

# 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

## SPU Goofs

The Student Peace Union is defeating its own purpose.

When their Y-Court demonstrations were in full swing last fall, the majority of the student body here joined blindly against the SPU and in favor of U. S. military involvement in Southeast Asia.

Then the peaceniks quietened. And while they rested, many average Joe Colleges began to consider seriously the possibility of the U. S. finding an equitable means of bowing out of the Vietnam conflict. When John Kenneth Galbraith suggested during the Carolina Symposium that we have no business in Vietnam, he was cheered by many students who would have thrown eggs at him for such a statement six months earlier.

The idea of evening workshops and discussions in residence halls is a good one. Perhaps for the first time since the origination of the SPU on this campus, the tenor of student opinion recently has been such that a profitable exchange of ideas between the peaceniks, the militarists and those in the middle ground could have been conducted without the affair erupting into a name-calling sessions.

But the members of the SPU have stabbed themselves in the back. An orange juice fast. Black arm bands. Daily meetings around the flagpole for "meditation and sustenance." Really people, you have to be kidding.

This is exactly the type action that sets the blood to boiling in the veins of most of our students. What can you expect to accomplish after you have set yourself and your cause up to be ridiculed.

We remember the early days of demonstration when we were dead against the anti-war boys and all they had to say. Since that time, we and many others have given a little ground — maybe a lot of ground in some areas. We really believe there are some good ideas within the group that wears the black and white chicken's foot button.

But we suggest that if you intend to convert anyone else to your viewpoint, you use your head. A little strategy can go a long way — much further than a gallon of orange juice.

## God's Candidate

This morning the Alabama Democratic Primary is history.

At least the first ballot is history. At the time we are writing this, we do not know who has tallied the most votes or if there will be a runoff.

Of course it has been speculated that Lurleen Wallace, wife of the present governor, would easily capture the party position on the November ballot. Although it is too late now to change anyone's mind or primary vote — if, indeed, any Alabama voters read the DTH — we would like to share with you part of an article written for *The Charlotte Observer* by Charles McDowell Jr. These are the last paragraphs of an otherwise serious commentary on the Alabama primary race:

"Waiting on the sidelines is Rep. James D. Martin, a conservative Republican segregationist, who currently is favored to beat any of the Democrats, including Mrs. Wallace, in November.

"Pending the showdown, we have the feeling that not enough attention is being paid to a Democratic candidate named Eunice I. Gore. Eunice is at least as interesting a name as Lurleen, but there is the additional factor that Eunice I. Gore is a man, and says he is running because God asked him to.

"Gore — one of his campaign slogans is 'Call Me Mister' — is traveling around the state, speaking from a motor boat. He tows the boat on a trailer behind his car. And to finance his inspired campaign, Mr. Gore is selling raffle tickets with the motor boat as the prize.

"Sounds to us like a natural."

# The Daily Tar Heel

Fred Thomas, editor; Scott Goodfellow, managing editor; John Greenbacker, associate editor; Ron Shinn, news editor; Barry Jacobs, sports editor; Ernest Robl, assistant news editor; Bill Hass, assistant sports editor; John Jenner, wire editor; Mike Wiggan, night editor; Joek Lautner, Jerry Lambert, photographers; Chip Barnard, art editor; Andy Myers, Steve Bennett, Steve Lackey, Peytie Fearrington, Carol Gallant, Lytt Stamps, Alan Banov, Bill Amstrong, staff writers; Bill Rollins, Sandy Treadwell, Drummond Bell, Jim Fields, sports writers; Jeff MacNelly, Bruce Strauch, cartoonists.

Michael Hollis

# Intervention In Viet Nam Unjustified

I have spoken recently with several students who support their country's war in Viet Nam. The arguments they put forth differ, but the gist is almost always the same, and boils down to something like this: "We are in Viet Nam to prevent the communist aggressors from taking over the country by force. If we don't stop communism in Viet Nam, it will spread all over Asia."

These arguments sound good on the surface, but are based on a colossal misconception of the state of affairs in Viet Nam.

A day after Dien Bien Phu, the representatives of the French and the Viet Minh met in Switzerland and agreed on what have since been called the Geneva Accords of 1954. By these agreements, all of Viet Nam was temporarily divided into two parts, and universal elections were to be held throughout all of Viet Nam within two years in order that the country should be reunited.

