Gov. Scott. Think about it.

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Harry Bryan, Editor

Mike Parnell Managing Ed.

Doug Hall News Editor

Lou Bonds Associate Ed.

Lana Starnes Associate Ed.

Mark Whicker Sports Ed.

Ken Ripley Feature Editor

Jim Taylor Night Editor

Bob Wilson Business Mgr.

Paddi Hughes Adv. Mgr.

Larry Kessler

American military shields oil interests in Asia

Rich offshore oil fields in Southeast Asia have attracted the attention and investment of the international petroleum companies. Troubled by the unstable political and economic conditions in the Middle East and South America, the oil giants are hoping for better days in Southeast Asia. The United States' presence in Indochina guarantees that.

As early as 1952, the National Security Council, the government's highest-ranking policy-making body, was spelling out the "domino theory" of "communist aggression" in Southeast Asia: "The loss of any single country would probably lead to relatively swift submission to or an alignment with communism by the remaining countries of this group. An alignment with communism of the rest of Southeast Asia and India, and in the longer term, of the Middle East . . . would in all probability progressively follow."

The National Security Council went on to warn of the economic consequences: "Southeast Asia, especially

Malaya and Indonesia, is the principle world source of natural rubber and tin, and a producer of petroleum and other strategically important commodities. Furthermore, this area has an important potential as a market for the industrialized countries of the free world. The loss of Southeast Asia, especially of Malaya and Indonesia, could result in such economic and political pressures in Japan as to make it extremely difficult to prevent Japan's eventual accommodation to communism."

In order to maintain access to the strategic resources of Southeast Asia and keep Japan tied to the "free world," the United States first supported the French and then took over from them the fight against indigenous revolutionary but nationalist movements in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A communist or even a coalition government in those nations would not tolerate United States companies extracting resources at terms so favorable to the foreigners. The United States had to, and still does under Nixon,

hold out for pliant non-communist regimes.

Sihanouk's neutralist government in Cambodia was very wary of United States aid and investment, but shortly after Lon Nol's coup of March, 1970, Union Oil of California had a concession for all on-shore oil and much of the offshore oil as well. Thailand, a bastion of United States air might in Southeast Asia, passed its oil concession law in September, 1970, and has leased its entire continental shelf area. Vietnam's law dates from December, 1970, and bids were opened in August, 1971.

In addition to the United States-created military and political buffer in Indochina, American oil companies are also getting government promises of financial aid and insurance (through the government-owned Overseas Private Insurance Corporation) against risks of revolution and expropriation.

If the United States military commitment in Indochina was basically to control the resources and markets of

Southeast Asia, then ongoing oil operations would create an even stronger imperative to keep troops there.

It has been argued that the United States went into Vietnam before anyone knew of the existence of rich oil fields. While this may be true (although evidence points to the contrary — that oil men knew of these reserves by the beginning of the 1960's at the latest), it still does not invalidate the argument for economic motives in the formulation of foreign policy.

As Lenin noted in his famous essay on imperialism in 1916, "Finance capital is not only interested in the already known sources of raw materials, because present-day technical development is extremely rapid, and because land which is useless today may be made fertile tomorrow if new methods are applied, and large amounts of capital are invested. Finance capital strives to seize the largest possible amount of land of all kinds and in any place it can, and by any means, counting on the possibilities of

finding raw materials there, and fearing to be left behind in the insensate struggle for the last available scraps of individual territory. . . . Lenin correctly analyzed the thrust of America's "Open Door" policy, which is as applicable to Asia today as when it was first formulated at the turn of the century.

United States oil companies are not the only ones driven on by the imperialist imperative to scramble for oil concessions in Southeast Asia. The Japanese, who must import 99 percent of their oil needs, want to decrease their dependency on the giant United States and European oil companies. Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry has set a goal of importing 30 percent of her oil supply from Japanese developed enterprises by 1975. Japanese companies already are producing oil in Kuwait, Iran and Indonesia, and are interested in expanding into Vietnam, Thailand, Burma and the Philippines.

The two major consumers of oil, Japan and the United States, presently share a

common interest in keeping Southeast Asia and its rich resources open to their exploitation. But strains in the relationship are growing, and fierce competition for control of the huge offshore oil reserves in the South China seas may aggravate the situation. But it seems likely that for some time yet these two industrial giants of the "free world" will operate together in Asia behind the United States military shield, which stretches from Thailand to South Korea.

It is too simple and sensational to say that United States business and political leaders have exchanged blood (both American and Indochinese) for oil in Southeast Asia, but any analysis of the war and United States activity in Asia which ignores this point is inadequate. To claim that we are in Vietnam to help the Vietnamese defend their independence and freedom simply confuses the rhetoric for the substance of American imperialism. Oil men in the United States, Europe and Japan are not likely to make that mistake.

Susan Miller

Academitis germ strikes again

Preregistration begins soon. Somehow this period always comes during that part of the semester when we have just about had it up to here with our present courses.

I am convinced University academic officials have it all figured out on how to time things so that the whole student body doesn't drop out.

Academitis gets all ready to strike in full epidemic force, and then begins the enticement of "Wow, this looks like a good course." Some students actually have trouble narrowing down their lists to five since so many courses sound like good possibilities — in the catalogue descriptions.

The germs of academitis return to their seclusion to await the proper time to infect everyone — next semester.

The pitiful academics of this semester now appear trivial and bearable as the student starts anticipating the new,

exciting, mind-expanding things to come in his spring schedule.

Catalogues will soon be unburied and conversations will soon turn from "ugh, I've got three midterms this week — talk to you later" to "What are some good courses to take?"

Naturally each person has a different idea on what constitutes a "good course."

