

1959

The following are things that probably won't happen in 1959:

- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- The Interfraternity Council vote for deferred rush.
- The Pan Hellenic Council abolish compulsory parties.
- The Student Legislature do something worthwhile.
- Governor Hodges praise someone for his outspoken stand in favor of the law of the land.
- The federal government take education seriously.
- Secretary of State John Foster Dulles resign.
- The Interfraternity Council vote not unanimously.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- The Russians not put up a six ton missile.
- The United States not put up an eight ton missile.
- The Russians not put up a ten ton missile.
- The race for more weight flying around the world cease.
- Justice Tom C. Clark vote in opposition to the current loyalty-security program.
- Dwight D. Eisenhower quit playing golf.
- Richard Nixon quit running.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- The Playmakers put on a perfect play.
- Anthony Wolff praise the Playmakers for putting on a perfect play.
- A politician speak out for heavily increased taxation.
- Ann Frye vote Democratic.
- The Women's Residence Council abolish their childish rules.
- The University rank higher than last in the American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- The General Assembly approve all educational budget requests.
- The Petites Dramatiques hold a play.
- The washing machine committee be abolished as too great an undertaking for the Supreme Legislative Body of the campus.
- The Ku Klux Klan be integrated.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- The Women's Honor Council institute a fair trial procedure.
- Orval Faubus be arrested for contempt of court.
- The University's library rank first in the south.
- Girls stop chasing boys.
- Freshmen be allowed to have cars on the campus.
- Fraternities with discriminatory clauses, discard the clauses.
- The trustees abolish the drinking rule.
- Adlai Stevenson campaign actively for and win the Democratic presidential nomination.
- March Wind turn into an April Breeze.
- The United States develop a consistent and sound foreign policy.
- The YMCA not want space on The Daily Tar Heel's "front page."
- An amateur athletic system be adopted at UNC.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- Hubert Humphrey lose the stigma of his introduction of the Communist Control Act.
- Peanuts grow up.
- A western hero die after losing his riding skill.
- Television improve.
- Movies improve.
- The downtown merchants have the lowest prices in the state.
- The proofreading of The Daily Tar Heel be perfect.
- The Arabs be friends with the Israelis.
- The Israelis be friends with the Arabs.
- Madison Avenue say that somebody should not buy something.
- Nuclear testing be suspended.
- Dwight Eisenhower be a president.
- The Student Legislature provide a sensible judicial system.
- The female leadership on the campus emerge from the Victorian Age.
- The Di Senate hold a debate.
- Students be interested in academic affairs.
- The South be integrated.
- Joint Honor Councils be established.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.
- A South American country not have a revolution.
- Mendes-France start drinking wine.
- The English give up claim to Cyprus.
- The Democratic Party become a party.
- The Symposium on Public Affairs pick a chairman.
- The Publications Board not be revised for the twentieth time in as many years.
- The course system be abolished.
- Brains be considered a virtue.
- Liquor be legalized in Chapel Hill.
- The Ackland Art Museum have some paintings.
- The United Nations be trusted by countries as something more than a debating society.
- The New York Yankees lose the American League pennant.

Continued on Column 7

Defense Spending

Jack Raymond

How much should the United States spend on military defense? This fiscal year (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959) it is expected to spend \$40 billion. That is more than half the government's estimated total expenditure of \$79 billion. In the next fiscal period, military spending is expected to rise by at least \$1 billion despite cutbacks in uniformed manpower, reduced production of weapons "hardware" and the elimination of some costly missile programs.

President Eisenhower has let it be known on several occasions that he is worried about these expenditures. The government deficit is \$12 billion, and the President has warned that unless some way is found to reduce military spending, "Then I will tell you we better go into a garrison state." Yet, when Mr. Eisenhower presents his budget for Fiscal Year 1960 to Congress next January, he will be faced by critics whose views of military preparedness, if adopted, would require even greater expenditures than the economy-minded President will be forced to propose. Influential Congressmen already have announced that they will fight the President's orders to reduce the size of the Armed Forces. A Congressional debate over the military budget is thus pending.

The perfectly credible report that the Soviet Union has flown a nuclear-powered airplane illustrates the challenge. For, if the report is correct, it is a nuclear-powered military airplane that Moscow has produced. And it was a military missile that lifted the gigantic Sputniks into orbit around the earth. And it is in the production of military vehicles such as tanks and armored cars, and long-range missiles and manned bombers, rather than in other fields that the Soviet Union is outproducing us.

The Soviet Union's huge ground forces of 2.5 million men—more than three times the size of the United States Army—is the only fighting force in the world today that has completely re-equipped its units with post-Korean weapons, including missiles capable of firing nuclear warheads.

