

The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-ninth year of editorial freedom, unhampered 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.

March 2, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 104

A First Step

New Codification

A bill to codify procedures in the Men's and Women's Honor Councils was scheduled to be introduced in Student Legislature last night.

Although the bill incorporates only a few changes in the already existing procedures used by the Councils, it is nonetheless an important piece of legislation. Prior to this bill, no complete codification of procedures existed, making it at times difficult for defendants to know what procedural guarantees they have. Central to the bill is an article defining grounds upon which a student may move, postpone or terminate a hearing. This not only assures uniform procedure, but also provides the defendant with a written guarantee of his rights. If any of these rights can be shown to have been violated, a move for postponement must be granted until such time as errors can be corrected. The article also provides for termination of a hearing if the defendant is under jeopardy of conviction, or has been acquitted in another student government judiciary.

Also, if the council hearing the case has no jurisdiction, the defendant may terminate proceedings. This is a particularly important section in the new codification. Last year, a law student was suspended by a court which was forbidden by the Student Constitution to try his case. The section should eliminate future recurrences of such slipshod practices.

Also important is a section calling for an increase in the number of members required to hear a case from six to seven. This will eliminate the possibility of having a student suspended on the strength of only four votes. Since a two-third vote is required to suspend, the new procedure will require five out of seven votes, instead of four out of

six, which is currently the case. The bill also carries a recommendation that the number required to hear a case be raised to nine as soon as the number of council members is raised to allow for it.

In either case, the danger of error is lessened.

All the changes included in the new codification are for the best.

However, there are others that could be added—and, we hope, will be added—to improve the quality of the student judiciary.

Some of these can be included in the new codification before it is ratified by the Student Legislature. Included in these needed changes is a provision to insure that all hearings are open, with the possible stipulation that no defendant's name be used without his permission. Another is a stipulation that no student can be disciplined by any part of the student judiciary unless it can be clearly shown that his alleged infraction is in some way connected with his capacity as a UNC student. This would eliminate Council action on cases which are in no way connected with life in the academic community. The student judiciary should not act on cases involving civil infractions and which are not connected with the University.

Re-evaluation of the judiciaries with consideration for their true purpose—which is to act only in the academic area—is needed. Restricting their area of jurisdiction would be a valuable first step toward such a re-evaluation.

The new procedures bill will be a valuable aid providing firmer basis for the student judiciary.

It might also be a first step in strengthening it.

Liquor Logic

Senator Olin Johnson (D., S.C.) wants a law against serving free drinks on airliners. He says it's wrong for non-drinkers to have to

"bear the expense of distribution of free cocktails and champagne to others."

Superficially this has a logical sound, and it's bound to be applauded by drunks. But there is a flaw nevertheless.

The same thing, for instance, would under the rules of consistency apply to free meals. We have seen passengers turn them down too—particularly during what the loudspeaker sometimes mentions as a slight turbulence.

There's even a weight question. How about the thin man who carries one shirt in a linoleum brief case and the fat passenger who uses a cowhide two-suit? Except when you get into overweight, or anyhow as we've been given to understand it, airlines figure weight factors on the average rather than the individual.

Mind now, we are not holding that there aren't persuasive arguments for doing away with the free drinks. All we're saying is that when you're selling service the cost accounting isn't as simple as it might look to a Senator who's never had to sharpen a pencil and sit down to it.

—Detroit Free Press

Disarmament: What Chances?

EDITOR'S NOTE: Within the next week diplomats from 18 nations will begin gathering at Geneva in search of a less fearful formula for peace than the existing "balance of terror" between East and West. United Press International assigned a three-man team to report on the outlook for the Geneva disarmament meeting. It consisted of Stewart Hensley, chief UPI diplomatic correspondent in Washington; Henry Shapiro, UPI Moscow manager and dean of American correspondents in Russia, and K. C. Thaler, chief diplomatic correspondent in Europe. Their findings are presented in the following dispatch written by UPI's foreign editor.

