

## 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.

October 2, 1962

Tel. 942-2356

Vol. XLX, No. 11

## Honesty

Honesty . . . It means that you are leveling with people, telling the truth, not hiding anything. It means that you are open and above board. Consequently, people do not think of honesty in hiding, or honesty behind closed doors. Honesty-and-openness" it's a simultaneous implication, a simultaneous expression.

But that has not always been the case with honesty at this University. The student honor system, which is supposedly based on Honesty, has long conducted its trials in secret, behind closed doors. The "openness" has long been missing.

Today, finally, someone from the Honor Council has had the insight to see this and the courage to say so and the gumption to try to change it. Men's Council Chairman Walter Dellinger's statement in favor of open trials is a refreshing development in light of traditional antagonism surrounding past recommendations of this nature, recommendations which have previously had to come from outside the Council itself.

Yet even now, many will oppose all efforts to open the trials to reporters from the TAR HEEL. Most of these persons will be sincere in their belief that the present "closed" system best protects student defendants. But in spite of their sincerity, we feel that they will be wrong. But their arguments are wrong in their promise and harmful in their present execution.

It is often argued that if trials are opened, rumors about the defendants would spread rapidly. On the contrary, the best protection from rumor in every instance and for all time is Truth. Truth about a defendant, about his case, and about the actions of the Council members.

The reporters would report the case fully, with the exception of the names of the defendants, which would be used only when the defendants gave permission. The reporters would be on their honor (as are members of the Attorney General's staff) not to reveal defendant names.

The proposed opening, then, is very much in keeping with one of the basic concerns of the Honor Council trials—protection of the defendant in every way possible. The tradition of protection will be nur-

tured and strengthened if this proposal is adopted.

And there is yet another concern, the concern for the protection of the rights of all students, whether they are defendants or not. This concern—this tradition—too, will be made more healthy by the opening of trials.

For them every student would have access to full and accurate information about the trials. He would be able to see that Honor Council offences do occur, to see how the Council deals with them, and to see how the "judges" he elected are performing their duties. This information, like all information, is protection—protection from rumor that springs from the unknown.

With this information, students can more honestly and intelligently evaluate their system. Students will know that a person tried for a particular offense received "such-and-such" a sentence. They will know if the Council is administering one brand of justice to some students and a varying brand to others.

These are but a few of the advantages. Chairman Dellinger's statement goes further. It is a well-stated document, one which will be of importance to every student, one which should become familiar to every student.

For open trials will not be just a matter of course. The benefits of open trials will not automatically fall into place just because it is said that they should.

The student body will decide. You will decide if there will be open trials. You will decide on the value of open trials.

Chairman Dellinger hopes to get the student legislature to adopt the proposal as a constitutional amendment to be placed before the students on the fall ballot. The fate of the proposal will be decided with a campus-wide referendum. The decision is yours.

If the campaign for this proposal is handled like so many student government and student political campaigns have previously been run, it will fail. And it should not fail.

But if petty student politicians treat this matter as they treat too many other matters, it will inevitably fail. Only a concerned, informed, and questioning student body can prevent this failure.

This is a proposal which could and should raise the level of debate in the coming fall elections. This is an issue which could alter the nature of this campus; it is an issue which has been with us for years, an issue which none should take lightly.

We must consider this proposal seriously, we must ask serious questions and demand serious answers.

If we do this, then all stand to benefit, even if the proposal is defeated.

However, an enlightened and concerned student body will not defeat this proposal, but rather, will demand and dictate that "Honesty-and-Openness" be a simultaneous and continuous state of affairs.

Bill Hobbs  
Chuck Wrye

## "But Cheer Up—We Hope Soon To Develop The Bomb Which Will Enable Us To Start A Nuclear War"



Jim Reston

## Honor System Failure Lies With Faculty Quiz Practices

(Editors' Note: The author of this column, Jim Reston, is a senior who has just returned to UNC after a year's study abroad.)

