

America's weak excuses for ignoring the hungry

A spirit of sacrifice is one of the hardest attitudes to create and maintain. Guilt seems to be the easiest way to make people share their wealth, but in the long run guilt breeds resentment, not altruism. A genuine willingness to help your starving neighbors comes only from inner peace and security, not anxiety and apprehension.

UNC students have much to be thankful for, and we are smart enough to realize that the scare-tactics used by many population experts and nutritionists are of limited effectiveness. But just because the world hunger problem is usually presented in startling, rather than sobering, terms should not lessen our commitment. We are, after all, children of fortune and of the fortunate, born by pure geographical accident in the richest nation in the history of the world.

Americans don't need to worry about their own well-being when, for example, they are already eating twice the protein they can use, when U.S. per capita meat consumption has faddishly doubled since 1940, when the dung of American livestock contains as much protein as the entire U.S. soybean crop, or when the grain now fed to American cattle could feed both India and China. Most Americans are overweight, not undernourished, although there are several hunger pockets left here in the U.S. There is no reason but gluttony to make affluence a self-perpetuating spiral.

Skeptics may claim that America is not so rich or powerful as we believe after the energy and inflation crises. Vietnam and the rigors of detente. But again this is only an excuse for our own selfishness. The energy crisis is on the luxury side of the coin of the far more significant world-wide food crisis. The U.S. has long had a near monopoly on food



surpluses just at the OPEC countries now have on oil. America has even gone so far as to pay its farmers not to grow crops. Little wonder that when the economic pinch affects us we continue to want more oil for our gas-guzzling autos instead of bread for our neighbors.

Emphasis on population reduction has also been an excuse

for American self-interest. Many so-called experts claim that we are simply wasting food aid unless birth control is practised world-wide. The population problem does have to be solved but historically the best way to limit population growth has been to raise the standard of living. Thus if Americans are willing to share a significant portion of our wealth, the population problem will take care of itself.

Triage is a third major rationalization for our selfishness. The idea (left over from World War II field hospitals) is to sort the dying into three groups: the curable and those who can probably care for themselves. Of course the second category is the only one that will be helped.

But triage assumes there is not enough food to go around, which simply is not true. America has not tried hard enough for anyone to use triage as an excuse for even partial failure. For example, it only takes 14 American cents to keep one of 100,000 Bangladesh children from being blinded by a Vitamin A deficiency. Under triage, are we to write these children off as hopeless invalids?

Americans must not be scared into such sophistry as this. We should be confident of our position in the world and our duty to help others when we have only six per cent of the world's population and more than one-third of its resources. What more could we possibly want?

Rorin Platt

Moral imperative to aid Vietnam

The Republic of Vietnam is probably in its last years of existence. Congressional reluctance to provide enough military aid to Saigon will facilitate this impending disaster. This Congressional refusal to lend American aid to an embattled people when the economic crisis at home is worsening reflects wise political judgement and lack of moral imperative.

American justification for intervention in Vietnam can be traced to our treaty obligations (SEATO) and our unwillingness to let a country be denied its right of self-determination. Our national security was also involved since the internationalist posture of American foreign policy required vigilance in the face of Communist aggression. The argument which denies that our national security was at stake is a poor one. If the Communist plan to overtake all of Southeast Asia is successful, the waterways of the Indian and Pacific Oceans would no longer welcome an American presence. Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Indonesia and the Philippines would face the threat of Communist aggression with the realization that the U.S. might not honor its treaty commitments if more Vietnams are in the making. The present sentiment of the American people would prohibit any

mention of such future Vietnams.

The average liberal professor of political science would probably attribute the present losses sustained by the South Vietnamese to their "corrupt", "facist", "unpopular" government. Perhaps the real reason for the South's recent setbacks can be traced to the incredible amount of military and economic aid North Vietnam has been receiving from Red China and Russia. Public resistance in Moscow or Peking to such aggressive designs is of no consequence to Brezhnev or Mao. They, unlike President Ford, are not accountable to the popular will.

It's not too difficult to visualize a country such as the Republic of Vietnam falling to its imminent destruction just two years after the Paris Accords were signed. This flimsy "peace" agreement left nearly 300,000 North Vietnamese troops within the territorial boundaries of South Vietnam. If this does not constitute *de facto* aggression then what does?

Since the Paris Agreement, the number of North Vietnamese troops in the South has risen to 400,000. Massive shipments of military hardware, including SAM II missiles, have also arrived in the South (another violation of the Accords).

