

As We See It

The 'New Left's' Dilemma

Affecting NSA, War Protest

The Contemporary Left has come to a fork in the road. One route is Liberalism. The other, Radicalism.

And upon which way the left goes depends many important things — three of them being the future of NSA, the effectiveness of protests against the war in Vietnam, and the outcome of the 1968 Presidential elections.

This became apparent this past weekend both at the Carolinas-Virginia Regional Conference of the National Student Association, and at a three-day conference held in a hotel just off Times Square in New York.

At the NSA conference in Fredericksburg, Va., the group's president, Eugene Groves, was saying how the Radical faction is growing stronger in NSA, "partly because of bitter frustration over the war and the draft."

"I think there's going to be some pretty big disagreements at the National Congress this summer," he said. "They'll be on how to phrase a position against the war — whether its an ideological attack on the whole of American Society, or merely against the war. It will be the same way with the draft."

"In both cases, civil disobedience is going to be a big factor. There might be a big split on whether NSA opposes draft card burning."

And that's the way things are going. There is not only debate between the Right and the Left, but there is much hotter debate amongst the Left on how to debate with the Right.

The Liberals say that it is necessary to work within the system. The radicals say the whole system is lousy and there's no use trying to work with it.

And this is bothering Groves, a 23-year-old Rhodes Scholar who in his undergraduate days was student body president at the University of Chicago. It is bothering him because he is a Liberal, not a Radical, and there are many things which Groves is afraid won't get done if the chasm between Liberal and Radical becomes too great.

Coed's Chance To Join RCS

With all the attention being paid to the two referendums coming up on the 16th — the Vietnam war and women's rules — the vote today has been all but forgotten.

Tonight, the coeds vote on whether or not to join — officially — College System.

Since the inauguration of the residence college concept here a year or so ago, the objective has been for coeducational colleges, where the women can serve an active and viable function as part of a college.

With a positive vote on this referendum, the coed dorms will join — financially, which is usually the basic criteria for membership — with their present "brother" houses of men's residence colleges.

If the bill passes, the women of the college will be represented in the college coffers and can take an active part in the decision — making on how to spend it.

Social functions, academic improvements and a wholesale betterment of the living learning idea will be the result of the residence colleges probably whether or not the coeds join in the action.

However, the college idea can obviously not reach its potential if the structures remain men's housing only.

The bill tonight will put the women on equal footing with the most going concern to hit Carolina in years.

\$.250 seems like a cheap enough price to pay.

But just how many students do the Radicals represent? And what good do they do representing them?

These questions were posed at the New York conference, held Friday, Saturday and Sunday in the less-than-Grand Ballroom of the Woodstock Hotel on the west side of the city.

Jed Dietz, vice president of the student body, was summoned to the conference to represent student opinion by Al Lowenstein, a Carolina alumnus who is in the ranks of the Liberals.

About 150 of "the leading minds in the country" were there, Dietz said, mentioning professors from prestigious colleges and universities, and other articulate Left leaders.

At the conference, three groups were represented: The New Left, the Old Left and the Young Left.

The groups break down this way:

NEW LEFT — These radicals concerned more about protests of the war than about actually getting anything done. To them, burning a draft card is more meaningful than working quietly to build sentiment against the war.

The futility of their protests is not nearly as traumatic to them as would be living with their conscience after not burning their draft cards.

OLD LEFT — These are the left-overs. Leftists from the days of socialism. Many of them joined the Left during the '30s, and have stayed with it since. Most of them went through the McCarthy witch-hunts with the blackball hanging over their head. Their main concern isn't with ending the war, either. It is instead with social welfare, and they'd rather form a coalition behind President Johnson in 1968 — regardless of his handling of Vietnam — than to have Republican candidate be elected and possibly destroy their other program.

YOUNG LEFT — These are the moderates, the Liberals. Their main concern is presently with the draft and the Vietnam war. They want to force at least de-escalation of the war through political means — such as showing Johnson that the war is so unpopular that it will cause his defeat in the 1968 Presidential race. They want to do this, however, by conventional and moderate means — and not by draft card burnings and similar protests to which the New Left is endeared.

Dietz, who places himself in none of the three categories, said he attended the conference to explain that "the really relevant issue to our generation is Vietnam and that this relevance stems from a very rational political interest — avoidance of the draft, not because we're cowards, but because we're interrupting an educational process."

