

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.
ERNIE McCrARY, EDITOR
JACK HARRINGTON, BUSINESS MANAGER

Politics Above Reason

Durham Morning Herald

Ordinarily the appointment of a federal judge is of little interest outside the state or district he is to serve. But the challenge to the credentials of Francis X. Morrissey, nominated by President Johnson to be a district judge in Massachusetts, has made his selection a matter of nationwide interest because it involves standards for the appointment of judges.

The chairman of the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary testified before the Senate Judiciary subcommittee (which approved the nomination 6-3) that Mr. Morrissey, now a municipal court judge in Boston, lacks the intellectual capacity, the legal scholarship, the trial experience, and other qualifications a federal judge should have. His testimony concerning Judge Morrissey's legal education not only indicated that the Massachusetts appointee received his law diploma from a Georgia diploma mill but also contradicted Mr. Morrissey's testimony. Indeed, Mr. Morrissey's testimony before the subcommittee did not always agree with what he had told the Justice Department and the Bar Association.

Mr. Morrissey, after failing courses at the Suffolk Law School in Boston, went to Athens, Ga., where he claims to have studied three months in the Southern Law School, from June until September 1933. The ABA investigation showed that he went to Athens Sept. 7, received a diploma and was admitted to the bar under a Georgia law, already at that time repealed, which allowed holders of a law diploma to be admitted to the bar without examination, went to Atlanta the next day where he was admitted to practice before the Georgia Supreme Court and the federal District Court, and returned to Massachusetts Sept. 9. Mr. Morrissey, hazy over the sequence of events to his admission to the Georgia bar, says he stayed in Georgia for some nine months. As to his trial experience, he says that he has tried only one civil case and a few misdemeanors and minor felonies. One wonders what municipal judges in Boston do.

Judge Morrissey's chief claim to consideration is his faithful political service to the Kennedy clan. But John F. Kennedy understandably passed him by in making appointments to the federal courts in Massachusetts, although Mr. Morrissey had the endorsement of Joseph P. Kennedy. Now Mr. Morrissey has the backing of Sen. Edward Kennedy, and with that backing received the appointment from President Johnson.

While judicial experience is not a necessary preparation for a judicial appointment, learning in the law and the respect of the profession are. Mr. Morrissey seems to have neither. His preferment is a case of not what one knows, but of who one knows. And that is, we submit, a totally inadequate qualification for the judgeship of any court.

Horns Of A Dilemma

An anonymous herd of Baptist Woolly Bullies storned the ramparts of Hogan's Farm Tuesday night and fleeced the University of North Carolina.

Well, almost.

The Demon Deacon rampage could have been a teetotal success if it weren't for the fact that the Goodly Brethren made off with Rameses VI rather than Rameses VII.

The ramifications of this oversight are obvious: Wake Forest is on the horns of a dilemma.

In the first place, the Elder Rameses is considerably more rambunctious than his youthful proteges. Being totally immersed in the jaded atmosphere of Carolina life, he is addicted to such excessive vices as drinking and dancing. Will it be possible, we wonder, for the Higher Ups at Wake Forest to shield these activities from the eyes of the impressionable youth at that institution?

In the second place, Rameses VI has never let anyone pull the wool over his eyes.

Armistead Maupin, Jr.

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; Barry Jacobs, managing editor; Fred Thomas, news editor; Pat Stith, sports editor; Gene Rector, asst. sports editor; Kerry Sipe, night editor; Ernest Rohl, photographer; Chip Barnard, editorial cartoonist; John Greenbacker, political writer; Ed Freakley, Andy Myers, Lynne Harvel, Lynne Sizemore, David Rothman, Ray Linville, staff writers; Jack Harrington, bus. mgr.; Tom Clark, asst. bus. mgr.; Woody Sobol, ad. mgr.

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.



Peaceniks Are Making News, But Not Sense

By JAMES RESTON
 New York Times News Service

It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Viet Nam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace, troubled by the bombing of the civil populations of both North and South Viet Nam, genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China, and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifism has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the government and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, but not only within their rights but must be heard.

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community, but unfortunately are bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Viet Nam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Viet Nam International Control Commission, Mr. Blair Seaborn.

He flies regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Viet Nam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the anti-war demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it, and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Viet Nam between 1950 and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Viet Nam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dien Bien Phu.

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the government in Washington, no matter what Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Viet Nam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson Administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war, but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

Senator Stennis of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the Administration pull up the anti-draft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscious objectors, hangerson, intellectual graduate school draft dodgers, and rent-a-crowd boos who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the nation is supposed to represent, nor for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

Those involved in the business of education—whether in giving or receiving it—are the persons to whom the freedom of that education is the most essential. Since the North Carolina speaker ban went into effect, the most qualified argument against it has come from the university campus. Students and professors who have tried to express their views have seldom succeeded in being heard outside the campuses, however. Their opinions have been repeatedly discredited by accusations of attempts at subversion or of selfish motives or they have been blatantly ignored.

Letters To The Editor

UNC Needs 'Humane Code' For Carolina Non-Gentlemen

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Perhaps UNC needs a "Humane Code." The Honor Code and Campus Code apparently fail to prevent some of our Carolina Gentlemen from behaving like animals. As case in point, I here relate a shocking occurrence at Saturday's UNC-Maryland game that should be an utter embarrassment to us all.