This does not mean that the Soviet Union's rulers want war. It means that the Soviet Union has developed and maintained a capability for war that we must take into account in planning our own military effort.

Pentagon officials quote the following figures:
—In World War II, a B-17 Flying Fortress cost \$188,000, a B-29 Superfortress cost \$625,000. Today a B-47 Strato-jet Bomber costs \$1.9 million and the B-52 Strato-fortress costs more than \$7 million.

—In World War II, a submarine cost \$6 million to \$8 million, but the atomic-powered Nautilus cost \$65 million. A World War II destroyer cost \$9 million while its modern counterpart costs \$27 million.

—The aircraft carrier Lexington, built in 1937, cost \$45 million. The supercarrier Forrestal, commissioned last year, cost \$204 million and the first atomic carrier, Enterprise, now under construction, will cost \$321 million.

—Even the Army, whose equipment normally does not carry astronomical price tags, finds itself paying \$134,000 for a tank today, compared with \$81,324 for a World War II tank. To equip a Pentomic Infantry Division of 13,748 men costs \$56.8 million, compared with \$43.7 million for a World War II-style infantry division of 17,000 men.

These figures illustrate the tremendous burden of inflation and the higher cost of "sophisticated" weapons.

And just to press that point harder, it might be noted that intercontinental ballistic missiles, such as the Atlas fired successfully last month—more than a year after the Soviet claimed a similar feat—cost at least \$1.5 million apiece. And ballistic missiles cannot be recovered and used again.

Even more fundamental to the size of the defense budget than either inflation or improved weaponry is the strategic policy of the country. In this respect, defense spending depends upon two considerations:

1. The aims and obligations of United States military abroad as an adjunct of foreign policy.
2. The roles and mission of the individual services in relation to the radical changes in weaponry.

The first of these considerations seems obvious enough. Certainly we could reduce the costs of national defense if we withdrew our overseas divisions, abandoned our world network of air bases and reduced military aid to foreign countries. We could concentrate on an intercontinental ballistic missile defense, based in this country, and hope that economic aid to foreign nations would enable those countries effectively to counteract Soviet and Chinese Communist penetration. We would accept some form of "neutrality" in critical geographical areas in return for some form of Soviet concession on inspection of nuclear weapons tests and defense against surprise attack.

The second consideration for the defense budget is the cost of supplying the individual services with the weapons they need. But many of the weapons our military people seek have not even been designed. Can we afford to spend money on every idea? We spent \$690 million to develop the Navaho intercontinental guided missile before we gave it up as a bad job. Yet if we economize excessively on research and development, we may find the Soviet Union producing a weapons system that would render our forces obsolete.

Then there is a question of civilian defense. Some Administration officials a few years ago proposed a nationwide bomb-shelter construction system that would cost \$40 billion. The price tag killed the proposal. Americans are so embarrassed anyway about their air raid drills that they balk at the thought of digging elaborate holes to hide in. Yet if we do not build such shelters and our deterrent weapons do not deter, millions of peoples may be killed by hydrogen tipped missiles who otherwise might have lived. At the same time, if too much emphasis is given to preparedness for nuclear war, we may fall short in the critical areas where only conventional military forces can be employed. And if we fail to keep ahead in mass destruction weapons, even large numbers of conventional forces may fail to counter aggression.

These were some of the problems of choice raised by the Committee for Economic Development last July. The committee also emphasized that the choices, once made, cannot be quickly changed. It takes a long time to develop a weapon—ten years for the Atlas ICBM, six years for the B-52 jet bomber—a long time to equip a division of fighting men. And a lot of money.

Ostensibly each of the services is responsible for conducting operations against its enemy counterpart. But it is clear that there is a great deal of overlapping. The Air Force will be sending men into space and hoisting observer satellites to spy on an enemy from stations whirling above the atmosphere. But the Air Force no longer will have a monopoly on strategic air missions, when the Navy can launch 1,500-mile missiles from its new Polaris submarines. And the Army says that since man faces the prospect of being sent into space and landing on the moon and planets, its mission to seize and control the "ground" will follow.

It is evident that good arguments can be made for providing each of the services with the weapons it wants or thinks it needs. But this introduces a third dimension of cost to the military budget problem. The first two dimensions are inflation and the greater "sophistication" or capability of modern weapons. The third dimension is related to weapons improvements in that the better weapons in turn prompt the military services to expand their military objectives, creating a new need for even better—and more expensive—weapons to achieve these objectives. Moreover, it is not so much US but Soviet scientific advancement that makes our weapons obsolete.

