

Students And Their Crisis: South Building Guilty, Too

"Students must face the value of integrity if they are to overcome the current crisis in student initiative."—Director of Student Activities Samuel Magill, speaking to University Party this week.

The crisis Director Magill mentioned was created not only by the students. The administration is helping a great deal, too.

In very many of the tense situations that have faced student government in recent years, the administration has taken away student government's freedom and integrity.

Student government, Magill told the University Party, is in a "depression." In the same breath he talked about increasing violations of the honor code, increased drinking and unwillingness of students to discipline themselves.

Let us examine how the students—and the administration—have handled themselves in crises in the past:

1. Increasing violations of the honor code: Not too long ago, two Carolina students traveled to Woman's College and did something very nasty. They returned to the Carolina campus.

Woman's College officials discovered the crime, identified the two students and called South Building. The students were tried through student judicial channels here.

They were given sentences—one, probation; the other, a stern warning.

Woman's College officials, who wanted to bring the most possible punishment out of the case, and South Building, which disagreed with the honor council's decision, effected the "appeal" of the case to a faculty-administration court.

The two students were given much harder sentences. One, we recall, was suspended from the University.

2. Increased drinking: Just how Director Magill got his statistics on increased drinking, we do not know. But we will wager there is no more drinking here this year than there was two, three or five years ago, when the increased enrollment is taken into consideration.

Rather, Magill has just started to look around him and notice that students are drinking intoxicating beverages.

The University has a rule which

it does not enforce. The rule prohibits drinking on the campus. Other rules outlaw drinking in fraternity houses when there are coed guests present.

Both rules are farces, lip-serviced by the University because the University knows the trustees would blow their tops if the rules were not on the books.

It is illegal to possess alcoholic beverages in dormitory rooms, just as it is illegal to possess food there and to stick cellophane tape on the walls and woodwork. But any student who wants to keep his bottle in his room has no more trouble than the student who cooks coffee there or tapes Marilyn Monroe Hiller in front of his desk.

The funny thing is, South Building knows that. Up until this week South Building had not admitted it, however. It was a sort of silent compact between the student affairs office and the students. The rule was there, and it could be broken at will.

We admire Director Magill for noting that students are drinking alcoholic beverages. We would admire him even more if he would either enforce the rules or campaign for their repeal.

3. Unwillingness of students to discipline themselves: Consider the case of a coed who came into her dormitory a little bit tight one night.

She was turned in to the proper student judiciary group.

The judiciary group felt the girl needed counsel, since she obviously was not the type of coed who was incorrigible. So the judiciary group asked the dean of women's office for help.

The dean of women's office helped, all right. The coed was immediately punished, and punished severely. Justice had been dealt.

Why should student groups attempt to discipline themselves if they know they will get little help from the administration?

It is true that student initiative has been very slack during the past academic year. But when student government has attempted to exercise its inherent (we feel; obviously South Building doesn't) powers of self-government, and when at the same time South Building has disagreed with the students, there has been only one answer: South Building's answer.

Magill's statement this week can and should be interpreted as an ill omen for student government. It means South Building is thinking seriously about limiting student freedom—probably, starting with the student courts.

Once South Building has control of the student courts, freedom will be a day-to-day thing.

The University of North Carolina will not be worth attending.

But while student leaders and students in general are considering Magill's policy statement, Magill and the others employed in the Division of Student Affairs might well consider what they have done in past months to meet the "crisis."

If they would perhaps encourage student initiative instead of cutting it to pieces whenever they don't agree with the students, the "crisis" might not be a crisis after all.

Until then, South Building is guilty of hypocrisy.

THE LIVELIPIKE:

The Menace Of The Video Screen And The Downfall Of Newspapers

Fred Powledge

Television, which was a baby industry not too long ago, still is.

Even worse, it appears to have hurt the American mind far more than it has helped.

When it started, it was experimental of necessity. Polls and the obnoxious rating companies often held the industry's pulse in their hands, because the companies honestly didn't know what would make a hit with the viewing public and what would go undigested.

But the television industry has had enough time since its inception to decide what is a good product and what isn't.

What is being seen now is definitely a bad product. Most of the television shows now being produced during the "good" evening hours are pure trash, seldom better than comic books.

The product consists of money giveaway shows, putrid dramas which have little plots and no acting, a few semi-decent talent shows and spectaculars which are spectacular only because of their lack of quality.

Television does not inform as it should. It satisfies wants, and most of the wants are merely sensual.

Compare The New York Daily News with The New York Times. That's the difference between what television is, in my opinion, and what it should be.

How has TV hurt the American mind?

