

Students Failing Probers

It now seems that students generally are looking with apathy upon Newspaper Research Committee hearings being held in Graham Memorial.

Of six persons who appeared before the committee Tuesday, all are now or have been associated with The Daily Tar Heel. NOT ONE PERSON DISASSOCIATED WITH THE PAPER HAS YET APPEARED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE.

Thus we see that appraisal of the Tar Heel and suggestions to improve it are coming from within the publication. That is not as it should be, particularly since the hearings are being held by a committee set up by the student legislature.

Indeed, if only Tar Heel associates are to appear before the committee, it would have been easier for the legislature to come directly to our Graham Memorial offices and interview each staff member as it saw fit.

We do not feel that the legislature wanted to limit its findings only to Daily Tar Heel staff members, and for that reason set up a committee to get a cross-section of testimony and ideas from divergent areas of the campus. It is unfortunate that, thus far, the committee has failed in that respect.

Some suggestions, doubtless, will come out of the Newspaper Research Committee hearings and reports from other colleges and universities in the country. These will be presented to the legislature, debated, and its not inconceivable that some of them will be adopted as future policy for the publication.

In fact, it is the Newspaper Re-

search Committee which is the heart of the Student Legislature's investigation of the Daily Tar Heel. And when it reports to the legislature, it will do so with the authority of a body having studied at close range suggestions and ideas to improve the paper.

Then, outside of the legislature, it will be too late for a cross-section of student opinion on the investigation. From this apathy could grow student dislike for recommendations at a time too late to do anything about it. The committee report will have been presented without benefit of suggestions from a cross-section of students.

The argument has been made that Tar Heel staff members, because they are close to the paper, are in a better position to make recommendations for it. To a degree that is true. It follows that persons who work on the paper know more about its operations and shortcomings than those who are not familiar with it.

Nevertheless, there could exist on the campus ideas about the newspaper which would not only be an asset to the committee hearings, but which also might play some role in determining future policy for the Tar Heel. And such ideas coming from non-Tar Heel staff members would be made without possibility of personal interest in the publication, save that it become an improved one for the university community.

Thus far, it appears that the committee hearings have been little more than the newspaper's examination of itself — and any fool knows that that is not the purpose of an investigative body.

GUEST EDITORIAL

Look Again, Gov. Hodges

Last week Gov. Luther Hodges said that a half million Escheats fund dollars were available for college loans but that he had found students just don't want to borrow money and have to pay it back.

Hodges made it appear that college students were not much interested in getting an education. But he would have done better if he had taken a close look at methods by which this money is loaned, to see whether University loan fund officials themselves are very much interested in education.

We speak from the experience of having once tried to get a student loan from this fabulous fund of a half-million unused dollars.

Some red tape is inevitable in any loan. But we found it was easier to borrow from banks or individuals than to try to separate U.N.C. officials from a dollar of this money.

The loan fund people demand just as much statement of security and collateral as the bank people do. They insist on a note signed by people of property just as a bank does. And their attitude is one of vague reproach, as if it is faintly sinful to be in college without being rich.

The fact that you may be a struggling student with family, no income except what you can earn between classes, and no collateral beyond what you are now training your mind to do — these things

are easier to justify to a bank than to the University loan office.

The loan office is more likely to suggest what expenses you should cut than to lend you money. Generally its attitude to many loan applicants we have known has been that the world is full of thieves — and mightn't you just be one?

Perhaps what happened to us is what happens to many of these other applicants. By the time we were finally approved for a loan we preferred to go into debt to someone else rather than the University loan fund. And we did, and were able to repay it long before any loan fund deadline would have applied.

If other students have reacted as we did, then their problem is not repaying money. It's getting it in the first place.

And the recent news release which stated that "University loan officials almost have to beg students to take the money" must be a very recent innovation.

When a student is working his way through college he feels he is gradually learning both individual responsibility and dignity. Hodges and loan fund officials should remember that the same student prefers to borrow from organizations which treat him accordingly.

—The Sanford Daily Herald

Local Chapter Has Project

The United Nations never has attained the world stature which was hoped for it after the body's formation following World War II.

Instead, a united organization for world peace seemingly has become second place to the impending struggle between the United States and Russia for supremacy on the planet.

If the United Nations is to survive, it will take a concerted effort on the "grass roots" levels of all nations, and it is to that end that chapters of the Collegiate Council for the United Nations are being established across the country.

We are glad to see that the UNC chapter of CCUN is doing its part toward world peace in attempting to establish other chapters of CCUN at colleges and universities in North Carolina. And we hope that the presence here this weekend of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, herself a strong advocate of the United Nations, will be an asset to the local chapter's project.

CAROLINA CARROUSEL:

Reds Are Busy Producing Own Unreal Culture

By GAIL GODWIN

After the "beat-Russia-making-satellites" race began, several of the better American thinkers began warning of the danger of a singular, scientifically-focused aim. They pointed out what had happened to countries who momentarily sacrificed their culture in order to make giant-steps in the scientific field.

