

**The Daily Tar Heel**  
72 Years of Editorial Freedom

Chapel Hill  
Site of the University  
North Carolina  
Which has  
opened its doors  
in January  
1793

Published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations, throughout the academic year by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc., 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news — 933-1012. Business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1880, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Second class postage paid at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C.,  
Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8.00 per year.

## The Air Force, Honor—And Us

Last Of Two Parts

Yesterday we examined the recent cheating eruption at the U. S. Air Force Academy in an attempt to discover some of its possible causes, including "big-time athletics" or undue academic pressures. Concluding that the blame cannot be attributed totally to either of these causes, we undertake today to approach from a more subtle direction by asking ourselves "Could it happen here?"

The answer, unfortunately, is that it could.

As with the Air Force Academy, however, a cheating uproar here probably could not be blamed successfully on specific factors, be they high-powered athletic recruiting, academic pressures or whatever. Rather, it appears that we must look far deeper to find the real source of such revolts against accepted morality—past "honor systems," grades and student pressures. We must look into the very moral heart of our society, for it is there that the answers seem to lie.

There is strong evidence that what we are now witnessing at Colorado Springs, as well as upheavals seen elsewhere in recent years, is a product of some basic attitudes of the American society with its emphasis on "cutting corners."

Almost daily the nation's headlines ring with terms such as "price-fixing" and "influence peddling."

In New York City, dozens of bystanders watch a young woman die at the hands of an assailant, but take no action because they are unwilling to "get involved."

We would rather try to fix traffic tickets than pay them, industrialists try to squeeze out competition by fair means—or foul if they can get away with it, union featherbedders do nothing and expect pay for it and our Senators take a "hands off" attitude in an investigation into corrupt government employees.

As Edward P. Morgan, ABC news commentator, observed last week, "we have become a nation of cribbers."

"We fudge on our expense accounts, our income taxes and our wives and husbands," he said. "The embarrassing fact is that for most Americans, honesty is not always or necessarily the best policy."

Like Mr. Morgan, we are not attempting to advance a blue-nosed argument to the effect that the ultimate demise of the American civilization is just around the corner. But it does seem that certain basic American attitudes are due a re-examination.

Consider, for example, the attitude taken by the parents of several now-defunct Air Force cadets. They cringed at the thought that their sons might, in some cases, have been expelled not for personal cheating, but for fail-

ing to report cheating which they had observed. "We haven't brought up our sons to be 'tattletales,'" they screamed. Then they proceeded to blast an honor system which required their sons to "snitch" on offenders.

To anyone with a true concept of a college honor system, this parental disgust is itself disgusting. Have we become so immune to the consequences of cheating that we can condone it in others even if we avoid it personally?

If so, then the Honor Code under which Carolina students have lived and worked for years is not worth the space it consumes in the Student Constitution, and we should consider it an obsolete monument to a past in which responsibility was encouraged, not frowned upon.

Our honor code is identical to that of the Air Force Academy, and it requires a slightly warped sense of values to deny that it is both equitable and practical. Parents of UNC students who feel that it is somehow improper to be intolerable of cheating here should remove their sons or daughters today, for there is little to be said for public morality which sneers at "tattletales" who report dishonesty in their midst.

In summary, then, there are indeed cracks in the system of "honor" which governs this and similar Universities. Some of the faults are specific and easily discernible, such as the constant emphasis on "grades" instead of learning, and the pressure of intercollegiate athletics which causes the frequent acceptance of marginal students.

But if the University of North Carolina is ever rocked by a cheating scandal, these obvious shortcomings will not bear the blame alone. Rather, we will have to attribute it to a degrading and embarrassing shift in public attitudes which has somehow made "honor" a dishonorable trait, and revamped the dictionary so that "quick" and "easy" have become synonymous with "right."

Finally, however, we might pause to ask ourselves one final question: why hasn't it happened here?

Of all the questions advanced so far, this one is by far the most difficult. Just last week, a Columbia University researcher showed that more than half of the students in 99 American colleges admitted cheating at some time during their undergraduate days. Yet, a survey of student and administration leaders on this campus turned up only one who thought such statistics were realistic when applied to UNC.

The answer may be, of course, that the students and administration leaders were wrong—that Carolina students cheat just as frequently as others. Yet, anyone familiar with the student judiciary at this institution probably would doubt that so much cheating could or does go undetected.

Further, the answer that Carolina students have fewer opportunities to cheat holds little water. True, a large percentage of quizzes and exams here are "essay" in nature, a factor which discourages cheating. But it is doubtful indeed that this fact alone could make this University the exception that it appears to be.

For the moment, then, this final question must go largely unanswered. Certainly we may congratulate ourselves on an unusually effective student judiciary and a usually understanding attitude on the part of faculty and administration members.

