In Our Opinion...

Fast, Efficient Service Not At Y-Court Snack Bar

It wasn't surprising to hear a great deal of complaining this fall when Y-Court Snack Bar hiked the price of a cup of coffee from fivecents to a dime. What is surprising, though, is that those complaints have died completely and no other ones have been lodged.

At the risk of stirring up a hornet's nest, we feel it time to comment on several unsatisfactory conditions around Y-Court.

Have you ever bought an ice cream cone there? At first we were impressed that the Y-Court Snack Bar sells the frozen delicacy at six cents per scoop less than the Dairy Bar. But after seeing the size of the scoops at Y-Court we are conviced you get more for your money across the street where the price is higher.

Then there is the milk shake which invariably comes in a cup slightly more than half filled.

The place is generally untidy, and especially repulsive is the glassware that sits on the shelves

under a heavy coat of dust.

And have you ever noticed the way the clerks grab a Bic pen from the display, mark stock with it, then stick it back on the rack to be sold. We got a pen there the other day from which at least a quarter of an inch of ink had been

Then there is the check-cashing counter - the only place on campus where students can convert their slips of paper into a week's spending money. So for the 13,000 students, there is one girl employed to handle all the financial trans-

Y-Court is an animal without a twin on the main part of campus. Students who want to buy a snack or class supplies or need to cash a check have to use the facilities of Y-Court.

So why can't we have a little better service for the students? As we see it, this is just one more area in which the UNC Book Exchange — that horrible monster is short-changing the students.

Holding Out For Booze

A law that was put on the books in 1913 will be enforced starting Dec. 13. That's the word from the North Carolina Alcoholic Beverage Control Board. But watch out for the determined people of Mecklenburg County.

It was early last spring when the attorney general made his pronouncement that law enforcement agencies would be obligated to enforce the statutes prohibiting the consumption of liquor outside the home. And close on the heels of this statement came a reply from Mecklenburg that it would be impossible to enforce the law.

Somehow the obviously ridiculous - but nevertheless clearly stated - law found itself being challenged in the state supreme court. In a less than earth-shaking decision, Associate Justice Susie Sharp last week upheld the statute as being constitutional. Now the warning comes that as of Dec. 13 North Carolineans will have to live within the law.

But Mecklenburg County isn't taking it sitting down. A statement issued yesterday by Charlotte ABC board member Charles E. Knox said that county will seek to continue brown-bagging until after the Christmas and New Year's holidays.

Who knows what luck they might have. They managed to get around the law for seven months. Why not for another 30 days? On the other hand, the situation is getting tighter and official rulings have been made. If the Mecklenburg luck runs out, the most popular Yuletide song in Charlotte this year might well be "Drink To Me Only With Thine Eyes."

Do You Know A Legislator?

The State Affairs Committee and the University need the students' help.

As a part of a stepped-up program to aid the University by brightening its image and explaining its position on many controversial issues, the committee included in its early planning this fall a program whereby every member of the state legislature would be visited in his home by a UNC student for the purpose of discussing an increase in the per occupant financial ceiling on residence hall construction, presently \$3,000.

It is an old story that the University can no longer provide adequate housing for this price. The task now remains to convince legislators of the reality of the situation and of the students' concern over over the matter. President Friday, Chancellor Sitterson and other administrators have voiced their approval of the State Affairs Committee's plan.

Now the committee needs the help of students who know members of the state legislature. As much as we tend to think of the General Assembly as an unfriendly. inhuman animal that sits in Raleigh and dictates to UNC, we all know that it is made up of prominent citizens from the various localities of the state.

We also know that we have students from these localities, and it stands to reason that at least one student here should know a legislator from every district. So if you fall into that category - if you are acquainted with your local representative - contact the State Af-

fairs Committee. Discuss with them the plan for approaching the legislators. Then go to it. You can do the University a great service in this manner.

The Baily Tar Teel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Fred Thomas, Editor Tom Clark, Business Manager Scott Goodfellow, Managing Ed.

John Askew Ad. Mgr. John Greenbacker..... Assoc. Ed. Bill Amlong News Ed. Kerry Sipe Feature Ed. Sandy Treadwell .. Sports Editor Bill Hass Asst. Sports Ed. Jock Lauterer Photo Editor Chuck Benner Night Editor

STAFF WRITERS Don Campbell Lytt Stamps, Ernest Robl, Steve Bennett, Steve Knowlton, Judy Sipe, Carol Wonsavage, Diane Warman, Karen Freeman, Cindy Borden, Julie Parker, Peter Harris, Drummond Bell, Owen Davis, Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders.

CARTOONISTS Bruce Strauch, Jeff MacNelly.

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. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc., 501 W. Franklin St., Chapel Hill, N. C.

'So Da Ting's Only Haf Full! Whadaya Wunt Me T' Do 'Bout It?



<u>Peter Harris</u>

U.S. Shouldn't Draft

The doubt over Viet Nam. strategically and morally, has grown for the past few years at progressive pace. In between have come

LBJ's unpredictable increasing-decreasing bombings and the raising of the hopes of Americans through a jaunt to the Far East.