They gave examples, Germany, Japan, and now Russia. Their arguments were plausible. Obviously Russia thought so, too.

Recently, she has been wooing Argentina—whose provisional government will have elections next year—with her "cultural prowess."

She has rented a downtown movie theater for a clever, Moscow produced movie bill of classics, space stories, cartoons, propaganda and adventure films.

She sent the Bolshoi Theater ballet to the South American country this fall for three successful performances.

Violinist Igor Oistrakh gave concerts and lectured throughout Argentina.

Chess masters from the Soviet are touring the country; local book publishers are being subsidized to turn out inexpensive editions of Karl Marx and other books with pro-communist titles; artists, engineers, and scientists have been offered all-expense-paid trips to Russia.

Here in America, the Russian Embassy is busy putting out neat, slick magazines with beautiful covers. Such as USSR. The magazines feature Russia's intellects and artists, the picture stories of progress in Russian education, etc. One article recently running was entitled "Towards Progress, Friendship, and Truth."

Yes, the Big Red Country can mass-produce culture along with her firecrackers and rockets. For momentary purposes, that is. But a quick look behind the scenes may reveal that Russia's culture, like beauty in the proverb, is only skin-deep.

John Arends, of Olympia, Wash., can tell you what any man knows—that becoming a father is no picnic. After an all-night vigil at the hospital, Mr. Arends proudly rushed up to kiss his wife as she was wheeled from the delivery room. At the whiff of the ether, he passed out cold, landed kerpunk on the concrete floor. Mother and child? Doing fine. Father? Two broken teeth and a banged-up face!

"Never Mind About Trees And Soil— Make Us Some Fruit"



TERBLOCK IS THE WASHINGTON POST

Committee To Give Two Reports

By CHARLIE SLOAN

(This is the second of three columns on the student legislature's newspaper research committee. Sloan is a former managing editor of The Daily Tar Heel.)

When the committee to investigate the selection of Daily Tar Heel editors takes its findings to the legislature on February there will be two reports.

The committee has already agreed that a minority report as well as a majority report will be filed with the student law-makers.

But it appears that members of the committee have already decided who is going to write which report. At least one member of the committee is already confident that his side will be presented to the public only in the form of a minority statement.

That a distinction apparently already exists between the feelings of the committee members is unfortunate. They have not yet gathered enough information to arrive at logical conclusions, so it must follow that each of them started the investigation with a preconceived notion of the outcome.

This split in opinion has already shown itself in the committee's policy toward the press. The hearings could be conducted in several ways. There could be fully open hearings, similar to the investigative circuses in Congress.

Or the "interviews," as one member of the committee would rather they be called, could be conducted one at a time in the manner of Honor Council investigations.

A third alternative would be to hold individual interviews with a reporter covering the session for The Daily Tar Heel.

Tuesday's hearing was publicized as "open." On Monday reporters on the student government beat found it was to be closed, at a Honor Council, without newspaper coverage. Fast talking on the part of the reporters won news coverage.

On Tuesday a committee member said the committee would have to vote to settle the issue of coverage. When the group gathered there were seven members of The Daily Tar Heel staff present. Three of them are on the committee. None of them were covering the meeting. News Editor Paul Rule dropped in to listen for awhile, and by a fast exchange of notes told me that he didn't know who was covering the meeting but that committee-member Curtis Gans might do something on it.

A story written by a committee member is too much like a hand-out, even when it is accurate and well-written. Handouts have a quality of being considered propagandistic. Propaganda is not what the committee needs at this point.

This is no reflection on Rule's ability as a news editor. The Daily Tar Heel staff is well organized on a beat system, and reporters assigned to beats sometimes ask fellow staffers to cover meetings for them.

But Tuesday's session was a surprise. Although it was not supposed to be an open meeting as advertised, anyone who appeared to testify was able to sit in the room where the questioning was being carried on.

Therefore anyone interested in knowing what was happening at the meeting could sit in, as at an open hearing.

Although the people present were mainly from The Daily Tar Heel staff no one was covering it as a reporter.

Blame for the error in news coverage must be placed with The Daily Tar Heel, for it is now known that a reporter would have been admitted to the hearings. On the other hand the committee should make absolutely clear its stand on publicity, so that this week's misunderstandings will not be repeated.

In its short, not-too-public lifetime, the newspaper research committee has made a couple of mistakes, but as the members get more accustomed to what they are doing the bugs will be eliminated.

Something worthwhile is bound to come out of the group.

PROSPECT FOR 1958

Human Intelligence Is Needed For Salvation

The central problem of our time—as I view it—is how to employ human intelligence for the salvation of mankind.

For 12 years now we've sought to stave off (the) ultimate threat of disaster of devising arms which would be both ultimate and disastrous. This irony can probably be compounded a few more years, or perhaps even a few more decades. Missiles will bring anti-missiles, and anti-missiles will bring anti-anti-missiles. But inevitably, this whole electronics house of cards will reach a point where it can be constructed no higher.

