

The Daily Tar Heel

In its seventieth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the University administration or the student body.

All editorials appearing in the DAILY TAR HEEL are the individual opinions of the Editors, unless otherwise credited; they do not necessarily represent the opinions of the staff. The editors are responsible for all material printed in the DAILY TAR HEEL.

November 6, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXX, No. 40

Open Trials Mean Honor

Although it does not seem necessary for students found guilty of honor code offenses to wear a scarlet letter, a little bit of that dubious distinction which they earn by being violators of the code would seem to go a long way toward heightening their understanding of just what their actions mean and just what this ambiguous concept "student honor" means to the campus at large.

As the situation now stands, one who commits an honor council offense becomes automatically entitled to all manner of anonymity, that is, to the extent that no other student has the right to know that said individual is a violator of the code. The only people who are cognizant of a student's dishonesty are those who tried and found him guilty.

Certainly, we would not advocate the "scarlet letter," but we fail to see why the campus seems to object to having the truth known by and about every individual. Indeed, in this matter of truth, whether or not a person violates a particular code should be but a part of the total, the whole knowledge of one's person, and as such, if the whole truth were the concern, would not receive the inordinate amount of attention which we seem to place on it when it is isolated.

There are two, among other, pertinent reasons for a more "open" honor system on this campus, and these two, which we would like to present as paramount, find, understandably enough, their focal points in the concept of "purpose." That is, what is the purpose of an honor system?

Is the honor system only concerned with the cessation of student cheating, and failing that, with the punishment of student cheaters? No. But by the same token, the honor system should and does address itself to this problem. An honor system would have, ideally, no cheating; and an honor system would attempt, realistically, to curb cheating.

Well then, it would seem that if an individual were to suffer the self-acquired notoriety of being a cheater—or more to the point of "preventive honor"—if he were to labor under the threat of being known on the campus as "one who cheated," he would be less apt to cheat.

But as the system now works, if a man is found guilty, no one knows outside of the Honor Council. Well, this is a pretty big campus, and you go around quite a lot without ever running into a member of the Council,

and most of your business on campus does not concern the Council.

So, in effect, "nobody" knows that you cheat (or just once cheated), and apparently nobody cares.

But they should. For two reasons at least. First, every student should be concerned with eliminating cheating on this campus. And if this can only be accomplished by embarrassing publicly those who do cheat, well then, in search of honesty, cheaters should be embarrassed.

The second reason brings us to consideration of that same old topic, "purpose." If the honor system does not think primarily in terms of eliminating cheating through punishment of cheaters, then consider as a possible purpose for the existence of an honor system "the teaching of Honor."

Well, if we are to learn that Honor is a worthwhile ideal, and that Honor is worthy of respect, we might be most effectively taught this by seeing that dishonor will not go unnoticed, by learning that the campus as a whole is concerned with acts of cheating.

If we were to be forced, by mere truth, to realize our transgressions—to encounter more regularly, individuals who knew that we had broken the code—would we not be more sensitive to what Honor means? Would we not at least feel more strongly what it means to break an honor code? After all, it does mean something. Doesn't it?

We think so. And we believe that the student body thinks so also. That is why an "open" honor system will work on this campus. That is why we advocate open trials. (CW)

Pray For Brown

One of the lowest characters who ever crawled up out of the gutter to run for public office will put his political future on the line in California today. Without further preparation, we introduce Richard Milhous Nixon, the Almost-President, husband of mink-coated Pat, and friend of Murray Chotiner, Joe McCarthy and Checkers.

Until recently we assumed Nixon had exhausted his store of sneaky political tricks in his many previous smear-smeared campaigns. Particularly, it was difficult to imagine how the former vice-president could use his familiar Red-baiting tactics against a governor who has no part in national policy and therefore cannot be accused of appeasing the Communists.

But we understand Nixon's resourcefulness. His supporters have faked the ultimate fake—they got hold of a picture of Gov. Pat Brown bowing to a young Laotian visitor, and merged it with a picture of Premier Khrushchev. The picture then showed Nixon's opponent bowing to the Russian boss. Brilliant. Simply fantastic—so shrewd—and so dirty...

Last night Nixon was slated to go on statewide television for a last-minute appeal to the voters. He probably sat there before the television cameras, and cried a little, and told about his poor wife's cloth coat and his little dog and his daughters and ended with a plea to "Help find employment for this needy man. Sole qualifications—unscrupulous."

Those who wish to take a step back to honest and ethical politics in the United States, those who wish to be rid of the Almost-President, should pray tonight for stodgy little Pat Brown, a man who makes the rare mistake of saying what he believes and standing by it. (JC)

—Vote YES For 'Open' Trials Amendment—

"What Was All The Excitement About One More Nuclear Weapons Base?"



Letters

Dorm Raise Backed, Rightists Hit

Social Programs Must Be Larger

To the Editors:

Every resident of every men's dormitory on campus pays a social fee of 75 cents when he pays his room rent. This fee automatically goes into a dormitory social fund which is used to finance the activities of each dormitory.