There are those of us who enjoy the lulling bars of "Dixie" but whose regional-national orientations are such that we choose not to stand in observance of its rendition. (Nor, incidentally, do we stand at the playing of "Marching Through Georgia" in New York City or Minneapolis or Seattle.) Fellow students seem to have respected this choice in the past. But, alas, I am a Caucasian and there may lie the explanation for such tolerance. Seated near me at the Maryland game was a Negro couple who remained quite understandably seated as the chords of "Dixie" penetrated the air. Taking quick notice of this, a male student a few rows behind struck up his own one-man chorus of shouts to this effect: "Hey, you burr-heads down there! Stand up!" "Robert E. Lee was the greatest man who ever lived"; and "We want segregation." Neighboring Carolina Gentlemen added their own, "Stand up, you damn niggers" and "We shall overcome you."

Happily, nothing further developed, and my compliments go to the young couple for quietly ignoring such a show of Grade A ignorance. Now, I realize that the blind prejudices and biases of many of our students will never be overcome by any manner or means, but such despicable behavior as this should be inexcusable and intolerable at UNC. This is not a Selma or a Bogalusa. Let us attempt to keep it that way, my fellow students somewhere on the campus, by at least refraining from the kind of verbal abuse that marks one as an unmitigated bigot, at best. No university should really need a Humane Code. If you're here to get a quality education, get it and demonstrate it. If you're not, why waste everyone's time? Leave! They can use your type in the Alabama KKK or the San Diego Zoo.

Gary Tiedeman
 Miller Hall

No Interest Seen In Campus Radio

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Now that the results of the campus radio referendum are in, it should be particularly interesting to see what the campus "leaders" do with the facts. Most undoubtedly, they will clamor that a majority has chosen to have campus radio and therefore that there is a need for it. But is such the case? No, it is not.

The referendum was to be an indication of campus interest so that the leaders could judge whether there was a "need" for a campus radio, "need" being used here as something that enough people are interested in and are willing to pay \$34,000 for.

Just what were the final results. Out of about 12,000 students approximately 3,000 voted for a campus radio, 1,000 were definitely against it, and the other 8,000 couldn't have cared less either way what happened because they didn't care enough even to

Curtain Up

A Duke University professor who voiced his objection to the ban received a rebuttal amounting to little more than a "mind your own business." If the ban is not the business of every member of the academic profession then it is left to those on the state supported campuses. If it is not the concern of every North Carolinian as a voter then it is not the concern of legislature as government by the people. Political rejection of opinions voiced from outside the university campuses has not been followed by recognition of the university's right to be heard.

LETTERS

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

vote. These results hardly show a "need" for or an interest in a campus radio. It will be interesting to see how those "leaders" who are in favor of such a program will get around facts which so blatantly point the other way.

John W. Pettingill, I.
 213 N. Boundary St.

Quiet Spectator Dampens Cheers

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

After being a student at UNC for a little over two years, I thought I had seen just about everything. Well, I got quite a surprise at the Maryland game Saturday.

As everyone who was there knows, the game was very close, and at certain points in the game the Carolina rooters tended to be rather quiet. At several instances when quiet reigned on the Carolina side a friend of mine, who is never quiet, thought it appropriate to cheer our team as best he could. There was a student in front of us who had his wife and his mother at the game, who did not appreciate my friend's cheers, and on more than one occasion turned around and told my friend to be quiet. At one point he even threatened to have him thrown out by the police.

I want to state that my friend had had a few drinks, but every cheer he gave was a standard Carolina cheer, completely devoid of any vulgarity, with the exception of a few "hells."

On the other hand this "fan" in front of us almost never cheered. In fact the only times I heard him say anything were twice when he got up to curse our Coach Hickey and a few times when he yelled at our defensive secondary for letting Maryland complete a pass.

To me this was the most ludicrous exhibition of Carolina spirit I have ever seen! I would like to suggest that in the future that anyone who does not care to cheer for Carolina sit on the east side of the stadium. From that side they can curse our Coach Hickey all they want and they will only have to listen to "Carolina cheers" from afar.

Mark Emory
 1039 Morrison

Women Protest

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

This letter is to protest, in general, the dual standards for men and women on campus and, specifically, the invasion of personal freedom which the housekeeping rules for resident women accomplish. Is it not an outrage to tell the students who rent dormitory rooms how these rooms must be ordered, short of actual damage to University property and a sanitation threat? It is petty and a usurpation of rights for the administration to issue call downs leading to campusment when a woman student fails to conform to a prescribed stereotyped and arbitrary arrangement of her possessions.

It is an unhealthy and restrictive policy in addition to being, on its face, and encroachment. We suggest to the tradition-minded that we are not here for a course in clothes-arranging and bed-making by 10 a.m. and that these are matters of individual concern and surely not the province of the administration. This policy is an anachronism and we ask the support of all students in condemning it.

Pat Thomas
 Claudia C. Madeley
 227 East Cobb

Louise M. J. Ambrosiano
 424 East Cobb

