

# Judicial Bill Amendment Could Improve Proposal

We already have endorsed the one-court system proposed by a bill now pending before the legislature for equal administration of justice under the Honor Code. Today we want to show how such a system could work even though, as some argue, a code might tend to reduce testimony before a mixed court.

Take, for instance, a case cited by a member of the women's Honor Council who favors a two-court system. It involves plagiarism by a child who, it was made known in the course of her trial, was pregnant and without a husband.

The Women's Honor Council, finding the code guilty of plagiarism, took into consideration the girl's pregnancy and put her on probation instead of suspending her from school. The reason: she was in her final semester as a student and probably never again would have the opportunity to complete her education.

It was, we believe, a fair judgment. But it is one which the two-court system proponents argue might never have been rendered under the one-court system since, in the presence of the mixed council, the code would have been reluctant to admit to the pregnancy. And under present proposals that might be true.

But let's amend current proposals to show how, in the interest of justice under the one-court system, the pertinent testimony could have been made known despite the presence of male jurors and male council members.

First, the purpose of the jury under the proposed one-court system is solely to determine whether the defendant is guilty as charged. In the above instance, its only duty would have been to determine the code's guilt or innocence of the plagiarism charge.

The second factor, the pregnancy, would not have concerned the jury. It therefore could have been retained from the jury and made known to the council alone.

By allowing for ready admission of such factors to the council, where lies the need for amendment to the one-court proposal as it now exists. This should be effected if our legislators and our judiciary are sincere in their efforts to protect the individual from embarrassment while at the same time employing all pertinent data to render a fair judgment.

Here is the amendment: Set up the one-court council so as to allow for three women members in cases where a code is on trial. This would retain two male members for the trial. When a male is on trial, revert the practice and have three male and two female council members.

Then proceed with the hearings. When the jury has rendered its decision on the charge as stated, dismiss the jury and then let the council consider all data which for some reason might have an influence on its decision. Take, for instance, the fact of pregnancy in the aforementioned case.

Obviously, the presence of two males on the council would again, if we accept the two-court system proponents' arguments, influence testimony of the defendant. Here is where the amendment lies, with an eye to protecting the individual but yet allowing full benefit of pertinent data.

The defendant could make known to a female member of the council that personal circumstances exist which she would prefer not discussing before the male members of the council. Upon such notice, the male members could dismiss themselves to permit open discussion between the existing members—and, incidentally, the majority—of the council.

When testimony before the women members was completed, the defendant could be dismissed and the male council members recalled for a full council discussion of the personal data. The decision of judgment then could be made and reported by the council to the defendant. And a fair trial would have been insured, by virtue of the majority of female members on the council.

This, at least, is a suggestion for those who believe in the one-court system. We believe it pacifies the arguments of two-court proponents and offers a workable plan for those advocates of the one-court proposal who are willing to compromise.

After all, compromise is the key to our present system of government.

## Gimmick Seen In Postal Hikes

Well, the gimmick has finally been exposed in the administrative proposal for increased postal rates. It appears, after all, to be a postmark-making deal.

You'll remember that after Summerfield closed post office doors once last summer he began an urgent campaign for increased rates in order to make ends meet within the postal department. Either give us more money, he said, or we'll stop delivering on Saturdays.

The campaign hit high gear when President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union address, proposed that three cent stamps be placed to five cents thus providing the additional revenue needed to run the postal department—in the black, that is.

So now, the nation experiences an economic slump, millions are unemployed, and the President proposes a \$2 million program to modernize post offices and postal services. It would, Press Secretary Hagerty said, "afford greater job opportunities in every section of the country."

The only thing wrong with the program is that—if it can be believed—the current employment slump will be over long before the President's proposal could be approved by the Congress. Then we'd have another \$2 billion program to finance at a time when the government is already spending in the red, and there would be no reason for government action to raise employment—after all, it will pick up in March.

The real gimmick, however, lies in the way which the administration would finance the program. You guessed it—through the increase in postal rates—a tax on every widow, orphan and little business man in the nation.

If the administration wants to modernize post offices and the postal department, we suggest that it so state in its request for additional funds instead of citing the lack of resources for paying the mailman as reason for closing down post offices on Saturday. If they want money to carry out a renovation program that's one thing; if they need it to get the mail to the poorest citizens, then that's another.

It would appear to us that improvement of federal edifices could wait until improvements in the nation's economy, which might then supply the revenue for the job. Meanwhile, let's keep on sending three-cent letters.

## WISDOM AND OTHERWISE: Conformity Is Defended Here By Conformist

By Whit Whitfield  
During the past few years the favorite topic of the writers on college papers has been conformity. You've read it until you're sick of it, but this is a new twist. We'd like to defend conformity. We might as well; we're victims of it.