But in the end there can be no final conclusion. We can only count ourselves fortunate, rededicate ourselves to the system of honor which has stood us in good stead for so long—and proceed in the knowledge that, as Emerson noted, "It is as impossible for a man to be cheated by anyone but himself, as for a thing to be, and not to be, at the same time."

# Basketball

(Editor's Note: The following letters were written immediately after the basketball game against N. C. State here January 14. The Daily Tar Heel's printing schedule precluded publication until today.)

## Outside Help Is Needed Quickly

Editors, The Tar Heel

For ten years I have been in Chapel Hill and followed closely the athletic teams of the University. Numerous times over the past several years I have been tempted to speak up regarding our poor showings and tonight, after the game with N.C. State, I feel compelled to speak.

It seems to me that we need to give some serious consideration about seeking new leadership, especially for our football and basketball teams. Why should they be coached by men who got their job through their different, but both untimely circumstances? Isn't it time we went out and brought in some outside help? Now I know that both are "Carolina Gentlemen," but does mediocrity also have to be a criteria for our coaches. In 1957 I thought we were ready to roll and I guess we still are, but not it seems to be steadily down hill.

David R. Williams

## Let Freshmen Have Limelight

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Congratulations to the coach and his basketball team for their performance Wednesday night!

Most of the people in this area missed the Indiana and Wake Forest games so they were unable to see just how badly a team can lose its poise. Not wanting to slight the hometown fans, the team very considerably gave everyone a demonstration of just how well it can be done. For years the words "Carolina Gentleman" have been quite nebulous to me. Now the meaning is clear. How much more gracious can a team pos-

sibly be than to let another team have a ball game so a one-loss record would continue unblemished? For such gentility the team should receive special honors.

To make future home games more exciting, maybe the athletic department will let the freshmen play the second game so the hometown fans won't entirely forget what the "good old days" were really like.

The campus needs a little controversy. There is no indication that any foment is being directed toward the repeal of the gag law. However, since the team will not have a winning season, maybe they will live up what might otherwise have been a very dull spring.

William E. Novasky

## It Isn't Smith, It's His Team

Editors, The Tar Heel:

Carolina bites the dust in basketball again, and the jeers mount up against Dean Smith. Just like a seesaw, if we win, the team was great, but if we lose, Coach Smith ought to be strung up by his thumbs. Anybody could tell last night when the State game what Coach Smith should have done, because a lot of geniuses in the crowd were telling everybody. It was just as bad, or maybe even worse today (A good night's sleep seems to have helped our fifth period coaches).

Nobody can say that Vic Bubas is a bad coach or that Duke has a bad team, but our coach and team beat Duke. For teams that are in the top ten, or were when we played them, Carolina is three and one. Now second ranked Indiana is the only loss. That doesn't sound like poor coaching by Dean Smith to me.

Admittedly the team has not been up to preseason predictions, but let's make another supposition, that it's the team and not the coach that is not doing its job. The team repeatedly missed open shots and threw the ball away. The team lost that game, not the coach.

Ben Lamm

today's student?



## Letters To The Editors

### BANOV'S BLASTS

By ALAN BANOV  
DTH News Editor

Hey, wait a minute! I thought I understood this here American Association of University Professors, but their chapter at Davidson sort of confuses me.

The UNC chapter of the AAUP had convinced the Daily Tar Heel that its closed meetings here in December were in the best interests of the University. We understood that the AAUP expected to persuade a state legislators privately to abolish the Speaker Ban.

The chapter's president told this reporter that the AAUP hoped to save the legislators embarrassment by sending its recommendations through the chancellor, president and trustees. If the AAUP blasted them publicly, the politicians might retaliate by cutting Chapel Hill's funds or infringing even more upon the rights of the UNC trustees.

With such pragmatic words of wisdom calming our Irish temper, we relaxed and waited to see if the AAUP's mysterious wand would magically make the Gag Law disappear. We were still waiting to see if the General Assembly would condemn the law's evils, until Davidson surprised us. Known as the college with the South's best basketball team, Davidson also is blessed with some of its best professors.

The AAUP there urged the legislature to repeal the speaker ban and successfully persuaded the college faculty to oppose the law. Although the Presbyterian college is immune to the law's restrictions, professors there have grabbed the loose reins of the Anti-Gag Law Express.

They stated: "We feel that this law imposes unnecessary and inappropriate restrictions upon the officers of the institutions concerned, tends to discourage an open and critical discussion of current issues, and will, in the long run, prove to be extremely detrimental to the reputation and good name of North Carolina's state-supported institutions of higher learning."

