

The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-ninth year of editorial freedom, unbampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff.

February 15, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 92

Why The Silence?

Tuesday night's meeting of the Student Party appears to have been one of the most spirited and profitable gatherings in recent months.

An undertone of student resentment surrounding some aspects of the student judiciary finally came out into the open where they can be thrashed out completely with a minimum of tip-toeing, veiled statement and innuendo.

At the same time, several of the participants in the discussion, notably Honor Council spokesmen Jey Deifell and George Campbell, felt it necessary to withhold part of their presentations due to "the presence of a Daily Tar Heel reporter."

While we are aware that the two men are accustomed to functioning, for the most part, behind closed doors, we are still a bit alarmed that they feel there are things that can be said in an open party meeting that cannot be reported to the campus at large. With the possible exception of the names of specific persons involved in hearings, there is no part of Council procedure, or any other matter involving student government, that should not be made wholly known to every student who cares to be informed.

Part of the distrust of the judiciary that already exists comes from a lack of information and rumors that are neither confirmed nor denied by Council members.

For some time, the student body president, members of the Honor Council and others have been participating in an extensive program of speaking engagements, discussions and presentations designed to clarify judicial procedure. Why the hesitation to make a full presentation when statements might be quoted?

We have no idea what statements Campbell and Deifell planned to make, nor why they were withheld. We are certain, however, that no constructive effect can result from clandestine presentations made with full regard to the presence of reporters. Far too many student government representatives—and the members of the administration as well—choose to make all remarks "off the record" and keep communication at a minimum on controversial matters.

As a case in point, we now have

a report on our desk which provides statistics concerning the number of cases coming before the various councils and courts during a certain period, and their disposition.

There is nothing in the report of any major interest. All in all, it is little more than an innocuous statistical report of judicial activity. Yet, a member of the administration told us recently that "he would rather we wouldn't print it."

The fact is, we could see no reason to print it, nor did we intend to do so. We still don't—at least not until we can find something in it that's particularly enlightening.

The point is, the administration member did not want it printed. Why not? Why, too, are the Councils hesitant to have open trials or make statements for publication.

We are not suggesting that anyone has anything to hide. We don't think they have. But we are alarmed about the hesitancy to bring ticklish judicial problems out in the open sufficiently to solve them. Everything that surrounds judicial problems seems to be discussed in whispered tones, while everyone is looking the other way.

The honor system is supposed to be a student system. Its problems are student problems; this is ideally true, at least. The way things seem to be going, the system is the private property of the relatively few who are directly connected with it—at least where its deficiencies are concerned.

Many people are beginning to tire of endless platitudes, tepid homilies and overworked moralizing. It's time the judicial system was carefully discussed. And we don't mean just the bright side. Most people are well aware of that.

We'd like to know what's wrong with it. From there, some solution can be found to remedy its faults.

Why Bother?

"Nobody is going to muzzle me," Senator Strom Thurmond told the press Friday, declaring he'd spill any information about military censorship unduly sealed up by the Stennis committee.

Now, the Senator seems on past evidence to have an ample imagination. But whatever sinister hand he feels may be clapped over his not overly laconic mouth, there is no sign, present or future, that Senator Thurmond is in danger of being "muzzled."

To muzzle the Senator, though it might give everyone's ears a rest, would be an unconstitutional act. Article I, Section 6, of the U. S. Constitution says, in part, of senators and congressmen: "... For any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place." This is what is known as congressional immunity. Senator Thurmond enjoys it.

The question, perhaps, is not whether someone will muzzle Senator Thurmond but whether anyone would bother.

—Greensboro Daily News

"I Hear They Let Powers Out"



Kill Or Be Killed

To The Editor:
Norwood Pratt's well-written and factually correct article which I read with approval, has given me the excuse to point out some things that need saying.

Right now and for the next fifty or one hundred years, the free world is going to have to be quick on its feet just to survive. For the past few (15) years the United States has been acting like a punch-drunk boxer warding off blows and backing up in a circle begging for time and waiting for the bell. No one can win a fight that way.

