

(Letters to the editor do not necessarily reflect the views of the editor.)

On Myopic Whims

Student body feeling concerning the maintenance of certain conduct regulations in the student body constitution has hardly changed from what it was before the abortive referendum in December.

should not be sacrificed by the whims of myopic voters. At the same time, this re-evaluation of rules governing conduct should see the elimination of certain provisions which are indeed unnecessary as well as unwanted.

A Solution At Hand

One of the thorniest and most persistent problems to plague college campuses currently is the lack of adequate parking facilities. Davidson, alas, is not without its vexation in this area. Unlike other schools who are perplexed with a space problem, however, Davidson has the land area and exact site to expand the parking facilities for students.

Student body feeling is further divided by the jealousies of many students who receive financial aid from the college and are thus penalized by being prohibited from keeping a car on campus. The college's banal explanation for such a penalty is that students who receive a stipend on account of financial need should not be allowed the "luxury" of an automobile on campus.

Or perhaps the college is content to let the red clay erode and wider pathways be worn by the fraternity men on their treks to meals on Patterson Court. The glaring lack of parking areas for student automobiles is evident from a count of the spaces reserved for permit holders.

Perhaps those students on financial aid should be further penalized by having no janitor service. Seriously and quite obviously, an automobile is becoming more of a necessity every day, especially on the isolated Davidson campus.

Vietnamese Quandary

The student survey on page one, although somewhat limited and necessarily not a totally accurate reflection of Davidson opinion, indicates nevertheless that Davidsonians do favor U. S. involvement in Viet Nam. Students and faculty members alike see defeat of the Communists there as ultimately important for the security of the rest of the free world, including the U. S.

by using such an approach, do, however, reach the same conclusions as the flag-wavers: (1) the military power of the U. S. is necessary at present to prevent control of the South Viet Nam by the Communists and (2) the containment of Communism in Southeast Asia at least within its present limits is important to the security of the free world, the U. S. ultimately included.

We do regret, however, that the Vietnamese issue on the national scale has, like the "civil rights" controversy, been clouded with so much emotionalism and demagoguery. Although a substantial portion of the emotionalism, i.e., the labeling of all opposition to the war as unpatriotic, un-American, "pink", etc., favors much of the same policy we endorse, we feel that only a rational analysis of American foreign policy and rationally-reached conclusions concerning what this policy should be are the only valid determinants to what U. S. policy in Viet Nam should be.

Those opposing U. S. involvement should do so by refuting these conclusions, rather than by bypassing ultimate implications and consequences and just making unrealistic statements about the evil of fighting, the immorality of U. S. intervention in a foreign country, and the desirability of turning our other cheek to the enemy.

Contributors this week: Doug Crisp, Bob Reid, Cliff Duke, Jim Marrow, K. D. Weeks, Bill Richmond, Yates Faison, Joe Saunders, John Williams, Ron Snow, Mike Powell, Bob Travers, Bruce Weihe, Carter Fussell, Price Cameron, Mason Stephenson, Jon Ward, Sam Smith, Tucker Laxton, Jim May, Grey Pash, Mike Bates, Bob Schofield, Craig Wilson, Johnny Wessel, Dick Richards.

THE DAVIDSONIAN is published by the students of Davidson College weekly during the school year except examination periods and holidays. Subscription rate: \$4.00 per year (if billed, \$4.50). Payable to THE DAVIDSONIAN, Box 218, Davidson, N. C. 28036. Entered as second class matter at Davidson, N. C.

Jones Defends Roundballers, Hits Duke

Dear Editor: John Todd's domination of the sports editor's column in the last issue was to say the least ill-fated. Duke may or may not be a great basketball team. They did not prove it against UCLA. The zone press did not make two national champions. The men who ran it did, and the two who anchored it — All-American Gail Goodrich and Keith Erickson — have graduated.

by Duke's destruction of UCLA's quite mythical top national rating, it is interesting to note what the Blue Devils did in the face of two local pre-season evaluations. They lost to South Carolina, predicted last in the ACC, and defeated Virginia, predicted next to last, by only three points. If Davidson's young basketball team (5-1 when this column was written and 10-2 and 4-0 in the conference now) is "embarrassingly green," the embarrassment is worth having.

and that since that time they have refused to play us away from Durham. Last year they refused to play us anywhere and have shown little interest in our contacts since then. The athletic department spokesman referred to in the column is not named, but he did not come from the basketball office and he was not Dr. Scott. If there is burden of proof here, it is on Duke — not Davidson. If it is possible momentarily to overlook the factual inadequacies of this column, one might still suggest that there are more appropriate places to read of Duke's alleged greatness and no less appropriate place to read unconstructive criticism of the Cats. On the whole, I find the

writer's comments lacking in insight and taste. Tuck Jones, Davidson College. (Editor's Note: Mr. Jones is certainly entitled to his opinions; however, the spokesman referred to in the column was Athletic Director Dr. Tom Scott, who told THE DAVIDSONIAN again this week, "I would say there is no prospect in the near future," for a basketball game between Davidson and Duke. We call the readers' attention to this week's column on page four.)

Graham, Davidson College. Security within the status quo has become the goal of the Board of Trustees and Administration. The problem with Davidson generally is what sociologists call institutional inertia. Older professors are so much a part of it that they are unaware of it; younger professors are in the process of being disenfranchised by the trustees (I understand there is even an informal "blue light" being conducted now by the Administration).

Graham

Older professors are so much a part of it that they are unaware of it; younger professors are in the process of being disenfranchised by the trustees (I understand there is even an informal "blue light" being conducted now by the Administration).

