

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.

SCOTT GOODFELLOW, EDITOR

Split Pill Vote Expected

One-half of the coeds interviewed here recently indicated that they would be in favor of allowing girls to decide for themselves whether to use birth control pills.

One-half opposed it. We would have been upset if the verdict hadn't split so decisively. Let's analyze the members of the two groups.

There are two types in the group favoring liberalization of pill distribution: those who feel that they need the pills (perhaps some who presently use them and would prefer not to do it illegally) and those who trust themselves and their friends with proper discretion in the use of the pills. Both groups feel the pill is better than the tragedies of illegitimacy.

Likewise, there are two types in the group who would retain the *Status Quo*: those who see a chaotic breakdown of our present system of sexual morals if the change is made, and those who do not trust themselves and their friends with sufficient discretion in pill use. Perhaps no distinction can be made between these two types.

If the results of the survey had not spanned both of these groups, we would have felt that it was inaccurate, since the problem should

and does cover both rational and emotional problems.

One girl commented that the moral attitude was already present and would survive intact long after a sudden change in pill distribution is made. She said that one of the main reasons for the present level of pre-marital sexual activity is fear of pregnancy.

She is right. But is any system which is based upon fear a good one? Our fear of pregnancy policy isn't even effective, because thousands of illegitimate children are born every year. We are not condoning pre-marital sex—it is certainly an individual matter. But it is alarming that everyone does not accept the fact that pre-marital sex occurs continually, everywhere. By ignoring it, we have promoted our present *sexual* moral attitude above our *general* moral attitude, an attitude which would not allow for the "accidental birth of human beings."

There is no high rate of illegitimacy in Chapel Hill, a fact which those in our infirmary will readily tell us. At whatever time we do decide to issue pills to requesting coeds, it will mark an endorsement of a higher moral attitude in addition to a recognition of true morality: the pill or the illegitimate child?

He Sure Did Try Harder

For all the talk about the obscurity of his position, the Vice President did himself well yesterday afternoon.

With the finesse of a violin tuner Hubert Humphrey felt out his audience with a few humorous opening remarks, and then launched into his oratorical justification of administrative policy. And quite a justification it was, too, for seldom have we heard so much of the reasoning behind the government's decisions in such a concise manner.

True enough, Humphrey manipulated his answers so that he frequently used questions as platforms to launch into another subject. But what really counts is that the subjects he ultimately chose to discuss were the ones students wanted to hear: the Vietnam problem, its possible solutions, and the resulting domestic difficulties.

The Vice President's defense of

We All Respect Dissent Right

"One of the greatest assets of your campus," he said, "is the intellectual atmosphere where ideas continually clash and are discussed."

Humphrey had just begun when he said that.

Out in front of Memorial Hall the protestors picketed. Some of them carried signs requesting certain policy decisions. Others carried signs which were not so intelligent, "Bomb the LBJ ranch," and "Humphrey Is A Killer."

Midway through his talk the Vice President said, "I respect the right to dissent until the point when disorder prevails."

When Humphrey left the building, the dissenters were still marching around, very orderly.

Perhaps the most effective part of the orderly demonstration was the mass of participating students. The "activists" were not the main feature.

We do, however, wish to correct the Vice President after seeing the sign-carriers. We respect the right to dissent intelligently. We tolerate the right to dissent when it is poorly thought out.

our war policy was particularly interesting because, in his words, "I have been called a 'peacenik.'" His conclusion that cessation of bombing would not in itself initiate negotiations seemed well documented.

Thursday night in Student Legislature a bill will be introduced calling for a campuswide referendum on the Vietnam question. The factual bases presented by Humphrey, coupled with the reasoning of those who signed the recent letter to the President should provide everyone with the materials to conduct debate.

The Vice President was able to dispel far more than the hazy thinking about his number two position yesterday—he helped to clear up a great deal of uncertainty about why our policies appear obscure.

The Daily Tar Heel

74 Years of Editorial Freedom

Scott Goodfellow, Editor

Tom Clark, Business Manager

Sandy Treadwell, Manag. Ed.

John Askew Ad. Mgr.

Peter Harris Associate Ed.

Don Campbell News Editor

Donna Reifsnider Feature Ed.

Jeff MacNelly Sports Editor

Owen Davis Asst. Spts. Ed.

Jock Lauterer Photo Editor

David Garvin Night Editor

Mike McGowan Photographer

Wayne Hurder Copy Editor

Ernest Robl, Steve Knowlton, Carol Wonsavage, Diane Ellis, Karen Freeman, Hunter George, Drummond Bell, Owen Davis, Joey Leigh, Dennis Sanders, Joe Saunders, Penny Raynor, Jim Fields, Donna Reifsnider, Joe Coltrane, Julie Parker'

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.

