

The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor

Don Walton, Business Manager

Pamela Hawkins, Associate Editor

Wayne Hurder, Managing Editor

Rebel Good, News Editor

Kermit Backner, Advertising Manager



Scott Goodfellow

Backward Logic In UNC Politics

The story is told of the professor who informed his class that he would give them a test the next week, but that if they knew what day the test was going to be on ahead of time, he would not give it to them. As the story goes, he cannot possibly give them the test.

The logic is simple. If the students make it through the week until Thursday, then they know the test will be on Friday and the professor can't give the test. Likewise, if the students make it through the week until Wednesday, then they know the test has to be on Thursday (since we've just found that it can't be on Friday if he wants to give it), and consequently he cannot give the test. And thus the logic proceeds systematically through the week and the professor simply cannot give the test.

I'm not much of a logician, but even I can tell that this backward line of thinking is screwy. And backward it is.

All this goes by way of introducing a similar backward means of logic which is being tested in campus politics and cam-

pus elections right now.

It all started on the less than memorable occasion of the Student Party convention some weeks ago. At that time a major controversy occurred when the question arose of who would support the party's nominee if he didn't happen to end up the nominee. One of the candidates committed himself to upholding the party's principles regardless, the other committed himself to supporting the nominee. Simple grammar difference? Hardly.

Although it would be naive to think that the supporter of party principles was being totally selfless, the point was one of dissension. GOP-H Arthur Hayes (Grand Old Party Hack) invoked his entire repertoire of melodrama to point out that the party was the most important consideration, not the candidate. Consequently, inveighed Hayes, he would condemn the candidate who felt the party's principles were more important than the party.

But Hayes was wrong, and the fact

that the whole campus is questioning his philosophy is more evident today than ever before. The irrelevancy of the party to the campus thinking on who should become their next president is shown clearly by the relative popularity of acidic DTH cartoonist Bruce Strauch.

The present forerunner in the race is boyish-looking liberal, Jed Dietz. Dietz has made no bones of the fact that he planned to run with or without the Student Party brand. His philosophy was and still is that the product he is selling is the same interested progressivism which has characterized him throughout the past two years.

Languishing behind only due to a noted past lack of effort to grab publicity, University Party candidate Ken Day has shown his flair for administration to the satisfaction of most everyone who knows him.

But while the candidates themselves are fast becoming the center of attention, the parties are practically being ignored. The University Party has ensconced

itself into a palatial office over Harry's, while the Student Party has an office near the McCarthy for President rooms. From these two locations party members venture forth with their mimeographed sheets.

It was only two years ago when the two parties engaged in veritable warfare to the detriment of practically everyone involved, not to mention the campus as a whole.

The party-minded operations gripped the campus closely until last year when the Student Body President began a number of what were termed then as NSA-type radical endeavors. This type of person had little use for the less admirable facilities of the political parties. Thus the only battles which the parties could sustain themselves with were rather minor ones in student legislature.

The last vestiges of a totally party minded operation carried through into the current year, when the Student Body President used party techniques which occasionally prompted the impression of viciousness. Nevertheless, once in office, he managed to create a rapport between the two parties which made the student legislature a political operation far more often than a party operation (something sought for in the past, but rarely realized).

This year, however, none of the three candidates has the personality or the interest to make the contest a clash between campus parties. One wants to instill progressivism into Student Government. Another aims particularly at a viable, inventive Student Government active primarily on the campus and in-state. The third candidate opposes the apparent silliness of many student government activities, vowing to make it a more widely-respected, serious operation.

In any event, the present state of the election is one of tremendous, satisfying vitality. The true direction of a student government is not being overlooked in this campaign, as it often has before. The part played by party politics has in the past often been highly suspect. The relative unimportance of the party structure compared to the prominence of the candidates and their varying conceptions of a student government—all this is very welcome.

Why Won't Chapel Hill Leave The Dark Ages?

The government of the Town of Chapel Hill is so wrapped up in its strait-jacket of regulations and ordinances that it can hardly breathe.

A classic example of how these rules waste time and accomplish little was demonstrated Thursday night at a meeting of the Chapel Hill Planning Board.

In three and a half hours of debate the Board managed to fence in a project to build a third Granville-type residence so tightly that it may not be built.

And this fence was built despite a report made to the Board by Town Planner Robert DeMaine that such a project would increase the tax base and be of economic benefit to the community.

The preservation of the aesthetic nature of Cameron Avenue seemed to be of major concern to the Board.

DeMaine emphasized such characteristics as its historic value, how it is tree-lined, and how it is a good pedestrian entrance to the campus.