The reason for this provision should be obvious. Viet Nam is not two, but one. The present boundary between North and South has no relation to language, culture, custom, religion, or family ties. It is an artificial boundary, and to speak of the North Vietnamese as "foreigners" is absurd. They are Vietnamese, and many of them have brothers, sisters, fathers or mothers who live in the South.

The Geneva Accords also contain other important provisions, all intended to keep foreigners out of the country. Articles 16, 17, 18, and 19 ban the introduction of fresh troops, military personnel, arms, munitions, military bases, and foreign military alliances on the part of either zone.

The United States did not permit the universal elections to take place. The reason should be made clear by these astounding words, which come from no less a person than Dwight D. Eisenhower (Mandate For Change, p. 372): "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indochinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held at the time of the fighting (1954), possibly 80 per cent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai." And no one who knows anything about Viet Nam will deny this: had we allowed the people to decide their own destiny, Ho would have been elected by a landslide margin.

Little wonder that the communists were eagerly looking forward to the elections. Little wonder that they called the Geneva Accords a "great political victory won by a great military victory." They felt that they had all of Viet Nam in their hands, and they were perturbed (to say the least) when the United States:

1. co-operated with Diem to prevent the elections (the Dulles mentality of "rolling back" communism);
2. formed SEATO;
3. began sending troops into Viet Nam, albeit under the verbal camouflage of "advisers";
4. began building military bases in the South — all in violation of the Geneva Accords.

Well, as everyone knows, a war broke out. This country intervened massively to save the South Vietnamese government from collapse, and the situation has escalated upwards from the point in a spiral which has blown to smithereens all the earlier foolish predictions of Pentagon officials that we would be out "by the end of 1965" or "by Christmas of 1966."

We are there now, supposedly, to prevent the communists from taking over the country. And what right do we have to do that if the communists there are native to Viet Nam and if they are in the majority?

The only foreigners in Viet Nam are ourselves. There are no Chinese or Russians there. There are only Vietnamese and about a quarter of a million Americans who have no business there.

There could only be two justifications for our presence:

1. If there were other foreigners there — Chinese or Russians — as there were Chinese in Korea or Russians in Eastern Europe; 2. If the government that invites us is obviously representative of the vast majority of the people.

The government in the South today is a farce, and represents no one except itself. It has alienated the Buddhists, the Catholics, the students, the police, the soldiers, and even some of its own generals, and it loses control of nine tenths of the countryside at night. By contrast, not only is there no guerilla war in the North, but from the few films we get, we see mostly large crowds with helmets on, cheering "Uncle Ho," as they call him.

The point is this: you cannot stop communists or anyone else if they are home-grown. You have no right to do so. If you do, you are junking majority rule and the self-destiny of nations, and no little country on earth will have any sovereignty. It is as absurd to demand that the North

Vietnamese should get out of the South as it is to claim that Federal troops should have gotten out of the South in the American Civil War.

In Viet Nam, the so called "aggressors" live there, and they are tearing up their country (which they have every right to do), because they were cheated out of it before. The VC are willing to hold an election this instant. Indeed, it is part of their platform, since they are confident of victory. Only our side speaks of the "impracticability" of elections now. It is easy to see why. If we lost, which we would inevi-

tably if all of Viet Nam could speak, it would prove to the world that this huge country had gone wrong, and that several thousand of its young men died in an unjust cause.

As regards our loss of pretige and the loss of confidence in us by other little nations of the world to whom we are committed—both results, supposedly, of our immediate withdrawal—I reply only that you cannot lose what you have not got. No one in Latin America or Canada or Africa supports us. We have little support in Asia, and hardly any in Europe.

The French spent millions of francs and thousands of lives in Algeria. No one supported them. One fine day De Gaulle picked up and pulled out completely. People have chosen to forget this incident. De Gaulle took a huge risk in pulling out: he implicitly admitted to the world that the whole mess was a blunder. Regardless of how much his actions since then have angered us, we cannot take this from him: he saw the light and got out. Nor did his prestige suffer; in fact the contrary was the case.