John Greenbacker

Vietnam Success Is Near

(Editor's note: This article, it should be noted, was written three days before Vice-President Hubert Humphrey appeared on campus. The points of view are entirely Greenbacker's own and in no way reflect the opinions expressed by Humphrey yesterday.)

The news bulletin last week that announced Doctor Bernard Fall's untimely death in Vietnam rocked the academic world in this country, and those who pride themselves as experts on Vietnamese history and politics will realize immediately the gravity of their loss.

Fall, whose books "The Two Vietnams", "Street Without Joy", and "The Vietnam Reader" were widely read, had recently finished a book about French defeat at Dien-Bien-Phu that was given rave reviews. A French citizen by birth, Fall was professor of International Relations at Howard University for many years. His studies of Vietnam date from the early 1950's, and they clearly established him as the nation's leading expert on Vietnam.

Thus with another paradox the Vietnam war continues, and the intensity of Allied involvement is rapidly reaching higher levels. The bombing of the North has been compounded by the mining of North Vietnamese rivers and the initiating of massive naval bombardment.

It is interesting to note that above all things, Bernard Fall taught Americans to be realistic about the war. He had a way of assessing a situation by examining the facts that led inevitably to the truth. He clearly illustrated the conviction and the will of the Johnson administration in Vietnam by noting that long term loans for building construction were being issued by Saigon bankers. They wouldn't be issuing five year loans, Fall realized, unless they were convinced of a continued American presence.

Besides the massive intricate and costly series of six airbases for jet bombers which we have now built, we have devoted billions to harbor construction. In Saigon, a permanent 25 million dollar office building is being completed to house the headquarters of America's generals in Vietnam. The list is too long to tabulate.

What we must realize now is this: Regardless of the question of America's reason for being in Vietnam, regardless of the foolishness and short-sightedness of past foreign policy decisions, and regardless of the monstrosity of a war that wounds or kills 5,000 South Vietnamese civilians a month, America's government has gone too far to retreat precipitately.

Ho Chi Minh and the cutthroats who have assisted his rise to power thought, and

continue to think, that American public opinion will rise up against the involvement, especially after the Harrison Salisbury dispatches. They continue to play on the American public with reports of civilian casualties. But the public here hasn't changed and it is not likely to. Almost everyone in the nation is groaning about the mess in Vietnam, but they are grudgingly backing it up.

If Lyndon Johnson were replaced in 1968 by Ronald Reagan, George Romney, or even Senator Bobby, none of them would end the war. The latter is likely to promise much, but deliver nothing. These are the reasons why they will not change the policy:

—The Vietnam involvement was initiated under Republican Eisenhower and escalated under Democrats Kennedy and Johnson. It is run today by John Kennedy's Secretaries of State and Defense.

—The investment and money and manpower has now been too great to tolerate defeat. Any President who ends the war on unfavorable terms will be cursed by the people who sacrificed for it. It will not matter who that President is. No politician wants to suffer this fate. Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea sacrificed too.

—The quality civil war in the South has been eliminated, thus making the arguments of the doves stale. The Viet Cong operate only in the

Mekong Delta now, and the assumption of the war burden by North Vietnam makes Ho appear as red handed as Johnson has been viewed in the past. At least Johnson didn't start matters. He only felt obligated to continue them on a grand scale.

—South Vietnam is beginning to gain a sense of national identity. They have a Constituent Assembly and elections, even if they are minus the Viet Cong. The democracy is rudimentary, but gaining.

—America's policy makers have been encouraged by the tide which has run against the proposed Chinese Communist Empire in Asia. C. L. Sulzberger in *The New York Times* wrote, recently, that Indonesia's coup and the unity of other Southeast Asia nations may be attributed to America's Vietnam policy. Some scholars are convinced that China's failure to regain suzerainty over Southeast Asia, and the overall failure of Chinese foreign policy in Asia, Africa and Latin America in the years since Bandung led to China's current turmoil.

If this is true, and there seems to be validity in this point especially after Chou-en-Lai's recently reported speeches, it seems as if the front-running revisionist wave in China's civil bloodshed might possibly alter Chinese foreign policy to a soft line approach. After all, this did come about

in Russia four years after the death of Stalin, who had terrorized his comrades as chairman Mao recently had done.

Now, America sees success in sight for a variety of reasons. Russia is seeking an end to the war, as was clearly indicated by Mr. Kosygin's recent statements in London. The Soviets might be persuaded to put the damper on Ho's ambitions. They must recognize that America is not likely to give up bombing in the North, especially when Ho is still adamant about his four points and U. S. officials can still remember the drawn-out, eighteen month side-show negotiations during the Korean conflict.

What is now left for America is simply this: those who have criticized the war must redirect their efforts to propose a pattern of negotiations that a self-confident government is more likely to consider seriously. This is the only way to achieve any gains. On the governmental level, the U. S. should continue to aid and expand the quest for peace negotiations, by Ambassador-At-Large Averill Harriman especially by increasing contacts with Russia.

