

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.

ERNIE McCrARY, EDITOR

Watch That Other Guy

'Tis the season to be jolly and most of us will be. But without sermonizing or wet-blanketism, the fact should be pointed out that the odds are very high that at least one person reading this will not return to school after the holidays.

He will not return because he will be dead, and he will be dead because somebody was negligent enough to cause an automobile wreck.

There is not much we can do about that "other guy" who takes to the highways with a "gotta get there now" attitude, perhaps bolstered by some liquid cheer.

But it is unforgivable if you are one of those well-lubricated nuts behind a wheel, because you can prevent that.

Sure, it will not happen to you. It always happens to somebody else. Ask the friends of the UNC students killed in the last few years.

Polluted drivers and anxious hotrodders keep the undertaker busy. Keep your eye out for them and try not to join them.

Make a Christmas wish when you take to the road. Wish for next Christmas.

'We Bottled It'

Worried about what to give HER for Christmas? If advertisements are any sort of indicator, we recommend that nothing besides perfume be considered.

Look at these come-ons, found in almost any current magazine:

"What makes a shy girl get intimate?" asks an ad. "It's the fragrance that does all the flirting for her. The uninhibited perfume that makes things happen. What kind of things? That's her affair."

Emeraude says, "Want him to be more of a man? Try being more of a woman. For the woman who knows..."

Then there is the observation, that "Interlude, like love... must be experienced."

'Aimant says it is "like a kiss across the room," and you can almost hear the come-hither model in a full-page display whisper, "Give him Madame Rochas. A few drops at a time," as she applies a few drops about her plunging neckline.

Replique claims that it is "for women who are interesting to begin with," while a competing brand of bottled magic says, "All she wants is a little Emotion (a lot if she's daring!)"

Perhaps the manufacturers should at least partially qualify this advertising statement: "Caleche—it's all a woman needs to wear."

Some of the ads are more graphic than vocal. Ma Griffe perfume depicts a man and woman tightly embraced in a misty sylvan setting. The headline says, "We bottled it."

In another, a laughing nude coyly clothes her bosom and proclaims, "Imprevu is here!"

On second thought, maybe you fellows ought to steer clear of the perfume counter this shopping season. Chances are that you might buy something which could create a dangerous situation. These ads indicate that perfume is pretty powerful stuff, and sometimes it is not wise to put a weapon in a woman's hands—or behind her ears.

Consider the risk involved and decide for yourself. Decide, that is, which is more provocative—the perfume or their advertisements?



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.

Ernie McCrary, editor; Barry Jacobs, associate editor; Pat Stith, managing editor; Andy Myers, news editor; Gene Rector, sports editor; Jim Coghill, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Robl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; Ed Freakley, John Greenbacker, Lynne Harvel, David Rothman, Wayne Hurder, staff writers; Bill Hass, Bill Rollings, Ron Shinn, Sandy Treadwell, sports writers.

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.

He Says It's Just A Light Atop A Bell Tower



Liberal Comment

Capitalism And Problems

By TERRY FOWLER

Several articles about Ludwig von Mises have recently appeared in the DTH, presenting him essentially as a paragon of economic and political perspicuity. My acquaintance with von Mises, unfortunately, is limited to only one slim volume entitled *Bureaucracy*. To the degree that it is representative of his work, von Mises' position is open to serious question.

Bureaucracy is a diatribe against socialism and welfare statism. In praise of capitalism, von Mises maintains that there is no compromise, no halfway point between these two economic philosophies. The author attacks socialism by attacking its indispensable tool, government bureaucracy.

There are two ways of conducting affairs, says the preface, bureaucratic management and profit management. The former is defined as the "method applied in the conduct of administrative affairs the result of which has no cash value on the market"; i.e., bureaucracy's output cannot be evaluated through economic calculation.

The outstanding feature of capitalism, von Mises feels, is that it efficiently calculates what the consumer wants without any complex bureaucracy. The reason capitalism has such wonderful results is that the consumer's decision to buy dictates to the capitalist what to produce, namely, the cheapest, most efficient product that will compete with those of other producers. Profit management, then, according to the author is subservient to the consumer.

