

# The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of the Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. Letters and columns, covering a wide range of views, reflect the personal opinions of their authors.  
ERNE MCCRARY, EDITOR  
JACK HARRINGTON, BUSINESS MANAGER

## Musta Been A Real Party

There's nothing new about a social fraternity catching hell for being too social.

But we certainly have to give credit to Sigma Nu at the University of Texas in Austin for originality.

The city said the fraternity owed \$2,300 in back taxes. The fellows said they thought they should be tax exempt.

But the city won — by threatening to make public some photographs made at a Sigma Nu toga party. Obviously there had been some tuggin' at the togas during the festivities because the fraternity paid up.

As Austin lawyer and Sigma Nu alumnus John Cofer said, the pictures were enough to "prejudice me against my own fraternity."

The injustice of it all is at least partially offset by the grounds under which the fraternity claimed tax exemption.

For this, we give these Sigma Nus the Originality Award. They said, "We shouldn't have to pay taxes because we have a study hall, a swimming pool (to maintain our physical fitness) and we have a Bible class."

## Good Old Discrimination

One of the rankest examples of flat-out discrimination has come to light in Rockingham County.

It happened Thursday night in Wentworth at a meeting of the county Good Neighbor Council, of all places.

David S. Coltrane, head of the North Carolina Good Neighbor Council, attended the meeting — and so did a dozen picketers who were demanding representation on the council. They claimed no representative from their group had been asked to participate.

The sheriff met the protesters and suggested they submit a list of members to the council to be considered.

Such a display of courtesy can hardly undo this brazen affront to that noble organization, the Ku Klux Klan.

Maybe there's something to be said for discrimination after all.

## Those Theatrical Politicians

Whatever happened to the good old days when all a movie star was expected to do was flash his smile across the big screen?

It seems that famous folks just aren't satisfied anymore by the glittering marquee — they've decided to branch out — into politics, of all things.

In industry, they'd call it "diversification," but when the stars begin turning in their make-up kits for the speaker's platform, it's time to raise some doubts.

Two of the most conspicuous theatrical politicians are George Murphy and Ronald Reagan.

Murphy, a freshman Republican senator from California, defeated former Kennedy press secretary Pierre Salinger for the job. Actually Salinger never had a chance. He just couldn't compete with Murphy's potent campaign publicity weapon — the late night movies on television.

Reagan is another Californian, who would rather be governor of the state than have a new television series. An outspoken conservative, he's trying to take the stage as the Republican gubernatorial nominee.

Actor Gary Merrill, 48-year-old former husband of Bette Davis, announced a few days ago that he will run for the Maine House of Representatives as a Democrat next year. Why is he running? He's "always been interested in politics."

Back in Hollywood, there are strong indications that Steve Allen will run for the House of Representatives seat being left by Democrat James Roosevelt.

Television star Dan Blocker, "Bonanza's" big "Hoss," isn't making any secrets about his desire to play a role in government for a while.

The list continues, but the point should already be made.

All these naive, inexperienced box-office types are just going to ruin that dirty old art of politics.

If worse comes to worse and more of them get elected, there will have to be some sort of retaliation.

We can just see it now.

Everett Dirksen singing "I Used To Be With The In Crowd," accompanied by Lyndon's Longhaired Five.

# The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

The Daily Tar Heel is the official news publication of the University of North Carolina and is published by students daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations.

Ernie McCrary, editor; John Jennrich, associate editor; Kerry Sipe, managing editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Jack Harrington, business manager; Woody Sobol, advertising manager.

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all ap news dispatches.

## "I Wonder If This Means We're Gonna Have A Housemother?"



(Carolina Comment will appear from time to time whenever there is a single campus issue which is the subject of editorial comment by several of the North Carolina news media. Guest editorials from state newspapers will continue to be printed occasionally in the DTH editorial column. With regard to the Dickson case, many North Carolina newspapers have carried news stories. As of Friday evening when the DTH edit page went to the printer, two newspapers and WRAL-TV had written editorials on the subject.)

RALEIGH TIMES

One factor overlooked in the general uproar over the fact that the president of the Carolina student body has an honor council conviction on his record is the double standard which seems to have been applied in this case.

The male student, Paul Dickson, was given an official reprimand by the male student government honor council on a charge of visiting a fraternity house with a coed during unauthorized visiting hours. The girl in the case was tried by the woman's honor council and was suspended from Carolina. The incident occurred during the summer session.

Without having access to the full testimony in the cases, it would seem reasonable to assume that since the two made the visit together to the same fraternity house at the same unauthorized time, that the punishment should be identical. If the male student deserved only an official reprimand and was allowed to remain in school, the coed deserved that and no more. And just as surely, if the coed deserved suspension from school, so did the male student.