Well, think what would happen if everybody in the United States started reading only The New York Daily News. Pretty soon, everybody would be thinking about murders, rapes, incest, gambling scandals, sordid affairs in cafe society and a smattering of the more glittering world and national news.

They would be thinking about these things because they would be deprived of information about the important things: The American government (which would be a wonderful subject for a television documentary series), other nations' governments, meetings of the caliber of the Geneva Summit Conference, tense world situations, documentary stories in pictures of the situations in our very own states.

In the last category, think of the television shows that have gone unproduced—segregation, the dust bowl, crop failures, floods, local government, municipal improvement and plain old small-town life which is, after all, at the core of America.

Instead television brings into the American home visions of pure magic—the magic of winning \$64,000, the magic of a movie star marrying a prince the magic of a hastily- and sloppily-written love story that could never happen in real life, the magic of countless hours of puns and punch lines that are bound to have an ill effect on the American mind.

Television does not cover the real human emotions, the real

human actions, that make the public recipes and shallow feature stories instead of news. They starting adding a "Daily Magazine" to their newspapers, and they shoved the news right off their front pages.

They put puzzles and circulation-building contests in place of the front-page news. And on the inside they added more columns of stories about television personalities and movie people.

The pull-out weekly television guide became a standard part of the Sunday paper. The news got smaller and smaller. It is presently continuing its shrinkage.

It is now so small that one northern newspaper (neither The Times nor The Daily News) last week had its entire front page covered with:

1. A feature story, very entertaining, about a Protestant

Publishers started offering the public recipes and shallow feature stories instead of news. They starting adding a "Daily Magazine" to their newspapers, and they shoved the news right off their front pages.

They put puzzles and circulation-building contests in place of the front-page news. And on the inside they added more columns of stories about television personalities and movie people.

The pull-out weekly television guide became a standard part of the Sunday paper. The news got smaller and smaller. It is presently continuing its shrinkage.

It is now so small that one northern newspaper (neither The Times nor The Daily News) last week had its entire front page covered with:

1. A feature story, very entertaining, about a Protestant

in-column inches (as long as a column-and-a-half in The Daily Tar Heel).

The northern newspaper just mentioned is not alone. Most of its sisters behave the same way.

Publishers are certain that they can compete with television by offering the same tripe television offers. They are spitting their own faces.

Right now, the newspapers of this country are the only organs of objective reporting of information. Radio and television and the "news" magazines are certainly not doing this job. Only the newspapers are left.

The newspapers showed a long time ago that they are capable of efficiently and objectively selecting the real, significant information from a

'We Want To Look At This Very Carefully'



ing indexes of television viewers, they started getting worried. The advertisers were pushing more of their ad budgets toward television, where a larger and more imprisoned audience could be had.

So the publishers decided to try to beat television at its own game: Entertainment. They started forgetting about information, something that television forgot altogether.

girl who posed as a Jew to see if people were prejudiced.

2. A banner headline, very sensual, about airplane crashes. With long story.

3. A story about nude women. I forget the details.

4. A huge picture of the winner of the latest Tangle-Towns puzzle.

The world news, I found, was on Page 10. It ran about 15 doub-

day's events and placing it in cold type. A few good papers still show it. But their ranks are thinning.

I have an idea that television, which is a young and flexible industry, will someday realize what is going on. If, when this time comes, the newspapers have thrown away their right to gather and publish significant news, television will have a perfect right to take over the license.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editor — FRED POWLEDGE
Managing Editor — CHARLIE SLOAN
News Editor — NANCY HILL
Business Manager — BILL BOB PLEEL
Sports Editor — LARRY CHECK

EDITORIAL STAFF — Woody Sears, Frank Crowther, Barry Winston, David Mundy, George Pfingst, Ingrid Clay, Cortland Edwards, Paul McCauley, Bobbi Smith.

NEWS STAFF — Clarke Jones, Ray Linker, Joan Moore, Pringle Pipkin, Anna Drake, Edith MacKinnon, Wally Kuralt, Mary Alys Voorhees, Graham Snyder, Billy Barnes, Neil Bass, Gary Nichols, Page Bernstein, Peg Humphrey, Phyllis Maultsby, Ben Taylor

BUSINESS STAFF — Rosa Moore, Johnny Whitaker, Dick Leavitt, Dick Sirkin.

SPORTS STAFF — Bill King, Jim Purks, Jimmy Harper, Dave Wible, Charley Howson.

