

As We See It

Tonight's Vietnam Debate: A Big Chance To Learn

A lot of people say a lot of things about the war in Vietnam. Some say bomb, kill, win. Some say leave, apologize, get out now. Some know what they're talking about.

And two of those who know what they're talking about will butt heads in Hill Hall at 8 p.m. tonight. They are Daniel I. Davidson and Allard K. Lowenstein.

Davidson will debate Lowenstein on the issue of whether the United States is justified in being in Vietnam. Davidson works as special assistant to William Bundy, the Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs. He will say the U.S. is doing the right thing. Lowenstein used to work as a foreign policy advisor to Vice President Hubert Humphrey. He will say the U.S. is doing the wrong thing.

Both will walk onto the stage of Hill Hall armed with the facts to back up their cases. Both men have made in-person tours of Vietnam and will speak on first-hand knowledge of what the war is doing to that country.

Morrison's Big Push

Morrison College is making a big push to extend the women's visitation agreement to allow coeds on the upper floor social rooms seven days a week from noon until closing hours.

Morrison's Governor Parker Hudson drew up a long proposal stating why the social rooms should be changed from Area 3 to Area 1 of the Women's Visitation Agreement, and then met with members of the deciding board for a couple of hours Friday afternoon to see how his proposal was received.

As of late Tuesday afternoon, Assistant Dean of Men Fred Schroeder said "no decision has yet been made, either officially or unofficially."

But Thursday night, there will be a reception in the Cannon House social room for Dean of Women Katherine Carmichael and other administrators and faculty members to show them just how ready these "dorm party rooms" are to have women students in them.

The Cannon house lounge was a particularly good choice of exhibition rooms, for it has recently been decorated and furnished—complete with sofas, rugs, lamps, end tables, paintings, et. al.

And entirely with the resident's money, which they voted to spend on the furnishings.

There are two major objections to the extension, one voiced openly and the other mentioned among administrators only with quick glances and understanding nods.

The expressed reason is that men really don't want to have women up there in their social rooms, regardless what the students' elected college leaders say. Men students want a place where they can be men and not have to worry about coeds' presence.

It seems obvious, however, that actions such as social room decoration imply that men do indeed want coeds there.

Cannon House is by no means atypical of Morrison houses. Since the idea of the possibility of coeds' being allowed upstairs first came to mind, house meetings have been picked up tremendously. Enthusiasm has mounted and decoration plans are being laid on almost every floor.

Since the idea came to light, students have been thinking of ways to turn the house lounges into places to have a study date, a place to play cards, or, in Hudson's words, "somewhere where you can meet coeds as people"—to sit down and talk with them and enjoy spending a few minutes

Both are youthful, energetic, bright and articulate. Each will have much to say for his side of the question and will say it well.

Both men—even though they disagree—know what they're talking about.

Which brings us to the purpose of this debate: it's a preliminary bout before the Vietnam Referendum to be held Thursday, May 11.

The referendum will attempt to gauge student opinion and let everybody see just what UNC thinks about the war in Vietnam. It will give an equal voice to every student on this campus who takes the trouble to vote, fairly testing the validity of an earlier statement that there is a growing concern among American college youth with the posture of their nation in Vietnam.

But if opinion is going to be accurately measured, it must be intelligent opinion. And the only way to learn what this whole thing in Vietnam is about is to seek the answers—from both sides. Tonight, those answers will be offered.

with a member of the fair sex without the feeling that every coed on campus has to be a prospective date.

The whole idea is to have some place where young people—of both sexes—can meet and enjoy each other's company without having to divide up into dating pairs.

And this leads naturally into the other objection of the administration—and its obvious refutation.

"When coeds get up onto the living floors, well... the men's rooms are right there close by... and a couple of coeds might stray... and well, you know."

The whole purpose of the proposed agreement is to allow men to get to know coeds on bases other than as prospective partners.

Surely it can and will be seen by the members of the visitation board that the proposal does nothing to promote an air of promiscuity. Rather, it will create a badly needed feeling of ease and relaxation between the sexes in social contact.

The Daily Tar Heel

Bill Amlong, Editor
Tom Clark, Business Manager
Lytt Stamps, Managing Editor
John Askew Ad. Mgr.
Peter Harris, Stev Knowlton
Associate Editor
Don Campbell News Editor
Carol Wonsavage Feature Ed.
Jim Fields Sports Editor
Owen Davis Asst. Spts. Ed.
Wayne Hurder Copy Editor
Jock Lauterer Photo Editor
Bruce Strauch Cartoonist
Mike McGowan, Steve Adams
Photographers
Stev Knowlton, Hunter George,
Karen Freeman, Donna Reifsnider,
Sandy Lord, Joe Ritok, Joe Coltrane,
Penny Raynor, Joe Sanders,
Julie Parker, Mary Lyn Field,
Ernest Robl, Penny Satsky.

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.

In The Mail

Ten Questions For Secretary Rusk

To The Editor:

At a recent speech by Dean Rusk, the members of the Cornell chapter of Students for a Democratic Society prepared a list of questions that they felt needed answering. Rusk, of course, did not answer them. Read them and try to formulate your own answers.