Bureaucratic management, on the other hand, is autonomous; it exists as a separate, neutral instrument to execute the popular will. When people dislike bureaucracy, the fault lies not within the structure but with the policy administered. The book's main argument is that when bureaucracy is used to administer a business venture, it is unsuccessful, since it is motivated by something other than the profits system.

There are two heinous results of bureaucratization identified by von Mises: its self-aggrandizement and the idolization of the state. From here it is but a short step to totalitarianism. Another evil is that the regimentation concomitant with bureaucracy "spells the doom of initiative," for citizens see no place to go save into the government service, nothing to improve.

This is because utopians, in which class von Mises places socialists, see the perfect state as immutable. Finally, bureaucracy is by nature subservient to rules which resist change; the grizzled bureaucrat, after thirty years of following the same rules, is likely to be extremely conservative. The book's conclusion is that socialism's vehicle, bureaucracy, is not only not progressive, but rigid and reactionary.

Now let's see where these arguments break down. The first concerns capitalism's efficiency. Since competition's ultimate goal is to eliminate competitors, and since it is often successful in this goal, the result is monopoly. Monopoly is under no compulsion to produce the cheapest product efficiently.

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 limited to about 250-300 words. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length or libel. Longer letters will be considered for "The Student Speaks" if they are of sufficient interest. However, the DTH reserves the right to use contributed materials as it sees fit.

The Student Speaks

Why Are We In Viet Nam

BY BUCK GRINTER

Debate on our campus over Viet Nam has been particularly barren. Pacifists and jingoists have too long held the public's ear. Student participation is noticeably shrinking. In last Sunday's DTH, John Harrison stepped into the void with a new call for victory in Southeast Asia.

This interesting letter, so symptomatic of the frustrations our administration and people feel over its Asian involvement, should be examined in detail. It illuminates those moral shibboleths and myopias upon which the Johnson government draws its support.

First, let us look at Harrison's assumptions: (1) that we have never lost a war (2) that we have allied support in this war (3) that Laos and Munich are somehow related (4) that freedom ("our way of life") is what must be saved in South Viet Nam. Initially then, it is interesting to note that Harrison's list of American "victories" would have to include the razing of Washington in 1912, the Changjin Reservoir and Panmunjom episodes and the recent wallowing in the Bay of Pigs.

As for the "U. S. victory over the Communist Huns in the Philippines" we were under the impression that a nationalist patriot named Ramon Magsaysay had something to do with putting down that rebellion.

Secondly, let us take heed of where we stand. We are bombing the territory of a foreign state, without declaration of war, in violation of the U. N. charter, without consultation with our allies and in a manner comparable to no action by any Western power since Suez.

Thirdly, "Our Munich in Laos" — we ask could it not have been Mr. Kennedy's feeling that a feudal kingdom replete with all the trappings of princely corruption

and Cold War fence sitting and exhibiting a degree of Mandarin posturing utterly unrelated to its peoples' needs, was not worth a war?

And lastly, if "we cannot justify our sacrifices unless freedom is secured for the people that America has promised it to" we are curious to know when and what we did promise. After searching the Geneva Accords, the Eisenhower - Diem communications and John Kennedy's pronouncements we have yet to turn up any promises of freedom.

Military aid, yes. Pledgings for reforms and a lessening of the fantastic corruption surrounding Diem, yes. But freedom? Indeed, Mr. Harrison, just how attractive does our brand of freedom (Oxford, Selma?) look to the Asians and Africans right now?

Furthermore, is the preservation of "our way of life" in the jungles of Indo - China what we should go to war for or mame another country because of?

If the answers to these questions seem difficult and illusive, one can always turn to Mr. Harrison's alternatives. Implying a Pax Americana for a starter and an eventual remarking of the word in our own image, he may have something there.