It is reasonable that such a fee should exist; this is the only way to insure total participation in dorm activities so far as expense goes. It is reasonable also that this fee should be collected with the room rent; this guarantees collection of the fees.

We wonder, though, whether this fee is now fulfilling the purpose for which it was created. A few facts will help us decide. This fee was set at \$75 per resident per semester in 1949. It was probably quite adequate then, but since then costs have risen steadily. So, right now the fee, is far from adequate.

At present any dormitory—except Ehringhaus and Craige—which has one big party with a combo and all that goes with it would afterwards be bankrupt or nearly so. And one such party per semester will not suffice as a dorm's total activities program.

A dorm must have funds to participate in the Homecoming Queen Contest, the Yack Queen Contest, the UMOG Contest, the Homecoming Display Contest and the Beat Dook Parade Float Contest.

A dorm must also have funds to improve the physical conditions under which the residents live. They need table tennis equipment and other such supplies for intra-dorm competitions and individual recreation. They need a TV set which works reasonably well and which they can get repaired at their own expense if that's necessary to insure good workmanship. The present arrangement with Dollar TV leaves much to be desired.

Finally, a dorm must have funds to provide a responsibly edited newspaper which will serve as a means for communicating with residents on dormitory activities and campus issues.

And any active, spirited dormitory wants to compete in all the contests, wants the recreational facilities and wants a dorm newspaper.

But, at present costs, the social funds can support no more than a portion of these needs.

Some figures from dormitory financial accounts will add further support to our conclusion.

Last spring Joyner dorm was named winner of the Best Dorm on

Campus and was presented a cash award of \$100 for its showing. So, they had this money in addition to their usual social fund. By the end of May they had less than \$80.

At the end of the Spring Semester of 1962 six dorms had less than \$20 remaining in their social funds. Four of these dorms had less than \$10 and one had a deficit of almost \$10.

Likewise, at the end of the Spring Semester of 1961, eleven dorms had less than \$20 remaining in their social funds. Nine of these dorms had less than \$5 and two of them had deficits.

It seems, then, that present social funds are being well drained and, yet, the dorms don't have near the program they'd like to have.

Also to be considered here is the fact that the figure above included many dormitories which had 3-men rooms. This means, of course, that these dormitories had more residents and, therefore, larger social funds than is the case now that most of these 3-men rooms have been eliminated.

We pose our question: Is the present social fee fulfilling its purpose? Evidently not.

Since this is the case, it seems that these fees should be increased.

Ehringhaus has already taken a step in that direction. The entire dorm voted to have each resident contribute an extra dollar to the fund in order to have an expanded activities program.

Last spring the IDC urged increasing the fees to \$1.50 per resident per semester. This fall, they will submit the idea to the residents of the dorms in a referendum on Nov. 6.

If approved in the referendum, the increases will become effective next semester, according to William Long, dean of men. In other words, a positive vote will bring some tangible results on this issue this year.

To sum up, then, the dorm social fees should be increased and they will be—if the referendum passes.

So, vote YES in the dorm referendum today.

—Owen Bishop

Mitchener Backs Appell

To the Editors,

The Class of '64 would do well to elect Gordon Appell Class President Tuesday! Throughout this year at Carolina, Gordon has proven himself to be not only one who is 'academically' concerned with the problems of the student community, but, more importantly, he has also shown himself to be one who quickly grasps the essential 'issues' of a situation and begins promptly and willingly to

work for sound and effective solutions to student problems.

Nowhere has his ability and willingness to work been more effectively shown than in his work as IDC Representative from Joyner on the Men's Interdormitory Council, particularly as a member of the IDC Court and now as Court Clerk. Of the many problems facing Student Government, I dare say few require more time or greater effort than do those concerned with handling dormitory affairs. The competence Gordon has shown in IDC assures me that he will do a fine job for the Junior Class as its President!

—John Mitchener
IDC Pres. Asst.

Council's Scribe Urges Open Trials

To the Editors:

The so-called "open trials" bill is now before the student body in the form of a constitutional amendment. It is essentially a moderate bill which prescribes the rules under which an open trial may be conducted. The presence of TAR HEEL reporters is permitted only if the defendant so desires, and a trial is in no sense "open to the public" for casual inspection. The identity of the defendant is protected by law whether the trial is covered by TAR HEEL reporters or not.

I strongly urge the passage of this amendment; it has the endorsement of the legislature, the Men's Council, and the Women's Council.

—Whitney Durand
Scribe, Men's Council

Dick's Guttersnipe Tactics

From Greensboro Daily News

As Richard Nixon, now back home in the briar patch, faces his seventh (and maybe his last) crisis, strange things are happening—strange, even for a Nixon campaign in California.

California courts have now granted at least three restraining orders against dirty campaign literature against the incumbent Gov. Pat Brown, the "amiable Babbitt" who is Nixon's opponent.

Murray Chotiner, Nixon's old specialist at the sly innuendo, is hard at work again. This week Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Kenneth Chantry restrained from distribution a four-page anti-Brown pamphlet devised by Karl Prussion, one of Nixon's campaigners. Chotiner was nam-

Use Press As Weapon In War?