I don't think that bombing the North will solve any of our problems. The French did not need to bomb Hanoi or Haiphong; they controlled the cities. The real war is in the countryside. To "win" you must destroy the VC, who are inextricably mixed with the native population. The whole idea of a guerilla war is that "supply lines," in a conventional sense, do not exist. The only real organization is local, and the average VC gets his small arms from those he is fighting. His food he carries on his back. There is no front line in this type of war, and no over-all organization, directed from one headquarters.

General Thomas S. Power, former head of SAC, already had said that bombing of selected sites in the North would bring surrender within a few days, but years of this bombing has only consolidated support of the government in the North. Our own guerilla forces in the Philippines never suffered a casualty in three years of air strikes. "Operation Saturate" in Korea was a failure, as was the German Blitz on Britain. The Allies bombed Germany almost to ruin, but German war production rose steadily until the summer of 1944.

Even supposing that a meteor came rushing out of space and obliterated the North completely, yet still the war would go on. The substantial majority of VC in the South now are native to South Viet Nam.

Finally, I think the whole idea of "stopping communism" should be re-examined. If communists from other countries try to take over a neutral nation, then we have a right to stop them. But if they are native, we must let the country go as it will. If we are afraid to sit back and let the world choose, since it might not choose our system, then it proves that our system is rotten. We are not primarily defending capitalism. Capitalism does not work well in poor countries, and it is an open issue as to whether or not it is obsolete. But freedom and self destiny are always in vogue. We should be concerned less with stopping communism, which has done some marvelous things in certain areas of the world, and more concerned with stopping totalitarianism. If we set ourselves to this goal, we will not support the "government" in Viet Nam another day. We will pull out and let them elect whomever they wish.

"Sit-in, lie-in, sing-in, sleep-in, yes; but starve-in — Never!"



David Rothman

# Southern Fundamentalists Use 'God Is Dead' To Cover Issues

Harry Golden, editor of *The Carolina Israelite*, confirmed his reputation as "a man seeing the obvious before the rest of us can see it" when he related the "God Is Dead" concept to Southern Protestant guilt about segregation.

Eager to avoid dealing with this region's greatest social problem, the churches here for years have diverted their flocks' attention to matters far less important.

For years, preachers have been vainly warning Southerners about the relatively mild evils of sex, liquor and, God help us, tobacco.

Now, as shown by the recent resolution passed at church conventions, many Southern Protestants are beginning to realize that they have, in Golden's words, "backed away from (the) great moral revolution" of civil rights. And moral revolutions, mind you, are supposed to be well within

the church's realm.

But what to do? One way out is simply to say that God is dead, that God — the hallowed father figure who struck terror into the hearts of the "God Is Dead" Southerners before they "learned" he isn't alive — really wasn't watching over their church during the time it tolerated the gross immorality of racial segregation. Isn't it convenient to exonerate yourself from your guilt by insisting there has been no one around to see your wrongdoings? "The God Is Dead" thinkers may not themselves be guilty of these evils, but their consciences compel them to answer for the entire South.

Of course, if the Almighty has really passed away, there arises the question of when he died.

For instance, was He alive in the days of slavery?

Had God died by the time the Ku Klux Klan got started?

Was He alive when the churches were sanctioning the doctrine of "Separate and Unequal"?

Was God alive when Protestants bomb-

ed other Protestants' churches?

Quite likely, the "God Is Dead" Protestants in the South fervently wish He had conveniently passed away before any of these things took place.

Personally, I believe He is still around today, and if I'm right, many "God Is Dead" Southern Protestants will be awfully embarrassed upon reaching Heaven and discovering that He was watching them all the time.

And, should God still be alive, another group will also be embarrassed — the Protestant Fundamentalist preachers who, like the Rev. B. H. Ingle of Raleigh (a former Klan member), insist Negroes will not "enter the Kingdom of God until they are white."

When these preachers reach Heaven — and they'll make it only because they were preachers — they will discover that the place was integrated long before the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Then, they will join the professors at Emory University in wishing that God, who witnessed their sins, has been dead.



## Heelprints

About those hoodlums rioting again in California — it's Watts happening, baby!

Hollywood screen child discussing his elders: "Mother's not the type girl you'd want to bring home to mother."

Now that Washington, D. C., is probably getting a subway system, it looks as if the newspaper people there can do a better job of getting under the surface of the nation's problems.

— DAVID ROTHMAN