

The Daily Tar Heel

Editor Glenn Harden
 Managing Editor Bruce Melton
 Business Manager Oliver Watkins
 Business Office Manager Jim Schenck
 Society Editor Mary Nell Boddie
 Sports Editor Bill Peacock
 Subscription Manager Chase Ambler
 Associate Editors Al Perry,
 Beverly Baylor
 Feature Editor Walt Dear
 Advertising Manager Marie Costello
 News Editor David Buckner

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is published daily at the Colonial Press, Inc., except Monday's examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed \$4.00 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered \$6.00 per year and \$2.25 per quarter.

News Staff--- Thomas McDonald, Barbara Sue Tuttle, Clinton Andrews, June Pearson, Thomas Long, Virginia Hatcher, Betty Kirby, Jody Levey, Gayle Ruffin, Sandy Klostermeyer, David Rowe, Marion Benfield, Jim Oglesby, Joe Raff, Emmett Nesbit, Betty Ahern, Wood Smethurst, Truman Hon, Sue Burrell, Bill Scarborough, Barty Dunlop, Jerry Reece, David Buckner, Varty Buckalew, Punchy Grimes, Bob Wilson, Jim Nichols, Paul Barwick, Bob Pace.

Sports Staff---Zane Robbins, Ken Barton, Alva Stewart, Eddie Starnes, Buddy Northart.

Business Staff: Flossie Kerves, Wallace Pridgeh, Gerry Miller, Richard Adelshein, Frank White and Robert Drew.

Not every thing which the law allows is honorable . . . Legal Maxim

Big Bell

What we need on this campus is a good five-cent bell. And some pasteboard bell-towers for our enemy schools to practice their finger-painting on.

Something nice and cheap and unimportant, see, so we won't have to have pitched battles between the two menageries at Chapel College and Durham Institute, over something vital—like our cast-iron bell.

Comprehend? If we had some cheap replicas of the bell made up, we could pass them back and forth at every basketball game and tennis match. Then we could have a couple of extras so the juveniles on the two campuses could lie, cheat, and steal bells to their heart's content.

Not a bad idea, you know. We could have some more expensive ones (say about two bits worth) made to give to various championship champions, for instance the current winner of the Graham Memorial Championship Ping-Pong Tournament, or the intercollegiate marbles champion.

On the other hand, the poor individuals (mostly from UNC's big fraternity court) who have no other extra-curricular sports to participate in, might feel cheated if they couldn't defend the possession of Duke's victory bell and Carolina's sheep.

Besides it's so much fun to bust teeth and draw blood.

When it's over something important, that is.

Will there be a retaliation to the retaliation to the retaliation to the painting of the Bell Tower? Or will Duke students try once again to get our goat? Read tomorrow's paper for the next installment.

Letters To The Editor

Madam Editor:

In regard to "Reviews and Previews" written by your movie critic, David Alexander, in Tuesday's newspaper, we would like to suggest that you advise him not to antagonize the Daily Tar Heel's advertisers. It seems a bad policy to compare two motion pictures in the same community suggesting the patronage of one and not the other as he did in his review of "Golden Girl" and "Two Tickets To Broadway." The impression that the reader gets when reading this article is that he should most certainly not waste his money on the movie, "Golden Girl", but instead should exchange his 42 cents for a ticket at the Varsity. If ever there was a slap in the face of one of your regular advertisers this seems to be it.

And by the way, after seeing both movies, we can't see that one was so much better than the other.

Carroll Berry and
Woody Williams

Madam Editor:

It has been brought to my attention recently that the behavior and actions of our students is far from being as exemplary as it should be. I am specifically referring to the behavior of the movie-goers at the Varsity Theatre during the showing of "Lilli Marlene." We are now six years from the end of the war with

Germany, and yet we seem to be trying to relive the war. Some of the German exchange students who are our guests at the University were quite disgusted after the movie. When the American soldiers appeared, the crowd clapped. There is nothing wrong with that. People are usually proud of the soldiers who represent their country, but when the German soldiers appeared, the crowd thought it quite smart to hiss and boo. We should remember that the Germans fought first for their country, then for their families and friends, but rarely for the ideas of Hitler. Certainly Hitler was the "leader" of their country, but after seeing the plunder, rape, and slaughter of the Russians, and other invaders, the German soldier was inspired to protect his country from such other occurrences. Contrary to popular opinion Hitlerism was not popular with the citizenship of Germany.

The point I am trying to make is that the students of a country should be the elite of the country. Are hissing and booing the actions we want our guests to remember as being typical of the best in America? You may be assured that these things will stand high in their memory. Can we American students learn to control our actions, learn to think before acting, learn to stop offending? I think we should.

Don Angell

by Tommy Sumner Vitriol

There is a group of men in this country who have a certain amount of power. As are most such groups, they are striving to increase and extend this power. They, of course, deny this. It is their claim that they want only such powers as are thrust on them by the pressure of the times. However, they seem always careful to say or imply that the times are pressing now.

These men to whom I refer are the Military. Now, at the mere mention of this term, the cry goes up that this nation has no military caste, that our army is an army of civilians, that it's only purpose is to provide a defense against armed assault from without and armed rebellion from within.

When I say "the Military" I have in mind a group of men, and the limits of this group are not sharply and plainly observable, who think according to a certain pattern.

These men are molded in this way by many and varying circumstances, but the main institution dedicated to the production of such men is the armed forces. The discipline laid on the men placed voluntarily or otherwise in the service is designed to make men conform to these patterns. Anyone who doubts the effectiveness of these methods on a man subject to them for an extended period needs only to look at the difficulties of readjustment of men who spent relatively short terms under these influences, when they returned to civilian status after World War II.