At least three times in recorded

history, Western Civilization has had its proverbial back to the wall. All that saved it was its strong will to fight and survive—a ye - shall not - pass - while - I - live - and - I - intend - to - kill - you - before - you - can - kill - me attitude. First: the Greeks vs. the Persians. The battles of Marathon and Thermopylae. Second: Charles Martel's French vs. the Moslems; third: a handful of English long-bowmen killing a successor to Genghis Kahn somewhere in France to halt the Hords of the Tartars.

We are faced with such a situation now. Let us fight to save our life,

our property, our wives, sweethearts, parents, and children.

The Communists of Russian exterminated several million Cossacks, Russian peasants owning 10 or 15 acres of land each. If the Communists win here, there will be no saving us, no honorable defeat, only death in concentration camps by execution and starvation.

I would rather die fighting. It is better for a man to die knowing that he has personally killed several of the enemy, especially if he knows he is taking many Russians with him.

If our army surrenders, I will continue to fight and take an obscene joy in each Communist, Chinese, Russian, or home-grown American I kill. Any man or woman with an iota of patriotism or guts, or integrity will do the same.

If we manage to avert or survive a nuclear holocaust; the plagues of biological warfare; subversion, which is our greatest danger; for another hundred years or so then Norwood Pratt's predicted stall mate will probably come about.

If we do not, either the Communists will win and we will become extinct or we will win and their form of government becomes extinct. The big difference is they will kill us to the last man, woman, and child; and freedom—life as we know it—will be stifled, perhaps forever, if not for several hundred years, while we will only destroy their government if we win.

David Lobdell

Student Legislature Action This Week

Bills to clarify the order of presidential succession and to provide for the effective review of presidential appointments were both favorably passed out of the Ways and Means committee this week. Both will come to the floor of Student Legislature tonight.

Scott Summers's appointments review bill specifically calls on the Ways and Means committee to exercise the general review authority given to Legislature.

In the past legislators have rubber-stamped presidential appointments, rarely, if ever, questioning the President's decision. This bill

provides a sensible means to exercise the check on executive power.

TESTING

The nuclear testing resolution, which the Student Party endorsed 22-11 Tuesday, will probably come to the floor tonight. Opponents of the resolution will bring out the traditional arguments that for Legislature to take such a stand would be unconstitutional and invalid. Other opponents will be more honest and openly oppose the bill itself, rather than using "unconstitutional" as a smokescreen argument.

This resolution, however, is not a clear-cut proposition. There is considerable question whether students wish their legislature to pass such a resolution.

However, the issue in question is one which demands quick attention, if it is to be considered at all. Legislature is not only the "most representative body on campus," as resolution supporters claim, but the ONLY representative body on campus.

These considerations are augmented by the obvious difficulty of holding an accurate campus-wide poll one month before spring elections and by the traditional Anglo-American dependence on representation by relatively small, democratically-elected bodies. The resolution should be passed.

SCHOLARSHIP

A bill calling for a \$600 Cuban refugee scholarship was held in the Finance Committee this week. In its present form it does not deserve passage by Legislature.

"Many (refugees) are from previously well-to-do families," the bill says in defense of giving a refugee scholarship—as if this has anything to do with the problem.

"Most (refugees) are in dire financial conditions due to the loss of their properties in Cuba," the bill continues, overlooking the tremendous amount of U. S. relief given the refugees since the Castro takeover.

The question as to whether a refugee scholarship is needed at all should be considered by the Legislature.

—JIM CLOTFELTER

AL BUTLER

Real Muzzling Issue Is Ultimate Control

To the Editor:

Your vicious attack on Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina is most trivial, and the personal nature of your assault hits a new low for the DTH.

The matter of censorship of military speeches is NOT the REAL issue here, but in fact the issue is preservation of Congressional control over the military.

Mr. Robert E. Hansen, Commander-in-chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, filed a statement with the Special Preparedness Subcommittee, which contended, among other things, that "ultimate control" of the military rested in Congress, which was also a view of the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Charles Evans Hughes. To quote Mr. Hansen further, "Defense organization must facilitate at the national level the jointure of civilian judgment and direction with broad, professional military advice." How can we have "broad, professional military advice" if military leaders have their every word censored?

