

As We See It

Requiem For A Referendum

The Vietnam referendum is dead.

The hawks have killed it.

By a large majority, the student legislature decided that the students should not be allowed to express their view on an issue on the gravity of the Vietnam war.

At the previous session, by an even larger majority, the legislature decided the students should have this chance. Since the referendum was therefore legal, those who opposed it could change it only in the wording.

Some 28 legislators decided to change the wording by deleting all the words and, presto, no referendum and fears are calmed.

What happened between last week's session when the legislature magnanimously told the students at this campus that they did have the right to say how they felt about the war and this week when a great majority decided they couldn't, is somewhat a mystery, though several of the bill's opponents have offered excuses/reasons.

At least four of them—George Krichbaum, Tom Webb, Lacy Reeves and Harry Diffendal—said in writing that the choices offered were too few and too stacked against the hawk point of view to get any real idea of the consensus of campus opinion.

For two sessions, the floor was open to change any words or choices they didn't like. At the first session, two words were changed.

Coeds Join 20th Century

The coeds' vote Tuesday and Wednesday night to join the residence college system is most encouraging.

The overwhelming majority vote—almost four to one—shows clearly that the women on this campus are indeed ready to join in with an idea on the move.

That women want to get with the times is made more emphatic with the type of vote—not just a desire to join residence colleges, but a vote to tax themselves \$2.50

per semester per girl. When you vote yourself out of your own money for a cause, you're really up for it.

This vote—the women's rule referendum vote on Tuesday should prove once and for all that the women at Carolina really and truly do want to go into the 20th century. They can show the Great Protectors of Women's Honor in South Building that they do want to get with a progressive concern,

that they do want to liberalize closing hours, that they do want the privilege to live off campus, that they do want—and deserve—at least some of the same rights given the men.

The administration in general, the Dean of Women's office in particular, and Dean Carmichael in person have argued long and loud that the reason they don't liberalize women's rules is that women don't really want them changed.

The residence college vote of confidence blows a big hole in the argument.

Tuesday's vote could destroy it.

At the second, all of them were eliminated.

The other major point heard against the way the referendum was going was that the arguments were "stacked" in favor of the doves. The Lowenstein-Davidson debate was called "an obviously stacked debate with professional liberal debator Al Lowenstein vs. a State Department amateur."

A special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State, Daniel Davidson might resent being called an amateur. The showing he made is clearly not the fault of the Carolina Forum.

Also, it has been charged that Sen. Ted Kennedy decided at the last moment "or was it decided for him?"—to change the subject of his talk. That Sen. Kennedy's office called UNC some twelve days before the speech to announce the change has not been mentioned.

To assume that any of our Carolina boys, important though they may be, could intimidate the U. S. Senator into anything is ridiculous.

The other point against the referendum—and this one is far-fetched enough that we don't even call it a serious argument—is that the referendum wasn't designed to, see what students felt about the war at all, but was intended as a confidence vote for past student body president Bob Powell, student body vice president Jed Dietz and, amended as an inserted afterthought to make our editorial opinions seem less valid, Bill Amlong, DTH editor.

Powell is graduating in three weeks. How he could care whether the campus loves him is beyond us. Dietz two months ago won a nearly two-to-one "vote of confidence" when he got himself elected to office.

And Amlong? He, too, polled half the votes cast in the March elections. And most editors, Bill included, often don't give a happy damn when they incur the disfavor of some of their readers as long as they feel their position is correct.

Those are the four objections against the referendum. All are absurd. There must have been other reasons, but they weren't expressed.

Why they weren't is only conjecture. Unless someone informs us.

—Steve Knowlton, Associate Editor

In The Mail

Glee Club Silenced From Expo '67

To the Editor:

Last year, the Varsity Men's Glee Club, under the direction of Dr. Joel Carter, toured Europe, spreading good will in dozens of European cities and several capitals. The members dined with students of Utrecht, Lyon, and Munich. The crowning point of the trip was a third place win in an international singing festival in Wales, in which no less than twenty-six different countries took part.

This semester alone, under the di-

rection of Bob Porco, the Glee Club has performed at least twenty times in various cities in North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania and Ohio. Twice this year they have excelled at the Tuesday Evening Series at Hill Hall. As a result of the last performance at Hill, they were invited to participate in Expo '67 at Montreal, an honor afforded few other clubs in the nation.

The University of North Carolina, in recognition of the achievements of the Club, has cut its appropriations

for next year. The administration has also deemed it necessary to take the Glee Club office away—an office which is needed by various officers to contract for shows during the year. These shows, in turn, are necessary to obtain funds for making the various trips to the concerts involved. For its finale, the administration has refused to allow the Club the privilege to appear at Expo '67 by appropriating necessary funds for this purpose.

