

As We See It

The Vietnam Referendum: Is It Unfair, Or Too Fair?

With the days drawing short and tempers rising in proportion, the whole concept of the Vietnam referendum seems to have been distorted.

There are four points in the vote proposed, though there are those (hawks) who argue that the whole deal is not balanced and that there should be as many hawk choices as dove choices — somehow on the theory that the students will blindfold themselves and vote, so there should be as great a purely mathematical chance for a dove as a hawk vote to be cast.

Even at this level, the argument seems ridiculous and could do nothing but hinder the dove chances if anything by bringing out a spite vote of students who aren't going to be hoodwinked into doing anything just because there are more chances to do it.

However, hopefully the referendum will go beyond that level of pettiness and nonthink.

Keep in mind that the instructions are to mark the choice most nearly coinciding with the student's own views.

Choice A: favors the defeat of North Vietnam through wide-spread bombing and land invasion. This seems to approximate the idea presented by General Curtis Lemay who wants to keep going until there are no two bricks left intact in the whole country.

Choice B: recommends a continuation of the present policy. This is the hang-up, for the hawks are claiming that this is a policy of good old middle-of-the-road. The hawks say this should be the third of five, not the second of four.

How the hawks, or anybody else, for that matter, can say the present policy doesn't imply escalation is beyond us. To check any of the facts corroborates our opinion that that U.S. is indeed in the process of escalating. Take for one small example Gen. William C. Westmoreland's

appearance before the Congress asking for an additional 100,000 troops. Or look at the bombing records and put on a map where we are bombing now that we weren't a couple of months ago. Or pick up almost any copy of the New York Times and see what else is going on with the war.

Choice C: says the U.S. should de-escalate, stop the bombing in North Vietnam, and try to get negotiations going. This is the view held by Sen. Ted Kennedy who spoke here Tuesday night, and that of Al Lowenstein who made his whirlwind tour of the campus a week ago.

If there is a voice of moderation expressed in the referendum, this is it. It says that bombing has not brought about negotiations and a de-escalation might. If it doesn't, say these advocates, nothing will have been lost, for they all have statistics showing how fewer lives are lost during bombing lulls than during more vigorous warfare.

Choice D: says the U.S. should pull out of Vietnam completely and immediately. Though this view has not been argued by anybody as thoroughly as the rest, it appears that this is the viewpoint of the most radical of the leftists, most of the members of the SDS and the carry-overs of the old SPU.

If someone feels strongly in his conscience that he has to burn his draft card, or a flag, or something else, that's his own problem. Provided of course, he's willing to pay the consequences of trying to buck the whole system when he's in the vast minority.

While we don't feel that it is a good or worthwhile thing to do other than keep our card safely in our back pocket, we can see where others might. Without going into the argument of whether or not it is unpatriotic to stand up this strongly against the system where it wouldn't be to express doubts and questions, it seems that more can be accomplished when things are performed in a more orderly manner. And by more legal means.

Yes, there are critics of the upcoming Vietnam referendum, and most of them are hawks. But it seems that they're not complaining because it isn't fair, but rather, because it is.

And When We Get Rid Of These Grubby Students, We Can Turn It Into Something Useful — Like Offices For Us.



In The Mail

Purge On Lowenstein Continues

To the Editors:

There are luxuries which men of responsibility may not enjoy. For the journalist, one such luxury is thoughtless fervor. His medium is a potent instrument for persuasion, and it demands that he always distinguish between statement of act and profession of faith.

Friday's column "As We See It" was a regrettable example of failure. The writer seriously misrepresented Wednesday's debate on Vietnam by omission and overstatement. If the description had been calculated instead of gushing, it would have meant an unforgivable abuse of the editorial platform. As it was, the effect was distasteful.

Daniel Davidson was described as an "inarticulate hawk" who was "demolished to a quivering heap of black feathers" by a presumably more articulate Al Lowenstein. As I saw it, both speakers were ineffective. Both spoke without incisiveness or emotional control, and if Davidson plodded, Lowenstein babbled.

