

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.

FRED THOMAS, EDITOR

Fred, Can You Hear Us?

At about quarter of six yesterday evening, 45 minutes before the DTH editorial deadline, Student Body Vice president Bill Purdy entered the newspaper office, cleared his throat and dramatically announced that our noble leader — Editor Fred W. Thomas — has been abducted by the pledges of Chi Psi fraternity. He had summarily elected to take a little "pleasure-trip" to Virginia.

God knows where the poor devil is now, but in a rare showing of courage and spirit, his staff marshalled their forces and managed to perform his duties without him.

It was almost heartbreaking. His little grey typewriter sat alone in the corner of his desk. Clutched within its jaws was an unfinished editorial about the TV bill before Student Legislature. He never had a chance to finish it. (Sob.) It was the second in a two-part series.

No one knows as yet precisely how the fiends managed to get Fred out of the office. They must have utilized the back door, which runs through the ad-staff's domain and counted on the friendly help of Jack Harrington, rich, insidious, vituperative business manager of the DTH.

You can bet he put up a fight, though.

One thing the readers can also bet on is that before the week is up, those pledges will suffer woeful agonies for their transgressions. Fred is bound to make it back to town sometime and when he does, Mephistopheles will look like Peck's Bad Boy in comparison.

All we can say is, go to it, Fred. Hup, two, three, four, deep knee-bends, pushups, squat thrusts, the paddle, the rack, the lash. Give 'em a little something they will all remember for a long time.

And when you get back, please don't fail to write a few candid words about your experiences. Tell the inquiring public what you intend to do about it and make sure that the editorial will be suitable for framing and a position on the mantle as a reminder to pledges everywhere.

It'll make quite a crusade.

Wherever you are this morning, Fred, please remember that our hearts and hopes are all with you. Whether you're standing on the highway with long thumb extended forelornly, or shivering amid the scrub pine in your underwear, or sitting, tarred and feathered, in the Danville jail, we're pulling for you, Fred.

Fred?

Fred?

Can you hear us, Fred?

John Greenbacker

The CFI Lives

Just to ease the minds of the thousands of Committee for Free Inquiry fans on campus, the DTH conducted a short investigation yesterday and found that the CFI is indeed still alive.

The money CFI promised to collect for the imminent Federal Court case has been, sadly, a meager amount, but the American Association of University Professors and the American Civil Liberties Union have pledged their support, financially and legally.

The AAUP is busy collecting money for the court case, and has indicated it will file as a "friend of the court," as soon as the state makes its answer next month. The ACLU will probably file an *amicus curiae*, too.

A meeting is scheduled this week among some of the defendants in the suit. Most likely, it will take place in the attorney general's office in Raleigh.

— Andy Myers

Where Are The Big Mouths?

The sound of voices yelling "let's go, big blue" echoed in Kenan "valley" yesterday, but something was noticeably wrong.

The girls' voices drowned out those of the boys'.

Only five of 30 prospective cheerleaders showing up in Kenan Stadium yesterday were boys. Head Cheerleader Jerry Houle said he was disappointed in the turnout of boys, saying he "expected many more."

There are two male and three female vacancies on next year's varsity cheering squad which will be filled at tryouts next Tuesday.

This week cheerleading applicants are given a chance to learn the cheers and motions accompanying them.

Each day this week prospective cheerleaders will share Kenan Stadium with gridders going through spring practice. Instruction will be given by present varsity squad members from 4 to 5:30 p.m.

Houle said there is still plenty of time for other interested candidates to join in the practice sessions.

Wonder what ever happened to all the guys with the big mouths who're forever waving their arms around in the air?

Ernest Robl

The Daily Tar Heel

Fred Thomas, editor; Scott Goodfellow, managing editor; John Greenbacker, associate editor; Ron Shinn, news editor; Barry Jacobs, sports editor; Bill Rollins, asst. sports editor; John Jennrich, wire editor; Jack Lauterer, Jerry Lambert, photographers; Chip Barnard, art editor; Andy Myers, Steve Bennett, Steve Lackey, Glenn Mays, Peyton Fearrington, Carol Gallant, Lytt Stamps, Alan Banov, staff writers; Gene Whistnant, Sandy Treadwell, Drummond Bell, Bill Hass, Jim Fields, sports writers; Jeff MacNelly, Bruce Strauch, cartoonists.