"The relevance also stems," he said, "from a moral commitment our generation has made which is very rare — a moral commitment to being honest and direct, which I don't think the administration is being on Vietnam."

And so went the conference. The differences between Old, New and Young Lefts were discussed on panels, and during carefully timed five - minute speeches on the ballroom floor.

And while neither what was said at the conference, nor what Gene Groves was talking about in Fredericksburg, Va., really solved the dilemma of which route for the Left, both instances at least aired the problem.

From there the Left will have to move towards resolving its differences if it is going to accomplish anything. If it does not unify, it will dissolve.

And the students who oppose the war will be left out in the cold.

Besides, We Never Need Money On the Weekends Anyway.



Dick Levy

Ali TKO's Champ!

For those who missed the widely publicized bout between Daniel "The Bear" Davidson and Al "Flash" Lowenstein, here is a blow-by-blow account: It was Liston and Clay all over again.

After lengthy introductions the bell sounded to start Round One. Lowenstein, the challenger, sprang from his seat. After feeling out his audience he turned to Davidson, taking the offensive, pressing his heavier opponent, taunting him. Lowenstein dazzled the crowd with his Al Shuffle and he carried the fight. Pow! Pow! Sock! Quick, piercing jabs feebly defended against. Ending the round with a lightning flurry of punches, he sat down. Give the round to Lowenstein.

Rounds two and three were much of the same. The champ seemed too slow for "Flash." His rejoinders were weak. And at the end of each round the challenger praised apple pie and motherhood and the crowd cheered lustily.

The body punches seemed to be taking their toll. But near the end of the third, the crowd was stunned to hear that Lowenstein's body punches were really low blows. His Eisenhower and Westmoreland quotes were mis-quotes. Further, his leaping rights were repelled and his fancy footwork and style looked tawdry and fake. Maybe the Emperor was naked! Or maybe he used all his stuff too soon and was tiring. But the champ seemed content to box "Flash" into an enclave. Never did he attack, though his foe was obviously open.

Suddenly, however, the tenor of battle changed. The challenger was sucked by Davidson's feints as he rushed in like a fox in a chicken coup. How clever of "The Bear!" A couple of good lefts, then combinations, and the challenger's defense crumbled, riddled with holes. His aggression slowed markedly. Still the Champ refrained from using many of the beautiful punches in his arsenal. He seemed

content to jab his wide-open opponent when a few hard rights might have floored him for the count. Give the fourth and fifth to Davidson.

In the Sixth the fight degenerated into a dirty slugfest. Ironically, the champion threw most of the Rotary punches, even discrediting many of the challenger's friends. Some fans left in disgust.

Too bad. In the seventh Lowenstein rushed from his corner and unleashed a devastating combination of punches. Apple pie, America, life, he defended them all, ending the round as was his custom with a crescendo of crowd-pleasing activity.

At the beginning of the eighth a stung Davidson tried to get out of his seat but Referee West, a Lowenstein fan, stopped the bout, thus awarding a TKO to Lowenstein.

The fans, very taken by the challenger and sensing the weakness of the champ, began to throw bottles at Davidson and tried to humiliate him. A sad exhibition.

So Lowenstein won. But because of the fourth and fifth rounds one wonders if Davidson really didn't have more power in his fists, if only he had used it. He was too slow and methodical while the challenger's flash and brash made him an instant crowd-pleaser.

In fact, hurting Lowenstein as he did when he chose to open up and expose his opponent's weaknesses, Davidson led to interesting speculation. Perhaps he was really a set-up, an aging sparring partner. A real champ like Humphrey would probably have beaten Lowenstein.

So, in the end the bout was inconclusive. Men like Bundy and McNamara must be disposed of before Lowenstein may be called the champ. His performance was very impressive, but the combination was not represented by the caliber of competition both the Administration and Al Lowenstein deserve.

In The Mail

Free Speech For All

To The Editor:

I wish to commend the Carolina Forum for its role in continuing the tradition of open debate and free inquiry at this University, for sponsoring the debate between Mr. Lowenstein and Mr. Davidson this past week.

