

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

Good Riddance To An Era

A political era is being swept out the door by the long-expected federal court order to reapportion both houses of the General Assembly and to equalize congressional districts.

Since colonial days the legislature has been controlled by rural elements because, obviously enough, there were no cities. The first legislators were mostly well-to-do farmers, and that power structure has become so entrenched, mainly through regulation of apportionment, that urban regions have been unable to break the hold.

When one group is outnumbered, there is little it can change in its own favor.

The federal court's ruling points out this situation in North Carolina: A majority of the House of Representatives is elected by 61 counties containing just 27.1 per cent of the state's population. A House member from Wake County represents 82,059 people; the Tyrrell County member represents 4,520.

Senate districts range in population from 65,722 to 148,418.

The North Carolina Constitution says that the General Assembly must change the senatorial districts after every census so that each district is as nearly equal as possible in population.

Legally, the Assembly has no choice. It must reapportion and redistrict before January 31 or be reapportioned and redistricted by the three-judge federal court.

The job will be painful because some members will probably be shifting themselves right out of a job. But like it or not, power will slip from the underpopulated areas, notably in the East, to the population centers of the Piedmont.

An era will end. And it is about time.

A New Kind Of Kneel-In

The principal of a San Antonio, Texas, high school seems to be spending most of his time these days shortening hair and lengthening dresses.

Homer Smith, principal of John Marshall High School, outlawed long bangs last week. The students protested the haircut rule by boycotting the school cafeteria, but after two days they apparently got hungry enough to start eating there again.

Now a male teacher has complained that the girls' short skirts are classroom distractions. He did not say if they distracted him or his male students, but the principal issued this hem-length ultimatum:

The girls are required to kneel. If the skirt does not reach the floor it is too short.

Of course it is desirable for students and teachers to keep their mind on their school work, but there seems to be an unanswered question here.

Which is more distracting — the short skirts or the spectacle of all those girls kneeling around the principal's office?

Drugstore Education

Is there any student, glassy-eyed from staring at the textbook before him, who has not at some time wished for "instant knowledge?" Why can't somebody invent a little pill which, when swallowed, will send facts flooding through the bloodstream toward a vacant brain?

It sounds absurd of course, but so did the idea of television not so many years ago.

Scientists at the University of California at Los Angeles might be on the verge of becoming the saviors of all harried college students because they have conducted experiments which indicate knowledge can be transferred from one animal to another by injection.

They trained hamsters to do a particular thing, then injected a chemical from the hamsters' brains into the bodies of untrained rats. The rats were then able to carry out to some degree the actions taught only to the hamsters.

The process is still highly experimental, but perhaps the day is not far distant when needle marks on a young man's arm will not mean he is a dope addict or a coed's reference to "the pill" will have no connection with contraceptives.

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 Robl, 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.

"Which Red Light Are You Talking About?"



Letter To The Editor

Otelia Breaks Rules

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
I intended to write a letter of praise on Otelia Connor's last letter in the DTH. In that one she made pretty good sense about the dating places we should have here, up to the point about the churches. For once I could read one of her letters and say, "Very good, Mrs. Connor." Note that I said for once!

She, however, seems to have this "thing" (to use a current local expression) about politeness and manners. So, perhaps she

should take a good close look at herself and her own manners.

I realize that most people tend to overlook many things that the elder generation does, and chalk it up to eccentricity. But really, just how far are we supposed to bend backwards for her?

In her letter published in the November 18 issue of the DTH, she mentioned her surprise that the professor 'didn't knock 'em cold'. What is even more surprising to me, is that someone hasn't done that to her. I'm not sure that I would, but I do know some who wouldn't hesitate.

Now, before she goes and gets all hot under the collar, don't think that I am condoning bad manners or impoliteness. In fact, just the reverse. So much so that I see her manners as some of the worst displayed on this campus.

As children, even, most of us are taught that one of the worst breaches of etiquette is to correct someone in public. Either she was never taught this, she has chosen to forget it, or she feels that she's so far above reproach that it is all right for her to violate these rules of etiquette.

