

## 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 9, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. LXIX, No. 110

## A Matter Of Choice

The lead editorial in the Raleigh Times yesterday rapped the administration here for "inviting mediocrity" by imposing a low minimum standard for fraternities under the 80 per cent rule. The gist of the argument was that the rule challenges the fraternities to the "lowest possible mediocrity" a student can maintain and still graduate.

This is all too true. The 80 per cent minimum is certainly not too high, and we do not oppose it on these grounds. We do oppose it on others.

First of all, the ruling is unfair in that it is aimed directly at the fraternities, imposing a requirement on them, as collective units, that is not imposed on the rest of the campus. Fraternity membership should be viewed in the same way as participation in any extra-curricular activity. If any academic requirement is placed on fraternities, it should be done on an individual, not a collective basis. The responsibility for maintaining a "C" average rests squarely with the student, not with the fraternity. If any member falls below a "C", then any action that is taken should be taken against him, not against an organization to which he happens to

belong.

The logical extension of the 80 per cent rule would be to place on probation any organization that fails to have 80 per cent of its membership maintain a "C".

This would mean that an organization like the UNC band, for instance, would be required to have 80 per cent of its members maintain a "C", or be deprived of the privilege to accept new members.

That proposal doesn't make very much sense; yet, it would operate on the same basic principle that spawned the 80 per cent rule now imposed on fraternities.

We have no objection to raising standards. But the standards should be individual standards — not fraternity standards, dormitory standards, or any other group standards.

The problem of maintaining standards is one of choice. If a student chooses to put so much time in fraternity activities that he fails to meet minimum grade requirements, then he has made the choice himself.

The ideal situation would be one in which the standards were set as high as reasonably possible, and the student given the responsibility of meeting them, or failing to meet them.

## The Powers Case

The Senate Armed Service Committee, the Central Intelligence Agency and the special commission headed by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman have struggled manfully to reconcile the irreconcilable. They have produced probably as much information as it is prudent to produce about the extraordinary adventure of Francis Gary Powers. They deserve credit for the pains they took to clear up his name. The unanswered questions that remain are monuments to the incompatibility of democratic notions of open conduct of government and the essential elements of espionage. Basically, the authorities, from the beginning of the case, have been caught up in such contradictions. The response of President Eisenhower, at the time of the U-2 flight, reflected this embarrassment and nothing is likely to dispel it.

We have come a long way from the time when our country had no need in peacetime for such enterprises. In 1807, Thomas Jefferson, as an ex-President, could suggest to President James Madison that we ally Spanish fears that the Pike expedition to Santa Fe was for espionage purposes by telling Spain

that "this government has never employed a spy in any case." If it was an honest assurance then, it did not long continue to be an explanation that could be used with candor.

The kind of espionage in which Francis Gary Powers engaged no doubt was a lot less embarrassing (and a lot less in conflict with old-fashioned notions of propriety) than some other kinds of espionage. His daring enterprise involved none of the duplicities and deceptions in which more conventional spies have had to engage, throughout history. Reconnaissance is morally tidier than some other types of inquiry. We have profited a great deal ethically by shifting emphasis to the camera — to "Mati Hari with a glass eye." We should be grateful for that.

Citizens who are at all sensitive will may be kept awake nights by speculation about the deeds that are done in their names. It is better that they lose their sleep than that we lose our country. The case of Francis Gary Powers came to light because his mission failed. Of other cases, involving like risks and dangers, citizens will never learn.

The Government has made an appropriate deferential bow to the right of citizens to know about operations of a kind that they never can have full knowledge about. The very frame of secrecy that inevitably surrounds such endeavors, however, imposes especial obligations on those who authorize and execute these missions. Their failures may involve not only the lives of their agents but also the fate of their country.

Since history does not disclose its alternative, we cannot say what would have happened if this U-2 overflight never had taken place. We can say for a certainty that events would have been different. We are left to wonder how different things might have been if the Paris Summit had taken place and if President Eisenhower had gone to the Soviet Union. And this wonder, on the whole, ought to transcend our wonder about the fidelity with which the U-2 pilot carried out his contract. We cannot know much more about one of these riddles than we know about the other.

Editor's Note: Junior Pete Range is currently studying at Goettingen under the UNC-Goettingen exchange program.

\*\*\*

GOETTINGEN, GERMANY — Never have I felt the weight of the world situation upon my own shoulders the way I do now after another five-day visit to Berlin. This torn city of international strife, despite the many pleasures and modern beauties of its western side, brings the feeling of tension and inhumanity indelibly into the forefront of the thinking of any visitor who really understands Berlin.

Though Berlin (West) has many outstanding attractions and unusual features to offer her visitors, you feel yourself far more drawn to the ugly Wall that Ulbricht built, thus drawing a hard, thin line between East and West, between freedom and totalitarianism, than to famous museums, castles, or restaurants.