I also must protest, however, the reception accorded a representative of the United States government. There was much thought stimulated on this campus last year regarding freedom of speech; I hope the gains made since then are not easily forgotten, especially in the heat of debate. This campus and this generation are questioning and re-thinking vital issues, and that is as it must be. We are quick to call foul when our rights of academic freedom and freedom of speech seem to be impaired in the least measure, and I feel that also is as it should be. With those rights go responsibilities, however, one of which is the nobility of character to extend the same basic freedoms and courtesies we claim for ourselves to those whose views are different from our own. That courtesy was not extended to Mr. Davidson on Wednesday night, nor do I feel it was extended in this morning's editorial.

Most of us, myself included, went to the debate with firm views already in mind. It was obvious upon entering the auditorium that the audience would

be pretty well against any position Mr. Davidson defended. Mr. Lowenstein was downright eloquent, and I say "Bravo!" because my heart is with him.

I cannot agree, however, that the debate was "a sorry spectacle of an inarticulate hawk bobbing and weaving through the flak..." I must agree that the hawks blew their chance and did not give answers, but I submit that's because there are no answers, to be given, no publicly-defensible reasons for our involvement in Vietnam, not because the debate was a failure of an inarticulate spokesman.

Just as I call foul when the Administration attempts to curtail public debate or slander its critics, so I must also call foul on such needless personal attacks as Mr. Waller's long-winded comment and question, and your editorial. Let's debate, go at it hot and thick, get at the facts. But let's debate the issues, not engage in character assassinations or "a sorry spectacle" of conduct unbecoming a thoughtful audience. While you're telling the dove's side of the question, you might also note Mr. Lowenstein's dignified defense of Mr. Davidson's rights and freedoms, which the audience had conveniently neglected. We shouldn't have needed his reminder.

Frank Jones
745 Morrison

Peter Harris

American Future



Many individuals in our society, ranging from the new New Left to the John Birchers, are experiencing cultural claustrophobia.

There is a restless struggle for individual freedom, and a rejection of empty, out-of-date establishment-oriented middle class values which push the individual aside in favor of materialistic goals. There is the fear that free expression will be greatly injured unless given greater room to breath.

Within our society, there are two very striking movements away from modern society. One is characterized as the Left, the other as the state's righters. Both reject the trend towards increased societal classification.

While the rightists are more content to work through the traditional political structure, the Leftists are not. This is a crucial difference, because it is indicative of the Left's feeling of immediacy and their sense of alienation away from traditional politics. Whereas both the Left and Right sense the choking-off of their ability to influence the establishment, only the Left is willing to work in the world of the future. The Rightists seem to be dying through their grope into pre-electrical days.

The Left senses a need to work beyond existing modes of influence. Some preach violence, while others work for involvement and societal change. Traditional modes of protest and constructive suggestion have proven disillusioningly futile. The lack of response from the establishment, especially the Johnson Administration but including all outdated bureaucracies, has caused a bitter sense of futility in traditional protest. Hence, the new New Left, as described in Sunday's New York Times, is disposed towards violence, towards total rejection of the establishment and political order. Anarchy is the baby of alienation.

Why is there such a feeling of immediacy for our generation? Why the feeling of alienation?

IMMEDIACY

The feeling of immediacy is fostered by a full appreciation of what life can offer the individual. Our generation rejects the concept of afterlife and accepts an urgent feeling that we must experience life now. Likewise, societal influence must be gained now; we should not wait, cry the Leftists. We feel this urgency for both individual and societal expression because while we appreciate ourselves as individuals, we also believe in all mankind's freedom of expression. Thus, the concern for society through out social ideals is actually a transference of our own personal beliefs about individual rights. Through the mass media, as Marshall McLuhan points out, nobody can remain oblivious to other human beings and other societies. There is a total concern for total Mankind. The individual and society are very definitely linked.

This urgency for expression is illustrated in modern art and music, both of which often employ multiple sensory reaction — sound, vision, and touch (vibrations).

There is a dedication to total involvement, a sense of community not only on the national level but internationally, as well. This is a fantastic gift for the young generation. It has bred a deep appreciation for both sensual satisfaction and human dignity; it has bred the urgency to enact ideals, to conquer human indignity and injustice. It has created a total appreciation for life not only on the individual level, but for all men. The protest of war atrocities is, thus, natural and good; murder or mass killing is felt at the personal level for this generation. Humans are not perceived as mere pawns or tools of society anymore; society must be made the tool

of humanity.