Davidson's professors should be highly commended for their action. Perhaps it took courage or perhaps it took a private, church-owned institution. We hope that responsible Wake Forest and Duke professors back them up. The Baptists and Methodists can't be shown up by the Presbyterians. Maybe some "atheistic" UNC professors will join the fight.

# Suspension

Editors, The Tar Heel.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform all students of U.N.C. about the seriousness of an act I unconsciously committed and which anyone else could easily do.

On Thursday, January 7, 1965, one other student and I were given a sentence of one semester suspension because of a violation of the Honor Code—collaboration on an Economics take-home quiz. Neither of us realized at the time of the act the seriousness of it, nor did we consider the fact that it was an action detrimental to the Honor Code.

The real reason for my writing this letter now becomes evident. I know that all of us have at one time or another done something that is just as bad, if not worse. I would like to tell everyone how it has affected me, so everyone would think about how something like this could affect him or her. I want each of you to stop and think before you ever consider giving in to temptation.

Of course, I had to tell my parents. And like all parents should be, they were understanding and wanted to be of any help they possibly could. My father even took the time and effort to come to Chapel Hill to talk with the Dean of Students and find out the details of the crime and the consequences. Now comes the real factors involved in the action. I was put on a semester suspension and my parents were put to the fullest test of being embarrassed. I came home and naturally people wondered why I was home. Several people came up to me and asked, "When do your exams start?" What do I tell them?

At first I considered going to Europe or out West just to get away from the curious looks and questions. I did however, feel that this would be a form of

Name Withheld

## The Cows And The Isms

Idealism: If you have two cows, you milk them both, use all the milk you need, and have enough left for everyone else.

Socialism: If you have two cows, you keep one and give the other to your neighbor.

Communism: If you have two cows, you give them both to the Government; then the Government gives you back some milk.

Imperialism: If you have two cows, you steal somebody's bull.

Soft-pink Communism: If you have two cows, you're a capitalist.

Capitalism: If you have two cows, you sell one and buy a bull.

New Dealism: If you have two cows, the Government shoots one; you milk the other and throw part of the milk down the sink.

—The Princeton Alumni Weekly

# Berkeley And The FSM: Part II

(Last of a series)

Editors' note: This is the last in a two-part series of excerpts from a Saturday Review account of the Berkeley Free Speech Movement.

The Free-Speech Movement has been described in many ways: as a revolutionary plot and as a kind of socially conscious panty raid; as an inter-generational rebellion of son against father, and as an expression of pure youthful idealism. It is doubtless all of these and more. But whatever the multiplicity of forces at work, there seems little doubt that the central appeal to students who never before involved themselves in social or political action is found in the civil rights movement that has dramatized for an entire generation the issues of free speech and action. And the response to that appeal came from a student body of exceptional competence and sensitivity, whose members had few other places to give their allegiance.

The problems facing the university administration and Regents in handling so complex a matter are enormous. All state universities must constantly combat community and legislative pressures, and the problem is especially acute in the nation's most politically volatile state. In addition, in California the Governor sits as president of the Regents, and the Lieutenant Governor, and the speaker of the Assembly, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (an elective office) are all ex officio members.

Within the university, competing demands are equally strong. Berkeley's pre-eminent faculty was assembled, in large part, by "raiding" other campuses, and the loyalty of individual members is primarily to their discipline rather than to the institution. Therefore, if the environment at Berkeley should cease to be conducive to scholarly work, not only would the university have difficulty in enticing new men, but many already on campus could, and al-

most certainly would, listen to the blandishments of other leading institutions.

The situation is further complicated by the complex administrative structure of the university in which the lines of responsibility and authority are not always clear between the administration of the Berkeley campus (the chancellor's office) and the state-wide university administration (the president's office), which is located on the Berkeley campus. To operate effectively, the two administrations must speak with a single voice, but in the present controversy this has not always been the case—and both the image and the substance of the university have suffered.

As president of the state-wide university, Clark Kerr has emerged as principal spokesman for the administration in the current controversy. A number of commentators have pointed out the supreme irony of a situation in which he should become the focus of FSM invective. An industrial relations expert and labor mediator of national repute, he became chancellor of the Berkeley campus in 1962 and moved to the president's office in 1963. His administration during these twelve years has been one of the most liberal in the university's history. He was, for instance, instrumental in resolving the bitter loyalty oath controversy of a dozen years ago, and in 1963 was a leader in the moves to liberalize university regulations to allow Communist speakers on campus. Just last spring he received the American Association of University Professors' Alexander Meiklejohn Award in recognition of his "outstanding contributions to the cause of academic freedom."

In addition, he has analyzed more completely than anyone else the nature of the huge modern university—the multiversity—clearly foreseen its consequences, both human and institutional. In the 1963 Godkin Lectures at Harvard (later published as *The Uses of the Uni-*

versity) he forecast the student revolt against a "faculty in absence," institutional impersonality, and "a blanket" of rules that smother the individual.