As far as the students are concerned, brighter freshmen are aware of the system within three or four weeks; more retarded students realize it in their third or fourth year when it is too late. Anyway, by that time most of them are more concerned with their role within the social WASP's nest from which they emerged, their education being a meaningless formalism.

It was a Davidson professor (a new one) that said educational institutions are often good training for a bureaucracy, for a job at one desk in a vast mechanistic network interconnected with in-and-out baskets.

No doubt this same type of realization prompted Mario Salvo and the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley. Davidson may not be as large and impersonal as the Berkeley campus, but the cherished institutions are equally immobile. So what do we do?

RECRUITING. If, as THE DAVIDSONIAN reported, applications are running somewhat behind, why not begin intensive recruiting in New England or the Midwest? Davidson could use a little fresh blood. Why not computerize registration at the beginning of each semester?

Why not have competent upperclassmen teach freshmen and sophomores some of the more basic courses? Plenty of schools the size of Davidson do this. It would break the tedium of "canned" lectures and facilitate smaller classes and more discussion. Professors, after all, have no monopoly on knowledge.

SELF-STUDY. The Self-study recommended (so I am told, for it has been successfully kept from student scrutiny) provisions for faculty research? What about student research (not just for seniors with a 2.5 average)? Most universities are grappling with the "publish or perish" situation, which indicates the antiquity of Davidson thinking, in relation to other colleges.

And what about the rules which students detest and are now formally protesting. Many of them are appendages of Christian doctrine.

TRUSTEES. The trustees may have a legal right to impose what they do, as Rev. Morris has suggested, but I do not understand how they rationalize Davidson's artificial legalism in terms of their own "Christian stewardship." The ideal of this religion, the Bible department assures me, is agape.

If it is therefore concerned with the individual and his welfare, it should be concerned about the "spiritual welfare" of Davidson students. Hypothesize a counter-example: take any bright, young freshman.

Suppose he is initially neutral to Christianity but that because of required of Bible courses, vespers, and chapel he becomes a bitter atheist. Using the irrational calculus of some moral philosophers and many Christians, Christianity has then failed, since at least one individual has been led astray by the very system that seeks to stimulate it.

The trustees may feel the duty to provide an accessible Christianity for all students. How coercively prescribed religious observances make of the church a symbol for ritualistic obedience must make authentic Christians sick.

Stephen A. Graham, Davidson College

Creation Of A Pledge



by Hill

VIETNAM Soldiers Enjoy Christmas Cards

Dear Editor: I have received quite a few cards from students and it would take forever to answer them individually. We want you to know that we appreciate all of the cards that you have sent. I hope that some of you will continue to write me. This letter is going to be short because darkness is beginning to fall. Your friend always in Vietnam, PFC James W. Carroll, U. S. Forces in Vietnam

leges could have as much understanding as your students do. I thank them very much and also I wish them a very "Merry Christmas and Happy New Year." Joseph Trucchio, U. S. Forces in Vietnam

Trucchio

Dear Editor: I am writing this letter in appreciation for your students' concern and generosity. I thought it was very wonderful and thoughtful of them for writing a few lines to us soldiers. I got as far as the tenth grade in high school, and now that I see how mature it can make a person, I wish I had stayed in school. But as you can see, I learned many things the hard way. I wish that many more col-

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR. THE DAVIDSONIAN welcomes letters from any reader, either in support of or differing from its policies. Letters should be typewritten, double-spaced, and should not exceed 250 words. We also will receive longer articles, but must request that they be cleared with the editor. In order to be printed in the following issue, letters should be received not later than 4 p.m. Tuesday. All letters must be signed.

Thanks

by Hill



Cat O' Nine Tails. By MICHAEL L. HARRINGTON, Davidsonian Associate Editor. Includes a small portrait of Michael L. Harrington.

LOADED WITH SANTA'S GIFTS and twice as much as was taken away, most Davidson students returned this week to face all those papers and reviews left undone and unprepared. The average DC gentleman had two reviews and a paper due this week and declared he just couldn't get started. It's this "getting-started" business that is harder than both reviews and papers combined. Once started the work usually becomes fun—after all most of us do enjoy studying to some degree, no matter how much we may complain.

HALLELUJAH! FORMAL RUSH IS OVER! Probably the longest rush season in Davidson history is finally past. This year's attempts at reform of the Greek system have proved chaotic and unsatisfactory to friend and foe alike. Everything from Saturday rush parties over three months to bid-em-by-mail showed the signs of improvisation. The successive weekends of rush parties were much too-drawn out. Having the frosh visit all the houses initially was a good idea, but next year let's try having parties on successive nights so that the season can be shortened to about a month and a half. The IFC regulations on contact between frosh and upperclassmen have proved themselves ridiculous. This thick head initially supported them but then he too gave up in disgust. You know where this "salutary-greeting-off-campus" business can go: to the same place this "salutary-greeting-on-campus" plus "no-visiting" foolishness is going. Bid-em-at-home was a good idea but it too got fouled up in 12 different addresses, several days of no mail delivery, and a frightful amount of confusion. Southern Bell and AT&T were the only real winners here—one IFC representative bet he had \$75 of phone calls. Wonder if this could be done over Thanksgiving? There is little to be gained by blaming anyone. We've learned by experience and changes will be made for next year. But instead of making plans from the idea preventing contact between frosh and upperclassmen, why not emphasize increased contact? Please—no more segregation.

COMMENT TO REFLECT UPON: CHORTLE BY AN ANTI-GREEK PROF: "Fraternalities are really fixed now! If fewer frosh than usual pledge up, they're on the way out and we can put in sophomore rush and finish the job. If more or the same percentage pledge up, then they're still too strong and we can put in soph rush anyway."