

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

Drug Policy Statement: A Credibility Gap Begins

Student Body President Bob Travis Friday told a group of Student Legislators and other student government types that this University now had new policies concerning drug use and drinking.

The drug use policy, he said, was to be submitted to the Board of Trustees next Friday and would become official Consolidated University-wide policy at that time, if the trustees accepted it.

So, Travis said, it was very important that Student Legislature call a special session before exams begin to repeal existing drug legislation and implement the new policy. That way, President Friday could have the backing of UNC Student Government — for whatever that's worth — when he went before the board.

And if the Student Legislature didn't approve it while the trustees did, Travis said, then it would only harm the student body, since the new policy would go into effect anyway, only without any student participation in the judicial board being set up to hear drug cases.

It sounded like this was being snuffed down the throat of every student on the four campuses of the Consolidated University — especially the other campuses, since their student leaders had not even been on the student-faculty-administrative committee here which drew up the new policy.

But while Travis was attempting to shove it down throats in Chapel Hill, some Student Legislators here were already beginning to gag on it. Not only did they not like the new policy on first glance, but they disliked even more the idea that they should be forced to accept it and act on it with such short notice.

But, Travis said it was of immediate importance. It had to be considered, approved and embraced Tuesday so the Board of Trustees would go into its meeting Friday knowing how much Chapel Hill students liked the proposed policy.

Consolidated University President William C. Friday, however, said the next day that it had been decided not to present the policy proposal to the board Friday, and that when it was presented, it would be only in the form of a report.

Which means that there's not nearly as much urgency to getting this thing passed as Travis said there was.

Also, Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson said late Friday night (after The Daily Tar Heel had already gone to press that the new policy wasn't going to be shoved down anybody's throats. Instead, Sitterson told the DTH, he will abide by Student Legislature's decision on the matter: if they approve it, then the proposal will become the basis for University policy; if they don't, however, then it will become only a thing-that-might-have-been.

Which means that not only is there not nearly as much urgency to getting the thing passed as Travis said there was but also that there is not nearly as much desperation to get it passed as Travis said there was.

It is obvious that Travis was not intentionally lying: he is just too smart to try to tell that big a lie to that many people all at once.

More likely, Travis simply didn't know what he was talking about. Apparently, neither did any of the other students who were on the proposal committee and who were also at the meeting during

which it was announced. If any of them had realized what was going on, surely he would have spoken out to correct Travis.

So what it all boils down to is the same thing that the chain gang warden told Cool Hand Luke: "What we've got here is a failure to communicate."

Now, on a chain gang, that's bad enough. At a university, it is worse. Especially when it involves relationship between the Administration and Student Government on such crucial matters as drugs and drinking.

And if this situation is not cleared up soon — preferably by the special session of Student Legislature Tuesday night — both the Administration and President Travis are going to find themselves playing hot potato with an LBJ-sized Credibility Gap that will set both back for some time to come.

McCarthy: A God Who'll Fail?

We were both sceptical and optimistic when Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Wisc., announced a few weeks ago that he would oppose President Johnson in at least four Democratic primaries this year.

Now we are only sceptical. We were optimistic then because we thought that a major portion of the dissent to the war in Vietnam could be channeled into support for McCarthy. We also thought that McCarthy would be a responsible spokesman for the dissenters.

We were wrong on both counts. First of all, the more radical dissenters are having nothing to do with McCarthy. They see him as a semi-loyal Democat, who, when the showdown comes next fall, will back Johnson against whomever the Republican candidate might be.

The more moderate dissenters are politically afraid of McCarthy, because they don't want to go out on a limb with him, and have that limb cut off in the first one or two primaries.

Between the radicals and the moderates, there are the Robert Kennedy-type dissenters who will go all the way with McCarthy. The problem right now is that neither Robert nor his Brother Edward will publicly support the McCarthy campaign. And it is from the Kennedys that McCarthy needs support if his effort is to jell.

Secondly, although we thought McCarthy would be a worthy spokesman for the war dissenters, his campaign has proved to be about as exciting as a game of Old Maids. Perhaps because of his background as a college professor and a quiet Senator he likes to talk with academic aplomb.

But that certainly will not impress many potential voters who are distressed with the way the Vietnam war is going.