Admittedly the image is a bit tarnished by now, but the treasury appears bottomless. With predictions of a \$10 billion outlay next year and contingency planning for up to 680,000 American troops in Viet Nam by the end of 1967, it looks like Mr. Harrison's dream could come true. Your idea for a blood drive is a useful one, John Harrison. We know it makes you feel good. And who knows, maybe some of those donations will trickle down to the broken and burned bodies of Vietnamese children now enjoying that freedom you way we promised.

Letters To The Editor

Alexander Answers

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

We, the men of Alexander Hall would like to express our most sincere gratitude to the uninformed purveyors of mass riot and misinformation on this campus.

There has been a succession of anti-Alexander articles in the past week. Never since the NSA referendum of last fall has the DTH gone to more trouble to ignore the facts.

Mr. Greenbacker may be unaware that the touchstone for Sunday's protest was his article based on rumor rather than fact. He was, indeed, hanged in effigy and in a sincere protest of the very yellow journalism which could destroy this campus if allowed to continue. We plead for its halt.

The most recent article by Mr. Myers must have come from an earnest desire to see further and expanded demonstrations. Does he want a panty raid so he may reap the vicarious pleasures which he will find therein? Does he want to re-establish the wild gatherings of years past?

These have been suppressed by the more mature students who prefer to control themselves, even in the face of public attack. We have the name yet we refuse to play the game.

Analytically in reference to Mr. Myer's article of Tuesday, the 14th of December:

1. He failed to mention the reason for the gathering. That was to hang Mr. Fact-Lacker's effigy.

2. The demonstration began at 10:30 p.m. rather than at 8 p.m.

3. He neglected to mention the Choral-Can-Can of Contemptuous Controlled Cavaliers from Alexander Hall.

4. In the spirit of Christmas, carols were sung — yet the spirit did not reach wreath be-decked Graham Memorial, it would seem.

5. Shades came up to the tune of carols, sung from a respectful distance and never once did the crowd violate the women's wishes.

6. At approximately 11:30 p.m. a Winston lady poised herself in lingerie on the radiator by her open window. Visible to any but the blind, she put on quite a show.

7. The men of Alexander have shown a great deal of restraint in light of this and similar acts.

8. The women blinked lights and egged the men on — yet no one seems to remember this.

9. It would seem that in defense of the Carolina Gentlewomen, it is time for Silent Sam to level a warning blast to the east.

10. May the campus at large realize both sides of a story which at worst is a com-

pliment to men on this campus, despite the spectacular blow-up given it by the DTH in its sanctimonious orientation.

We must apologize for failing to consider a panty raid — now that you mention it — don't you want to field a DTH raid, with a prize for the best grab? No? Well, in that case, we suggest that you allow the proper authorities to deal with this matter and refrain from reporting news which is designed, however unintentionally, to excite rather than inform.

The men of Alexander appeal to reason — why not its organ of communication as well? We unannouncedly condemn such yellow journalism and we will find appropriate use for of DTH's if it doesn't cease. Thank you.

Seventy-four Residents of Alexander

Abolish HUAC

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

The appearance of a representative of the House Un-American Activities Committee on campus is a further reminder that the organization made famous by Senator Joseph McCarthy is still going strong, despite its failure to propose any significant legislation (the purpose of House committees) in all its twenty years of existence.

Why is such a committee allowed to continue when the House of Representatives Rule XI adopted in 1946 establishing HUAC violates the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution by its undue broadness, vagueness and uncertainty?

The rule has authorized the creation of a governmental mechanism with the sole purpose not of judging private citizens by their actions, but of forcing public disclosure of beliefs and associations of these individuals which may be unorthodox or unpopular, resulting in public stigma, scorn and obloquy; and it authorizes compulsory examination of witnesses so all-inclusive that it violates the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Despite the overwhelming reasons for its abolishment, the continued existence of HUAC, now concerned with determining such things as how much the KKK charges member for robes, can only point to the obvious failure of the FBI and the Justice Department to execute their responsibilities in the area of Civil Rights.

J. Edgar Hoover is more concerned about purported communist activity on college campuses and in the peace movement protesting the Viet Nam war than in the manifest, blatant fascist activity by the Klan and like organizations in Mississippi...

Peter H. Campbell
413 Patterson Place

