

The Anti-Draft Movement: Its Heroes And Its Villains

There is one big hang-up about the movement against the draft and the Vietnam War: not everyone involved is a nice guy.

There are those, of course, who really believe that the U.S. has no business in Vietnam, that it is a bad, evil and politically stupid war — for a myriad of reasons. These persons believe this, and many of them are so deeply convinced of this that they are willing to oppose it to the extent of refusing to serve in the Armed Forces.

These young men, most of them, have a special kind of bravery, the kind of courage that it takes to announce that one is against the system, and will even face a five-year prison term rather than coast along with it.

They are not cowards. They are putting too much on the line for the mto be thought of as being weak persons. A conviction for refusing to be drafted will pretty much ruin a future.

But then there are the others, the parasites who are leeching onto the movement against the draft purely because they don't want to inconvenience themselves for the time involved in being in the service.

There are also those who get swept up by a movement, any movement, just because it is there and they think movements are nice. These are like pawns in a chess game — except that pawns,

once committed, stay there instead of backing out as soon as the going gets rough.

These types are not heroes. They add very little to any movement — such as the anti-draft push. Mostly, they detract from it.

Vietnam Summer, an anti-war and anti-draft group, is holding a fall organizational meeting at 7:30 tonight. All three types will probably be there — the conscientious ones, the leeches, the pawns.

It would be well, however, that the persons who plan to go to this meeting, plan to oppose the draft and possibly plan to refuse induction, re-examine their motives and decide whether it is worth it.

If one believes sincerely that the Vietnam war and the draft are bad things, and that both must be opposed, he should be militant in his stand and put something on the line for what he believes in.

Those who decide this way earn at least respect — even if not agreement.

As for the others, they'll probably always be there — just like disease.

What It Was, Was Football

Real football. Honest to goodness football for a whole football game.

That's what Coach Bill Dooley gave Tar Heel fans Saturday afternoon in Carter Stadium. His team didn't win, but it showed Carolina people what real football is once again.

The sun turned to cloudiness but people in Carolina's section of the stands weren't dismayed.

Not even when there was less than a minute showing on the clock and State had the ball.

Not even when the final gun sounded, with a squirming runner trying to break loose for some sixty or seventy yards to the State goal.

Nobody was dismayed. They had come to see what this season was going to look like for our Tar Heels — and they saw.

Psych 26: A Change For Better

A new kind of Psychology 26 format has grown out of what department heads called "general dissatisfaction on both sides."

This is student power in its finest, most distilled essence — the cooperation of students, faculty and administration toward the solving of a common problem, which is administration of the academic community for the best interests of all involved.

The Psychology Department has designed the course to best utilize both the knowledge of faculty members who specialize in certain fields of psychology and will lecture on them, and of the newest methods of education, such as the teaching machines.

The course — even though it does have more than 1,000 students — should prove more educational than during past years.

It would be a good thing if other departments at the University would pay as close heed to the likes and dislikes of students — who are the ones who must benefit from the courses — as did the psychology department.

Letters To The Editor

UNC Needs 'Pontifex Maximus'

To The Editor:

It has often been said—by people who should know better—that Chapel Hill is—or should be—"a kind of Athens." Whether or not this is true with regards to our cultural status is a matter for debate, but I am truly surprised that no one has yet proposed that we model our government on that of the noble Greeks.

After all, with our small population here on campus—but 15,000 or so to our polis—is not the idea of a Legislature obsolete? In fact, are not all legislatures a necessary evil, a form of diluted

democracy as it were?

I propose that we abolish Student Government as it now stands. Only last spring did Student Government demonstrate its incompetence by a gallant but unavailing effort to crush the Vietnam referendum, and it has shown itself time and time again to be a clumsy, superinflated, money-devouring monster.

Abolish all this bureaucracy at once.

What I propose is that we at once inaugurate a popular dictatorship. Supreme legislative and executive and judicial

authority would be vested in a single man, the "Pontifex Maximus" of UNC, who would rule until graduation or his dismissal. The Pontifex would make and break all laws, be in charge of hiring and firing his staff, and would have control of the recruitment and direction of the student militia in case of war with South Building. However, he would be subject to dismissal at once by a mere vote in petition of one-third of the student body.

It can be seen at once that the Pontifex would have to be the servant of the

people, and would bend over backwards to defend their interests. His staff, which would be selected from lists of "dorm notables" offered to him by each dorm, would resign at once whenever he was forced out. If necessary, provision could be made to turn over WUNC radio and the Tar Heel to the Pontifex in case of emergencies.

