

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors. ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR

An Unusual Conference

University conferences and seminars are usually a dime a dozen, but the one planned this weekend merits more interest than most.

Student Government is sponsoring the Residence Hall Officers Conference Saturday and Sunday, and it is particularly well-timed. This is the make-or-break period for the residence college system. The recent student approval of immediately increased social fees to finance the venture means that there is no longer time for delay.

As with any new system, unexpected problems will be encountered in the residence colleges, so student leadership must be exceptionally well-prepared. Whether the student is a residence hall or college officer should make no difference in participation in the conference because the problems and goals of halls and colleges are mutual.

Speeches by Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey, sociology professor Dr. H. Douglas Sessoms, Student Body President Paul Dickson, former SG president Mike Lawler and Spencer Dormitory President Ellen Allen should provide valuable information. The topics will include the administration's role in residence hall activity, recreation planning, the relationship between Student Government and residence colleges, educational programming and cooperative activities between men's and women's halls.

Don Wilson, who has been making arrangements for the conference, has asked each hall president to bring an interested freshman or sophomore to the meeting so that continuity in leadership can be established. As it is now, too many halls have no resident with sufficient knowledge of the problems involved to take over leadership positions when vacancies occur.

The Saturday session will run from 2:15 to 6 p.m. and Sunday meetings will last from 2 to 5:30 p.m.

The idea is not new. A similar conference was planned last year, but it hardly got past the talking stage. Plans are complete now, however, and considerable good for all campus residents can be accomplished if residence hall and college officers attend with enthusiasm.

Community College Neglect

Greensboro Daily News

Accreditation now seems unlikely to be lost altogether to state-supported higher education because of the speaker ban law. But just because it is available it is by no means automatic for North Carolina's host of new community colleges. That is the most significant item from the Southern Association's meeting at Richmond this week. And it emphasizes anew that North Carolina has dissipated its energies over a mere phase of the accreditation problem.

Two features make the community college vitally important. The Carlyle Commission (on education beyond the high school) saw them as valuable adjuncts to the higher education system — relieving enrollment pressures on established residential colleges and universities, and putting college training within the reach of boys and girls who can commute to a local center.

Now the federal higher education act — moving toward the desirable national goal of making higher education available to any student whose brains and motivation merit it — has made loans and grants available to lower and middle income families. But these loans and grants may be awarded only to those attending accredited colleges.

Five new community colleges — Sandhills, Central Piedmont, Albemarle, Gaston and Southeastern — are without accreditation. The requirements for getting it can be reduced in the main to two words: faculty and books.

In both areas the problem is bothersome. Many new community colleges lie fairly distant from urban or older educational centers where a pool of qualified instructors, full-time or part-time, could be obtained. Nor can libraries, without considerable expenditures, be collected overnight.

The problems of North Carolina's community colleges, then, underscore not only the frivolity of those who pretend that accreditation doesn't matter. They are also the problems of potential thousands of Tar Heel boys and girls for whom community colleges, with the assistance of federal grants, are the feasible and practical hope for higher education.

The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom
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., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all ap news dispatches.

"Try To Think Of Five More You'd Like To Take"



Letters To The Editor

Marchers Ignore Cause

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Regarding my recent letter (which, incidentally, was rather chopped up by the editors and-or printers, and from which several key points—for example, the continuing U.S. effort to improve the South Vietnamese government with a view to more freedom for its citizens—were deleted) and the reply of Nancy Thompson, whom I thank for her correction.

I must, indeed, plead guilty to repeating myself and also to confusing my position with a misplaced phrase. I would hope, however, that even my critic would accept the sentence in question as it should have read: "The word 'war' is a description of a state of affairs." The misplaced phrase could hardly have been a deliberate "resort" since it obviously obscured the very point I intended to make. Interpretation depends not only upon definitions of words, but upon their implied meanings in a given context. In the case of the foregoing sentence, the intended implication (which I thought obvious) was as follows: "... it is impossible to be for or against a state of affairs in the same way in which one may be for or against the cause of a state of affairs."

Let me clarify still further: It is irrational to discuss an event as though it were a cause. And to discuss an event and deliberately ignore its cause is to insult not only one's own intelligence, but the intelligence of one's audience as well.

Yet this is precisely what the "peace marchers" have done. It is simply not enough to say: "I am against the horrors of war." The question is: "How are the horrors of war to be eliminated?"

The "peace marchers" are apparently of the opinion that if we will only close our eyes to aggression it will go away—or will at least be considerate enough to stop itself at some happily suitable geographic point. If we will just give the aggressors what they are trying to take now by force, they will not want anything more.

All of history, I believe, demonstrates the irrationality of such a view. Indeed, one has only to go back a few short years to the experience of the Second World War to see what pacifism accomplishes. Quite aside from Neville Chamberlain at Munich, how can any historian or political scientist worthy of the title choose to ignore the resounding words of historian-philosopher Oswald Spengler who observed in 1934—seven years before Hawaii was bombed: "... America must not grow weary. The only respect Japan will have is toward a nation virile and strong like itself. To avoid war the United States must maintain an attitude of calm and assured force."

But the United States did not maintain such an attitude.

Are we now to invite another near disaster for America, are we now to invite another world war because some scholars refuse to learn the lesson taught by history. Surely the lesson is not so difficult to understand: Aggression increases in direct proportion to the lack of response to it.

I might add that I also am interested in both sides of the argument. For that reason I regret that my critic offered no rebuttal to my contentions, but only an evaluation of my semantic skill (which, admittedly, is far from perfect). Perhaps, however, the absence of such rebuttal speaks for itself.