"Look, for the fifth time — I'm Fred Thomas, editor of the DTH." Symposium Keynote

Galbraith Calls For Change In US Viet Nam Policy

(Editor's note—The following is an excerpt from economist John K. Galbraith's Sunday night speech keynoting the Carolina Symposium.)

By JOHN K. GALBRAITH

Our involvement in Viet Nam will be, as I say, the last legacy of the automatic anti-communism of the established authority. I have sympathy for President Johnson on this problem; the proper time to have reversed the policy was before our involvement began. No one has suggested that Viet Nam is of strategic or military importance to the United States. No one, I believe, has suggested that this is a disciplined warrior race that we must have on our side. We are there because the old policy called for an automatic and unilateral intervention along the boundary. This being so it did not consider the advantages of the terrain in which we fought or the vitality of the social structure that we defended. Once it was considered sound military strategy to reflect on such matters. But the automatic anti-communism of the established authority precluded such choice—or left it to the enemy.

For the old coalition there was, as I have observed, only one kind of oppression. That was from the communists. Repressive or even incompetent governments on the right were on our side. Although credulity has been taxed by the governments of South Viet Nam as by no others, they have been defended nonetheless. A certain amount of righteous indignation has been directed at their critics right up to the moment of their final collapse.

One of the recurrent and unnecessary errors of our foreign policy going far beyond Viet Nam is the assumption that governments, which seem quite acceptable to excellent New Yorkers and our own diplomats, are equally acceptable to their own people.

We must, of course, abandon the notion—as I am sure most sensible people in Washington already have—that we are going to roll the Viet Cong back from areas that they have controlled now for up to ten years. We must not invest lives, even those of other people, in any such dubious enterprise. It is not all that clear that the alternative for the Vietnamese who happened to survive would be durably better.

We should remain on the defensive for the time being in whatever area we can hold with the present force. This may well be rather small. But it will provide a refuge for those who have joined our enterprise. It will sufficiently establish the point that we cannot be shoved out.

There can be no real doubt as to the military feasibility of this policy. The oldest tendency of military men is to describe as unfeasible what they do not wish to do. If one can clear and hold all of South Viet Nam with a large force, one can hold a limited area with a smaller force.

We should, and this is a clear but vital step beyond present policy, suspend air attacks on the North. This is not for humane reasons although I am not opposed to humanity. Nor is it because air power is both

indiscriminate and ineffective, although this is true. Rather it is because these, and the temptation to extend them, create the one major and intolerable risk which is involvement with China or conceivably Russia. The temptation to extend these attacks is especially strong when things go wrong politically in the South. This, above all, must now be resisted.

Meanwhile we must face seriously the likelihood that there will never again be a government in Saigon which is capable of prosecuting the war in conjunction with our forces. A government that reflects the interest of the people will encounter their suspicion of foreigners, their struggle for a national identity, and their terrible war weariness. A government that works closely with us and fights the war will not have the support of the people. This is not defeatism; it is a plain reading of the evidence of these last months and years.

Under these circumstances our policy must be a holding action that allows of the best possible bargain between the non-communist groups in Viet Nam and the Viet Cong. There is no longer any doubt as to whether negotiations are desirable or not, although I doubt that they will be conducted by us. The bargain, let us face it, will not be brilliant. But we need have no apologies. We can say that we remained as long as we were wanted.

What we should welcome, and in the end will have to welcome, is a regional settlement, as in Laos. At most, the central government will be only a loose federalism between areas under different control. But that is about all Indo-Chinese governments ever have been.

We have paid rather heavily for the myth of the older policy in Viet Nam. But fortunately the cost in money has been larger than that in lives. And fortunately, also, the lessons—the dangers of automatic and unselective reaction to communism in accordance with formula, the dangers of unlimited commitment, the dangers in supporting governments that are unsupported by their people, the shortcomings of military solutions—are all reasonably clear. It could be that these distant and inhospitable jungles were well designed to dissolve our myth.

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.



David Rothman

Sinners Get Double Their Money's Worth In Las Vegas

As every good God-fearing American knows, public nudity and gambling are both frowned upon by the Almighty.

Nevertheless, gambling is a well established part of our culture. And public nudity? Well, that's supposed to be the latest trend in bathing suits.

Both sins for years have been present in corruption-ridden Las Vegas, Nev., where they survive despite the ineffectual pleas of the clergy; as for the police, they've just about given up hope of ever eradicating the vice.

Now, however, the law enforcement agencies are ready to tackle the problem anew.