One of the first things the Pontifex might do is to pass a law requiring all faculty members to walk to school, thus relieving the parking problem and giving us a physically fit faculty at the same time. All book and stationery stores on campus could be at once nationalized, and prices reduced. The entire judiciary system could be scrapped, and one court, the UNC Assizes, could handle all honor code violations and charges of treason. A standing army of fraternity men could be recruited and equipped, ready to march on South Building or the Presidential Palace on Franklin Street at any time. In fact, limitless possibilities open up for the Pontifex, governed only by the limitation of the popularity of his moves.

In conclusion, let me suggest that I believe our present Student Body president, Mr. Travis, is well suited for the role of Pontifex. His long wars and meritorious actions against the enemy in South Building eminently qualify him for the role of leader. If he is reluctant, I myself would not mind taking the job. In any case, something must be done at once, for the administration is moving to the assault, and it must be stopped.

Yours in expectation,
Michael Hollis
104 Glendale Drive

Shoe Stickers?

To The Editor:

Car owners are hollering about the injustice of T stickers and the registration of cars off campus, and with good reason. Why should just the car owners get stuck with \$5 and \$10 parking stickers? This is discrimination against car owners. We are ignoring the students who do not have cars. Why should car owners pay for registration and not park, while non-car owners do not park, yet do not have to pay not to park?

We all know that the crowded classroom is a worse problem than the crowded parking lot problem. If parking stickers and registration cured the parking problem, why can't registration of shoes solve the overcrowded conditions of the classroom? I propose that to be completely fair, we register all shoes. Everyone has shoes, so everyone will be taxed evenly. Give everyone a sticker for each class, which must be affixed to his shoes in order for him to enter class. That way, overcrowding will be solved. Because of the cost and paperwork involved, each student may only register one pair of shoes. (Tennis shoes may be worn in designated areas with a PE sticker affixed) Stickers will be sold for \$10. The sticker regulations will be drafted into the honor code. (I.e.: I promise not to cheat, lie or steal, or wear unregistered shoes.)

Now, what about the person with several pairs of shoes? Register them too. We cannot have students running around town without registered shoes, so we must issue T shoe stickers for shoes to be worn exclusively off campus. The T sticker will only cost \$2.50 per shoe. Freshmen cannot register T shoes, though all upperclassmen with a 2.0 average or better will have this opportunity.

—Lee Biggar,
23 Ehringhaus



The Student Speaks

New Left Is Too Dogmatic

By MIKE COZZA

If there is one appalling characteristic of the so-called "New Left," it is the movement's inability to capitalize on liberal and moderate anti-war sentiment.

A recent conversation between a political liberal and a professed member of the New Left illustrates the point perfectly. The conversation ran something like this:

Liberal: You know, politically speaking, I think we should be able to get together. We both oppose the war in Vietnam.

New Leftist: You mean you oppose the war?

Liberal: Yes. I think the Administration is pursuing a foolish policy. I believe we're legally wrong and morally misguided to be involved in this war.

New Leftist: Well then, why don't you get out and join the movement. We're sponsoring a protest march on Washington next month. Shall I reserve you a picket sign?

Liberal: No, I don't think so. You see, while I'm not against picketing, I personally prefer to work against the war in other ways—like in the press, at the ballot boxes, and through political parties.

New Leftist: Political parties? Yeah, well that's okay too. As a matter of fact, we're trying to gain support for a peace party in 1968. We want to run Martin Luther King and Dr. Benjamin Spock. Can I count you in?

Liberal: I don't think so. I don't think King and a third party would have too much chance for victory. We need a man who can win if we're going to put an end to this war. Perhaps we could get behind a Republican who has been critical of the war. Maybe Romney, Percy, or even Hatfield.

New Leftist: Republicans? Are you kidding? They ran a do-nothing Eisenhower, a war-monger Nixon, and a trigger-happy Goldwater. And that's going from bad to worse. Besides, the Republicans are run by the big money industrialists and they make profit in a war. They'll nominate Nixon or Reagan or some other right-wing fascist. Forget the Republicans.

Liberal: Well, maybe we could get behind a Democrat and overthrow Johnson. I know that's a long shot, but a lot of people are unhappy about this war and the Democrats are usually pretty responsive to public sentiment. Even if we couldn't dump Johnson, we might be able to force him to run with an anti-war platform.