1) The President, Secretary Rusk, and other officials have consistently told us that we are bombing only military targets—roads, bridges, supply and oil depots—and that the destruction of civilian lives in North Vietnam is only accidental. We would like to believe our government, and we have even tried to believe that the third largest city in North Vietnam, Nam Dinh, may have been only accidentally destroyed. But Mr. Salisbury has recently written that he has been shown evidence that anti-personnel bombs of American make have been dropped on North Vietnam. Mrs. Griffith (another recent visitor to Hanoi) even showed us an element of these bombs which do absolutely no damage to military targets and can destroy only the living. If we do not wish to wantonly destroy human beings then

why do we use weapons which do nothing else?

2) It has been frequently stated that we are defending the South Vietnamese, who are victims of aggression from the North. At the same time, it has been also stated that our greatest problem is the pacification of rural areas. But if the South Vietnamese are with us and under attack from the North, then why do we have to pacify a friendly population? If one believes that the Vietnamese peasants are terrorized into supporting the Vietcong, the problem should then be one of driving out the Vietcong militarily and establishing law and order. But why then do we have to "win the hearts and minds" of people who are presumably our friends?

3) We often hear of the accidental destruction of "friendly" villages in South Vietnam. We also know from official testimony that at least 25 per cent of South Vietnamese villages are under Vietcong control. Does this mean that we bomb the unfriendly villagers un-accidentally?

4) According to official American figures, the Vietcong killed 8,882 civi-

lians and kidnapped 39,962 between 1961 and the beginning of 1966. We would like an estimate of how many civilians have been killed by our napalm, artillery, and bombing raids. If such an estimate is not available, we would like to know why we have not tried to estimate the damage we have done to the Vietnamese people in our effort to defend their freedom. In the most computerized war in history, we must surely have the means to count not only Vietcong atrocities, but also the casualties of our own good intentions.

5) Our news media have given us ample proof that the South Vietnamese government mistreats their prisoners of war. We have seen photographs and television shots of prisoners being tortured and often killed in the presence of American military advisors. Yet we continue the practice of transferring prisoners taken by U. S. ground forces to the South Vietnamese government. Is this practice of transferring prisoners to an ally who tortures them in accord with our responsibilities under the Geneva Convention (Article 21) on the treatment of prisoners of war?

6) We are told that large parts of South Vietnam are included in Free Strike Zones. Could Mr. Rusk explain what this term means and whether or not some of these Free Strike Zones are populated? If there are some populated areas among the Free Strike Zones, are we not conducting indiscriminate attacks on the civilian population in these areas?

7) In underdeveloped countries which were under colonial rule, traditional institutions have eroded and modern institutions such as constitutions and parliaments have not yet taken deep roots. As a result, the legitimacy of a regime comes from its nationalist heroes and martyrs. So it is a Gandhi, a Nehru, a Bolivar, a Marti,

and a Washington who command the love and loyalty of a population. The Vietnamese fought a long war of independence against French Colonialism. I would expect that the leaders of this nationalist struggle would command the loyalty of the people. In this light, who are the Washingtons, Gandhis, etc. of Vietnam's struggle for independence? What side were our current allies, Thieu and Ky, on?

8) Until our decision to bomb in North Vietnam, nations fighting against guerrillas had desisted from attacking the guerrilla's foreign sanctuary. Albania and Yugoslavia were not bombed during the guerrilla war in Greece. The British did not bomb the Chinese for aiding the Malayan Communists and so on. When the French bombed the Tunisian village of Saluet Side Youssef where the Algerian rebel army was openly in training, everyone, including President Kennedy, criticized the French for breaking the accepted norm of respecting a guerrilla sanctuary. France desisted, and Saluet Sidi became an isolated incident. We are the first country to have broken this international practice. The United States is a great power whose example is likely to set a precedent in international practice. If we acknowledge the rights of other nations to observe the same practice which we have followed in bombing North Vietnam, then do we recognize the right of Portugal to attack those countries of Africa which are aiding the guerrillas in Mozambique? Or that of Nasser to invade Saudi Arabia for aiding the rebels in Yemen? Or—if and when a guerrilla war breaks out in South Africa, that of the white South African regime to bomb Algeria, Tanzania, and other African countries which are training South African guerrillas?

James Kahan
Nash Hall

Victory Village Board of Whats?



Mental Health Problem Battled At Dorm Level

By MIKE MCGEE

Last fall the Student Government set up a Mental Health Committee to study the problem of student stress and make recommendations for improvements within the system. The committee was disbanded after Christmas because of a lack of participation and, evidently, a lack of interest.

Being but a cog in the machinery, I, a member, could not stop it from folding. But I intend to agitate for the reestablishment of the group next fall and a kindling of student interest in the idea. Eric van Loon has stated that there will be a Mental Health Committee next fall, so now all we need is for some students to get worked up over the concept, and to do some manual labor to make it succeed.