The weight now, more than ever, is on the shoulders of the diplomats. Only with their aid will the burden be eased from the backs of the peasant in the field, the worker in the city, and the soldier in the jungle.

'Pretend You Have A Bomb And ...'



Thomas Cabarga

You Bet Your Life!

One of the more wryly amusing aspects of our free enterprise system is that it allows a man to sell just about anything, from an anti-tank gun to a filter cigarette, as long as he can find someone who will buy it.

For example, I received a brochure in the mail today from a life insurance company in Pennsylvania offering to "protect (my) college son or daughter with \$10,000 life insurance . . . for just \$20 a year, complete." I must have gotten at least half a dozen of these things since I've been in school, although usually addressed to me rather than to my parents. This one however seemed to put so much emphasis on "needed security" and the "peace of mind" that I began to wonder: just who was being "protected," and from what?

The flyer assures me that the policy will give "my stu-

dent" the protection that "I know he should have"; the implication of this statement would seem to be that, somehow, this policy will ward off death. But this is absurd: the "beneficiaries" of the policy are dear old Mom and Dad, not the student. And what would he do with the \$10,000 if he did succeed in collecting it? Use it to line his coffin?

The flyer also stresses the fact that Mom and Dad are investing thousands of dollars in my education every year and that, somehow, this policy is protecting that investment. But this is absurd, too. Most parents don't put Junior through school with the understanding that he will pay everything back, with interest, when he gets out. Putting a kid through school is not an investment; it is a sacrifice, but one which most parents are only too glad to make, if

they can. The average parent would consider that \$10,000 a helluva "consolation prize" for the loss of a son or daughter.

However, there is one real benefit that this policy offers: the option to convert it to regular insurance when the student graduates, without his having to pass a medical examination. On the other hand, how many people suffer a permanent disability between the ages of 18 and 21? Obviously, not very many or the rates on this policy would be much higher.

Perhaps I'm just cynical, but it seems to me that what this offer boils down to is a sort of grisly bet between Dad and the insurance company: Dad is betting \$80 (four years at \$20 per year) that college is going to kill his kid, and the company is betting \$10,000 that it won't. I guess some people just can't pass up a bet.

Otelia Connor

Whizzing Around Otelia's Campus

The story goes that a man who had 12 cats was asked why he was cutting 12 holes in the doors when the cats could get out through one hole. He replied—"When I say scat, I mean scat!"

I was talking to one of the managers at Lenoir today, and I told him somebody needed to say scat in the Pine Room.

He had been talking of the behavior in the Pine Room—it was terrible—"They throw their trays on the shelves, or put them on the floor, for people to stumble over; they put their feet on the tables and chairs, etc." Someone ought to say scat in the Pine Room, and mean scat!

He also said, "you ought to have seen the mess at Chase after the dance Saturday night. After the trouble that ensued after the previous dance at Chase, you would think the students would learn some sense. What is needed is someone on hand to supervise and enforce order. Otherwise, they will lose the privilege. Spending large amounts in an attempt to provide attractive eating and social places for students is a waste of money on some students.

Two students came by my table today and asked for my autograph. I signed the two papers. Then they asked that I add a work, or two. I said I didn't know them, what would I say? They answered, "We are your children. That is what the Tar Heel said." So I wrote a little note for each one. They asked if I would be writing in the Tar Heel this week. I answered I didn't know. It depended on whether I had anything to say. Something usually turns up!

Freedom Forever!

(Ed. Note—This editorial is reprinted from the Wisconsin State Journal.)

There was a fitting footnote to history the other night at Eau Claire State University.

And it was a proper memo for modern times, too. George Lincoln Rockwell, who likes to be known as the Fuhrer of the American Nazi party, went to the college to deliver another hate tirade.

But before he spoke, an Eau Claire professor, Dr. Carl Andresen, delivered a few remarks which combined all the attributes of timeliness, relevancy and irony.

He welcomed Rockwell with a mild reminder that the last time he, Andresen, had been that close to a Nazi was in Nazi-occupied Norway when he marched down the street with a gun in his back.

Rockwell's appearance, Dr. Andresen noted, was a timely reminder that prejudice is a part of the Fascist ideology.

But more than that, the professor defended the right of the school to permit such an exponent of bias to appear on the campus.

"In my book," Dr. Andresen said, "the true test of freedom is to be willing not to silence the idea we abhor."

"May the day never come when pressures from groups outside our college communities will dictate which speakers American college students may or may not hear."

His words—etched from bitter experience—should be marked well and remembered throughout a state that is proud of its freedom of expression.

They should be remembered in legislative halls and elsewhere, long after Rockwell is forgotten.