People who have been students at Carolina in recent years say that such a double standard of student-administered justice isn't unusual. The woman's honor council, they say, traditionally hands out much rougher punishment than does the men's honor council. The prevailing opinion, they feel, has been that it is up to the coed to draw the line and to make the line stick, and that if she doesn't do so, she merits the tougher punishment.

This is a dreadful way to administer justice. Two persons who participate equally in any transgression of any law are equally guilty and should receive equal punishment. In fact, they should be tried by the same court, not by separate courts.

It may be that the woman's honor council has been too tough, though there are those who feel that some tough discipline toughly administered might not be out of place on many of today's campuses. And, it may well be that the men's honor council has been too lenient in its seeming leanings toward slaps on the wrist for the men.

Be that as it may, it would seem that the time is long past for the Chapel Hill administration to not only take a long look at this situation, but to straighten it out.

### THE NEWS OF ORANGE COUNTY

The hassle among the students of the University campus in Chapel Hill as to whether the President of the student body should resign is not just a "little" matter of concern only to the students themselves.

At this crucial time in the 176-year history of the oldest state University it is a statewide concern. And it is of especial concern to the citizens of the University community.

University Student Body President Paul Dickson was recently convicted in a student court of violating the Carolina Code by illegally taking a woman student into a fraternity house. Dickson does not deny his guilt. The penalty administered in this case

was a formal reprimand, which was attached to her permanent record as a University student.

Because of his being guilty of conduct unbecoming the elected leader of 12,000 students at the University, a number of his fellow student leaders formally asked him to resign his post. Dickson refused, and apparently has his mind finally made up. However, a formal recall election may be held, in keeping with preparations initiated late last week by petition of a good number of Dickson's fellow students.

The issue was unfortunately clouded when the University administration, realizing the significance of the situation, issued an ultimatum to Dickson to resign. This usurping of student authority was subsequently rescinded by the administration. But its shadow remains, so that this young man is in some quarters now depicted and admired as a chap who has stood up to and understandably challenged the administration's ill-considered action.

Indeed there are no doubt some students who even have admiration for a fellow who can keep a girl out all night and "get away with it." (The News does not believe that Dickson himself harbors this notion.)

So the issue is admittedly complicated. But there are still some simple maxims applicable to it. There is a well-established law which strips the legal citizenship of a person convicted of a felony. By the same logic a student leader who has been found guilty of breaking specific moral laws imposed and administered by his fellow students has paid his penalty for this offense. But Dickson is more than a "citizen." As an elected leader he must be concerned with the effectiveness of his personal administration.

It is obvious that his effectiveness is going to be seriously impaired by the understandable lack of faith that his fellow students now have in him as their leader. Furthermore, in obstinately refusing to step down because he does not legally have to do so at this time, Dickson is harming the status of the University across the state.

The fallacious notion is cast abroad that Chapel Hill is full of communists, beatniks, dope addicts, and irresponsible youngsters who must be protected from alien ideologies by a Gag Law.

By his personal example of stubborn refusal to humbly relinquish the office he cannot now fill as it should be filled, Dickson tends to give substance to otherwise false concerns about "what's going on down there at Chapel Hill." He further endangers the absolutely necessary continuance of freedom of inquiry and freely-elected student self-government. And finally, he does himself no honor as a Carolina gentleman.

When he does resign he will be a far bigger and better man than he now is in his mis-guided self-righteous action. And in exhibiting a true sense of humility by resigning he will prove that he does indeed have qualities of leadership — a quality he is not now exhibiting.

R. G.

### WRAL-TV

No useful purpose would be served by either moralizing or sermonizing in connection with the conduct of a young couple involved in a regrettable incident now the subject of controversy at Chapel Hill. And we suppose that polite laughter may seem, to some, the best medicine for squirming University officials who apparently lack the imagination to deal with a young man who, these very officials have declared, is "unsuited" to continue as president of the student body at Chapel Hill.

The picture is blurred with a number of remarkably intriguing contradictions. It began several weeks ago, during the Sum-

## Letters To The Editor

### Judiciary Clears The Air

Editor, the Daily Tar Heel:

The student judiciary of our University has, of late, been in hot water. Even though it commands a long history of respect and effectiveness, these qualities are now being overlooked due to certain popular misconceptions. First of all, the mock trial presented by the Women's Honor Council during freshmen orientation was "harsh, unfair"; therefore one logically concludes, all student courts are conducted in similar fashion. In my opinion, this trial was not typical. It was planned in poor taste, purporting to emphasize the Honor System while, in effect, doing injury because of its false image. Secondly, legislative leaders have proposed numerous judicial reforms, many of which will strengthen the court system; meanwhile, students believe that the judiciary, as it presently stands without these reforms, is violating their rights. Such beliefs are wholly in error. And thirdly, the recent Paul Dickson issue has brought many attacks upon our Honor System. I would like to point these out in some detail and hopefully bring to light their superficial nature.