Staff Photographer — Norman Kantor
Librarian — Sue Gishner

Subscription Manager — Dale Staley
Advertising Manager — Fred Katzin
Circulation Manager — Charlie Holt

Night Editor — Larry Check
Proof Reader — Manley Springs
Night News Editor — Clarke Jones

L'il Abner



Pogo



By A' Capp



By Walt Kelly



Students Taught Elders To Die

Gunnar D. Kumlien
In The Commonweal

In streams of blood and unspeakable agony something new has been born in Hungary, and is so new that it does not even have a name.

Like hundreds of other Westerners, mostly diplomats and journalists, I was caught in the midst of the fighting in Budapest and witnessed the few days of freedom, until it was submerged but not killed by a tempest of steel and fire.

Communism seems to be terrified by what it has been breeding and it is unable to kill it. The whole Eastern bloc is shaken by it and for the West it appears to be too new to be understood. But everything indicates that what has happened now in Hungary will later on be called a turning point in history.

I do not think that ever before has an uprising been more "pure" in spite of its horrors and in a way more absolute. It was not prepared and was as great a surprise for the Hungarian freedom-fighters themselves as for the rest of the world. No maternal or political interests had had time to infiltrate, in order to push the uprising in this direction or the other. It just erupted like a volcano.

For Communism the most ghastly meaning of the revolt is that precisely those who were supposed to be the new humanity, trained and formed to build up the radiant Communist world of tomorrow, the youth and the workers of the brain and of the hand, took the initiative and fought with a super human spirit although without hope.

I will never forget all those faces of high school boys and girls, with the heat of the battle reflected in them, and their smiles which were not of this world any more. It was simply imperishable beauty. They taught their elders how to die.

At the same time, it was not all senseless sacrifice, and the youngsters had a surprising sense for realities. Their great overwhelming desire, right from their first day was for bazookas. I remember them swarming around me in a backyard, where we were protected from the gunfire, pushing and asking for bazookas.

Most of these youths have no recollection of the capitalist world and therefore cannot look back to it. For them the only reality is the Communist world, which they reject with passion. They reject all of it—the study of Russian, the textbooks of Marxism-Leninism, the Marxist "reevaluation" of history, of geography, of economics, of everything.

For years they had given passive resistance to all this and now, finally, they had a chance to hit back. They were sick of the lies more than of anything else.

And when the Russians turned up, looking for "Fascists" and "white terrorists," obviously expecting an American attack from Austrian territory at any moment, these Hungarian youngsters could not even hate the Russians any more, but could only pity them.

There was something ghostlike about these Russians, prisoners of their own terminology. Don't they have an uneasy feeling of what they are heading for?

A strange thing happened when the Russians had struck for the second time and curbed the uprising. They discovered that infantry plus armor was not enough, if there were not enough inhabitants ready to act as guerrillas.

The Communists had seen the sign on the wall and those of their leaders who were not killed either did not dare to take any responsibility or were most reluctant to do so. The Russians measured the basic impotence of sheer might.

The desperate Communist attempt to stop the landslide halfway seems doomed to failure all over the satellite countries.

When the uprising had reached its peak and the Russians at first did not seem to react, many Hungarian refugees, having lived in Western Europe ever since the war, returned to Hungary. It was easy for them for the border was practically open several days.

Many of these returnees had belonged to the old ruling class of land-owners or had been owners of big industrial enterprises. But in the middle of the general chaos only two things seemed to be firm for those who made the uprising: no Communism and no return to things as they were before.

The farmers, killing off their Communist bosses as if they were animals, starting to break up the collective farms with a sort of silent fury, showed themselves at the same time hostile and even menacing to the returning big landowners or to their representatives. The farmers, too, proved to be the hard core in the passive resistance after the second Russian onslaught.

One night in Budapest just before the Russians struck for the second time, somebody knocked at the door of my hotel room. It was an engineer from Eastern Germany. It was a night full of evil forebodings for the heavy Russian tanks were moving without interruption around the center of town.

The German engineer settled down and opened his heart. He was not a Communist. In a low, even voice he told me about the plight of Eastern Germany and that the general feeling there was that "things simply cannot go on as they are now."

When he spoke about the young Hungarian fighters for freedom his eyes filled with tears.

"They and only they keep me from despairing," he said. "Did you see what dignity and pride and courage they have? What an example they are for us reasonable cowards! It is not only in Hungary that the youth is like this. It is the same in all the other satellite countries.

"Very many of us, their elders, have been crushed. Many of us could not stand it, but yielded—for the sake of our families, for the sake of bread and shelter. Our bones and our muscles were not strong enough, for we were brought up under other circumstances. But their bones and their muscles are strong enough. I can see it in my own children. And this fills me with joy and fear, a joy and fear you probably cannot even imagine."

He stopped for a while and we listened again to the sinister noises of all that steel, which sometimes made the walls tremble.