If she was never taught this, I apologize. If she has forgotten it, please take this as a kindly reminder. If she feels, however, that she is above practicing what she preaches, then she has my pity.

I really do not see why the students of UNC should have to put up with this obnoxious from a self-styled, self-important, egotistical, inclement person such as she presents herself to be.

Since the opinions that I have expressed are not mine alone, but also those of many of the students I have known well in my four years here, I hope that she will heed them.

By all means, let's try to promote politeness and good manners.

But if she feels this is her own personal discharge in life, then, for her own sake, at least if not for others, please use some finesse. I think she'll make more progress in the long run, if that is truly her aim. If it's not, then she deserves all of the ridicule and disrespect that she is now, and has been, getting.

Ford Clark
108 Main St.

History Helps

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:
I'm getting a bit nauseated. The letters to the editor seem to have taken on a tinge of idiocy, particularly when referring to our government's foreign policy. Paraphrasing something I once read: "The mark of a stupid man is his inability (or unwillingness) to learn from history."
Perhaps our beloved brethren, the V.C. (Viet Cong or Vietnik Creeps; take your pick) would like to see the period 1965-1975 follow the pattern set in 1935-1945 and 1915-1925. Most of us learned from those periods that the only time decisions reached at a conference table are honored occurs when one of the conferees has been smashed.

As to the recurring statement "Americans don't know what war is: they've never had one on their own territory." Perhaps this is so because we've tried to keep them from spreading this far. If we pull out of South Viet Nam, it's quite probably we will soon thereafter pull out of South Korea, the Philippines, Formosa, Guam, Hawaii, Alaska, Washington, etc., ad nauseum.

To Those Who Wonder

A lot of us here are living in fear
That you over there may think we don't care.

Don't think that the tricks performed by peace-niks
Express what we feel towards those who would deal

A fixed deck of cards. So be on your guards
And don't let us down. Help us keep our town,

Our state and country the home of the free.
We know you are brave, though some to your grave

Will carry the flame that lights freedom's name.
That torch that you bear, so far away there,

It burns also here, this land you hold dear.
Though all of us pray there will come a day
The world will be free from hate, tyranny,
And fear, we hope you, the men dressed in blue,

In khaki or white, continue to fight
And keep our land safe. So please do not chafe

When some silly fool, who fathered a mule,
Continues to shout that we must pull out.
You men in the ranks deserve all our thanks

For braving the worst of the enemy's thirst
To dictate to all. Allow not to fall
Into their cruel hands this cherished of lands.

Peter M. Slagan
154 Bagley Dr.

Free Press, Justice Conflict In America

By ED FREAKLEY
DTH Staff Writer

Press relations with the law is becoming an important question in America today. The issue of fair trial vs. free press has been before the public in increasing quantity since the assassination of President John F. Kennedy in November of 1963.

The bar charges that reporters infringe upon the rights of the accused by writing stories that present the defendant as either a big-time hoodlum or an innocent father of six children and a hard worker.

Both of these presentations would influence a jury and that is wrong.

To print the news is to print fact and the truth behind the fact. The truth about the fact must be the truth—not an opinion about the truth.

However more often than not there is a fine line between these two apparent extremes.

The bar proposes that reporters not mention the previous record of the accused, a confession he may have made or opinions of police officers and attorneys concerning his guilt or innocence.

What do these three proposals mean?

Is it wrong to consider the past record of the accused? What this man has done in the past is a matter of record, a fact. Therefore, by the standards of journalism it belongs in the news. On the other hand, it is clearly written into American common law that each man shall be tried on the merits of the individual case.

Suppose a man is on trial for murder and has a past conviction for armed robbery, is this not an important piece of evidence? Does it influence a jury into thinking that if a man has served time for armed robbery he is probably guilty of murder?

However, suppose this same man is on trial for murder and has a spotless record. He has been an outstanding leader in his community. If this is brought out in a trial, which the defense would most assuredly do, wouldn't it also prejudice a jury?