It's somewhat disheartening to return to Carolina to find that we are still at the same place as we always were with our honor system problems. The Tar Heel as in every year in the past is indulging in tiresome quips about the Honor Council and its legitimacy as a qualified body. Likewise, during orientation, honor council members were engaging in their normal activity of pontificating to the incoming freshmen on the "promise of Carolina" or more specifically, on their responsibility as a member of the Carolina community. Yes, these early signs seem to indicate that it will be a normal, unfruitful year in the discussion of the problem.

And, yet it is easy to see why this debate takes place every year. The honor system simply does not work in the way that concerned students would like it to. It is grievously clear to any student with his eyes open that cheating goes on here, perhaps in greater proportions than we realize, and that the honor code is in actuality no deterrent whatever, either in its positive or negative aspects. The code is a terribly idealistic document, which one can admire for the grandness of its intention, but criticize for its assessment of the facts.

The hope for its effectiveness really rests on its negative aspect: that a student is on his honor to report any student who he sees committing an honor code offense. It seems pretty well accepted that a student who is susceptible to cheating will do so, regardless of the system under which he is taking the examination. Hence, at Carolina, the only hope of catching him rests on the shoulders of his fellow students who see him.

## Reflections

This may be difficult for those people who knew him to believe, but Frank Crowther (UNC grad of '60 and Tar Heel associate editor) has been named Special Asst. to the Governor of Maryland, a job which supposedly has mild-mannered, responsible-type duties. Much too much.

From the Charlotte Observer:

Note to Mississippi: The University of Georgia has just awarded the first degree in its history to a Negro—a woman who got her master's diploma in music education.

But there can be no doubt that to turn a fellow student in, whether friend or unknown, requires an abnormal degree of character, a measure which even the finest at Carolina rarely have. And if those who even come to bother about the morals of their position vis-a-vis the honor system cannot comply 100%, what about the majority who don't give a damn. After all, this is a state university whose standards for admission on an academic basis are low enough, much less on a moral basis.

However, one can not help but sympathize with the arguments of the honor council, for all they really need ask is "What is the alternative?" The opponents are forced inevitably to answer with some reluctance and no large degree of conviction: the proctor system, and as can be expected the honor council can dispense with this argument in short order. For the proctor system is even less of a plausible deterrent to cheating. As has often been said, it turns the whole business into a game of cops and robbers between the proctors and the would-be cheaters, it removes the deterring thought that there might just be a student sitting in the vicinity, who is principled enough to make the effort of reporting the offender, and what is most objectionable of all, it completely eliminates the element of personal honor from the examination scene.

It is at this deadlocked point that discussion has stagnated. We have an idealistic, impractical honor system under which cheating continues unchecked, and the only alternative that has been offered is indescribably worse.

But this is not a problem without a solution, and it is time that we broke away from thinking that it is insoluble.

The group that is responsible for this impasse is not the students, but

the faculty. The only solution to this problem is the elimination of its source. It is the faculty that is responsible for providing the temptation to cheat in the first place. It is they who make up the standardized quizzes (multiple choice, true-false, fill in the blanks, etc.) and then make the whole grade in the course dependent on these quizzes. What do they expect the reaction of the less intelligent, less diligent, and less moral of our fellow students to be? The faculty should come to realize that any question which has one pat answer is immediate bait for a possible cheater.

The answer to this problem of cheating at Carolina is to revert wherever possible to the essay form answer. This is probably the best form of examination question anyway. It tests far better whether a student has acquired a grasp of the material and the techniques, that ideally the professor has taught. Furthermore, it provides more opportunity for the student to write—something that is not nearly enough encouraged here.

Obviously, some courses are not of a nature which would permit this type of questioning. In most of the beginning science courses where there are as many as one or two hundred students, such exams would be unwieldy (although there is no reason why a few short essay questions could not be used). In elementary language courses, where the quizzes consist of questions on vocabulary and syntax, essay questions are not possible.