Of course it is still early. The New Hampshire primary is two months away.

But if McCarthy is to have much success in his presidential endeavor, he must do two things:

He must force the Kennedys' hand either for him or against him.

And he must attack Johnson's Vietnam policy like a politician—and not like a latter-day Greek philosopher.

Letters To The Editor

Levy's 'Army' Plan Gets Replies

To the Editor:

Apparently Dick Levy forgot to think when he stated his objection to a volunteer army—and the result was ludicrous.

His minor objection, the cost, which he in no way proves to be "prohibitive," pales to insignificance (especially in a rich country) when compared to the moral cost of forcing a person to kill.

But his big objection, the type of man that would dominate a volunteer army, shows least evidence of careful consideration. The volunteer soldiers, he says, would be "the frustrated killers, the opportunists, the alienated, the failures," and he expects them, in time, to turn on their own country. The army would be "with no morality," and "without national checks," as the crusades supposedly show.

There are many points to consider here. First is the fact that the "power structure" in the armed forces today is of volunteer status, and while under continued national scrutiny they have continuously tried to pursue narrowly militaristic goals, they succeed only to the extent that civilian control and will are weak. The obvious remedy is, therefore, continued strengthening of civilian authority.

Furthermore, many of those who actually fight are volunteers, and this same control can be the key to preventing from becoming the animals Mr. Levy fears.

There is no reason to assume that such an army would have no national checks. The crusades, it's true, were vicious, but they were not subject to national control, whereas our armed forces certainly must be.

A national takeover? A volunteer army is not a sufficient condition for such a takeover, as any careful analysis would reveal.

Mr. Levy's error is not one of direction, I think, but one of degree and one of ignoring other variables. The Marine Corps, the most completely volunteer service, and the one with the greatest reputation for lack of humanity in training, is evidence that the tendencies cited by Levy definitely do exist. On the other hand, the volunteer enthusiasm of military officers has been curbed by strong civilian control in the past, and can continue to be.

Here is the major failure of Levy's argument—the assumption that a volunteer army will be free to run wild. If it is, then Mr. Levy is correct in his analysis. However, this points only to the duty of civilian governmental control. If this control has the backing of citizens (especially citizens not subject to conscription), there is no reason why it

should fail in this country. And the necessity to force a man to kill would be eliminated.

Stuart Lynn



To The Editor:

This letter is in response to Dick Levy's column in December 14's DTH entitled "Draft Is Practical Necessity." What he says makes good sense and I agree that we must "bear in mind that the draft is based upon practical necessities, not upon ideology." However, I think that this necessary compromise (necessary because we must live and act in this world, like it or not!) between our actions and our ideals does not automatically lead to the conclusion that to "protest against (the draft) because of objection to Viet Nam is misdirected." I would hold that our actions in Viet Nam are misdirecting the purpose of the draft! So, if the best way to oppose the Viet Nam war is by opposing the draft, so be it. An unworthy compromise of principle? With the highest of goals base means are often necessary. In the final measure, the individual must decide, and yes, he must also face the consequences of his actions.

My statements must sound like a defense of dirty politics. But quite to the contrary, I wish only to emphasize that, however lofty our ideals, we must be prepared to compromise our principles in order to live and work with other people in bringing about a better world. As responsible, thinking citizens, we must choose our practical course of action to the best of our ability. And we must be prepared to face the saddest part of all, that others judge us by our actions, not by our underlying ideals. To be misunderstood in well-intentioned behavior is very painful, and the ultimate burden falls on the individual, for he is constantly judged by his fellows.

Therefore, although we may not agree with the man who burns his draft card, we should seek to understand why he did it. We might become inspired by his courage and ultimate morality to the point of reexamining our own motivations, and as individuals then act more responsibly and considerably. If we can do this, he shall not have burned his card in vain. For his contribution to our betterment through self-enlightenment he may pay a price in jail, but for him, better that than killing another man.

Scott B. Macdonough
147 Craige

MUD.....

By JAMES DOUGAN

There is some unsightly mud right in front of the construction site of the new undergraduate library. When you step into it, the mud curls around the toes of your shoes. And when you stamp your shoes on the pavement, the mud sprays on your pants (or skirt).