Against the view of the Administration that failure to cut military spending may prove tragic to the economy is the view that "we can afford what we have to afford." Those who say this, however, are seldom explicit. What does that statement mean? The US now spends about 11 percent of its Gross National Product for military purposes. The Soviet Union, it is estimated, spends something like 15 to 30 percent of its Gross National Product for military purposes, depending upon how one calculates available statistics. Does our national security require us to match the Soviet effort and spend, let us say, at least 15 or 20 percent of our Gross National Product for the military? If that is our decision, it might mean a rise in military expenditures not of \$1 billion or \$2 billion, but of \$10 billion or \$20 billion a year! Who in Congress advocates that?—The New Republic

"The Situation In China Looks Interesting—"



American Studentry Lacking

Herbert Butterfield

My American friends had often told me that I ought to visit one of the small liberal arts colleges in the United States, so I was delighted to be asked to Wabash and Hanover, in Indiana.

For a man from an English university the surprises are many. At Wabash College and in Hanover the day begins at eight o'clock, whereas an English undergraduate feels himself unfortunate if there are many days in the week on which he has to go to a lectures as early as nine. Dinner is an hour or two earlier than in England; and it takes place, not in a College Hall, but in Fraternity Houses, where to the amazement and joy of a visitor, the young students who act as his hosts are liable to break out into song during the meal itself.

Whereas in England there is what I should call a friendly respectfulness between students and faculty, there is in the United States—at least in small colleges—an affectionate and not unattractive kind of nonchalance, the student manner being unpolished at times, but engaging in its freedom and frankness. At Wabash and Hanover the college is self-complete. Here the students can generally know one another and feel that they form a single society.

Some colossal universities give one an impression of anarchy—a sense of seething masses, living regardless of one another, attending a class but then dispersing to all points of the compass, so that neither the visiting outsider nor the actual member of the body can ever embrace the whole system with his mind. I came to the conclusion that it is a very happy thing to belong to a small college.

The American student begins his college career with much less background than an English undergraduate; but he does not necessarily lack ingenuity in debate, and he gains more than the formal teaching of the college can quite account for since undergraduates do so much for the education of one another. In Hanover, an undergraduate from Korea pressed me in a brilliant manner on the subject of some of the most subtle of the argumentation in my theoretical writings; and, having been accustomed to the way in which even professional colleagues have misunderstood that argumentation, I was delighted to see an undergraduate who had not only caught my meaning, but rapidly seized upon its remoter implications.

I am not sure, however, that so small a college, though it seems to me so happy for the undergraduate, is not in certain respects difficult for members of the staff. These latter have certain advantages; they are not locked away in vast departments of their own; the physicist and the historian, the classical scholar and the economist, are constantly rubbing shoulders, benefiting from intellectual friction and intel-

lectual exchange. On the other hand, there are not so many historians or so many physicists on the spot, keeping one another on their toes, as we find in the great universities. The very friendliness of the place—the kind of family spirit that emerges so attractively—may even have its disadvantageous side if it helps to produce low pressure or prevents the elastic from being kept at stretch.

I wonder what would happen if the virtues of an American education could be combined with that peculiar "drive" which is often imparted to the English student in his last years at school, particularly when he is preparing for university scholarships. I think that occasionally in Eng-

land this intensification of study is carried too far; and sometimes as a teacher of history in Cambridge I have found freshmen so crammed and so over-taught in history that for a term, or even longer, I have had to keep them away from history altogether.

The greatest thing that a teacher can do for a student is not to teach him—not to transfer information from his own mind into the student's mind—but to communicate to him that "drive" which carries him forward on a process of autonomous self-education. If this could be added to American education in the later years of school life the result would be very remarkable indeed. —The Saturday Review

Beat Christmas

'Twas the night before Christmas and all through the pad Not a hip cat was swinging, and that's nowhere dad; The stove was hung up in that stocking routine, In hopes that the fat man would soon make the scene. The kids had all had it so they hid their sacks, And me and the bride had begun to relax, When there started a rumble that came on real frantic So I opened the window to figure the panic. I saw a square short that was makin' fat tracks, Bein' pulled by eight dogs who was wearing hat racks; And a funny old geezer was flippin' his lid, He told 'em to make it, and man, like they did! I couldn't help diggin' the scene

on the roof As I stood there just waiting for chubby to goof; They stood by the chimney in bunches and clusters 'Til tubby slid down, comin' on like gangbusters. His threads were the squarest and I had to chuckle; In front (not in back) was his Ivy League buckle; The mop on his chin hid his button-down collar And with that red nose, man he looked like a baller. Like he was the squarest, the most absolute, But face it, who cares when he left all that loot? He laid the jazz on me and fled from the gig. Wallin' "Have a cool Yule and man, later, like dig?" —BILL OLEFSON in the Los Angeles Times

On Christmas

Sidney Dakar

Christmas is almost here again. This is the time when everyone is always giving advice to everyone else on how to spread good will among our neighbors. I will also give my little contribution. However, my advice applies not only to the Christmas season, but to every day of the year. It saddens me to realize that very few people will read these words and fewer will heed them.