Harvey Dickerson, attorney general of Nevada, said last week that gambling and sex may be all right separately but the combination is just too overwhelming.

Dickerson commented about some newly bare-busted blackjack dealers: "I feel very strongly that this effect distracts the player's attention from the hands that he's playing and makes it easier for the house to win."

But if the gamblers considered the almost topless dealers a threat to their winnings, they didn't say so. The Associated Press, in fact, reported: "The outfits, unique even for bold Las Vegas, drew a larger than normal crowd during the early morning shift."

Most of the girls didn't care either. Robert Miller, Silver Nugget casino manager, said that of the seven girls chosen to expose themselves to the gamblers, only one objected.

And a spokesman for the police admitted: "No one seemed to mind, including the women."

Dickerson confessed he hadn't seen the dealers' uniforms, though it's possible he might visit the casino for an inspection.

Discussing Dickerson's protest against the topless uniforms, one cynic asked, "Do you know a better way to get free publicity?"

Dickerson is being perfectly sincere when he protects Americans against this wedding of two different forms of degradation.

The morality-minded attorney general simply realizes that his countrymen can in good conscience stomach only one sin at a time.



Open Trials Bad For Student Courts

(Editor's note: This is the third in a series of four articles by the vice chairman of the Men's Council.)

By BILL MILLER

As a last statement dealing specifically with charges made against the Honor System by former DTH editor Ernie McCrary, this article is concerned with both the case for open trials and the area of jurisdiction of the Campus Code.

Our present judicial statutes prohibit the identification of students involved in disciplinary hearings before any student council, and furthermore prohibit the presence of a DTH reporter at a hearing unless the defendant does not object.

In reference to this situation, McCrary has charged, "The honor system is suffering," and has proposed a solution which "would literally stop every student who contemplated cheating or violating any oth-

er code offense dead in his tracks." The solution? "Have open trials."

There are numerous substantial reasons why we should not institute a system of open trials, in which students' names and offenses would be publicized.

First, the major premise set forth by the editor, that students would literally be frightened out of committing an offense if detection of the offense necessarily meant public exposure, is as negative and poor a rationale as one can design. McCrary believes the student "would be aware of his responsibilities under the honor system in a way now unknown at UNC." Most all offenders readily admit an awareness of their responsibility to the honor system when they committed the infraction. Would the threat of intimidation make them any more aware?

McCrary states that "the number of Hon-

or Code and Campus Code violators would decrease phenomenally." Does this same threat decrease the number of rapes and murders in civil society?

A better argument for open trials rests on the contention that students have the right to be aware of the proceedings of their judiciary, both for information and critical appraisal. A DTH reporter should be allowed to cover the presentation of testimony and cross-examination of witnesses and defendants (if there is one who would be willing to do so). But anonymity of defendants must still be maintained. Last year's Tar Heel evidently was willing to report cases under these conditions, but only two or three cases were handled in such manner. The fact is that reporters were not sent to the trials. Most defendants, if not all, would have cooperated, but only twice did reporters appear. In an attempt to in-

form the student Body of Men's Council proceedings, the author wrote and submitted to the Tar Heel accounts of all trials through December which were not published.

The question remains: Why not reveal the identity of Code violators? The answer is found somewhere between the necessity of having disciplinary action and the considerable social damage that sometimes follows such discipline.

An article in the "Yale Law Journal" declares that as a result of certain punishments, "the student suffers the loss of a status and the destruction of a set of relationships which have unique intrinsic worth." Even McCrary implies that "such treatment (would be) too cruel and rude." The AAUP, in its "statement on The Academic Freedom of Students," states in clear terms that "data from disciplinary and counseling files should not be available to unauthorized persons on campus or to any person off campus except for the most compelling reasons." And by far the vast majority of university students uphold this policy.

Exposure is too damaging to the student. This alone justifies anonymity.

A consideration of the area of jurisdiction of the Campus Code eventually boils down to the problem of "in loco parentis": should the university take over where parents leave off? And if so, how much?

Both legal decisions and prevailing examples agree that the university should (or may) impose behavior requirements on her students. We have ours — e.g., the Campus Code. Can we effectively enforce it by imposing two standards on students, one while in Chapel Hill and one while away?

There is no best answer, but students who either officially represent UNC or who will be identified with UNC because of their residency here as a student should be considered under the jurisdiction of the code if they leave the school.

The concluding article will present some important members of the Judiciary and will briefly explain the operation of our court system.

