

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

As You Dislike It

That strange air of quietness that seems to find its way to Chapel Hill every spring just before final examination period has arrived.

Suddenly faced with the challenge either to graduate or to bring the old Q.P. average up to a level that will permit readmission to the University next fall, the student newsmakers are producing less each day. It is at times like this that newspaper editors fall back on space-filling editorial comments about the weather, Mother's Day (ouch!), etc.

But such editorials often fall short of satisfaction.

Too many times readers have no particular interest in a subject on which an editor has commented. Therefore, today *The Daily Tar Heel* has decided to give you a form editorial and let you fill in the blanks according to your own personal grievance. Here it is:

The action of (Student Legislature, the IFC, the Panhellenic Council, the MRC, the WRC, the Administration, the Athletic Department, Chapel Hill Board of Aldermen, other) last (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday—nobody works on Saturday) is without a doubt the epitome of (petty partisan politics, "Brooks Brothers Bigotry," silly TCC nonsense, hasty action without careful planning, narrow-mindedness, poor recruiting tactics, disregard for the welfare of UNC students.)

The (TV Bill, closing hours, parking problem, ticket situation, high prices of town merchants) has been our single greatest concern this entire year. We had hoped that a solution would be reached in the (supply proper day) meeting. Now it appears that we are further than ever from an equitable agreement.

To say the (organization being slandered) disappointed us would be putting it mildly. To say they disgusted us would be a euphemism. In fact, no one word could describe their actions. We have found (pick a number from one to ten) adjectives that come very close to conveying our opinion: (choose from these — irresponsible, hilarious, drunken, Puritan, sinful, dangerous, blasphemous, libelous, conceited, selfish, ignorant, communistic, ultra-conservative, sadistic, other).

What do those people think we are here for? Could it be that people in a position of such responsibility do not realize that our first goal while in the University is (the free pursuit of knowledge, to make a 2.0 and stay out of the draft, learning to live with other people, finding a husband, finding a wife, raising hell, impressing everyone with our sharp new cars, seeing a brilliant array of collegiate athletics, self survival)?

It's high time someone took the University reins out of the hands of (second floor GM, Big Court, women, South Building, Woollen Gym, City Hall) and put them where they should be—in (second floor GM, Big Court, the women's hands, South Building, Woollen Gym, City Hall).

Ours is a great University now. It is (respected, loved, criticized, attacked) by people all over the (town, state, nation, world). We certainly (want, cannot allow) this situation to continue. But (how can it, it definitely will) continue if our leaders in the future behave in the fashion they did Saturday (maybe some people do work on Saturdays).

The statement by (Bill Purdy, Lindsey Freeman, Madeline Gray, Lew Brown, Susan Gretz, Chancellor Sitterson, C. P. Erickson, other) — "We felt our action to be the only possible course in light of present circumstances. We hope this set of regulations will in no way jeopardize future privileges of students involved." —was plainly self-contradictory.

How can students ever (get TV sets, bring women into their rooms after midnight, park on Polk Place, get box seats for their families in Kenan Stadium, get ten-minute laundry service) if the precedent is set in the opposite direction and in such strong fashion.

Seldom has *The Daily Tar Heel* felt so strongly about any issue. The students' welfare is being overlooked for the sake of (politics, Greek pride, a decent reputation, money, grass, God, country, Mother, apple pie).

We hope something will be done about this — and soon.

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 Jannrich, wire editor; Mike Wiggin, night editor; Jock Lanterer, Jerry Lambert, photographers; Chip Barnard, art editor; Andy Myers, Steve Bennett, Steve Lackey, Peytie Fearington, Carol Gallant, Lytt Stamps, Alan Banov, Bill Amlong, staff writers; Bill Rollins, Sandy Treadwell, Drummond Bell, Jim Fields, sports writers; Jeff MacNelly, Bruce Strauch, cartoonists.

"May in Chapel Hill. I sat up all night running my car so it wouldn't freeze!"



Letters To The Editor

Virtues Of DTH Praised, Panned By Seely, Lipsitz

Seely's Congratulations

Editor, The Tar Heel
About a year ago Ernie McCrary, Pat Stith, Ed Freakly, John Greenbacker and the rest of the Daily Tar Heel crew informed me that not only would they put out a better newspaper than Hugh and I, they would prove it by winning more awards.