The committee is designed to collect ideas from all the students suggesting why they are under unnecessary stress, then publish a report suggesting changes which might be made in instruction, administration, living conditions, etc., which could alleviate stress. Two suicides in one year on our campus indicates that at least a few persons are pushed beyond their limits.

We do not mean to suggest that students should be relieved of all competitive social and academic pressure. The premise is that a few of the stresses built into the system might be eliminated or reduced if they are found to be defective or not essential to the operation of the system.

I am the proud possessor of the notes collected during last fall's sporadic committee work. The ideas, even in rough form, seem to have some relevance, so I'll go over a few of them adding some of my own observations.

In every dorm there are a few students who don't seem to fit well into dorm life, or are making poor grades, or whose social life is nil. Many are freshmen, many are "introverts". These, not the all-round Joe College type, are the persons under the greatest stress. In present practice this person just plugs along the best way he can, sometimes flunking out, sometimes moving slowly into things, sometimes remaining on the borderline.

What to do? A group spirit is needed to supplement the present hit-or-miss social relations within a dormitory. To get this effect, there must be some organization.

The logical person to oversee such an operation would be the resident advisor. He should be given some responsibility for seeing that each person under his charge participates in college activities and in dorm life. It doesn't take a degree in psychology to note who is doing very well and who is doing very badly.

Of course he can't do it all himself. But he can enlist the aid of the active persons in the dorm, the leaders,

to keep him informed about persons who seemed to have problems. He might then assign a Joe College to "look after" the man—like the one who seems ill at ease and unfriendly, or who makes poor grades with or without studying a lot, or who talks and acts dejectedly. The result might be a kind of interpersonal responsibility developing between those who do well and those who do badly. Like, a student who begins behaving strangely is often shunned or just ignored by the rest of the guys on his floor. This man should be zeroed in on. Such a system is admittedly artificial, and effective only if it is pushed into existence. But it seems to work in some places—as in fraternities or sororities. We don't want to make a dorm a fraternity, but some of the same methods of organization apply.

We are all Carolina students, so we should try to help one another. If we don't, who will? Taking some time out to help another student might even benefit the Joe College who has problems he doesn't talk about. Concerning yourself with another's welfare for a while sometimes makes your own troubles seem a little less pressing or monolithic.

One student says, "The lack of originality here is frightening. At some colleges, students participate in organized activities." There is no real chance for many to meet new people on this campus, particularly those of the opposite sex. When you do get a date, there are not many places for the two to go if you're walking.

The new student union will provide for some a place to go, but still the men's dorms need social rooms open to women, with planned activities.

How do we get people mixed? Some ideas are: (1) Mixers at the girls' dorms, where the girls act as hostesses and don't feel "herded" into the mixer. (2) More informal classes where everyone feels at home, and knows each other. In small classes each person could get up and introduce himself once. It may sound silly, but I took one class at a college on the west coast where the professor asked everyone to bring to class a paper name-plate for his desk. It helped. (3) Some regular and institutionalized form of contact between UNC-Greensboro students and Carolina students. There is presently one dance in the fall where busloads of WC students come here. We could repeat that twice more in a year, and maybe our student government could negotiate with Greensboro to hold open houses or mixers there to which Carolina men would be encouraged to come.

As one man says, "Those who are able to take the initiative in righting social ills aren't doing anything. This attitude is bad, nobody wants to do anything. Push it off on others." After all, no major changes can be made without administration help.

Dick Levy

East Carolina College Has Inferiority Bent

Consolidated University status for ECC has gotten an unfortunate boost from Governor Moore.

Unfortunate because the main idea behind the movement is educational populism. Every child, so the argument goes, not just the smart ones, must have a University education. (i.e. diploma)

No matter that substandard PHD's would be turned out, or that the value of a UNC diploma would be lowered. No child would have to feel bad because he couldn't go to a University.

To be blunt we would be giving university degrees to people who don't deserve them; if they did deserve degrees they would be at Carolina, State, or WC already.

The argument that ECC is as good as some universities proves only that there are poor universities already.

More important, it ignores the concept of varying levels of educational institutions to fill varying needs. Universities are established for one group of students, colleges for a second, broader group, and technical schools for a third.

Hence, were ECC to be a univer-

sity (anonymously called ECTU or UNC-GV, no doubt), a hierarchy would still exist, with ECC on bottom.

What ECC is really fighting for, then, is a name. This reflects non-institutional pride, but an institutional inferiority complex.

The same is true of any institution embarrassed at what it is, whether it be Western Carolina College or Guilford Technical School.

To attempt to alter the carefully established balance of our state's higher education system is to hurt those thousands of students for whom our colleges were intended, while creating an inferior new university, based not on need but on injured egos.

Everyone loses in such a set-up. All because of a name and because of the vanity of Leo Jenkins, Robert Morgan and their ilk.

Let them instead perform a service by improving the quality of their college and thus offering a better education in the best American tradition to our average students.

But we cannot allow them to tamper with a far older and nobler concept: that of the University.