Paul A. Smith
654 Ehringhaus

Pravda And DTH

Editor The Daily Tar Heel:

Congratulations DTH! You have won the Red Star award. Only a newspaper supported with conscripted money from all, but which caters to the interests of a few can qualify for such a distinguished award.

Secondary requirements are (1) a quality journalism typified by an ignorance of the distinction between presenting an issue and taking a stand on the issue, (2) messing with letters-to-the-editor in such a way as to delete the meat of the argument which would neatly refute the editor's arguments and to leave only an introduction and a conclusion that is out of context and is thus meaningless, and (3) after having done such messing to have the gall of putting the original author's name at the bottom of the letter without any indication that the letter has been tampered with.

Yes the competition was close, you closest rival being The Pravda, but after reading the editorial page the Tuesday morning of the campus radio referendum and seeing the results of said policy on the final outcome of the referendum, the commissar's decision was final: the DTH gets the Red Star.

If you are going to mess with this letter, too, please be so kind as to use little round things called dots to indicate where you have tampered.

John W. Pettingill, I.
213 N. Boundary St.

Too Many Gifts

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Several Christmases ago I wrote that it didn't bother a child to see Santa Claus on every street corner. Recently I read a report of a psychologist's talk to parents, in which he spoke against live Santas in the store, probably on the streets also, because, with their loud voices and laughter, they often shocked a child. It is all right to have pictures of Santa displayed, and a Santa in the parade, but let's leave something of the magic of Santa Claus, the spirit of love and giving, to the child's imagination.

Pacifists Need To Visit Viet Nam To See Facts

(Editor's note: The following editorial was written by T-Sgt. Peter G. Gainutos, editor of The Advisor, newspaper of the Air Force's Second Air Division at Tan Son Nhut Airfield in Viet Nam.)

Time was when a boy went to college to study law, medicine, engineering, or one of the arts. And girls went to get the Mrs. degree. But for too many it is not that way anymore.

Today's crop of college cut-ups are no longer content to swallow goldfish, crowd themselves into telephone booths or small foreign cars. They—and we refer to the minority that makes the majority of the voice—now insist on dictating government policies, and are ready to parade, demonstrate, and sit in at the drop of a cause.

The latest gimmick among these intellectual midgets is a campaign to urge all members of the Armed Forces to desert their posts, rather than serve in Viet-Nam.

I have no quarrel with the right of the individual to voice his opinion. However, the hysterical babbling of these bourgeois bores borders on sedition, if not treason. I leave that to the Justice Department. It is a sad day indeed when the words "honor, duty, and country" have come to mean so little.

As a member of the military family, I have spent the better part of my adult life in the Saigons of the world. It never occurred to me to disobey an order, or to question the right of my Government to send me anywhere to protect and preserve its interests.

Like a lot of us here in Viet-Nam, I have had occasion to be at the base theatre during one of the memorial services, and I have seen the slow walking and heard somber music and soft prayers for those to whom rotation dates are no longer im-

portant. I muttered my own prayers, as well as giving silent thanks that it was not me inside that box.

As I stood there, I remembered preaching of these mentally retarded adults back home, and my compassion for a dead man turned to shame, and then anger that they dared to ask me to prostitute my profession, ask me to bring dishonor to myself, to my service, and to my country.

It is difficult enough to understand when the supposedly learned citizenry take the rostrum to rant and rave against our Government, and thereby feed the propaganda mills to the north, but to be subjected to the meaningless chatter of these embeccic sloths, whose idea of bravery is to lead a panty raid on a girls' barracks, is more than human dignity can bear.

It has been suggested that they all be drafted into the service and brought to Viet-Nam. I could not agree less. To put these morons in a uniform is to insult the memory of those who never came back from Guadalcanal or Pork Chop Hill, or those who did not survive the bombing of the Brinks Hotel or the American Embassy here.

Instead clean them up, cut their hair, and take away their sweat shirts and sneakers and bring them to Viet-Nam to live among the people. Let them expound their theories about the good, the kind, the misunderstood Viet Cong among the villagers whose homes were destroyed and their meager rice stolen.

Let them talk about war mongering to the widow of a Vietnamese Army private, who earns her fish and rice as a prostitute, or the village woman who lost a hand, one finger at a time, and finally the wrist to these misunderstood Viet Cong because she dared to stand up for what she believed was right.

Draft them into the military? Never! Ours is a proud organization made up of men and women who have ideals and principals and, what's even more important, men and women who have the courage and the will to live up to those beliefs.

They take great pride in themselves, in their uniforms, and in their nation, qualities that the campus "cuties" have yet to acquire. Until they do, they will never "belong." Their voice will be that of the semi-decimated, the fool who will leave behind only a legacy of shame, dishonor and ignorance.

LETTERS

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters must be typed, double spaced and must include the name and address of the author or authors. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel.

whether or not to scrap women's rules, and Fowler seems to have realized this. When it's something like cheating, stealing, or black lies, everyone can see sense in rules. The "basic rationale" is obvious—the harm of cheating, stealing, and black lies is obvious—and no one would be prompted to reexamine the "basic rationale" of the rules against them. The harm of discreet sex, in naked contrast, is not at all obvious. The sense in having rules against it is very hard to perceive, and the "basic rationale" of the existing rules needs very much to be reexamined. Try again, Fowler?

Bill Michaux
1018 Morrison

Vietnam Telegram

Editor, Daily Tar Heel:

In the November 19th issue of the DTH, the Vietnam was referred to as "The special Thanksgiving petition supporting U.S. involvement in Vietnam." Both the originators of the Vietnam and the DTH presented the telegram as a non-political expression of remembrance and gratitude, and it was with this understanding that many who are not in support of U.S. involvement signed the Vietnam. As one of these many, I would like to clarify my position and request that the DTH clarify its article of November 19th.

Bryden Manning
215 McIver