We conform. Why? We hate it if we don't, we're dead. How many non-conformists are successful? How many non-conformists are well liked? Right? None. How much chance does a beard, a ducktail, pegged pants, or dim glasses have in a society of conformists? Right again. None.

How far can a person go if he espouses opinions that are contrary to those of his peers? As far as the next country if he's lucky. So, we conformists are faced with self preservation, the oldest of man's common laws. It's either conform or be annihilated, so if you can't beat 'em, join 'em.

Mr. Conformist or Mr. Average-man is typically like this:

He goes to whatever church is the largest in his neighborhood.

He reads Life, Look, Time, you know, the type magz in the dentist's office.

He reads the sports section and the funnies, sometimes the rapes and murders if he has time. (He is always busy.)

He wears whatever is fashionable, regardless of how many old clothes he has in his wardrobe.

His hobbies are hunting and fishing. (He can't go wrong here.)

His favorite interests are channel 3, channel 2, channel 1, and Poker. (In that order.)

This is the man whom the writers propounding non-conformity constantly harass. Why? He hasn't done anything—nothing at all. He never does, he never will. Why bother him?

If you ever get the chance, look at the writer on non-conformity. He dresses like the rest of us. You can't blame him. He wants to live, too. You'll find him watching TV, at a flick, or criticizing Luce's handwriting.

He has to enjoy the worldly pleasures too. He's human. The fact that he is following the trend in college writing by writing on the same topic (and conforming meanwhile) doesn't bother him—he's a non-conformist.

God Bless Conformity.

ROUND FIGURES

The exceedingly fat woman was trying to wedge her way through the door of a bus. After delaying the bus with several unsuccessful attempts the driver suggested, "Lady, why don't you turn sideways?"

"Huh?" puffed the woman. "Can't you see I ain't got no sideways?"

—N. C. Education.



HERLOCK  
ENTER THE UNCHAINED POST.

COMES FROM VENEZUELAN

## Jimenez Appraisal Draws Fire

Dear Miss Greenfield:

I hate to argue with you because I heard you are one of the prettiest girls on the campus, and I would like very much to escort you to the "jungle" when you go back to Venezuela. Being a student here, as you are, I suppose that you know that a jungle is, by definition, an impenetrable thicket or tangled mass of vegetation and that with the knowledge you boasted to have about your country, you ought to know that all the population of Venezuela dwells in the mountains and plains regions. As you may someday discover, the "jungle" is an uninhabited region, unless we take into consideration the very few tribes of savages that live there.

According to your letter to the editor which appeared last Tuesday in this newspaper, it seems that the fathers of the constitution were mistaken when, in 1789, they tried to secure the blessing of liberty by establishing a democratic government to govern the rules of rural society which the United States was at the time; and that only adult societies, not those which, as you say, are in the state of adolescence, have the right to be ruled by democratic governments. I wonder what the prestige of the United States would be in the world, should the rulers of the U. S. always follow the ideas expressed by you in your letter and which you seem to be so fond of.

From the scarce knowledge that I have of United States history, and from what I have read in American newspapers, about the recent political events in Venezuela, I infer that fortunately most of your fellow citizens do not share either your ideas or your sympathies toward the ex-dictator's regime. It is true that we have not had a "history of democracy" as you mentioned in your letter; it is also true that we have had many dictators in my country, but if you have ever read our history, you would know that our people have carried on a continuous and never-ending struggle for freedom since the time it obtained its independence, when it gave freely in its blood to help our other brother countries obtain theirs. These are our democratic traditions, and following them, my people, unmercifully, lashed again their blood in the streets of Caracas and other cities to regain the freedom that was taken away from them nine years ago by your beloved Perez Jimenez.

According to your letter, a good government would be that which maintains good relations with the United States, and which is able to carry on a wide range of public projects. Without any doubt, the relations among our peoples were no better during Perez Jimenez's dictatorial regime than they were before it or than they are today. Besides, I can assert that neither the students nor the professors, doctors, lawyers, engineers, businessmen, laborers, farmers, clergymen and, in general, all the people who took in the riots against Perez Jimenez, would use the same yardstick you use to appraise the fitness of a ruler. Even Jimenez's companions were against him.

You say that my father's criticism of ex-president Marcos Perez Jimenez has been one-sided. You are right, my dear girl, because in Venezuela there are two sides. On one side is Perez Jimenez, and on the other, the people. The latter side is the one and the only one to which my father belongs, which is the reason why his opinion might be said to be one-sided.

I regret that our people have so unanimously shown their feelings against the ideal type of president which you have chosen for us, that is to say: Perez Jimenez.

Hoping that your ideas concerning the type of government we should have will someday change, and sincerely looking forward to meeting you, I am, respectfully,

Martin Perez, Jr.

## GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS

### French Aristocrat Looked Into Future

"There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points," wrote Alexis de Toqueville 125 years ago. "I allude to the Russians and the Americans."

The young French aristocrat, examining strengths and weaknesses of democratic institutions, was startlingly prophetic. He recognized, even in 1832, that a democracy is most vulnerable in the field of foreign policy; it must hammer out its decisions for its own citizens and all the world to see. In the process it can tolerate little secrecy; its people are inclined to blow hot and cold—demanding too much armament one minute and not enough the next. "If the Supreme Court is ever composed of imprudent men or bad citizens the Union may be plunged into anarchy or civil war," wrote de Toqueville of another important facet of American government.

But de Toqueville's comments about the relations of the 20th century's two giants—the United States and Russia—are appropriate for the New Year, a time of summing up and prediction.

All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and only to be charged with the maintenance of their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others are stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which the human eye can assign no term. . . . The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unchecked exertions and common sense of the citizens. The Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom, of the latter, servitude. Their starting points are not the same. Yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

How prophetic, indeed, for a philosopher writing 125 years ago—long before the final triumph of the industrial revolution, long before two world wars or the Red Revolution, long before Sputnik and the confrontation of the two giants, glaring at each other across the rim of the seas.

What would de Toqueville write today if he could see the fulfillment of his 19th century prophesies?

Would he note that the United States, under the impetus of the New-Fair Deal and Modern Republicanism, has moved a good distance from its reliance on "personal interest to accomplish its ends?"

Would he note, as well, certain capitalistic tendencies in the Soviet Union where all comrades are equal but some are more equal than others, a certain leveling process at work as the Russian people demand more better with their guns?

Would de Toqueville foresee continuing "competitive coexistence" in a world where push button wars will control the "balance of terror"? Or would he predict that conflict between these two feisty giants is inevitable, that one must, after the fashion of things, ultimately attempt to destroy the other?

Nobody can be sure. Yet there is considerable room for hope. De Toqueville's observant eye would not overlook other emerging potential giants on the world scene—the massive Chinese Red Republic teeming with undeveloped power, India fast flowering after years of colonialism. Even in Europe itself de Toqueville, as a Frenchman, would be forced to admit that a recovered Germany is a power to be reckoned with, and has not been smothered even while losing two mighty wars.

So while the United States and Russia eye each other uneasily across their empire boundaries, other factors are to be reckoned with. Perhaps the decisive act of leadership will turn on which power bloc most effectively wins the uncommitted nations. In this struggle the tyrants of the Kremlin have made astounding progress despite all kinds of obstacles (see, H. H. Zbuzek et al.).

Whether an aroused free world can provide that spark of imagination, that concentrated will to win will determine the outcome.

## Office Cat

An elderly colored man, called before the justice of the peace, was charged with keeping a vicious dog.

Mother—Why, that dog bit my little girl Mary three times.

Judge—Did your dog bite little Mary Jones?

Colored Man—No suh, no suh. My dog, he never bit any little girl.

Judge to the mother—Well, this man says the dog didn't bite your little girl.

Mother—I'll go right home and bring little Mary here and show you.

But the man interrupted: "Colored Man—in the first place the dog is so old he ain't got no teeth and he can't bite. In the second place the dog is blind and couldn't see Mary, anyhow. In the third place the dog is dead and can't hear a thing and in the fourth place he ain't my dog in the first place."

There seemed to be plenty of seals on the train so why the long-faced man had to sit next to him the man with the bottle couldn't understand. He pretended to ignore his newly-acquired companion and took a nip out of the bottle.

The long-faced man, who wanted the other to know how well he had lived as a teetotaler, declared:

Long-faced Man—Mister, I am fifty-three years old and have never tasted a drop of liquor.

Other tucker, the bottle into his suitcase—Mister, you ain't going to start now.

The vacationing businessman was on a plane bound for Europe when engine trouble forced the pilot to make an emergency landing in Newfoundland. As they landed, the businessman accidentally asked the little old lady sitting next to him if she'd been frightened.

Little Old Lady—Heavens, no. It wasn't even on our side of the plane.

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Sunday, Monday and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester, delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editor — DOUG EISELE  
Associate Editor — FRANK CROWTHER  
Managing Editor — ALYS VOORHEES  
Librarian — GLENDA FOWLER  
Subscription Mgr. — AVERY THOMAS  
Circulation Editor — JOAN BROCK  
Feature Editor — MARY M. MASON  
Business Manager — JOHN WHITTAKER  
Advertising Manager — FRED KATZIN  
Sports Editor — BILL KING  
Asst. Sports Editor — DAVE WIBLE  
News Editor — PAUL RUBLE  
Proof Reader — GRAHAM SNYDER  
Night Editor — GRAHAM SNYDER



by Charles Schulz

by Al Capp

by Walk Kelly