The Executive privilege which Pres. Kennedy used here sets a dangerous precedent in the control of Congress over the military, especially in view of the fact the recent changes in the Defense Department of an organizational nature is a trend toward the expansion of power resting in the Sec. of Defense.

The Legislative branch cannot supervise the Defense Department adequately with the usurping of its power by the Executive branch of government. The power to "raise and support armies . . . and to make rules for the government of the land

and naval forces" is specifically vested in Congress, and the will of Congress is being thwarted in this case. The Congress is having a great deal of trouble analyzing the sprawling Department of Defense at present, and obtaining frank opinions and information. Sec. McNamara's viewpoint of "loyalty down" is just another roadblock to Congress, for Congress is interested in the SOURCE of policy or grounds for importing a DEFEATIST attitude into censored military speeches.

This disguising of the REAL issue involved, and instead the smearing of a great American from a neighboring state, is typical of the stands taken by the DTH.

It is my sincere hope that in the future, the DTH can stay away from peripheral matters and the exhibition of personal wrath, and give due attention to the real issues at hand, in this case, the growing imbalance of power between the branches of government.

—ROBERT G. CLAWSON, JR.

Editor's Note: President Kennedy made it clear that his use of the Executive privilege was in no way to be interpreted as a precedent. Further, the responsibility for speech censorship is ultimately that of Secretary McNamara. Little could have been gained and much could have been lost by Thurmond's inference that individual censors, acting under orders, should be held responsible.

The Executive privilege, used indiscriminately, could be extremely dangerous. However, as a block to what could become witch-hunting—as it was in this case—it was wisely used.

Reader Hits Student Apathy Toward Politics, Religion

Dear Editor:

I am rather concerned about the general apathy on this campus. I have never seen things so dull anywhere. Supposedly a campus which does not preoccupy itself with topics such as politics or religion usually builds up to an avid interest in some other subject, such as sex.

To be sure, there is a tiny undercurrent of political feeling, but there is no tie-in with the major part of the student body. There can be no controversy on this campus because most students will not associate themselves with any particular view or opinion. I said the other alternative would be something like sex or liquor. It seems, however, that there is only a mild interest in either of these. Everyone is afraid of being "caught."

To use a banal expression, what this campus needs are a few vociferous individuals with half-decent ideas to stand up in public and speak their minds.

This could be done by use of soapboxes almost anywhere, or better yet in a public auditorium. For in-

stance, a place such as Gerrard Hall or some rather large classroom-auditorium could be opened in the evening for any student or group of students who wanted merely to stand up and expand their beliefs or challenge each other to debates. Students would be responsible for their own publicity and other such matters. Let's have some enterprise on this campus.

—ROBERT BALLARD

About Letters

The Daily Tar Heel invites readers to use it for expressions of opinion on current topics regardless of viewpoint. Letters must be signed, contain a verifiable address, and be free of libelous material.

Brevity and legibility increase the chance of publication. Lengthy letters may be edited or omitted. Absolutely none will be returned.



"It is our considered opinion that you are innocent . . . however, the administration thinks you are guilty, and since this is a student system, you must be guilty . . ."

—Cartoon by Mothers

The Daily Tar Heel

EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING.....Editor
HARVE HARRIS.....Managing Editor
LLOYD LITTLE.....Executive News Editor
JIM CLOTFELTER, BILL WUAMETT.....News Editors
JIM WALLACE.....Photography Editor
CHUCK MOONEY.....Feature Editor
ED DUFREE.....Sports Editor
CURRY KIRKPATRICK.....Asst. Sports Editor
GARRY BLANCHARD.....Contributing Editor

BUSINESS STAFF

TIM BURNETT.....Business Manager
MIKE MATHERS.....Advertising Manager
JIM EVANS.....Subscription Manager
JIM ESKRIDGE.....Circulation Manager

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester, \$8 per year.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of the News Bureau of the University of North Carolina. Published by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.