We visited Ulbricht's "Wall of Shame" (as we call it here in Germany) in many places along its 45-kilometer length. In the southern (American) sector we climbed up on little stands and parts of the Wall itself to gaze over at the two blank-faced German Vopos ten yards away on the eastern side. They say nothing to you, nothing to one another. We know they will use their

tommy-guns on us and each other if necessary. All Vopos work in pairs, never alone. And the pairs are switched around from day-to-day so that the possibility of getting to know each other is excluded. Although the Vopos are without doubt the hardest of those few East Germans who have been convinced that communism and Ulbricht are indeed right, there is no doubt that many of them deplore the present inhuman situation. If, therefore, two Vopos got to know each other well enough to realize that both wanted to escape, there would be many more Vopos coming over the Wall to West Berlin every day. As it is more than one hundred years in the six months since the erection of The Wall.

In the middle of the sector border (British sector) stands the beautiful and impressive Brandenburg Gate, for years now the symbol worn on lapels and carried in the hearts of all Germans in their longing for a reunified Berlin and Germany.

Because on the 13th of August the Germans stormed the Russian memorial, which is guarded by Russian soldiers and lies on the western side of the Gate, the West Berlin police cannot allow Germans, only foreigners, to approach within 200 yards of the Gate on the western side. Through the large columns of his Symbol of Freedom, the Gate, the West Berliner sees the long and

beautiful boulevard, Unter den Linden, with his East Berlin brothers trapped behind an ugly wall, on the other side. Because they also realize the delicacy of the situation at the Brandenburg Gate point, the East German government built the Wall about seven feet thick here, as opposed to two feet thick everywhere else.

The most moving and cruel sight is the extension of the Wall along Bernauerstrasse in the north (French sector), where the most escape attempts and scrapes between East and West police have taken place. The border of the Soviet sector here comes exactly as far as the sidewalk, the fronts of the buildings forming the border. On the eastern side all the windows and doors have been bricked in, all the buildings within 100 yards of the border emptied of their families (in a city with an acute housing shortage). In the places where the Wall stands between buildings it is about thirty feet high, as opposed to ten everywhere else. And besides the barbed-wire on top, two-inch-square pieces of broken glass bottles have been embedded into the concrete, producing a tremendously bestial impression on the viewer.

Along the sidewalk of Bernauerstrasse stand three memorials now. They commemorate three persons among them an old woman and a

student, killed by the fall and Vopo bullets in their escape attempts. On the spot where each of them was killed stand three poles which are wrapped with barbed-wire, symbolizing the odds which they tried to surmount. Around the memorials are always a number of funeral wreaths, brought there by West Berliners (Attorney General Kennedy added one from the United States during his visit last week). In the Bernauerstrasse area especially, the West Berliners have written "KZ" on the Wall in many places, meaning "Concentration Camp." It was with an extremely grave and heavy feeling that we ended our tour of the Wall.

Adding most significantly to my feeling of compassion for the East Berliners and East Germans and the incredulity of the Ulbricht-Soviet inhumanity were my talks with East Berliners. Though the West Germans have to wait about three hours to get through the checkpoints into East Berlin, for foreigners it goes rather rapidly, although the checking police can make things just as difficult and lengthy as they feel like. Though you never lose the feeling of being in the concentration camp you are rather free to go anywhere in East Berlin. I found myself in a student's room.

We spoke about the future of the East German now. Now that the only exit route and contact with the free world has been walled up, that it. Since 1953's unsuccessful June 17th rebellion, the possibility of revolution has been out. And the hope that Ulbricht-Moscow will change their

politics is gone. "For all these years since the war I have been holding out, living the rotten life they give us over here, hoping there would be a change or an escape someday," said an East German worker who was with us. He had to leave his home town, where there is no work for him, to come to Berlin where the Wall and the heavy police population has given them all too much work. "But now I've given up hope completely, there's not a chance now," he added. "Something like this just can't go on eternally," I replied. "Sure it can," answered my friends. "As long as those monkeys ruling us have the guns and Soviet support, there's no hope for us for anything better." There was nothing I could answer. I could only sit back and silently listen as the two depressed Germans talked of their situation, giving many examples and stories of life under a corrupt and inhuman system. Never has the sadness and hopelessness of a human situation rested itself so heavily on my own heart.

Life is bad in East Berlin. Many commodities are lacking. Fear and mistrust are everywhere. You don't know if your neighbor will turn you in to the Vopos for listening to the wrong radio station or not. A student's entire university career is endangered if he misses one of the many political meetings he is required to attend each month. The suicide rate of East Berlin has climbed considerably since the Thirteenth (of August). People have no more hope. What will Ulbricht pull next? What can we do? Where will it lead?

## "Sorry, Old Boy, But Your Wife And I Feel You're Becoming An Embarrassment"



## Go Home, Little Boys

The antics of these little boys from New Hampshire who are on a hunger strike at Fort Bragg because nobody will tell them when they're supposed to get out of the Army are getting boring.

Those little boys are Army reservists. They are at Fort Bragg because the nation needs their services. If they hadn't been reservists, they wouldn't have been ordered to active duty. Most likely they were reservists in the first place so that they wouldn't have to go on active duty then and there.

Most people don't like being in the Army. About 15,000,000 Americans didn't like it a bit during World

War II, but they did their duty and most of them did it well. They didn't act like little boys who went on hunger strikes because they couldn't have their own way.