The leaders of American attitude, the Left, saw the confusion of LBJ's method of justifying the war a long time ago. It has not been until recently that the rest of America has followed suit in expressing serious doubt and consternation over the handling of the war.

The more involved questions about why we are over there defending a peninsula of very little value has still been neglected by most Americans. The considerations are too complex for the average American to want to attempt to understand.

The fact is that even the far left intellectuals have failed to remain realistic about why we are there, whether it is morally right or wrong, and whether the government has any right to force young people into fighting for this controversial cause.

Communism

There is much to be said for Communist economic methodology. It appears to be the most effective type of mass economic reform. It is capable of working in a nation with high economic development potential where the people accept one way or another, the temporary hardships placed upon them.

It was able to work in the Soviet Union largely because the conditions were conducive to this economic reform. However, without the massive economic potential of a USSR or Red China, perhaps, the justification for Communist economics dwindles. Unless a smaller country (like Viet Nam) is supplied with heavy funds from another country, presumably the Soviet Union, the chances for increasing its material wealth are very poor.

The justifications for a dictatorship become less acceptable as the potential of the nation decreases. The immorality of a police state can no longer be tolerated as a positive means to an unfailable

Good Times. Bad Times

Since Viet Nam does not appear to be on the verge of economic prosperity no matter what system is employed, in particularly communism (under the supposition that potential is needed for pure communism to succeed), the justification for extreme social measures disappears.

Therefore, it is feasible that fighting communism in Asia is for the good of Asia. In possible lieu of economic prosperity the least that these people can be given is freedom from oppression. This is, again, under the opinion that Communism would be an unsuccessful economic method in Viet Nam and the rest of

There is the hope that the United States can help buildup the economy of Asia better and more efficiently than either China or the Soviet Union.

This is a very positive justification for our war efforts. The Vietnamese would not be any better off without us. despite the killings and destruction of the jungle. These hardships must be endured; it should be recognized that they will have to be endured and that if they are the results will be better than if

they were not endured. Therefore, the question of morality can be partly answered by saying that much good is to be gained through the war for the nation of Viet Nam.

On the other hand, the United States has no right to be there in the first place, and the fact is that we are exercising power in a similar fashion to the abuses of power by European nations in the nineteenth century.

The fact that we are there and will not withdraw is no justification in itself. But the fact that we may actually be able to help these people to a much better life does present a justification.

Conscription

Another problem has arisen from escalation. Does the government have the right to conicans into fighting for the script (in effect) young Amer-"cause of freedom."

It is the writer's opinion that as a nation gains more economic stability, indeed prosperity, there are less demands that the nation has the right to place on the individ-

For example, in the Soviet Union it is hoped that after a high economic order has been established, more individual freedom will be permissable. As the demands are less, fewer sacrifices have to be made. This is the way it should be. It is implicit in the theory

of leisure that as society becomes more efficient, more time can be spent on aesthetic, intellectual, and culturally productive ventures.

God knows the caveman did not have much time for leisure and that his cultural progress was slow and drawn out. As man becomes less dependent on personal sacrifice he is able to spend more time furthering his culture.

This leads us to the realization that the effects of the social contract begin to decrease as society becomes more prosperous. The rights of the individual grow, as they should. Past generations struggled through poverty in order that future generations would not have to struggle for the same

In an age of America where economic security has been a reality for most young people, it is no wonder that they should feel it their right to the pursuit of more meaning-

ful goals. As Gary Waller (SDS) says he never signed any social contract. He is right, too. He owes very little to a government which, in actuality, needs little sacrifice from its

This is true, especially, in comparison with poorer countries, even in the Soviet Union and Great Britain where economic sacrifice is crucial for survival as healthy nations.

The United States has the economic security to begin to engage in more productive activities, and that does not mean playing big brother to the rest of the world, Hopefully, after Viet Nam, we will have learned to keep our nose in our own porridge.

Therefore, the United States does not have the unquestionable right to call upon its youth to disrupt their more productive activities and spend two years, possibly a lifetime in case of death, in the armed forces.

The idea of alternate service is intriguing when you see that even our own nation, while highly prosperous cannot provide all of its people with necessary amounts of food and security. But even alternate service is not within the rights of the government. In this sense, the idea of

administration of things and not persons as presented by Frederick Engels becomes something of a real demand or hope, at least.

This essay has presented an overall look at Viet Nam. The conclusions are that we must win in Viet Nam because we can help the people. In the fu-ture, we must be more prudent before we commit ourselves to a precarious, per-haps unjustified cause.

Most importantly, though, we must not forget that America has progressed for a purpose. That purpose is to provide a more conducive atmosphere to the real, more Godinspired tasks put before man -to search the social sciences for knowledge and understanding about himself, his world and his total environ-

Legislator Criticizes Waller, SDS Tactics

In Letters

Cites Incidents

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel: I feel compelled as a member of Student Legislature to make reply to a DTH letter of December 2. This letter was composed by Mr. Gary Waller of the Students for a Democratic Society.