New Leftist: No, there's no chance of that. The Democrats are dominated by the big city bosses, and LBJ is the slyest boss of all. He holds all the strings and he's not afraid to pull them. He's got the Democrats in his vest pocket. I'm not going to have anything to do with the Democrats.

Liberal: But look, there must be some way we could get together. We both want to see this senseless killing stopped.

New Leftist: Nope. You're not really sincere about your opposition to the war. You won't get your hands dirty on a picket sign and you're not willing to support a third political party.

Liberal: But wait... New Leftist: Actually you're too middle class—scared to loose your "respectability." You probably don't like King because he's a Negro.

Liberal: Hey wait a minute. That's not true. I protest...

New Leftist: Forget it. There's no room in the New Left for bigots. We can never get together.

If this story has a moral, it must run something like this:

There are millions of liberals and moderates throughout America who oppose the war in Vietnam and who are willing to try any one of several methods to bring it to an end. However, they are not entirely disenchanted with the traditional American political system (I.E. the two party system, Democrats and Republicans.)

There are thousands of New Leftists who are opposed to the war, but who have lost faith in the traditional approach.

Together, these groups might muster enough sentiment and votes to bring the war to an end. But, should the New Left dogmatically continue its refusal to compromise with liberals and moderates and work within the two party system, they will only hurt their own movement. Their effect will remain minimal, the war will continue, and their cause will be lost.

Drop-Add 1: A Course In Anguish

By BLAND SIMPSON

Drop-Add 1 is the one course our University offers combining campus tours with physical exertion and mental anguish.

The unique feature of Drop-Add 1 is that every student who enrolls at this University automatically becomes a member of the course, whether he wants to or not. There is only one section taught, but it never closes out as long as you have the advice and consent of your academic sage with you.

There are no prerequisites, although most persons who take the course more than once (and most do) feel even more adept at it each new go-around. Since there are so many students involved in this "learning experience", field work usually takes in the entire campus.

Course enrollees are not restricted to any particular room or desk; they are in fact allowed to sit, stand, sleep, scream, climb walls, et cetera, just as long as they find some time during the course to contribute to the Book Eychange.

Nearly as amazing as the fantastic number of students is the superabundance of instructors teaching Drop-Add. Most of them are disguised as secretaries or other registration officials. They lecture from computer cards and occasionally from past experience, but students rarely agree with anything their instructors say.

One of the real reasons that the University hires so many extra in-

structors for the four-day Drop-Add course is to confuse WRAL's Jesse Helms. Our off-campus watchdog warns us of communist on our campus who are experts in propagandizing young minds and recruiting young bodies in the Marxist traditions. Well, the actions of Drop-Add instructors are evidences of our University's 100 percent American efforts to thoroughly bureaucratize and disorganize its students.

Many persons feel that Drop-Add 1 should be taught entirely by computer. This is basically a sound idea, but think yet of the ramifications of such a drastic switch. The delightful personalities of all the Drop-Add instructors would be lost forever to the dull efficiencies of a computer. In an economic sense, think of all the job opportunities which would be erased. While the United States government estimates that one million jobs have been created by the Vietnamese conflict, our University states that 2.3 million persons are on the payroll in Drop-Add teaching capacities alone.

Thus the "improvement" of entirely computerizing Drop-Add would not only be uninteresting, but also would wipe out Chapel Hill economically. Our suggestion is that the number of Drop-Add officials, registrars, and lecturers be doubled at least.

Most people would like to see the adviser staff increase, while making it mandatory to have the approval of at least three advisers other than your own

to enroll you in Drop-Add officially. Still others wish that all students in the greater University could come to Chapel Hill for the duration of the course, and a small minority want the Chancellor et al to take it.

All of these very good ideas should be studied by appropriate student-faculty committees. As we see it, only two more proposals need be mentioned. First, we support the plan to make Drop-Add 1 an integral part of the Experimental College curriculum. And secondly, we feel that, rather than have Drop-Add on a four-day-per-semester basis, this course should be offered year-round.

A booth will be set up in Y-Court to measure support for these suggest improvements. You should address any further inquiry to your adviser.

Letters

The Daily Tar Heel accepts all letters for publication provided they are typed, double-spaced and signed. Letters should be no longer than 300 words in length. We reserve the right to edit for libelous statements.

The Daily Tar Heel

75 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor

Don Walton, Business Manager



Don Campbell, Associate Editor

Lytt Stamps, Managing Editor

Hunter George, News Editor

Brant Wansley, Advertising Manager

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.

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.