In these situations, solution is also possible, although it would require a little more effort on the part of the professor. In large classes where the professor feels it necessary to use true-false or multiple choice questions, let him make out two or three different answer sheets, and then let him shuffle them up, and then let him announce the situation to the class. From an exasperated, sweating student is not liable to copy the answer of his neighbor at length, if he knows the chances of his neighbor having the same answer sheet are 1 to 3 (to say nothing of what the chances are of his neighbor even having the right answer anyway). Moreover, the cheater would also be aware that if the neighbor did have a different answer sheet, the chances of him being caught would be about 90%. That would be enough to make even the most hardened of cheaters stop and think. And there must be other such methods, which doubtless the PhD's can think up.

In the future let us not hear cries of exasperation from the faculty about the amount of cheating going on at Carolina. Let us not hear threats from the faculty to disband the honor council and eliminate the honor system. Let's take the heat off the body and the system which has done the best with the problem given to it, and put the heat on the group that is responsible for the problem initially.

## FROM STUDENT PAPERS:

## Comments About 'Ole Miss' Crisis

(Editor's Note: Following are excerpts from the views of two student newspapers on the integration crisis at the University of Mississippi. The papers were chosen to represent varying points of view.)

(From the 'Missippian,' student newspaper of the University of Mississippi, editorials by Sidna Brower, Editor.)

The Jackson (Miss.) Daily News printed an editorial on the front page of the Wednesday afternoon edition giving "a notice of special importance to the people of Mississippi at this time."

The editorial reminded the citizens of the state that although some newspapermen are extremely fair in reporting facts, there are some out of state correspondents who deal in presenting slanderous stories to the public.

"Unfortunately, some of them have never read the truth of Mississippi but have taken those radical 'reign of terror' propaganda releases issued by questionable organizations to embarrass the nation in the eyes of the world and to use Mississippi as the guinea pig symbol of racism for propaganda purposes."

The editorial went on to say, "If they are here to report factual information, they are entitled to do so."

We, at this time, would inquire if the editors of the Jackson Daily News have been reading their own paper this week. And if so, where did they acquire their "factual" information?

It seems that the majority of newspapers in the area, many of these out of state, have been somewhat more conservative in reporting the facts and views on the campus situation than some of the state's now newspapers.

The Daily News has truly followed the final words of the editorial—"let the verbs and adjectives flow!"—in their screaming headlines and sensationalized stories.

Although approximately 50 reporters from various newspapers and magazines over the nation have registered at the press room set up in the Lyceum, the Daily News has no registered representative on campus nor do its stories carry bylines. Again we ask, where are they getting their facts?

Perhaps the Jackson Daily News should reread their editorial and stories and "practice what they preach."

(from the Thursday, Sept. 29 Mississippian)

(Another editorial, from the Mississippian of September 21, read:)

We want to commend the students of the University of Mississippi for the mature behavior displayed during the past few weeks. The state and the University were at a point of crisis, and with the exception of a few "rabble rousing" students,

there were no demonstrations or loud outbursts of adverse opinions.

Thursday afternoon when a few students attempted to take the American flag down and replace it with a Confederate flag, the alertness and leadership of Ole Miss students immediately became evident.

The students of Ole Miss showed intelligent logic and reasoning in most of their actions. We are proud to be a part of this group.

(From an editorial by Carolyn Winter and Martha MacNeal in "The Michigan Daily," the student paper of the University of Michigan on September 26.)

It must not be forgotten that Barnett and the school board are not going against the will of their constituency, but are the personifications of the people they represent. If Barnett and the school board were jailed, the people who would be elected to replace them would hold the same views.

This does not eradicate the blame, but spreads it. The problem of blame is moral, legal and sociological. Morally, guilt lies with all Americans who believe that the color of a man's skin is sufficient cause to deny him the right to public education. It lies with every member of the jeering crowd and equally with every integrationist who would keep silent. Sociologically, the guilt goes back hundreds of years, embracing economics, religion, politics, and psychology. Legality enters the picture when it becomes necessary that a symbol be chosen to identify this vague, misty, ugly human condition, so that something may be done. Justice requires that the human symbol must not be chosen arbitrarily.