Most of us never realize the truly important things in life until it is often too late. We go through school worrying about whether we will make a B or C on some course which is supposed to be preparing us for life, but is not. We fret over whether we should wear high heels or flats, or whether we should wear a blue or grey suit. We spend hours or days trying to decide whether to buy some mundane article.

We miss the essence of life while we are right in the middle of it. We miss many opportunities to help a stranger with little effort on our part. We fail to give a child something that he wants dearly. We dismiss this want as not important and refuse to take the time to get him the inexpensive item.

Opportunity comes only once in many cases. We may no longer be able to find the stranger when we remember him years later. When it is too late, we realize how much joy we could have given him. The child grows up; he no longer desires the little thing which would have given him so much pleasure at the time. We can give the child more expensive items now, but somehow these more expensive things do not seem to make him as happy.

If we could only see these golden opportunities as they arrive, and not years later, our lives would be filled with happiness. I look back over my past years and see the many opportunities that I have passed by. I could have smiled at someone whom I did not like, but one who may have liked me. A smile, a kind word or deed, what a small price for years of happiness for us and for those who received them. Yet most of us refuse to pay this smallest of prices until it is often too late. For truly, we shall not pass this way again.

(Continued, 1959)

Continued from Column 1

Gambling be legalized.
A Graham Memorial floater float.
Premier Khrushchev say that America was not an imperialistic power.
President Eisenhower have any idea of the principles that the United States should stand for.
Politicians show great moral courage.
America produce a really great work of art.
Rock 'n' Roll cease to exist.
The University Party take a stand for something more than bicycle racks.
The dorms be quiet.
The Daily Tar Heel office be clean.
The Chamber of Deputies oppose De Gaulle.
The United States recognize Communist China.
Chiang Kai-shek give up thinking about the return to the mainland and return to reality.
The armed forces be unified to everyone's satisfaction.
The New York Yankees jump to the Mexican League because the competition is too strong in the American League.
The editor be happy.

Oh well, one can dream anyway.

Alford

Currently underfoot is a move to deprive newly elected Congressman Dale Alford of his seat in the house. Alford was victor by a write-in vote over Brooks Hays in a much publicized election victory in which Governor Orval Faubus' support of Alford was clearly indicated.

Any move to deprive Alford of his seat at this time, barring a fraud in the actual balloting or counting on election day, would be a bad thing.

Alford is not a person whom any self-respecting person would want in his legislature. He is not a person that promises any good by being in the House, but at the same time he is the representative of the will of the people in Arkansas, and thus he has a right to serve.

If during his term of office he violates any law, there can be impeachment proceeding brought about against him, but until then the House should be bound by the ballot of the citizens of Arkansas.

This is a bitter pill to swallow, especially to those like this observer, who feel that the loss of Brooks Hays was a tragic event. Yet, reality is reality and Hays lost. It would undermine representative government if Alford would not be seated.

This in no way should open the doors of either party to Dr. Alford. He should be regarded in the House as he was regarded at the polls—an independent segregationist, and as such should be excluded from either party if they want to keep the parties respectable in any good sense of that word.

The less prestige Dr. Alford gets the better.

Christmas

The editor and the staff of The Daily Tar Heel extend to the student body, faculty and administration best wishes for a Merry Christmas and a happy holiday vacation.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday and examination 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: \$4.50 per semester, \$8.50 per year.

Editor	CURTIS GANS
Managing Editors	CHARLIE SLOAN, STAN FISHER
News Editor	ANN FRYE
Associate Editor	ED ROWLAND
Business Manager	WALKER BLANTON
Sports Editor	RUSTY HAMMOND
Advertising Manager	FRED KATZIN
Circulation Manager	BOB WALKER
Subscription Manager	AVERY THOMAS
Assistant News Editor	ED RINER
Assistant Sports Editor	ELLIOTT COOPER
Asst. Adv. Manager	JOHN MINTER
Art Editor	ANTHONY WOLFF
Coed Editor	JOAN BROCK
Chief Photographers	BILL BRINKHOUS PETER NESS
Night Editor	O. A. LOPEZ