Daily reports of terrorism, assassinations, deliberate shelling of towns and villages, kidnappings and torture perpetrated by the Viet Cong and their North Vietnamese allies go unheeded by the American conscience. After all, we want to forget the tragedy that took the lives of 55,000 of our finest young men. And for what? What did we gain in Vietnam other than provide a few more years of existence to a fledgling anti-Communist regime?

The liberal conscience can be pinched by a My Lai (and rightly so). But what about Ang Snoul or Hue? Were is the public indignation when Communist atrocities are committed? Communist troops ruthlessly murdered 52 civilians at Ang Snoul on Jan. 1, 1975. Thousands were found buried in mass graves at Hue. Massacres committed by Communist gangsters are quite a different thing from the isolated acts of slaughter charged against American GI's, according to our cowardly press and academicians.

The Republic of Vietnam is not a paragon of democracy, yet strong elements of a democratic state do exist. South Vietnam, unlike its Communist enemy permits the opposition parties in its National Government unrestricted freedom to

criticize Thieu's Democracy Party. Nineteen of the 60 senators and 58 of the 158 members of the Lower Assembly belong to the opposition.

Despite repeated instances of government censorship of the press, three anti-Thieu newspapers consistently denounce the regime's policies.

The South Vietnamese, unlike their brothers in the North, are free to join labor unions, travel throughout the country, emigrate to other lands, demonstrate publicly against the government, worship as they please, own property, work at jobs they (not the state) desire and even vote in elections which American observers have judged as fairly administered. Such freedoms have never been enjoyed in North Vietnam or any Communist nation. The very fact that during the American civil war *habeas corpus* was suspended, and during World War II Britain held no elections makes one wonder how South Vietnam could even "permit" such liberties when its very soil is occupied by the enemy.

The stench of corruption which does exist in South Vietnam is not a good enough reason for the U.S. to cut off aid to Saigon. Few nations in the world today, including our own, are free of corruption. True, it does seem senseless to send billions of dollars to a nation, which sometimes misuses these resources intended to defeat an enemy. But to allow South Vietnam to die because of the vices of the few is quite an immoral course of action. American aid to India was never cut off for reasons of corruption there. Moscow and Peking obviously have not allowed their consciences to be wrecked over aiding North Vietnam despite its notorious black market.

We see that Thieu is aware of American discontent over this graft. Last October's acknowledgement by Thieu of the corruption and his subsequent firing of four cabinet ministers and 377 military officers reflect this concern.

Is it in America's best interests to aid South Vietnam in its darkest hour? The Israelis are nervously awaiting this answer. For they are next on the list of those whose right to exist will be questioned in terms of dollars and cents by American politicians.

We can no more allow South Vietnam to fall to the Reds than allow Israel to become extinct. The moral imperative, despite the tragedy of Vietnam, requires our continued struggle against the forces of international communism. Let the moral imperative triumph.

Rorin Platt is a junior political science major from Greensboro.

Mark Freedman

Fighting inflated grades

The overwrought student at UNC certainly has a multitude of problems these days. Rents are too high, groceries cost one bag for the price of two, and buying gasoline depletes the monthly allowance. Curiously entangled in this mesh of inflationary barrages are grades and grade point averages. Trying as hard as one can just doesn't help anymore; it's impossible to get that "gentlemen's C."

While the Executive branch and Congress grapple with the pocketbook, it is now obvious that we as loyal Tar Heels and as conscientious Americans must come to grips with gradebook inflation. All appeals to the University faculty have failed miserably; the keepers of the keys in the ivory tower senselessly continue to distribute A's and B's. This faculty policy has propagated a needless subversion of academic disachievement. As the federal government develops strategies for seizure of Arab oil fields and extracting petroleum from blood, so must the Grade Uninflation Resistance Union (GURU) initiate strategies to counteract the rising number of A's and B's.

GURU's first suggestion regards testing policy. Students at Chapel Hill have performed so well on these "bouts with knowledge" that grades less than A or B are rarer than house visits by doctors. GURU has devised a radical grading scale which should be adopted by all loyal faculty members. Under GURU's scheme all tests will be graded on the usual point scale, but each test will contain only 80 questions valued at one point each. Study as hard as he possibly can, but the student's top score will be no greater than 80, certainly not A caliber.

GURU has identified young teachers, fresh out of graduate school, as the chief inflation bugs; virtually a cancer growing in the university setting. GURU recommends that all faculty be investigated in regard to their grading policies. Those instructors whose average grade falls in the C range should receive life contracts, full professorial rank and substantial pay increases. GURU also proposes these loyal servants of grading sanity receive Distinguished Teaching Awards. As for all those young subversive teachers, the



easy graders, GURU suggests they be marched into the Pit, stripped of their Phds. and summarily executed at dawn—preferably with scarlet A's sewn to their academic garb.