Some people tip-toe through it like tight-rope walkers. Others run through it like dash men on the track team. No clever stunts seem to work, though. Everyone gets muddy, and the mud sticks to your shoes until it wears off in Bingham or Lenoir or the library or, at the very worst, in your room.

Briefly, that's what happens when you step in the mud by the undergraduate library site.

The mud, of course, comes from the construction site. It seeps under the fence surrounding the site, or it is thrown over the wire fence, or the wind blows it through the wire fence. The point is that the mud gets there. And, by a cruel twist of fate, it so happens that the location of

the mud is at the busy spot on the campus. Students who eat at Lenoir, study at the library, or attend classes at Bingham must daily face (during the rainy season) the haunting spectre of . . . mud.

The estimate is rough, of course, but perhaps four thousand students per week—or one third of the entire student body—or more graphically, one half the population of Mt. Airy, North Carolina—will tramp through this sickening mud hole.

So what does this mean for the unconcerned student?

Plenty. Besides to the very obvious menace to life and limb which the mud presents, there is the larger concern of what the mud does to the atmosphere, the charm, and the spirit of "Olde Chapel Hill." You don't have to have muddy feet to feel the stigma which the mud imposes on everyone.

Chapel Hill should not become a veritable quagmire. Let's clean up that mud.



would mean reprisals against opponents and probably a form of authoritarianism more efficient than now exists in Saigon, could not possibly be as dangerous a result.

It is time Americans faced the fact that their country is now the major world power. What we do with our power has profound consequences everywhere. Right now, and in the recent past, we have been the leading military interventionists. Think for a moment about how you would judge the Vietnam war if it were being fought say, by England or France. Would the arguments of their leaders seem reasonable when they spoke of falling dominoes and Chinese appetites; when they permitted torture of prisoners; when they expressed a desire to negotiate yet in every case refused to make meaningful concessions; when they sanctioned indiscriminate and terrifying use of anti-personnel weapons (see the N.Y. Review of Books, Jan. 4, 1968, pp. 3-5) yet preached the sanctity of human life. An imagine further that these leaders controlled the most formidable arsenal in the world. We would quake in our shoes at the thought of such men winning victories. That is our situation and as Americans it is our responsibility to deter our own country and to enlighten it. Narrow-minded, self-righteous patriotism, no matter how it may disguise itself, is an enemy of truth and compassion.

Yours,
Lewis Lipsitz

Back The Patriot!, Hershey In '68!!

To The Editor:

Where are the Russell Bakers of this year? Observe. Everyone—be they doves or hawks, Christians or atheists, teetotalers or alcoholics, soldiers young and dying or soldiers old and living—seems to misunderstand the motives behind the actions of Selective Service System head General Hershey.

People don't realize that HE knows, as the late President Kennedy put it, that "Unless mankind puts an end to war, war will put an end to mankind." HE knows that as long as countries continue to maintain standing armies man will balance precariously on the brink of nuclear self-destruction. And HE knows that conscription is not the root, the cornerstone, the foundation of standing armies. HE realizes, then, that the first step to a realistic world peace is the abolishment of the draft.

But how can he come right out and say it? That would be incredible. . . unbecoming. . . and undemocratic. Anyway, Americans (at least those living in the United States) don't like to be told anything; they prefer to discover such great, universal truths for themselves.

So? There is method in his madness? Indeed. By misusing his position and power; by asserting himself as accuser, defender, judge and jury; and by directly contradicting the Department of Justice, the Supreme Court, the Senate, and the Constitution, he knows he will outrage the conscience of all citizens of this great country.

Many will begin to . . . think. They will begin to question him, and his motives. And then they will begin to re-evaluate the entire Selective Service System, and the concept—legal and moral—of conscription (which has been deplored throughout history by men far greater than he—though few there be). Should this evil, diabolical (and undoubtedly Commie inspired) plot succeed, we might find the concept of "peace on earth" within our grasp.

Obviously the only way to ward off such an awesome prospect is to unite behind this truly great Patriot and keep him in office. Hershey in '68!!!

Best wishes for the new year,
Scott Bradley

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 is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Mondays, examinations periods and vacations. Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1611; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C., 27514. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C. Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.