In his rash statement that "news flowing from actions taken by the government is part of weaponry" during cold war crises, Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester has raised a crucial issue in the cold war itself. Indeed, this is exactly the theory of public information—hence of political responsibility—entertained in Red Square, Moscow.

Dictatorial oligarchies, whose shenanigans could scarcely survive the searching light of a free press, always chuckle over the deference democratic officials pay to "freedom of the press."

"Why not," they argue in so many words, "do as we do—regard the press as an instrument of government policy and tune it to tell the people what we think they should know, when we think they should know it?" In short, why not use the press as a WEAPON? And so we find the assistant secretary of defense suggesting that the U. S., in effect, fight fire with fire.

Of course, American newspapers sympathize with high officials plagued by "leaks" that often debilitate carefully-planned maneuvers. For instance, if American headlines had trumpeted to the world beforehand that President Kennedy would soon quarantine Cuba, the bite would have been dulled, its surprise annulled. So the American press has traditionally recognized the occasional need for secrecy, particularly in shooting wars when the Bill of Rights would be worthless without survival.

Beginning with this latently dangerous premise, however, it is possi-

ble for government officials to reach insupportable conclusions. The Kennedy Administration's recent high-handedness with the press proves it, and one insupportable conclusion is that of Mr. Sylvester, who maintains that the flow of news in moments of crisis should be regulated, like the jet of water from a hose, so that the American press "speaks with one voice to our adversary."

Heaven forbid, in the first place, that the press should "speak in one voice" on any topic, at any time, to anyone—even an adversary. From such frightening uniformity, Mr. Sylvester, deliver us.

The truth is that the assistant defense secretary, with amiably patriotic intentions, has quite overlooked the distinction between secrecy and manipulation. The practice of the Eisenhower Administration was excessive and sometimes foolish secrecy. The more dangerous practice now urged upon us by the Kennedy Administration is manipulation.

There is a difference. Secrecy, discreetly used, is defensible—though never desirable if government is to be by consent of the governed. Manipulation—use of the press as "weaponry"—is never defensible, in any conceivable circumstances.

The fundamental right of the people to know what their elected officials are doing is not a ball of wax to be sculpted by some arrogant bureaucrat, however efficient or patriotic. This is an approach to dissemination of news, moreover, that is bound to boomerang. For the administration will find that every attempt to dupe the press, to use it as an instrument of policy, will be repaid with interest. And who knows but that such repayment will take the form of a disastrous leak in moments of crisis.

That is why Mr. Sylvester's philosophy of the press as "weaponry" is not only contrary to the traditions of a free press, it is also incredibly short-sighted.

—Greensboro Daily News

about peace by insulting our guests.

—Robert Bullard

DTH Misquoted Student On Cuba

To the Editors:

I would like to call yours and the attention of the campus to a very regrettable bit of behavior by one of your staff. I refer to the article which covered the meeting of the Di-Phi on October 23, 1962, and which appeared in the DAILY TAR HEEL on Oct. 26, 1962.

The point which I would like to make is that while the quotation did in fact say what I implied in my talk, there were words employed which I did not use, there were statements which I did not make, and there was a very important point which I did not even to imply. I am sure that you can understand my extreme frustration on this matter.

I think that is such things as this which tend to cause hostility towards the press, because it happens too often. For unluckily it does not happen often in our paper. I remain confused on exactly how it happens, but I am sure the mistakes were innocent ones.

For obvious personal reasons, I would greatly appreciate it if you would print this letter in the DAILY TAR HEEL as soon as possible.

—Joe McDonald

The pamphlet seeks to link the California Democrat Clubs to "softness on Communism" (where have we heard that before?)—then to show Brown as an enthusiast over the clubs. One pamphlet photo purports to show Governor Brown applauding the C. D. C.'s. Actually, the photo was taken of Brown as he applauded a little girl stricken with polio. For Nixon campaign purposes, the little girl was lopped off.

Another photo, as Drew Pearson reports, pretends to show Brown saluting Khrushchev in the obsequious Oriental manner. Originally, that photo was taken of Brown saluting a Laotian. The Laotian was sliced off, Khrushchev substituted.

People in more subdued parts of the country have long since come to realize that California politics excels all others of the no-holds-barred school. But there are limits. Nixon's California underground has passed those limits, and it simply defies common sense to suppose that Nixon knows nothing of the gutter literature being sent out against his opponent.

Indeed whenever Mr. Nixon has entered a campaign—with the possible exception of 1960, which he lost—the guttersnipe tactics have not been behind-hand in appearing. They are almost predictable.

This, then, is the man who sought the highest office in the land and missed it by a few-score thousand ballots. Will he never grow up?

—Vote YES For Dorm Social Fee Raise—

The Daily Tar Heel

JIM CLOFFELIER
CHUCK WRYE
Editors

Bill Hobbs — Associate Editor
Wayne King — Harry Lloyd
Managing Editors

Airt Pearce — Dow Sheppard
News Editors

Ed Dupree — Sports Editor
Curry Kirkpatrick — Asst. Spts. Ed.
Matt Weisman — Feature Editor
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 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 8, 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.