GURU also realizes that the practice of keeping Wilson and House libraries open for interminably long hours contributes to grade inflation. In light of this administrative error, GURU policy-makers recommend that the libraries only be open during lunch hour and while basketball games are being played in Carmichael. This policy would not only benefit grade reduction, it would cut down on light bulb usage and allow carrels to be employed as storage space.

Finally GURU insists that quality instructors and students have caused grade inflation to run rampant. So GURU advocates that instructors deliver only every other line of material

when lecturing. Of course students will be held responsible for the information in between the lines. Furthermore, student course loads should be increased, preferably double the current five subjects. A 10 course schedule along with incomprehensible lectures and 80 point tests should pull down those inflationary grade point averages.

GURU strategies do not end here, but for the time being the GURU policy-makers feel implementation of the preceding proposals plus a little "biting of the bullet" will bring back the sanctity of the normal curve. We at GURU stick by our motto, "A gentlemen's C—for a return to mediocrity."

Mark Freedman is a physical education graduate student from Chapel Hill.

Darrell Hancock

'Village' retains its rustic charm

Traditions don't die easily. Take Chapel Hill for example, full of history and academic tradition which continues to live and grow. Many landmarks remain much as they were nearly 200 years ago when the University first opened its doors. South Building, Old East, and the Playmakers Theatre are just a few examples of the numerous reminders of the past to be found in Chapel Hill.

Yet, despite the seeming preeminence of these landmarks, Chapel Hill offers a real taste of the past as a part of everyday life for local citizens and visitors to remember long after their visits. What we are referring to, of course, is the genuine 18th century condition of the local streets and thoroughfares. No, friends, those aren't imitation plastic potholes in the roads, those are the real things, maintained to enhance the "village" atmosphere of Chapel Hill.

Regrettably, in recent years, some of these quaint reminders of the past have been altered, much to the chagrin of local citizens who now complain that major problems on their autos go unnoticed as a result of not being checked regularly. Such was not the case when it was necessary to visit garages three times annually for realignment and new shocks. Fortunately, people in this category represent a minority as only the major streets have undergone resurfacing.

As an extra added attraction, the Chapel Hill Transit authority has recently leased several Orange, mint condition coaches from the city of Atlanta. Although powered by diesel engines, instead of the traditional horse, these bi-centennial specials still give a ride comparable to what could have been expected 200 years ago. Public coaches were noted for jolts and irregular schedules at the time of the American Revolution. There is very little noticeable change in these conditions locally, thanks to the concern of the city fathers here for detail and realism. The similarity is simply astonishing!

The Old Salsams and Colonial Williamsburgs may boast authentic buildings and simulated conditions, but they don't have a thing on Chapel Hill. Hats off to the Chapel Hill municipal government for their patriotic concern for detail and realism in conjunction with the coming Bicentennial celebration.

Darrell Hancock is a senior journalism major from Salisbury, N.C.

Letter to the editors

Causes for apathy

To the editors:

The *Daily Tar Heel* editorial of Feb. 26 gives a graphic picture of dying student interest in campus elections — very discouraging to people interested in the democratic process for representative government.

If we turn back to page 1 of this same issue of the *DTH*, we find other straws in the wind that sears this campus. A student has been found innocent of a charge of disrupting a speech by a speaker invited to the UNC campus by the Union Forum. The speaker was selected by the members of the Forum in planning the Forum program for 1974-1975. This body is representative of the student body in that its membership is drawn from students, sufficiently interested to serve, who apply for selection interviews by elected Student Government officers. Notices of these interviews are posted for reading by the

entire student body, on bulletin boards and in the *DTH*.

Now that we know what constitutes freedom to prevent a guest's appearance, it'll be touch and go: If our SG guest touches black sensitivities, he/she's gotta go. We know where we stand. All of this talk about freedom of expression is a sometimes thing. Everyone's equal—only some are more so! This fine old university will founder on this rock.

Is it possible that what has been perceived to be indifference or apathy is, in fact, withdrawal from participation by many students whose good will has been brutalized in past experiences at UNC when they have been put on notice that their participation can not be on a true 50-50 basis?

Just call me "White and Mourning."
Sylvia King
Rt. 3, Box 285



"THESE PEOPLE JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND MY DEEP CONCERN FOR THEIR WELFARE!"

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosek
Editors

David Ennis, Associate Editor
Lu Ann Jones, Associate Editor
David Klinger, News Editor
Alan Murray, Features Editor
Susan Shackelford, Sports Editor
Gene Johnson, Wire Editor
Martha Stevens, Head Photographer
Jim Grimsley, Night Editor