Finally, he has sought, unsuccessfully, to find a means to provide small, more manageable groupings of students on Berkeley's campus. And in planning new campuses of the university—at Santa Cruz, for example—he has insisted that undergraduates be grouped in clusters of small colleges, with access to common facilities, so that they may enjoy the advantages of the multiversity without becoming lost in its mass.

Yet for all his understanding of the problem and the respect of his colleagues, President Kerr is sharply criticized for his handling of the current controversy. He is accused of understanding the problem but not the people involved. He is remote and inaccessible even to the faculty, and has virtually no contact with students.

President Kerr is criticized, too, for his concept of the role of the leader in the multiversity as essentially the mediator who seeks effective compromise among competing forces. Under ordinary circumstances the mediator—leader may successfully avoid destructive conflict and forward the welfare of the university. Under extraordinary circumstances, such as those that developed at Berkeley, it appears that a firmer, more positive role might prove more effective. But the overlapping authority of campus administration and the state-wide university administration, also based at Berkeley, may have inhibited firm, consistent action by either.

The events at Berkeley have a significance far beyond the confines of the San Francisco Bay area. What has happened there is an advanced example of the ferment on many campuses. Therefore, we should try to understand the sources of student unrest before it grows to crisis proportions.

Ten years ago there was widespread concern with the political and social apathy of the nation's college students. It was possible, then, to wish that more of them would take to heart Oliver Wendell Holmes' admonition that, "It is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time—at peril of being judged not to have lived." Today, when it seems that many students have heard Justice Holmes' message, we need not shrink from the result. A passion for social justice among the nation's youth is a prize that should be eagerly sought. But we must understand clearly that this is not the only source of ferment.

The modern university has to serve the immediate needs of contemporary society. The scholar's skills are no longer applied solely to man's past, but in very large part to humanity's future. Notable advantages have been gained by the university from its new role, but there are dangers, too, in making higher education so responsive to the importunate community. And the students, perceiving the role of the university in serving government, business, industry, and others, wonder why it should not serve their immediate needs equally.

Almost inevitably students will have a greater voice in the affairs of the university in the future. Certainly today's better prepared and more knowledgeable students should have a larger voice in determining the rules that govern them, and in other campus matters. But demands are also being made by some of the more advanced student groups for a voice in determining policy on the curriculum, in selecting faculty, and related matters. Surely these are of vital concern to students, and almost certainly their demands to be heard in relation to them will increase. Yet, just as the demands of society for research projects and other services cannot always be met without distorting the ba-

sic role and function of the university, so the immediate interests of students, which seem so urgent, may be better served by a long view of ultimate objectives. Experience in other countries—notably in South America—demonstrates clearly that a policy of allowing students a major voice in some sensitive areas of university policy can lead to academic chaos.

Therefore, university administrators, increasingly, must be careful not to confuse the demands of students that can lead to anarchy on the campus with the desire for freedom to participate freely in the great social movements of our time, and the request to contribute a responsible voice in university matters that concern them directly. These will not always be easy to distinguish—not least because the distinctions will sometimes be confused in the minds of the students themselves.

And there will be other barriers to understanding. However lofty their morals, student manners are often atrocious. The etiquette of social protest is changing; new standards of speech and action are being widely accepted. Therefore, it is doubly necessary to listen carefully to what students say, rather than to how they say it. Also, students who are passionately devoted to attacking injustice in our society are often impatient with the slow process of orderly procedure. Having learned the techniques of civil disobedience, they will sometimes employ them to seek goals for which their use is not appropriate. The objective of the university must be not only to provide an environment of freedom, but, both within the classroom and without, to instill a surer sense of responsibility.

The administrator's lot has never been an easy one, and certainly it will be ever more difficult in the years ahead. To meet the future successfully will take a large measure of firmness, sensitivity, and above all, human understanding.

## The Daily Tar Heel

Fred Seely, Hugh Stevens

Co-Editors

Mike Yopp

Managing Editor

- Associate Editor ————— Pete Wales
- Business Manager ————— Jack Harrington
- Asst. Bus. Mgr. ————— Betsy Gray
- Photo Editor ————— Jock Lauterer
- Advertising Manager ————— Woody Sobol
- Asst. Ad. Mgr. ————— Jim Peddicord
- Sports Editor ————— Larry Tarleton
- News Editor ————— Alan Banov
- Asst. Managing Editor ————— Ernie McCrary
- Night Editor ————— Fred Thomas
- Sports Reporters ————— Pete Gammons
- Pete Cross, Tom Haney, Al Kaplan
- Art Editor ————— Chip Barnard
- Intramural Reporter ————— Bill Lee