Have we already gone too far in this search for peace through the accumulation of peril? Is there any way to halt this trend—or must we push on with new devices until we inevitably come to judgement before the atom? I believe there is a way out. And I believe it because I have acquired in my lifetime a decent respect for human intelligence.

It may be that the problems of accommodation in a world split by rival ideologies are more difficult than those with which we have struggled in the construction of ballistic missiles. But I believe, too, that if we apply to these human problems, the energy, creativity, and the perseverance we have devoted to science, even problems of accommodations will yield to reason. Admittedly, the problem of peaceful accommodation in the world is infinitely more difficult than the conquest of space, infinitely more complex than a trip to the moon. But if we will only come to the realization that it must be worked out—whatever it may mean even to such sacred traditions as absolute national sovereignty — I believe that we can somehow, somewhere, and perhaps through some as yet undiscovered world thinker and leader find a workable solution.

I confess that this is as much an article of faith as it is an expression of reason.

We can compete with a Sputnik and probably create bigger and better Sputniks of our own. But what are we doing to prevent the Sputnik from evolving into just one more weapons system? And when are we going to muster an intelligence equal to that applied against the Sputnik and dedicate it to the preservation of this Satellite on which we live?

How long—I would ask you—can we put off salvation? When does humanity run out?

We can't sit about waiting for some felicitous accident of history that may somehow make the world all right. Time is running against us, and it is running against us with the speed of a Sputnik. If we're going to save ourselves from the instruments of our own intellect, we had better soon get ourselves under control and begin making the world safe for living. —Omar N. Bradley addressing the St. Alban's Convocation

Did Eban Blur Facts?

To The Editor: Ambassador Abba Eban's assertion that the refugee problem constitutes the major source of regional conflict in the Middle East is correct.

However, Mr. Eban is a clever propagandist for the Israeli cause and as a propagandist I'm afraid he is inclined to blur the facts.

The refugee problem was caused directly by the Israelis and they have consistently refused to resolve it either by repatriation or payment for territory taken.

Driven from their lands by a combination of war and terrorism, the Palestinian Arab refugees now number close to 900,000 and live in unspeakable conditions in camps located in the Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and the Gaza Strip. Prior to partition in November of 1947, the Jews declared in sincere tones that they would make full restitution to the Arabs for any losses they might incur. Since the truce agreements of 1948, the Israelis have consistently refused to acknowledge any responsibility for the former owners of the land they occupy.

Mr. Eban cites refusal of the Arab nations to absorb the refugees. It might be pointed out that Egypt with its 23,240,000 inhabitants, its rising birth rate and a relatively small amount of cultivatable land is hardly in a position to absorb Egyptians, let alone Palestinians. Jordan, where the majority of the refugees are located, is mostly desert and cannot even exist as a State without sizable foreign subsidies. Syria is very underpopulated certainly but it is also short of water and again a large part of its area is desert. The Lebanon, a tiny country with modest resources is not possible. Iraq, which is beginning to boom, has absorbed some of the refugees and will probably absorb more. Because of its oil and its rivers it is the only really viable state of the area.

Mr. Eban said that he could not conceive of any territorial problem from Israel's side when Israel possessed only 8,000 square miles of territory as compared to 4,000,000 possessed by the Arab nations. Apparently Mr. Eban lumps all the Arab states into one vast area of Arabdom and does not consider these countries as separate entities. What Mr. Eban failed to note is that the land of Palestine occupies approximately 11,000 square miles which for 1,600 years has been inhabited by Moslem and Christian Arabs. In 1922 at the beginning of the British Mandate, there were 85,000 Jews in Palestine. As of the 1956 Israeli census there were 1,850,000 Jews in Palestine and they now occupy 80% of the land belonging to their former hosts.

Mr. Eban blames General Gamal Abdel Nasser entirely for the invasion of Sinai. He fails to mention that during the years 1949-54 the Israelis were condemned by the Mixed Armistice Commission for 95 severe border violations in the Jordan area alone as opposed to 60 violations by the Jordanians and that in late 1955 in retaliation against the Fedayeen (Self-Sacrificers, mostly Palestinian guerrillas) engaged in a series of stepped-up attacks which included El Auja in the Sinai Desert, three Syrian villages on the northeast shore of Gallilee and Qalqilya in Jordan. The invasion of Sinai was undertaken just one day after Ambassador Eban, himself stated to President Eisenhower that "Israel will start no war."

I think that contrary to Mr. Eban's assertion, the Arab nations do not want to solve the World's most troublesome problem; it is the Israelis, who contrary to all reasons of sense and humanitarianism refuse to come even part of half way.

Elizabeth C. Wait

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 8, 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
- News Editor — PAUL RULE
- Asst. News Editor — ANN FRYE
- Sports Editor — BILL KING
- Asst. Sports Editor — DAVE WIBLE
- Business Manager — JOHN WHITAKER
- Proof Reader — GRAHAM SNYDER
- Night Editor — GRAHAM SNYDER



by Charles Schulz
by Al Capp
by Walt Kelly