Lowenstein was depicted as "cooing triumphantly to all those who had given him a standing ovation." The standing ovation came after his frenzied outcry against nuclear holocaust. Considering the militant crowds that turn out for "Vietnam debates" on this campus, he should have brought down the house.

It was surprising to read, in Friday's editorial, that Davidson did not explain why Lowenstein's proposed "enclave" strategy would not work in Vietnam. As a matter of fact, Davidson explained it so clearly that Lowenstein finally retreated on that point, saying he did not actually advocate the enclave strategy, but only questioned our present course. This, incidentally, is what is wrong with enclaves: if we hold any number of seated-off strongholds and the enemy controls the vast, surrounding remainder of the country, then the enemy can go about the business of ruling Vietnam until our fortresses turn to powder. It is naive to believe there would be free elections in a communist South Vietnam any sooner than there will be free elections in communist North Vietnam. Those Vietnamese democrats who could not be sheltered in our enclaves would fall on hard times, and the other few would sit by the telephone forever waiting for negotiations to be proposed.

Your writer asks two questions: 1) Why are we in Vietnam? and 2) What good is it doing to bomb the north? Davidson did not adequately answer these questions, but they have been answered before. It is incorrect to say that our government sidesteps them. Though I am not privy to the deepest motives of our policy-makers, I find several good reasons for our presence in Vietnam. For one thing, as Davidson said, we are buying time for the development of popular government in other countries. This idea is not based

on a simple "domino theory" linking South Vietnam's regime with those in other Southeast Asian countries. In fact, Davidson could have said, without exaggeration, that our action in Vietnam safeguards the chance for self-determination in all of the world's developing states. The ideological split among communists is drawn largely down the line between world-revolutionists and advocates of competitive coexistence. The first faction still aims at the old Comintern goal of subverting Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and thereby amassing human strength against the encircled capitalist countries. If the world revolution concept is allowed to succeed in Vietnam, its influence in other communist movements will be enhanced.

Davidson mentioned our need to demonstrate that we will ensure the security of small nations. A state which is militarily weak cannot be expected to endure a marathon "war of liberation" alone, and its enemies cannot be acclaimed as the people's choice merely because they have a superior organization for waging war. It is a fact we must face that most of "the people" in a country such as Vietnam are neither pro-government nor pro-communist, but in fact apathetic. For them, the authority of the communist faction resides in its unchallenged ability to coerce them.

If it seems absurd for us to be at war over one small country such as Vietnam, remember that war no longer erupts in massive movements of armored divisions or in air raids at dawn. It no longer is fought under the crude banner of "Lebensraum," but in the name of "national liberation." Appearing hesitantly in one country and then another, it is always portrayed as popular insurrection. If the slogans seem ubiquitous and the people seem always to be directed by professional, trained cadres, then forgive these national liberators. Their subtlety is not yet perfect.

The bombing of the north is intended to put a high price on the enemy's logistical operations. To suggest, as some do, that hospitals and residential areas have been deliberately bombed is foolish. Even aside from being morally repugnant, such bombings would be militarily pointless. It is inevitable, however, that an attack on almost any target in the Hanoi-Haiphong area involved civilian casualties because of the region's population density, one of the greatest in the world.

But what bothers me most about Friday's editorial is not its viewpoint, but its alarming irresponsibility. Your writer has impatiently rejected the simple truth for an alloy made with dreams and desires. In the latter half of his essay he's just plain tripping the light fantastic, indicting the government wholesale without justification. The impression is that the debate revealed our national leadership to be sinister

The Student Senate at NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY blasted an Illinois House of Representatives bill that would make picketing unlawful at governmental and educational institutions. Any person who violates the provisions of the bill would be fined not more than \$1000 or imprisoned not more than one year. The Student Senate president was elected two weeks ago after running on a student power platform which included two "bitch-ins" and subsequent marches on the administration building.

A 19-year-old UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA coed who recently advertised for a temporary mate so she could move out of a dormitory won't have to get married after all. Elizabeth Freedman of New Rochelle, N. Y., has been accepted at one of Penn's housekeeping dorms next fall. Each of the dorms will house 18 women. Miss Freedman had placed an advertisement in a local newspaper two weeks ago for a temporary husband with an apartment so she could get out of her dorm.