performance is not necessarily a reliable guide to the future. This is especially true when the future hinges on the mercurial temperament of Nikita Khrushchev and the devious paths of Soviet diplomacy. SUMMARY It is the view of officials in Washington that Khrushchev's call for a summit meeting of the 18 nations at Geneva is tied in closely with his efforts to prevent the United States from resuming nuclear testing in the atmosphere. There is real fear in the Soviet Union that the United States may get some nuclear weapons advantage, according to Thaler's report from London. In Washington the view is that Khrushchev hopes for a summit session to put pressure on President Kennedy to dissuade him from renewed U. S. testing, but at the same time the Americans assume Khrush-

chev knows Kennedy is sincere when he says he will base his decision solely on the nation's security needs. This brings up another likely Khrushchev motive—Propaganda. "It is likely that Khrushchev is paving the way to blame the United States, and incidentally Britain, for failure of the Geneva talks to make any progress," says Hensley. "It is assumed that such propaganda, combined with attempts to stir up world reaction against resumed U.S. tests, fits into Khrushchev's plan to discredit the West." Well in advance of the Geneva meeting Khrushchev has accused Kennedy of dooming the talks before they could get started by opposing a summit meeting. Having completed its own set of nuclear tests, the Soviet Union now appears anxious to impress the world with proclamations of peaceful designs. Why is it that Khrushchev is not content with a foreign ministers' meeting at Geneva?

Shapiro, who has known Khrushchev longer than any other American correspondent, says the Soviet chief feels foreign ministers' meetings are a waste of time. "For practical purposes, he is his own foreign minister and he doubtless considers Kennedy and Macmillan as the effective foreign secretaries of their countries," Shapiro reports. "In private, and sometimes in public conversations, he has expressed impatience even with summits on a broad level and has suggested that the United States and the Soviet Union alone should solve the problems of peace. 'Who will object,' he asked me in an interview in 1957, 'if these two great countries agree on world peace?'" Sincerity Does Khrushchev really want disarmament? Shapiro believes the answer is yes—if he can get it on his own terms. The Russian premier's interest in arms cut is tied in closely with Soviet problems at home and decisions taken at the 22nd Communist Party Congress last October. The party congress adopted a grandiose 20-year economic plan to catch up and surpass the United States. On this plan Khrushchev has staked his claim to the ideological leadership of world communism. The continued arms race would retard fulfillment of the Soviet program.

ade and the interventions in Hungary and Tibet.

"Russian tactics still are seen here as designed to deprive the west of nuclear deterrent, which is considered by Britain still to be the fundamental basis of the West's defense," reports Thaler from London. "This would give Russia, with her overwhelming conventional forces, dangerous advantage over the West."

The Russia position, as outlined by Shapiro, is this: "Disarmament first and then controls."

Inspection without disarmament is espionage, the Russian contend. After disarmament is achieved—on pure faith—all countries will be open to inspection, Khrushchev has said, because then "there will be nothing to conceal."

It is obvious the West never will trust Khrushchev that far and, even if it were to do so, there still would be another barrier to disarmament. That is Communist China.

Any agreement between East and West would be useless without including Red China. And it is unlikely Red China could be persuaded, even by Khrushchev, to agree to a major disarmament plan.

Agreement At Geneva Against this background of mutual distrust, is any agreement at all possible at the Geneva conference? The answer: Not much but maybe a little.

The three UPI reporters, after adding up their findings, see it this way:

Hensley—Neither side can seriously expect a breakthrough on a broad front when the disagreement is complete on the heart of the issue—inspection. But there might be agreement on some fringe issues.

Shapiro—Since the Western powers have not irrevocably rejected Khrushchev's offer for a summit meeting it is reasonable to expect that the Russians will accept a limited agreement at Geneva to pave the way to a summit meeting later. Diplomatic opinion in Moscow holds there is better than a 50-50 chance of a summit meeting later this year.

Thaler—Prospects for success of the Geneva disarmament conference are rated low in the light of past experience and present indications. The consensus is that very little will come out of the Geneva conference in concrete terms, unless there is a reversal of the Soviet position. And that is unlikely.

One reason Kennedy and Macmillan have held out some hope of a summit meeting later this spring is that they hope this will induce some concessions from the Soviets at Geneva in order to win a top-level meeting later.