For a group which has contributed so much to the image of the University in terms of hard work and good will, this is certainly a slap in the face. Those in charge are quick to award the members of athletic teams with praise as well as gifts of letters and sweaters. Athletic and debate teams are also given mode than enough in moneys to travel to their destinations

in order to participate in various activities.

The Glee Club, on the other hand, comes into direct contact with more alumni, friends, and potential allies than any of these organizations. They are given no award for their achievements; indeed, they pay dues and furnish their own year-end banquet with their own funds. The only reward which the Club receives is its own self satisfaction for a job well done which will reflect well upon the University.

It is, then, a sad commentary to see such an organization handed several successive defeats by those whom it wishes to please. As a graduating member of the Club, I feel both anger and irony at the administration's attitude.

Greg Van Damm
240 Finley Golf Course Rd.

We Never Did Have All This Funny Rain Around Chapel Hill 'Til They Started Foolin' Around With Them A-tom Bombs In Nevada.



Beneath Blind Beliefs Lie Covered Untruths

To the Editor:

It seems to me that Michael Hollis in his letter of May 10th is very wrong in saying that we ought to respect and have tolerance for others because they believe in what they are doing. This sort of relativism is unsound because it misses the point. Another person's opinions ought not to be valuable because they are well-packaged in belief and sincerity. When I buy something, Mr. Hollis, I attempt to assess the quality of the merchandise and not the wrappings. If you value sincerity for itself, ultimately, you encourage people to sell themselves since you no longer evaluate what they say but how they say it.

Although I believe that Johnson and Mr. Davidson are, for the most part, earnest, I have no respect for what they say. They are ignorant in a very important way: they hold, like you do, Mr. Hollis, that because they believe in what they say and do that is enough. It is certainly not enough to believe that you are a peace maker or that you do not want to kill civilians. You must assess whether your acts, in fact, make peace possible or avoid the killing of civilians. It is not up to the Administration to decide the significance of its acts out of its conviction that they mean one thing as opposed to another in the same way that it is not up to the author to tell you what his story means. The Administration is ignorant and not to be respected because it attempts to dictate significance. Rather the significance of an action lies in its consequences, not in its alleged intentions. And there is no peace. And hundreds of thousands of civilians have been and will soon be killed. And I count not only those killed by Americans but the victims of the Vietnam as well. For they are our responsibility too.

Jay Greenfield

DTH's Power?

To the Editor:

I have been quite disturbed recently at the reporting and editorializing that has appeared in The Daily Tar Heel, especially regarding the current Viet-Nam debate. There are, I hope you gentlemen realize, a number of people on this campus who have other

commitments on the nights of important lectures or debates, and who are not fortunate enough to be able to attend; we depend almost entirely upon The Daily Tar Heel to give us an accurate, unbiased representation of the proceedings. In this morning's paper (May 11) I read a letter by Dave Mayo which completely disagreed with The Daily Tar Heel's reporting of last Mayo called one particular column ("As We See It") "gushing". I quite agreed with him when I read that column last week; Mayo's representation of that debate appeared to be more believable than The Daily Tar Heel's. However, I was not present at the debate, so I do not really know who is really correct. I am inclined, moreover, to write off last week's debate as a complete loss in contributing to my knowledge of the Viet-Nam situation. And how about Senator Kennedy's talk on Tuesday night? I was also unable to attend that. Can I believe what The Daily Tar Heel has written about it? For that matter, can I believe what The Daily Tar Heel writes about anything? I ask that you try to remind yourselves of the power and indispensability of your media, and be more responsible to all f your readers in the future.

Sincerely,
Kevin P. Twine

Brother Honda

To the Editor:

Chief Beaumont's enlightened attitude towards motorcycles is really beautiful. He would like to enjoy motorcycles by doing away with cycles altogether—but like a true liberal he will submit to them as enduring evils.

But if you can't get rid of them completely at least put as many restrictions on them as possible. Help protect these idiots from themselves; make them wear helmets—and then set a nice safe speed limit on motorcycles, like 15 m.p.h.—and make them have windshields—and then why not make both driver and passenger sit in a barrel—remember safety first. But it certainly is encouraging to know that Chief Beaumont and the North Carolina Legislature have our welfare in mind. We all could use a Big Brother to tell us how to live.