Today I watched them win, and win, and win, and the coffers of the Charlotte Observer - Charlotte News Collegiate Press Awards apparently have flown to Chapel Hill.

The awards the DTH won today were not only a credit to the men who received them, they reflect credit upon the newspaper, the student body and, most of all, the University.

Of course, my congratulations to everyone who had a part in winning the awards, and also a warning to the present regime: You've got a hard act to follow.

Fred Seely
Sports Writer
Charlotte News

Editor's note — For those who don't know, Fred Seely and Hugh Stevens were the co-editors of the DTH before Ernie McCrary took office.)

Northern Women Again

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
"Loud Yankee Broads" seem to be Steven Kropelnicki's speciality as is evident in last Thursday's Daily Tar Heel. He takes the opportunity of expounding upon Northern women and of course he is in the position to judge being a Southerner, for he has been North. The image of the Northern woman according to Kropelnicki is a woman in curlers with deplorable speech, an obnoxiously loud voice, and oh yes, let's not forget clothes as no "Southern Gentleman" does. They were in "absolute conformity to the latest styles."

It is painfully obvious that Kropelnicki's judgment falls short in his mass generalization of women of the North. Also obvious is that his acquaintances from the North constitute members of a lower-middle class. If you are looking for refinement, breeding, and background, break your social barrier, Kropelnicki, come up, come up, come all the way up . . .

David W. Goodnow
300 S. Columbia St.

Lipsitz Was Misquoted

In a terribly broken up and incoherent article reporting my talk to a SPU-sponsored seminar, I am quoted as saying Viet Cong have killed 60,000 civilians and that the U. S. is killing 10,000 civilians a month. Where the reporter got such fantastic figures is anybody's guess, but he certainly didn't get them from listening to me. No one has accurate figures on these matters, and so there is great need to be cautious in discussing the organized murder that is taking place. What I said at the seminar was The New York Times had reported 4,000 village leaders and something on the order of 10,000 - 11,000 other civilians killed by the VC since 1964. As for

civilians killed by the American and South Vietnamese government forces, there are only the estimates of people like Vietnamese government forces, there are only the estimates of people like Jean Lacouture and Bernard Fall that between two and six civilians are killed for every VC. Given 1,000 VC killed per month, this would mean a minimum of 2,000 dead civilians, assuming the two to six ratio is somewhat accurate. My point was a very old one, repeated by almost everyone who has been a critic of the war: it is strange to save a country by massive slaughter of civilians. If the only way to defeat the VC is through such massive killing, is that worth the cost? It seems to me that this is one of the questions raised by the recent Buddhist demonstrations in South Vietnam. How extensive the killing of civilians actually is, however, no one can say for sure.

There has already been so much misinformation and myth - making concerning the Vietnam war, that we should be very careful not to add further confusion. There are very real moral issues raised by American actions in this war, and it is time Americans looked at these issues squarely. It is no help when the free press quotes a bit too freely.

Lewis Lipsitz
Political Science Dept.

Lynd Sees Capitalism As Unstable; Love Is Needed

(Editor's note — The following are excerpts from a speech made last March in Chicago by Dr. Saughton Lynd of Yale University. Originally published by the Minnesota Daily. They give some indication of the view of American capitalism held by the professor who defied the State Department go to North Viet Nam.)

American capitalism is not a permanent or stable system. It cannot provide constructive and remunerative work for all its citizens. It refuses to support those without work at a level of life consistent with human dignity. The technological progress to which it is driven by corporate competition for profits puts more men out of work by automation. The only public works it is willing to undertake which alleviate unemployment significantly are war and the preparation for war. But automation of these activities decreases the effect of such spending in increasing jobs and income; further, possession of nuclear weapons by both sides sets absolute limits on the degree of escalation available to the permanent war economy. Therefore, the permanent war economy is not permanent. It will either be transformed into its opposite, socialism, or commit suicide.

A second source of contradictions is the spread of socialism throughout the underdeveloped world. The option of alleviating internal economic problems through overseas investment is increasingly foreclosed. The spread of socialist economic planning in the underdeveloped world is the fundamental fact of our century and must be taken as a given. It is not a paper tiger, as was the apprehension in the 1950s that the Soviet Red Army would march to the English Channel, but a real and increasing threat to American capitalism.