Normal people, of course, view a good course as one which requires little attendance, little reading, few papers to write, a genial professor, a minimum cost in textbooks and — on top of all that — the course certainly should be interesting. And, oh yes, the exams should not be "bummers."

A good catch-all term for this sort of good course is "slide." For a course to be honestly termed a slide it must have at least half of the above characteristics.

Everyone — rather, those of us who have any sense — tries to balance his

schedule with one or more "nice courses."

In picking courses, students must rely upon the primitive oral communication — word-of-mouth — instead of the more advanced academically tested written word. Why? Because UNC catalogues, unfortunately, do not list courses according to difficulty.

Word-of-mouth is not the most trustworthy method of picking courses. It works only when you take to heart only those verdicts coming from those who rate courses the same way you do.

Chances of success in balancing your spring schedule are directly proportional to the number of slides you want compared to the number of people you know who rate courses as you do.

Failure could be detrimental to your health.

Why must students have slide courses in their schedules in the first place? Is this

wasting educational opportunity?

Every student from the most extreme bookworm to the goof-off who just wants the degree has a need for easy courses.

That is — if the student wants to be sane after four years of University education.

The guy desiring the degree wants to do the minimum amount of work necessary for a decently salaried job upon graduation.

The bookworm intellectual, however, came to college to learn. He picks courses with tough, expectant professors and challenging reading material. What would this guy want with a slide in his schedule of mind exercises?

Relief. If a student chooses five tough courses, he will bury his sanity in books, tests and papers trying to do all the work to perfection. A slide as a fifth course allows this student to do his best in the courses he cares about. This is taking full advantage of educational opportunity.

Slides enable students to become the "well rounded" persons they'd like to be. Well rounded means having time to play and talk and make money in a job and date and . . .

Time is precious. I'm sure you don't have to be reminded there are only 24 hours of it per day.

Be sure to use well the extra hour coming from the conversion from daylight to standard time. Go play in the leaves. And then take that shower you've put off for a week.

Letter

Is Cansler moving up?

To the editor: Well it seems that Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, James O. Cansler has finally taken a positive, forward moving position on something. His campaign for campus beautification (DTH October 11) is certainly a noble gesture but, really, isn't grass preservation a rather safe issue? After all, who is against campus ecology? Given Dean Cansler's past activities, however, one wonders what his real motivations are. Could it be that this is a subtle method of controlling students (by deciding for us where we should walk)? Maybe, but even Dean Cansler is not that devious.

Could it be that he is simply speaking out on safe issues so that everyone will tend to forget his past blunders? Rumors have it that the present Dean of Student Affairs, C. O. Cathey will soon retire, and it is no secret that Cansler is very interested in that position.

But, Dean Cansler, some of us can still remember the past.

Who can forget his involvement in issues such as visitation (he was against it!), the drug policy (he was for a strict policy), double jeopardy (he wanted students tried in criminal and University courts for the same offense), required residence policy (he was for it) and student fees (he has them now)?

Who can forget the innuendoes that he has made concerning certain "liberal" faculty members?

Who can forget his strong-arm-control of the Office of Student Affairs? (Did you ever try to get anything done through him?)

Who can forget meeting with him about a personal problem and being told that "You really don't have to go to school here if you don't like our policies and rules?"

Believe me, I'll not forget!!! Let's all hope that he never becomes Dean of Student Affairs, but watch him, "he hath a lean and hungry look."

Robert Gaines
7 Old East



Charles Jeffries

The 'revolution' continues

The release of Huey P. Newton, minister of defense for the Black Panthers, a year ago brought waves of optimism to the black world about the progress of the "Revolution."

The great leader and co-founder of the Black Panthers was now free to "do his thing" in helping the oppressed people of the U.S. free themselves from the chains of racism and injustice.

There were even rumors that another important figure in the Black Panther hierarchy, Eldridge Cleaver, might even come back from Algeria, where he is in self-exile, to help revitalize the "Revolution."

This development in the revolutionary end of the "Black Awakening" somewhat overshadowed the capture of Angela Davis in a famous motel chain, shacking up with some millionaire black playboy.

And then the roof fell in. George Jackson was killed in an "attempted escape" from prison. According to reports, he hid a gun in his

natural. (It seems that the famous prison haircuts were not the order of the day when Jackson was sentenced to prison.)

The New York massacre of 37 persons at Attica State prison followed, and the revolution seemed to be steadily going downhill.

But then came the clincher. Rap Brown, everybody's "main man," was captured in New York robbing a liquor store. Just think: a man who had eluded the trench-coat-clad bunch of J. Edgar Hoover for 19 months was caught stealing petty change from the customers of a sleazy Manhattan bar!

Makes you think that the "Revolution" had just about come to an unsuccessful end.

The question now arises: What is to become of the "Revolution?"

The answer is obvious. The movement must continue, with or without its early leaders. Did the oppression of black people stop when Abraham Lincoln died? Did the duping of black folk by

so-called liberal politicians die when John Kennedy was assassinated? Did the move by liberal elements in urban communities to infiltrate the less militant black organizations like the NAACP stop when Martin Luther King was removed from the scene? Was there any lessening in the tensions between the white folk and the black folk when the riots of the '60's were quelled?

The answers to these questions is no. Everybody knows that we're still being duped, oppressed, infiltrated and forced to riot, to make our cry for freedom more audible to the ears of the hard core racist and the so-called liberal.

Our cry for freedom must be transformed into a cry for victory in the continuing struggle to halt the genocide of our people and its leaders.

Perhaps if the less militant of us had supported the movement financially, we could have prevented the capture of the last of the early leaders of the "Revolution."