Rick Wheeler

Good Vocational Guidance Offered At N. Carolina

To the Editor:

The staff of the University Testing Service, whose major activity is providing vocational guidance to students, were most interested in Mike McGee's article of May 5, "Choosing a Major Can Cause Stress," and agree with its main thesis. We were surprised, however, by his statement about the "lack of adequate vocational guidance" on the campus, and by the statement that "vocational guidance is almost unknown here for the average undergraduate." We thought we had been doing a fairly good job in obtaining legitimate publicity for our guidance services, and it is disconcerting to discover that the Student Government Mental Health Committee is apparently unaware of our existence. We herewith extend a cordial invitation to them, and any other interested groups or individuals, to visit us.

Our services are described in the General Catalogue of the University, in the Undergraduate Bulletin, in materials distributed to freshmen during freshmen during Orientation, and through periodic notices and features appearing in the Daily Tar Heel. We have arranged for many student groups, including men and women dormitory counselors, to visit our facilities in Peabody Hall, and members of our staff have talked with many student groups about our services. Although we have been providing vocational guidance to several hundred students a year for over twenty years, and the numbers have been increasing in recent years, we would agree with Mr. McGee that too few students who might benefit from our services do seek them, and perhaps more publicity is needed. A change in our title to include "guidance" which is now under consideration, may be of assistance in this respect.

I should like to take advantage of this opportunity to give additional information about our services for the

benefit of other students who may not be familiar with them. We have a staff of professionally trained vocational counselors and psychometrists, and are listed in the 1967-68 Directory of Approved Counseling Agencies of the American Board on Counseling Services. We offer vocational and educational counseling services to all University students without charge; the fee for the same services to non-students is \$50. I should also like to mention that we offer a non-credit individualized reading course designed to improve reading skills and study habits.

May I close by quoting in full from our most recent notice to the Daily Tar Heel about our guidance services, appearing on April 25 under the heading, "Need Advice on Vocation? Go to UTS":

The University Testing Service offers counseling, testing, and up-to-date occupational information designed to help students. They may stop by 019 Peabody Hall or call 93-2175 to make an appointment at their convenience to talk to a counselor.

The educational-vocational guidance program of the Testing Service is tailored to meet individual needs. Perhaps talking with one of the counselors about educational and vocational plans may be helpful. If the results of interest, personality and aptitude tests seem useful, appropriate tests are scheduled at the student's convenience.

If background reading about occupations seems useful, a guided tour through the books and files in 015 Peabody is arranged. Any combination of these seems likely to be helpful to each person is discussed and planned during the initial interview. Then further conferences to discuss one's explorations are scheduled as desired. This service is free to all University students.

J. W. Little, Director
University Testing Service

Mr. Leo's Reply

Dear Dr. Nash:

I appreciate your kind letter regarding an editorial in last Saturday's issue of The Daily Tar Heel. I agree with you completely that we have failed largely sophomoric editorials. I was very pleased when the editor of our student paper advised me that he had no intention of answering this or any other editorial of this type.

The thing that disturbed me most during the past year was the realization that our great State will be in real trouble when we arrive at a place where a new idea in education cannot be debated in the public forum without fear of reprisals or condemnation. We came dangerously close to this position, and I must hasten to say that most of the condemnation and outright ridicule came from the products of our state-supported institutions of higher learning.

I sincerely believe that one of the finest receptions that I received during the past several months was from the Chapel Hill Chapter of the AAUP. The question period was stimulating, and the reception that followed gave me an opportunity to know better many of your fine associates.

Leo W. Jenkins
East Carolina College

Generational War

To the Editor:

College students hear many references to the effect that the Viet Nam conflict is "our war." And it truly is, for no small number of our generation have died and will die in Viet Nam.

But let us not be so self-centered. This war is not the College Student's War alone. In an even more terribly-real sense, it is the High-School Student's War. Many of us who are already in college will avoid going to Viet Nam

through previous service, college deferments, reserve status, parenthood, and so forth. The prospects for today's high-schooler are much darker.

In fact, if we take note of General Westmoreland's recent statement that the war may last another 10 — even 15 — years, we must realize that Viet Nam is also the Junior High-School Student's War — and the Grammar-School Student's War. By the estimate of our commanding general, this conflict is the war not only of today's 20-year-old but also of today's four-year-old. And if the war should drag on only a few years beyond that which our general is willing to foresee, then it is also the war of the as-yet-unborn.

The war must be justified in light of its costs. And its costs may very well include the lives of many, not only of our generation, but also of the next generation — and the next — and the next — and the next. Such considerations should be a legitimate part of the calculus by which we search for the answer to a fundamental question about the war — Is it worth it?

Larry Walker
107 Connor

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.