(Both) the intellectual and the poor person in Mississippi or Newark act personally. They are concerned with ends, not like the politician with means (otherwise known as votes). Both have in view — and I think anyone who worked in the South will bear me out on this — both the Negro Baptist field hand in Mississippi and the intellectual activist have in view an ideal community, something like a family but bigger, something like a seminar ex-

cept that people act as well as talk, something like a congregation except that people work together as well as pray together.

I don't think you can build a movement on hate. In my experience, the most militant people have also been the quietest. In my experience he who thinks the policeman can become a brother is less likely to get hit on the head. The toughest nuts among us, I have noticed, will shyly confess in an odd moment that what really keeps them going is the vision of a band of brothers standing in a circle of love.

This vision . . . simplifies many knotty strategic problems. It makes the fundamental assumption that if enough people want such a society they will sooner or later find a way to achieve it. The really important thing is that in the meantime we not lose hope, that we stay together, that we deal with each other in an honest and kindly manner, that we share our resources — socialism is a very natural idea for poor students, as it is for poor people of any kind — in faith, or to use a new expression, that we keep our eyes on the prize and hold on.

It's not a new vision. It is a very old idea that God gave the good things of this world to his children to share as in one family; that the idea of someone owning a field, or owning a portion of downtown Chicago, that the idea of private property is blasphemy. It is a very old idea that society should be made new on the model of the family, so that we would bear each other's burdens as brothers and sisters and like the early Christians, hold all things in common.

But it's Utopian, I hear someone cry! Even if people can live that way in little groups they cannot change the structure, cannot solve the problem of power!

The vision of community . . . is not utopian because it is not pie in the sky. It doesn't put off action until tomorrow. Its creed is: If not now, when? If not you? who? It is the faith that says each of us must act as best we can in response to each day's moral outrage, not waiting till the party decides its perspective for the coming period.

Kennan On Viet Nam Involvement

(Editor's note — The following is the first of a series of articles reprinting former ambassador George Kennan's remarks on the US Viet Nam involvement before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.)

The subject on which I am invited to give my views this morning is, as I understand it, the complex of problems connected with our present involvement in Viet Nam. I would like to explain in undertaking to speak to this subject, that Southeast Asia is a part of the world for which I can claim no specialized knowledge. I am not familiar with the official rationale of our policy there except as it has been revealed in the press. I cannot recall that I have ever during my official service in government or subsequently, been drawn by the executive branch of our government into consultation on the problem of our policy in Southeast Asia, or even been made privy to the official discussions by which that policy was decided.

I am sure that there are many data that are relevant to any thoroughly founded judgment on these matters which are not available to me, and this being the case, I have tried in recent weeks and months not to jump to final conclusions even in my own thoughts, to remain sympathetically receptive, both to our government's explanations of the very real difficulties it has faced and to the doubts and questions of its serious critics.

I have not been anxious to press my views on the public but I gladly give them to you for whatever they are worth, claiming no particular merit for them except perhaps that they flow from experience with communist affairs that runs back for some 38 years, and also from the deepest and most troubled sort of concern that we should find the proper course, the right course, at this truly crucial moment.

The first point I would like to make is that if we were not already involved as

we are today in Viet Nam, I would know of no reason why we should wish to become so involved, and I could think of several reasons why we should wish not to.

Viet Nam is not a region of major military, industrial importance. It is difficult to believe that any decisive developments of the world situation would be determined in normal circumstances by what happens on that territory. If it were not for the considerations of prestige that arise precisely out of our present involvement, even a situation in which South Viet Nam was controlled exclusively by the Viet Cong, while regrettable, and no doubt morally unwarranted, would not, in my opinion, present dangers great enough to justify our direct military intervention.

Given the situation that exists today in the relations among the leading Communist powers, and by that I have, of course, in mind primarily the Soviet-Chinese conflict, there is ever likelihood that communist regime in South Viet Nam would follow a fairly independent course.

There is no reason to suspect that such a regime would find it either necessary or desirable in present circumstances to function simply as a passive puppet and instrument of Chinese power. And as for the danger that its establishment there would unleash similar tendencies in neighboring countries, this, I think, would depend largely on the manner in which it came into power.

In the light of what has recently happened in Indonesia, and on the Indian subcontinent, the danger of the so-called domino effect that would be produced by a limited communist success in South Viet Nam, seems to me to be considerably less than it was when the main decisions were taken that have led to our present involvement.

Let me stress, I do not say that that danger does not exist, I say that it is less than it was a year or two ago when we got into this involvement.

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.