ALIENATION

The problem facing too many members of the young generation is alienation. While we sense our ability to begin to conquer human ills, we sense futility in being allowed to enact our ideals. Whether it be the civil rights movement (by definition constructive), or anti-war demonstrations, a futility has been fostered due to the lack of response given our thoughts by the establishment. This sense of alienation is further enhanced when the establishment screams "unpatriotic" at us. They must realize that our protest is asking for a reconsideration of outdated actions antagonistic to our ideals of internationalism and total humanity.

A frustration develops from this inability to work through the too slow, traditional political structure. A new method of influence is often groped for.

Unfortunately, this unresponsiveness by the "powers that be" has sometimes driven members of our generation to violence as the only means of their gaining attention. Organized civil disobedience, indeed a violent revolution with Che Guevara its hero, is being developed to strike centers of racial strife. This columnist does not condone this violence, however.

It is true that almost anyone from our generation who has tried to influence the establishment with his or her ideas has come up against this resistance. The establishment does not share either our dedication towards total involvement or our inbred sense of humanity and consequent horror at traditional inhumanity. This resistance can easily breed alienation.

The challenge, now, is to ward-off alienation and attack the established ignorance through proving that we are correct not only in ideals but in strategy. In other words, real involvement such as working for tangible accomplishments in ghetto communities will give great strength not only to our arguments but to our changing society.

Promises and goals which remain merely promises and goals are worthless. But they will not be gained through destruction of our society. Indeed, we must change our society and its outlook on real humanity and real individuality. Tangible goals must be gained. Inequality must be ceased and expression must be listened to. However, it is crucial to realize that we will only be able to achieve these goals through impressing upon society the urgency to change.

To fail in this task is to retreat from our own dedication. Likewise, the establishment must co-operate or be threatened with massive non-communication. It must quit yelling ignorant phrases like "unpatriotic." It must stop its hypocrisies, for the only way to achieve ideals is to practice them. Mass killing in Vietnam is not in this vein, nor is discrimination at home. Ignoring the demands of a generation aware of the problems it faces is certainly not practicing enlightenment.

The Administration, above all, must realize this or else face a growing communications gap, increased alienation and violent rejection by our generation.

It is crucial for President Johnson to realize this. It is crucial for all men to realize that we are not in a state of complacency or complacency. We are at a point of crucial transition. While the young generation must not secede, it must be given co-operation from elected leaders of our society.

It is time, indeed, for them to take the lead.

Our beliefs and actions shall not be deterred by the establishment's attempt at ignoring our pleas. Our generation is headed in a positive direction and to ignore this is to ignore the future.

Cessation Is Foolish

To The Editor:

In your editorial, "Hawks Had Their Chance," (May 5) you pretended to be ignorant of the reasons for pursuing the war in Vietnam. As an alternative to the present U. S. policy Lowenstein's suggestion that we "stop the bombing and go into enclaves in South Vietnam to wait until fair elections can be held there" is so naive that it hardly deserves an answer. Expecting fair elections to come about amid Communist terror attacks while we sit with our hands folded amounts to Disneyland optimism.

Vice President Humphrey gave plenty of sound reasons (which you have conveniently ignored) why we should be in Vietnam and why we should be bombing the North.

The most notable decision JFK made while President was the hawkish one to use "brinksmanship" to get the Russian missiles out of Cuba; the worst one was not to follow through on the invasion of Cuba once he had initiated

it. The most commendable decision Eisenhower made was the hawkish one to use "brinksmanship" to end the Korean war; the worst was not to actively support the Hungarian freedom fighters. The most notable by Truman was his hawkish decision to end WW II with the atomic bomb. One of FDR's greatest blunders was brought about by his Lowensteinian optimism that allowed the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor.

Chamberlain will be remembered for his dove-like giving of a country (which did not belong to him) to the Nazis. Winston Churchill will be remembered for facing the world realistically while others followed pipe dreams.

Knowing all the facts about Vietnam, though important, is not the making of a wise decision; knowing what ought to be is not making it fact. Decisions of this kind are, by necessity, a compromise between the real and the ideal.

Kearney I. Smith
Graduate: English