Yet how many of the Board members have noticed that Cameron is also lined with perhaps the dirtiest automobiles in the state (thanks to that lovely Chapel Hill gravel, or whatever you call it)?

Mrs. George Welch favored a "six-foot screen" to protect the viewers' eyes from a "sea of automobiles."

But has she ever taken a look at

the Carolina Inn parking lot?

The Board was nice enough to provide for pedestrian access to Cameron Avenue (though they denied vehicular access).

But it doesn't seem to bother them that present Granville residents must crawl under a fence and up a mud incline to get to class now.

FRANK HITCHINGS, a representative of Northwestern Mutual Life, the financial backers of the project, told the Board that the proposal was 'marginal' as the company proposed it.

Yet the board persisted in debating stipulations that would effectively kill it.

As it now stands the Board's recommendations may prevent the building of a dormitory that would be of obvious advantage to the University, and of more obvious economic advantage to the citizenry of Chapel Hill.

It seems that it is high time that Chapel Hill decided to get with the program and get out of the dark ages.

After all, since the town has for some time been enjoying a rather conjugal relationship with the University—and especially with the students, who swell both the population and the merchants' coffers—it had better stop demanding alimony-like tribute unless it is seeking a final divorce decree.

'Congress Lacks The Guts'

From The Raleigh Times

"Congress doesn't have the guts to stand up to its responsibilities. And the American electorate doesn't have the interest to see that Congress does so."

Those are serious charges, and their seriousness is emphasized by the condition of America today. We have the spectacle of a Congress which has submitted to the "arrogance of the executive branch," in the matter of an undeclared major war in Vietnam, and also in the failure of a Congress to take the steps needed to give the American economy a chance to prove its ability to heal itself of its current ills.

These serious charges are worthy of full consideration because of their source. They were made by Philip B. Kurland, a University of Chicago law professor, during the Brainerd Currie lectures at the Duke University Law School this week. Professor Kurland, who edits the Supreme Court Review, would hardly make such charges lightly, and they shouldn't be considered lightly by the thoughtful people of America.

His message at Duke dealt with what he described as the "arrogance of the executive branch" and the cowardly nature of the legislative branch of our government. He said that congressional investigative and enforcement powers have been perverted and for a number of reasons Congress is being stripped of even more authority. Congress, he continued, is understaffed, badly organized and bogged down with private bills. On the other hand, the executive branch of the government has learned the lessons of using experts, including Madison-Avenue type public relations personnel. Congress rarely calls to its aid such expert help.

Any weakness in Congress can be traced directly to Congress. Its

members traditionally resist efforts to change the system which has been built up over the years. The seniority system of choosing committee chairmen is an example. That plan has brought some good men to chairmanships but it also has brought some real political hacks to places of great power, men who couldn't use that power wisely, or who used it shrewdly for personal or political profit. The power of committees is terrible, and so often it has been used against the real good of the country. A committee chairman can do just about as he pleases, and a revolt by a committee is just about unthinkable.

There is growing resentment in Congress about President Johnson's continuing escalation of the Vietnam war, a conflict which Johnson has escalated into a major conflict without benefit of a Congressional declaration of war. It is true that Johnson contends that the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution has given him the authority for these continuing escalations, but there is a growing concern that the administration was less than frank in the information which it furnished Congress as a basis of that resolution. So, Congress has continued to bow to the arrogance of the executive in this matter which so vitally affects the lives of every human being in the world.

Congress has failed to act on the measures needed to halt inflation in America, and to restore to the American dollar the respectability it must have in the markets of the world. A major step would be a change in American foreign policy to find a more effective way of combatting communism instead of the continuing escalation of a war which cannot be. A second major step would be tax increases. A third major step would be constructive budget cutting.



Letters To The Editor

Youth's Responsibility In Vietnam

To The Editor:

After all the ink that has been spilled, including a bit of my own, surely there could be little to be added on the subject of Vietnam. Yet, because of the critical nature of this issue, because of the entrance of a Kennedy into the Presidential race against the policies of Johnson and Rusk, as well as the surprising success of Senator McCarthy in the New Hampshire primary, because now the young people of this nation have their best chance to affect the direction our policies will take with two, perhaps (after Gov. Rockefeller announces today) three candidates who seem to speak for their interests and carry their hopes into the various primaries and ultimately to Chicago this summer, the dialogue must be continued.

Senator J. William Fulbright, in his recent book, *The Arrogance of Power*, speaks with a wisdom and insight into the aspirations and frustrations of my generation which are rare in a politician of his age and experience. I select one paragraph which has a direct bearing on the right, indeed the responsibility, of the young, you, me, "anyone under 30," to express themselves on this issue, in whatever manner he may choose.