So we see a conflict in our system. If the past record is bad it cannot be brought out, unless the defendant takes the witness

stand. But if the record is good, it will be presented to the jury for consideration.

Confessions are a bit harder to handle. They cannot be introduced in court if they are forced or taken under duress.

Here the reporter must be very careful. He must know the police and its creditability. This also applies to statements by attorneys and others involved in a case.

Our constitution guarantees a free press. With this right, which belongs not to the press, but to all the people, goes a responsibility. This responsibility includes upholding the rights of a defendant.

What it comes down to is the discretion of the reporter and his ability to be fair. What happens in the future depends on public opinion.

An example of what happened in England is a good illustration.

The British Press Council has set strict and severe limitations on the press in this area.

In all cases of an arrest and trial the press may only say that police have picked up so and so to talk with him. They cannot say why a man was arrested or in what connection.

Following the arrest no mention of the case can be made until the trial. And then the only thing that can be reported is what occurs during the actual court proceedings.

Ten people saw John Doe shoot a woman in the head six times. They all watched as he cut her into little pieces. Four police officers arrested Doe in this act of murder.

The following day there is this newspaper report:

Police officers last night arrested a 36-year-old man in connection with a serious matter.

John Doe of 109 Wellington St., is being held until his trial comes up in a fortnight.

The bar has some legitimate complaints about the press. Reporters do at times infringe on the rights of a person on trial. Something needs to be done about this situation.

Trial by newspaper is wrong, no exceptions withstanding. But journalism by judges is by no means the answers.

John Greenbacker

Discipline Committee Suggests Reforms, But Nothing Drastic

"You are requested not to wear shorts and slacks in dormitory parlors, on the campus and in the downtown area and in restaurants in Chapel Hill.

"Shorts and slacks are to be worn for active sports only, unless in route to activities which warrant such apparel.

"The penalty for any violation of this rule will be left up to the discretion of the House Council."

Sounds pretty harsh, doesn't it? How about this:

"Woman students will also receive call-downs for soft drink bottles found in the rooms, unmade beds, and food not stored in tins."

And this:

"The president may assign telephone duty to each student in the dormitory. The penalty for not taking phone duty is a Friday night's campus."

And this:

"Attendance at all house meetings will be compulsory. The penalty for an unexcused absence is a Friday night's campus."

And this:

"Freshmen must observe closed study Monday through Thursday from 8 p.m. until 10:30 p.m."

And this:

"There shall be no talking out of dormitory windows. A violation of this is a call-down."

About once every year at the University some embattled coed will get up at a public meeting and speak her mind about the current status of women's rules, but the public little notes nor long remembers what she had to say.

The great discrepancy between the rules of conduct for male students and female ones will be apparent to anyone who reads the 1965-66 edition of "Regulations for Women Students" published by the Uni-

versity.

The University administration usually writes these concessions to Victorianism off as a good means of pacifying parents who fear for the purity of their daughters when away from home.

A small ray of hope was cast into this black picture a few weeks ago when the Student Government Ad-hoc Committee on the Judiciary submitted 30 pages of judicial reform to the Faculty Committee on Student Discipline.

Even though the report proposes a massive plan for the reorganization of the student courts and takes steps towards ending the "double standard" of penalties when women's closing hours are violated, no recommendations for the elimination or alteration of the above statutes were made.

The committee's recommendations are very moderate and do leave some things to be desired, but committee members know that even these few alterations will meet with opposition from some University administrators.

The report does point out that the committee felt it had to be "realistic" in its proposals for change.

Admittedly girls are not supposed to be as unmindful of their behavior as boys, but the current rules are just a bit ridiculous.

One can only hope that more complete provisions by the faculty and Student Government committees are forthcoming.

Though the student committee did recognize the impossibility of making all rules equal for both male and female students, it also reached the conclusion that "a woman student should be viewed as an individual capable of establishing her own code of conduct."

There are a few administrators who ought to consider this point more carefully.