It would seem entirely proper to suggest that the Department of Defense send these little fellows back to New Hampshire as soon as possible on grounds that their continued presence in the Army surely isn't doing the defense posture of this country much, if any, good.

## Reflections

More on a detections than reflections point of view, we notice that the local merchants are stocking up on \$9.95 a piece Bausch and Lomb small size telescopes.

At first this was interpreted as anticipation of a market of nouveau astronomers due to the recent Glenn flight, but scrutiny of consumers and of the major areas represented — i.e. Everett and Stacy Men's Dormitories — led DTH researchers to another conclusion. Sportsmen in that area are fitting these scopes on guns in preparation for open season to be declared on Cobb next fall.

## 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.

## Comments On Blanchard Editorial

To the Editor:

As a member of the committee making arrangements for the visit to this campus of a group of 11 young people from the Soviet Union, to be here from the 21st to the 27th of March, I read Mr. Garry Blanchard's article about the visit in yesterday's TAR HEEL with some concern. It occurred to me that a hasty reading of the article might lead some to think that Mr. Blanchard has a hostile or negative attitude toward the visit, which I am sure is not the case. In order to contribute to a broader understanding of the matter, therefore, I would like to offer DTH readers some further facts about our visitors.

Most of the Soviets are in their late '20's or early '30's; the group includes several engineers and teachers, a journalist, an architect, and so on. Rather than being students, they are members of the rising generation of young Soviets, to whom the last war is becoming a dim memory (but let me warn you, not so dim as in this country!). In other words, these are people who, having already made a successful beginning to their careers, will in 10 or 15 years be occupying really important decision-making positions in Soviet society. It is obviously quite

important that such people have an accurate understanding of the nature of our own society — and, of course, we of theirs. It is this broad purpose that we hope the visit will serve.

Mr. Blanchard was quite right in pointing out that our Soviet guests will undoubtedly be representative of what the Soviet regime considers to be the best the USSR has to offer. A trip to America is a great plum for a Soviet citizen, especially of the younger generation, and their selection as members of this group is a sign that our visitors are being rewarded for their exemplary behavior and achievements.

I think, though, that Mr. Blanchard may have exaggerated a bit in his estimation of the probable intellectual complexion of the group. My experience with similar examples of Soviet young people, both in this country and in the USSR, leads me to expect that our Soviets will be neither fanatic ideological zealots, nor mindless robots, tonelessly mumbling the Party line. They will simply be bright, intelligent young people, very much interested in seeing how things are done here, and quite eager to listen to what we have to say about ourselves. Naturally,

much of their vocabulary on social problems will be structured in terms of the "official" line their society lays down — but after all, nobody, including ourselves, escapes this entirely.

To those of you who have a chance to meet and talk with our guests (and we hope there will be many such opportunities), may I offer this advice: in meeting the Soviet visitor, throw away most of your preconceptions, and approach him for what he is — an attractive, intelligent person who shares many thoughts and perceptions with you, but also honestly sees some important matters from a different point of view.

Don't be afraid to vigorously urge your own point of view, of course — your Soviet acquaintance expects you to do so, and will be disappointed if he suspects you of deliberately holding back from a frank expression of your opinion. And while you should speak without hesitation of shortcomings in our own society, don't start apologizing for it, either; he will almost certainly misunderstand your meaning. Just talk with your Soviet friend (especially about anything you have in common) in a friendly, good-natured way; you will be surprised to learn

how open he is, and that he is not at all as rigid and doctrinaire as you may have expected.

— JAMES W. ROBERTS

To the Editor:

Garry Blanchard's editorial in Tuesday's DTH was aptly titled "A Unique Opportunity." It uniquely represented for our own society that which it was attempting to portray for communist society. The piece began with the traditional call to holy war by raising the traditional stereotypes, and proceeded to outline a texture of further preconceptions which could only serve to frustrate any possible good that the mission of Russian graduate students to the university could accomplish. Witness the self fulfilling prophecies. We are urged to condemn the Russian leaders "who have forged a system that turns people into semi-automatons as many persons expect our guests to be." Is this Southern hospitality? It would seem to stretch the meaning of the word hospitality beyond recognition to identify a warning such as the following with it:

We know that they are really a bunch of automatons who can do nothing but reflect and ventilate

stereotypes, but let's tolerate them and listen closely. We MAY find out "what makes them tick." This is the author's hospitality. And further, "We are almost certain to be frustrated in our attempts to befriend the students." I wonder how many of us have become friends with people toward whom we were "almost certain" to become unfriendly. One could attempt to unravel other inconsistencies from this mass of unreasoned ideological projection but its final sentence sums up its themes rather well. "... we should expect to learn from them that which we are told we have most to fear from communism."

When one wishes to see what he already knows in a new situation, the odds are high that he WILL see it. No new knowledge can possibly arise. When one wishes to see what he has been told to see, it would seem that there has been no knowledge to begin with. When one thinks what he has been told to think out of fear, the result can only be perversion. The editorial, in adapting the mode of thought which it condemns, has merited its own condemnation.

JOSEPH W. LELLA  
WILLIAM L. GRAVES  
BARBARA BRADSHAW

## 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 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 to 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.