"It is one of life's injustices that young men must fight the wars that older men begin. To a great extent, therefore, the lives and hopes of the present student generation turn on the wisdom and judgement of the men of an older generation to whom the people have entrusted political power. Surely, considering what they themselves have at stake, it is not improper for young people to question the wisdom and judgement of the maker of our foreign policy. Surely it is the right of citizens in a democracy, especially citizens of military age, to ascertain that the great decisions of war and peace are

made with care and deliberation. The calling of public men to account unquestionably adds to their burdens, but the convenience of policy-makers is not sufficient reason for the shutting down of public discussion. The responsibilities of high office are burdensome indeed but they are borne, let it be remembered, by men who actively sought or freely accepted them, men who accepted not only the obligation to use power but the obligation to account for its use as well." (pp. 37-38)

In light of Mr. Johnson's latest appeals to patriotism and sacrifice, to perpetuate the war in Vietnam and safeguard the American dollar, as well as

the smears against Senator McCarthy in New Hampshire, these words ring just as true in 1968 as they did in 1966 when they were spoken at Johns Hopkins. Caveat elector!

Peter C. Gerding

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publications Board, daily except Mondays, examinations periods and vacations. Offices are 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 U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.

based on the concept of "I know best what is good for you". The only printable answer to this attitude is "mind your own business".

These people who know what is best are found in many walks of life. They are our "moral thought-police" the Chapel Hill Police Dept. They are our self-appointed saviors in the W.C.T.U. and the S.D.S. They are the winners who come up

with campus codes and speaker bans. They are the no-minds who try to censor our movies. They constantly conceive (or is it abort?) new plans to make their own

ideals those of us all and if we disagree; well we're only students anyway.

In conclusion I'd like to thank those who have made it this far. Take hope. The greatest weapon against these people is an educated electorate and schools like UNC are forging the weapons and turn-

ing them out each year. Just remember when you read about these people, what is said in the Bible; "and you too shall pass". We'll just have to wait for the changing of the guard. Hopefully it will be accelerated this November.

Dan Schustack
904-James

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.

Postmark Greensboro

Our society often rewards imagination, even negative imagination. Take for example a unique rationalization. In a University we often call it an 'excuse'. At Chapel Hill, the athletes, the mentally retarded, and the faculty are the only members of our community who may be excused from classes.

Occasionally, we find some brilliant student who can offer an ingenious excuse. And we reward him for it. Such was the case last year in a psychology course.

The teacher had assigned a term paper which counted half the grade. It was due on a Friday, and instructions had been made explicit on lateness—one day, one letter grade. As the deadline approached, there did exist one student who, as usual, had not begun. Fortunately though, he was blessed with an imagination, and here is his solution to the dilemma.

Thursday afternoon before the crisis, he drove to Greensboro, bought a large manila envelope, and addressed it "in pencil" to himself in Chapel Hill. Although he remained here at school for the weekend, he did not go to class on Friday

but sent an excuse saying he was in Washington.

During the weekend, he worked diligently on his paper, finishing it late Sunday night. He then erased his own name on the envelope, which he had received on Saturday, and readdressed it to his teacher's school department. Late that night he put the finished paper in the envelope and sealed it. Slyly, he stole across campus to the instructor's office and slid the addressed envelope under the door.

Monday morning the story unfolded. The teacher got the paper, postmarked 'Thursday afternoon' from Greensboro. The student had been gone on Friday with excuse, and apparently his typist had sent it from UNC-G. The teacher consented; paper, not being late, got an A, and that is the end of the story, almost.

There is one mistake. And it is the reason I am able to relay this incident to you. If his girl friend had typed it and sent it from Greensboro and he had been in Washington, why did the envelope have his handwriting on the outside?

And that is why the story ended in the Attorney General's office.

Protestors- 'Wrong Way'

To The Editor:

I am writing this letter to protest against individuals such as those who were in the group that sat down in front of Gerrard Hall.

Despite their opposition to the war and the Dow Chemical Corp. for making napalm, they were definitely in the wrong. While they have a right to picket

and thereby make known their views, they had no right to prevent those students who wished to do so from seeing the Dow recruiter. And although they have a right to issue a challenge to a debate, they have no right to expect the school to penalize someone for not taking them up on it.

If they oppose Dow's production of napalm they can get a job making Reynold wrap instead of Saran wrap. But they can't force those who disagree with them to do the same.

This intolerance is not only limited to these protestors. Censorship in general is