In this letter Mr. Waller stated that subjects such as the war in Viet Nam, the draft, and use of university facilities for war research should be debated and discussed among "Student legislators who, as representatives of the Student body, are obligated to concern themselves with matters vital to the wellbeing of the students and the university."

It would first be necessary to prove the importance of the war itself in relation to the university. I would contend that the war in Viet Nam is of no more direct consequence to the educational process than is taxation, the rising cost of living, or , if I may be so bold, birth control.

It would be utterly impossible, as anyone can see, for Student Government to debate the many controversial issues that have some remote effect on this campus and still have time to work on programs and legislation concerning housing improvements, illegal drug sales on campus, improved curriculum, court reforms, and the many other such problems that directly involve students all of the

The above arguments can also be applied to the question of the use of university facilities for war research. If someone could prove that the educational process of university students is disturbed by this research, Student Government action would certainly be appropriate, but at this time, it would seem that the only students whose education is hampered are those who are too busy protesting against this policy to study and learn.

Of course, the draft is an entirely different matter. A large percentage of our students come into immediate contact with the draft from their eighteenth birthday usually until long after their stay at UNC is over. As the Daily Tar Heel was kind enough to state, Student Government is already undertaking a study to find ways in which the draft can be made more equitable for not only students here but for all those who come under the draft's

However, this study is being conducted because Student Government wishes to be constructive and helpful. May Student Government be plagued by eternal damnation if ever it undertakes to form opinions on national problems simply because Mr. Waller feels that, in his own words, he doesn't "owe this damned country anything."

This brings us to the problem of what is actually a detriment to the well-being of the students and the university. I cite the following two incidences as ones which were, in my opinion, of great potential harm to all of us at

During the Speaker Ban controversy, Mr. Waller and the SDS attempted a coup d'etate within the Committee for Free Inquiry so that that organization would vote in favor of boycotts, picketing, and civil disobedience on this campus. This action would have caused all of us to pay dearly and might have struck the campaign for free speech a fatal blow had not responsible student leaders taken steps to block and eventually

overcome the SDS. During the Michael Paull English Department controversy, I attended a meeting of English graduate instructors at which Mr. Waller tried to persuade the English grads (he is a sociology grad) to take a course which would have included an immediate campus-wide teaching boycott. As it turned out, the situation was soon rectified without any improper action. This is largely due to the competence with which the English graduate instructors handled their responsibility to their students. Mr. Waller showed no such

responsibility. I do not attempt to deny Mr. Waller's right to his opinions because I see a valid, ever-present need for the voice of dissent. I do, however, intend to state my firm conviction that the right to dissent is never the right to subvert, and it would seem evident to me that, at times, Mr. Waller and his minions have dangerously encroached upon

subversive ground. Therefore, they have in these instances made themselves a greater danger to the educational process of this university and to the general well-being of all students than the problems they oppose.

Rep. George Krichbaum Student Legislator MD VII

Richard Doner

Americanism Pure In N.C. Legionaires

As I sat in the Jack Tar Hotel lobby last Saturday evening, the tones of Christmas songs filled the room and seemed to radiate a sort of glowing cheerfulness contrasting with the bitter cold out-

All the American Legion officers who were there for a convention mush have sensed this atmosphere also, since they seemed to be feeling themselves very much at ease. They were standing around, joking, laughing, and awaiting the chief speaker of the evening, a high Marine officer. As I was looking at a few

of the Legionnaires walk in and out with brown paper bags in their hands, my eyes fell on the American Legion Auxiliary pamphlet which gives the group's general goals and describes the events of the weekend meeting.

The front cover is highlighted by four words: "For God and Country." Following this slogan is a paragraph describing the purposes of the Legion. A few lines surely deserve comment: "We associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order: to foster and perpetuate a one hundred percent Americanism."

That word Americanism caught my eye and I can't stop thinking about it. I keep wondering who these seemingly normal people are who believe themselves capable of fostering "a one hundred percent Americanism." There is

a bizarre singularity as well as a historical familiarity about this last phrase. What does it mean, "A one

hundred percent Americanism?" Does it mean that there is only one way to be American?

Naturally, in any democracy one's status as a citizen must be defined in certain terms, such as nationality of parents, birthplace, etc. But in the vast majority of cases, definitions go no further than this, since, in terms of everyday behavior, neither a teacher nor a Governor has the right to define, limit, or analyze the loyalty one feels toward one's country.

But in America the citizen has institutionalized organizations to judge whether he has "American" ideas in his head, whether his affiliations are "American."

The simple fact that the American Legion Auxiliary dares to use the phrase "a one hundred percent Americanism" seems to show the existence of this tendency to define something which is, by the individual nature of human beings, indefinable.

But, as we all know, things don't stop at the pressure group level. The U.S. House of Representatives provides us with the House Un - American Activities Committee, a group of fine upstanding "Americans" who have the power to further describe exactly what our national sentiments should

be and how to express them. There is an American Legion Auxiliary "Americanism" and there is a HUAC because everyone feels small, and no one cares.

And the American Legion Auxiliary Program in the Jack Tar Hotel on December 3, at 9 a.m., the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag was lead by the Department Americanism Chairman.