A well known illustration of the methods used in applying pressure to anyone under the control of the armed forces is the case of Captain Evans of the U. S. Navy who expressed a criticism of navy policies. He lost his commission and was dismissed from the navy, not for criticizing the government but for, "failing to clear his statement through proper channels," before its publication—channels which obviously would not have allowed the statement to cleared for publication.

Anyone who is a member of the armed forces is just sort of a second class citizen anyway, especially if he is an enlisted man. Notice that term "enlisted man." It implies a man who has voluntarily assumed the status doesn't it? Quite the contrary in reality, it designates a man who has lost most of the rights and privileges which the government is designed to protect.

When a person enters the service he is immediately made subject to a code of law called the Uniform Code of Military Justice. This document bears some similarity to civil laws but is curiously arranged only for the enhancement of discipline.

A man in the service may well be faced with the task of carrying out an order given by an incompetent who holds his job through politics. This order may be stupid, unproductive, and dangerous to himself and others but he must carry it out or face a court martial.

Of course, this court will render a fair verdict. It is composed largely of and always controlled by officers who know that the maintenance of their favored position rests on the continuance of the traditional caste system under which officers are right, and only officers disagree with officers.

Riff . . . by Joe Raff

Did you hear the one about the guy who asked his girl for just one more kiss before going home, to which she asked, "What, on an empty stomach?" He then retorted, "Of course not, right where the last one was." Or did you hear about the kid who went crying to her mommy that her pop had poisoned the cat, and when asked why she carried on so, she replied, "Daddy promised I could poison it?" Then there's the one about Lulu wondering whether or not a girl in a strapless evening gown was called a "bust-truster."

There was the personal ad in the DTH to the effect: "Lassie, come home; all is forgiven. It was the wet umbrella." I heard of a Chaplain who allowed a prisoner five minutes of grace before walking the last mile. The prisoner replied, "That's not very long, but send her in anyway."

In looking through a humor magazine from another college I found that these were listed under the heading "Jokes," although at times there may arise some doubt. They may not convulse any of you far-too-few readers of mine into paroxysms of laughter, but they might start enough of a gentle titter to produce a few questions as to why Carolina is devoid of a

humor magazine. A good chuckle is a necessary part of college days, and UNC inmates are becoming chuckle-less and chuckle less as days go on.

"What this country needs is a good Tarnation," was said by a local blue boy. I agree with him. Of course, I realize I shall be knotting my own noose by the fulfillment of such a wish, and even though I've heard the phrase "no noose is good noose," I believe, at the sacrifice of losing any reader I may have (notice I use the singular), we should gain a giggle from a school publication.

Some people have said that The Daily Tar Heel is a laugh. Well, maybe it isn't, but we still need a Tarnation. Some folks get laughs from "Non-Plus" while others find themselves elated over discovering typographical errors on our pages. Some have stated that "Non-Plus" is a typographical error, but this is talk of social climbers trying to gain popularity through probing pointless tongs of criticism at others. In our vain attempts to be funny maybe we need an escape for our jabs and jibes.

There are a lot of good humorists around this campus; it's a shame their puns are restricted to lecture halls and student government rooms.

Letters To The Editor

The Maroon Case

Madam Editor:

Ever since the news-break here announced the end of the term of office of Al Kimmel as editor of the University of Chicago Maroon I've been meaning to write you some of the facts of the matter as seen by a new student here and an old student there. In the latest Tar Heels received here the Campus Scene even summarized the nationwide sympathy for Kimmel and the Maroon. So, I now take key in hand to give another view of the affair in hopes that some impressions may be changed a bit.

For several years the editorial policy of the Maroon has been very near the (Communist) party line, even on such issues of international affairs as the responsibility for the Korean War. It has followed the line that the United States was responsible for the failure to end the cold war and make a peaceful and happy world. In short, it has expressed and given vent to the views of only a small minority of the student body.

This policy has been possible because of the way the Maroon is set up. It is in the form of just another campus organization, recognized by the university, publishing largely on revenues from advertising, and choosing its own officers. It is not a part of student government, nor is it in any way responsible to the student body. The Maroon is governed only by the wishes of the staff members and the constitution of the Maroon which the staff established.

Last spring the dean of students requested that the student organization take definite steps to make the election of the edi-

tor a campus-wide matter and to establish in other ways the responsibility of the Maroon to the students. The student government, dominated by the active left, did nothing at all. In the fall, Dean Strozier finally took action. In letters to Kimmel and to Student Government, Strozier fired Kimmel and suspended publication of the paper until new elections had been conducted.

There is no doubt Dean Strozier acted in suspending and removing without the authorization of the student authorities. However, it is equally true that, Kimmel, the Maroon, and the inadequacy-in-action of the student government gave him ample provocation.

One more aspect of the situation demands comment. Petitions were circulated. In this field, both sides got to work, and all students were faced with the results of the work. One petition attacked Strozier for his attack on student rights. The other enlisted support for the dean, declaring it was about time something was done to remedy the Maroon's malady. The results: pro-Strozier, 1611; pro-Maroon, 239; this out of a student body of some 7,000.

The overall consequences of the affray show remarkably little change in the situation. Kimmel still writes and is given much play in the Maroon. Maroon editorial policy is still left of center. Students still lack control over their vocal chords, but such power may be in the offing. The University of Chicago still believes in and practices freedom for freedom's sake. All is not lost, and much may yet be gained.

Bill and Sally Mackie