Class credit for outside activities will be given to students at the UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA who work in community action organizations in a new work-study program sponsored by the National Student Association. The program will encourage students of urban and community affairs to gain practical experience by working on community projects on a quarterly basis. They will receive three credits per quarter for their work.

The UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN Student Senate voted unanimously last week to sponsor a campus-wide referendum on a bill which would end all faculty and administration power over non-classroom student affairs. The measure would strip the student-faculty committee which regulates campus groups of its powers and make the groups independent.

On Other Campuses

The Freedom To March Challenged In Illinois

The study of Urdu, a dialect of the Hindustani tongue, will be the only requirement at a paperless, testless college to be established at FORDHAM UNIVERSITY in New York. Students and professors will plan the curriculum themselves and will choose where they will meet for classes. Urdu was chosen as the required course because it would be a totally new experience for the students who are members of the class of '71 — and because it would be a "challenge" to them. Said Dr. Elizabeth Sewell, head of the college, "We hope to make life so interesting that the students won't need LSD."

Former Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace's car was pounded and rocked by DARTMOUTH COLLEGE students after he addressed the student body last week. Wallace, shaken but not hurt, said, "They were trying to turn the car over and to knock in the top. That's academic freedom. That academic freedom will get you killed." The students, including Negro members of Dartmouth's Afro-American Society, waved placards saying "Wallace is a racist!" and "Wallace killed my brothers."

Letters



The Daily Tar Heel accepts letters typed and signed. We welcome open discussion by all interested persons. Our policy is to print all timely letters in the public interest.

Will BVP R.I.P.

Battle-Vance-Pettigrew is dying. BVP dorm is being turned into offices for administrators and faculty, probably by next fall, according to the latest from the Director of Housing.

The residents haven't been told yet — officially, and they weren't told at all until after room reservations had been closed for a long time.

Granted Craig and James are nice places to live and hopefully the men in BVP will like it, because this is where they'll be.

But the odds are that those in BVP were there for the express purpose of not being 18 miles away out on South Campus. Many who are in BVP have been there for at least two years and many more than that. They don't want to give up the large rooms, the accessibility to both classes and Harry's.

But they had no choice. Not even told about it in time to get rooms in Old East or Old West or wherever they wanted to be.

The third oldest dorm on campus. Almost an institution in itself. The home of Thomas Wolfe the Great. Turned into offices because "they need the space."

Why not the Alumni Building which most everyone will admit is the biggest set of architectural blunders ever massed under one roof?

Our aesthetic sense is injured. Maybe a petition by all the residents presented to the Board of Trustees Friday might help. It's worth a try.

The Daily Tar Heel

- Bill Amlong, Editor
- Tom Clark, Business Manager
- Lytt Stamps, Managing Editor
- John Askew Ad. Mgr.
- Peter Harris, Steve Knowlton
Associate Editors
- 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
- Steve 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.

Victory Village

To The Editor:
I am apathetic. There is no doubt. As a resident of Odum Village since September 1966 and having no knowledge of my appointed governing body, having no knowledge of elections held in the spring (but not this year because I was apathetic), having no knowledge of whom to call regarding broken-down equipment in the Jackson Circle playground (it will never be fixed now since it is to be torn down), I have certainly been apathetic.

I agree with the Tar Heel editorial. Let us forgive and forget what is past, but why wait until September 1967. Let us hold elections now. Spring is still with us. There is still time to be apathetic with knowledge.

Yours truly
Moira S. Pearson

Poem To Yank

The Peters and other yanks have their psychedelic dictionaries to carry them thru the soulful columns of the learning-factory tabloid. Fun, fun, fun, and a great learning experience to come where you're not wanted and criticize, complain, bitch. The cascading brain-juices in the hollow skull drip rats, toe-jam and Groucho Marx and pachyderms, strikes and war dissent and sunflowers and Celia. Go home, Peter and other yanks, back to Greenwich and other cold places; back to the glue heads and free-mind poets. Go home, cool Peter, frigid yanks,
GO HOME

Bob Haisley
Ray McGraw
369 Connor