There are undoubtedly thousands of Southerners who heartily echo Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett's vicious innuendo against Meredith. The real problem lies with each and every one of them, for they are all guilty of Barnett's vow "There is no case in history where the Caucasian race has survived social integration. We will not drink from the cup of genocide." But Governor Barnett has furnished the courts of Federal law with an ideal, self-proclaimed symbol of a society's mass guilt—himself.

Law cannot immediately deal with the blatant guilt of thousands of people. The legal system must punish all in one man, and let him stand as a symbol of outraged justice, to proclaim to all who follow him the irrevocable end of a vicious way of life. We cannot jail the mail, into their list of social ideals.

Governor Barnett has volunteered to go to jail to defend the so-called principles of white supremacy. Let him stand by his word. May other segregationists watch and be warned.

## Letters To The Editors

The Daily Tar Heel solicits and is happy to print any letters-to-the-editor written by a member of the University community, as long as it is free of slanderous and libelous remarks. No letters will be edited in any way, unless they are unreasonably long. Letters should be typewritten, if possible, and triple-spaced. DTH editorial offices are on second floor, Graham Memorial. Edit page material should be turned in two-to-three days before publication is desired.

a vehicle for learning to clash with other ideas in an orderly and civilized fashion. Y. C. Hio Teshima, last year's N.S.A. Foreign Exchange Student, said that the U.N.C. Debate Squad was very impressive, because it was more interested in the form and procedure than in the actual ideas, the topic under discussion.

—W. ROBERT BULLARD

## North Carolina Making History

To the Editors:

With reference to your editorial of September 27 ("Ignorance"),

Yes, ignorance totally prevails in such states as Mississippi and Alabama etc. (omission of capital letter intended). No intelligent educated person will willingly live in those parts of the South.

I have but one example in my own experience of this: i.e. The Chemstrand Research Corp. moved its labs from Decatur, Ala. to North Carolina. The main reason being that people, of the caliber necessary to do research, could not be convinced to live in the South.

Let me here point out that North Carolina stands as the shining example of progressiveness to the South, to the whole land, in fact. The Durham, Raleigh, Chapel Hill triangle is now one of the fastest growing centers of intelligent people in the world. I might suggest that this is partly due to the fact that people like to be where history is being made, and that they realize that in North Carolina steps are being taken that need to be taken all over the nation, and not just in the South. This is history and we are making it.

THOMAS H. LINDENMEYER

## Debate Purpose Not Training

To the Editors:

If Dr. Springden's interpretation of the purpose of debate is representative of the campus, then debating at Carolina is indeed dead. From Dr. Springden's letter understand that he believes the debate is useful training for future public speaking. To be sure it is very nice to be able to present a carefully prepared speech favoring either side of a given issue. It is nice to travel about and engage in contests with other schools. It is also nice to invite well-known debate squads from other schools to our campus. But nice is all it is.

Debate is not a training aid for learning to give orderly, and carefully prepared speeches. Debate is argument in a civilized fashion. The Di-Phi has as its main function the exchange of ideas. It is nice to be able to give a good speech for the side of a question you are personally against. But the training is worthless. The purpose of talking about an issue is to convince others of our own views. Debate should be (and is in the Di-Phi)

## The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOTFELTER  
CHUCK WRYE

Editors

Bill Hobbs — Associate Editor  
Wayne King — Harry Lloyd  
Managing Editors  
Bill Waunnett — News Editor  
Ed Dupree — Sports Editor  
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. Ed.  
Chris Farran — Matt Weisman  
Feature Editors

Harry DeLung — Night Editor  
Jim Wallace — Photography Editor  
Mike Robinson — Gary Blanchard  
Contributing Editors

DAVE MORGAN  
Business Manager

Gary Dalton — Advertising Mgr.  
John Evans — Circulation Mgr.  
Dave Wysong — Subscription Mgr.

The Daily Tar Heel is published daily except on 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.