In a letter to The Daily Tar Heel on September 24, William Rogers made it clear that Paul Dickson received a light sentence and instead, because of the sentence given his accomplice, should have been suspended; that Dickson, because he is president of the student body, did not have an ordinary trial; that Dickson was guilty of a "campus honor code" violation; and furthermore, that "supposing he did receive the same consideration that

anyone else would have received, never again should a student at Carolina be suspended for taking a co-ed off-limits."

As a member of the Men's Honor Council and as one who heard all testimony presented in Dickson's trial, I can emphatically deny all of Rogers' conclusions about the "partiality" of the trial and his erroneous concepts about our judicial structure.

First of all, Dickson was in no way charged with an Honor Code offense. The charge consisted of a two-count violation of the Campus Code, both counts dealing with aiding a co-ed break women's rules. (Because of extenuating circumstances Dickson was found not guilty of the first count that he assisted the girl to stay out after curfew. On the second count — that he helped her enter a closed fraternity house — Dickson received a verdict of guilty and a sentence of official reprimand.) It is important to realize the difference in the two codes, for the Honor Code refers to a student's personal honor and integrity, whereas the Campus Code considers ungentlemanly or unladylike behavior.

One of the most damaging statements made by Rogers concerns the supposed partiality accorded President Dickson. Admittedly, the Council cannot completely dissociate the accused and his position when a student as well-known as Dickson is involved. But the Council followed normal procedure during all testimony and deliberation and did at no times base its decision upon the impact or lack of impact which such a decision would make outside the judiciary. In fact, the verdict and the sentence were both precedented in a very similar case tried not more than one hour before Dickson's own trial.

Concerning the charge that Dickson should have received suspension, and furthermore, that suspension is not just in such cases; Rogers has centered his decision around the fact that the Carolina co-ed involved in the case received one semester's suspension, and Dickson did not. It is important to realize that the Women's Honor Council handled the girl's case, and the Men's Council heard Dickson's — there were two separate trials. When a co-ed breaks a major social rule such as this one, the WHC has traditionally treated this very seriously and has given suspension. The MHC considers this rule violation to be on the most part the responsibility of the girl. The Carolina gentleman, nevertheless, still has some responsibility to see that she obeys her rules; so he is guilty of a lesser offense. Only if he has forcibly persuaded the girl to commit the violation must he assume the major responsibility. These are the reasons for Dickson's official reprimand and not a suspension.

The Men's Honor Council has recently spelled out in more detail the gentleman's responsibility toward a co-ed. I hope that all students will attempt to understand this policy — as it pertains to him — or herself, and also, as it pertains to Dickson's case.

Bill Miller, for the Men's Honor Council  
324 Teague

## Dickson . . . Again

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Last August the Tar Heel reported that it knew Paul Dickson was being tried for an Honor Code violation, yet it could not give the students the facts of the case as they were being withheld by the Attorney General's office. In an indignant editorial the DTH claimed it wanted the story not for its value as a scandal, but rather for the noble purpose of reporting the facts to the public.

Now the DTH has the story, and the result has been some of the highest grade of yellow journalism I have ever seen. In its editorials and stories the DTH has made several obvious insinuations about Paul Dickson's motives, his integrity, and his courage. I feel confident that if the DTH can keep the story alive for a few more days they will eventually get around to his lineage. Now that is real factual news reporting! Good show, Tar Heel. You too are a credit to our school.

Robert Beck, Jr.  
18 Davie Circle

(Editor's Note: On August 19 the summer Tar Heel stated editorially that "the Tar Heel extends apologies to those readers who have inquired about rumors that a high Student Government official has been or may be charged with an Honor Code violation."

"We heard the same rumblings, and off we went to see if they were valid. But, alas, an intensive investigation by two staffers revealed only bits and pieces of the story, and it would be contrary to our journalistic ethics to print only part of the whole situation."

The first time The Daily Tar Heel mentioned the Dickson case was after eight students publicly issued a letter asking for Dickson's resignation.)

## Letters

The Daily Tar Heel welcomes letters to the editor on any subject, particularly on matters of local or University interest. Letters should be typed, double spaced and include the name and address of sender. Names will not be omitted in publication. Letters should be kept as brief as possible. The DTH reserves the right to edit for length.