KENNEDY ... no summit yet



KHRUSHCHEV ... uncertain

Summary

Summit—The Western allies see Khrushchev's proposal for a summit meeting at Geneva as a grand stand play which might make it possible for him to turn the disarmament sessions into a propaganda circus or to blame the West for blocking disarmament by refusing to talk to him. That is why they have held out the hope for a summit session later, if the Geneva talks show a genuine Soviet willingness to negotiate.

Sincerity—Khrushchev would like disarmament if he could get it at his own price—meaning no international controls. The reason is that he needs to spend the money at home to reach Soviet production goals and raise the Russian living standard.

Barrier—The West distrusts Soviet intentions. Khrushchev refuses to accept international disarmament controls which he calls "espionage." And any real agreement on disarmament would have to include Communist China, which will not be represented at Geneva.

Agreement—Because of mutual distrust there's not much chance of a breakthrough on a broad front. There's always a chance of some give and take on side issues and a possibility of progress on some East-West issue outside of the disarmament question.

Failure—The world will continue to live under the "balance of terror" between East and West that is created by the terrorizing prospect of nuclear retaliation.

Legislature Should Stick To Campus

Can the votes of 18 representatives of the Student Legislature be interpreted as representing the opinion of the entire student body of UNC on a national issue? If it can be, then the Student Legislature has

embarked on a new form of government that is a far cry from democracy. There has been an amazing amount of warped logic and absolute bunk used to justify the legislature's passage of a nuclear test ban resolution which is to be sent to President Kennedy. There were 15 representatives who had enough respect for true democratic action to vote against the resolution, but unfortunately there were 18 who lacked this respect. Where or from whom did these 18 representatives receive the authority to vote on a non-campus issue?

Maybe they got it from the Di-Phi debating society. After all the Student Legislature evolved from the Di-Phi, and the Di-Phi is always debating on non-campus issues, so naturally the current legislature should be able to pass resolutions on non-campus issues. In other words the Student Legislature equals the Di-Phi. So why don't we change the Student Legislature into a huge Di-Phi society and have it debate on such imperative issues as the superiority of men over women, and send that along with the nuclear test ban resolution for President Kennedy's close inspection. No, these 18 representatives will have to look farther than the Di-Phi society for authority to speak out on non-campus issues.

Well, then, maybe they received their authority from the student body. After all the Student Legislature is the "one group elected to be truly representative of the student body." But representative on what issues? Is there one representative in the Legislature who honestly feels that he has been given a mandate by his voters to represent them on non-campus issues? If so, it would be interesting to hear just how such a mandate was obtained, since in the last election of representatives there was no mention of non-campus issues.

If these 18 representatives did

not receive their authority from Di-Phi or the student body, where did it come from? God? Yes, of course, that is where it came from! They received a divine message from heaven, and were ordained prophets to lead the poor, ignorant, blind student body over the rough sea of national issues into the promised land where "outstanding leaders and thinkers" can pass resolutions on any issue that happens to bug them. These prophets do not need the student body's consent. They do not need democracy. They are the chosen few, picked by a benevolent God to speak out and represent the masses. They are Nietzsche's supermen, towering above the ignorant herd in their intellectual superiority.

If the student body has a voice, let it be heard now. Do not allow yourself to be led like blind sheep by these self-appointed prophets. Do not roll over and play dead. Rumors of your death have been heard far too often lately. A petition condemning the student legislature's assumed authority in representing the student body on national issues is being circulated. Those who care in the slightest about having a democratic form of government should sign this petition. Not to sign it would be to condone oligarchy and the murder of democracy at UNC.

Isn't There Some Way To Blow The Hatch On These Things?



The Daily Tar Heel EDITORIAL STAFF WAYNE KING Editor HARRY LLOYD, HARVE HARRIS Managing Editors LLOYD LITTLE Executive News Editor JIM CLOFFELTER, BILL WUAMETT News Editors JIM WALLACE Photography Editor CHUCK MOONEY Feature Editor ED DUPREE Sports Editor CURRY KIRKPATRICK Asst. Sports Editor GARRY BLANCHARD Contributing Editor BUSINESS STAFF TIM BURNETT Business Manager MIKE MATHEWS Advertising Manager JIM EVANS Subscription Manager JIM ESKRIDGE Circulation Manager

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.