

Don't Vote Today On E. Carolina

Raymond Mason Taylor

Don't vote today. We don't need responsible student leaders who will stand up for what is right. We do not need those who will further the interests of the University and make it a better place for those who follow us. We do not need leaders who will carry the problems of the University to our legislators and strive to obtain the results that will make the University a university per se, rather than just a group of buildings set on a lovely campus.

We do not need student leaders who will point up to the administration and the faculty the shortcomings and needs of the university.

Students do not need to exercise the right they have of choosing their leaders. Everyone should try to be a leader; we need no followers.

Students should not try to improve conditions at the University by choosing competent leaders who will be assets to the University and to the community.

We do not need those who will try to profit by the mistakes of their predecessors. We do not need those who will try to supplant old and outmoded methods with new and more workable ones.

We do not need leaders who will encourage individuals to be more than just individuals, but persons who feel a sense of responsibility to their class and to their university.

We do not need new Honor Council members who will strive to strengthen what the Honor System stands for. We do not need those who will strive to bring about more impartial judgment of their fellow students. Don't vote today.

R. S.

Never Knocked Out

We take this opportunity to take one more parting shot at all people involved in keeping the amendment calling for a re-districting of Honor Council elections off the ballot today. In particular, citations should be given to the members of the Student Council for the manner in which they handled the case. Chairman Erwin Fuller should be at the head of the line with the rest of the members playing follow the leader.

It is still clear to us that according to the wording in the Student Constitution of this University that the Student Legislature was correct in directing the Elections Board to place this measure on the ballot for the Fall Elections. The reason they are not is because of the action of the Student Council and its support by Student Body President Charlie Gray. We maintain that the Student Council should never have heard this case, as it clearly states in the Constitution the rules under which an amendment may be presented. These rules appear to have been followed by the Student Legislature. They have not been followed by the Student Council.

This another glorious chapter is written into the judicial history of the University. Off knocked down, but never knocked out, we will rise from the canvas and lead the way for a special referendum. Mr. Fuller has not seen the last of us.

D. B. Y.

So What?

1. The nation is at war.
2. The nation is losing the war, badly.
3. The nation must exert a vastly greater effort

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 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.00 per semester, \$7.00 per year. The Daily Tar Heel is printed by the News Inc., Carrboro, N. C.



Editor: DAVIS B. YOUNG
 Associate Editor: FRANK CROWTHER
 Assistant Editor: RON SHUMATE
 News Editors: DEE DANIELS, EDWARD NEAL RINER
 Sports Editor: ELLIOTT COOPER
 Feature Editor: MARY ALICE ROWLETTE
 Coed Editor: JOSIE MORRIS
 Photo Editors: BILL BRINKHOUS, PETER NESS
 Advertising Manager: BARRY ZASLAV
 Subscription Manager: ED SCHENCK

Pranksters



Herblock is away due to illness

Copyright 1959 The Pulitzer Publishing Co., St. Louis Post-Dispatch

Perspectives By Yardley

Jonathan Yardley

The "new diplomacy" has come of age. Until 1952, relations between nations were conducted by and large, by subordinate officials of the involved countries and by diplomatic correspondence on lower levels. The most important people in the "old diplomacy" were the ambassadors and the career diplomats. They were the nation's representatives to other nations, and it was through them, and through their communication of the leader's wishes, that foreign relations were solidified or broken.

Now, utilizing the embryo of the new pattern given genesis by John Foster Dulles, the nations of the world have changed the entire character of international relations. The subordinates no longer are the most crucial communicators; the leaders of the countries are their own voices.

This trend has been explosively dramatized by the announcement by President Eisenhower two weeks ago that he will make a nine nation tour beginning on December 4. This tour will cover areas of Asia never before visited by a President of the United States.

On December 4 the President will be in Rome to visit Segni of Italy and Pope John. Italy, one of Europe's largest countries and one which trades with the U. S. in great volume, hopes to gain a larger voice in summit preparations; if it does not, trouble may be in store for what has been to date one of our most trusted alliances.

On December 6 he will visit Menderes of Turkey in Ankara. The recent history of Turkish-American relations has been a good one; at the moment Russia is pressuring her about accepting an IRBM base. The President must encourage and strengthen this already devoted NATO ally.

On December 7 he will visit Pakistan's Ayub in Karachi; this important ally is in economic straits of incredible depth and must be bolstered. From Karachi he goes to Kabul in Afghanistan to talk with Daoud, whose close ties with Russian aid make this neutral nation's friendship a necessity.

Perhaps the most important visit of all takes place from December 9-13 when the President will be in New Delhi with India's Premier Nehru. This immense and impoverished land is threatened from the North by Communist raids, and must be given firmer guarantees of support from the United States and NATO. To lose the sometimes wavering friendship of this nation may be to lose Asia.

On December 14 the President will be in Tehran for talks with the Shah of Iran. This oil-rich, strongly pro-Western country is bordered by the Soviet Union and Iraq, and finds pressures constantly

heavy. She is one of the most important allies we have, and also must be given guarantees of full support.

The President's next stop will be Athens for conferences with Karamanlis of Greece. This ancient land, long a devoted friend of the United States, is involved in a bitter imbroglio with Great Britain over rights of Cyprus. The President must carry some tentative plans with him for solutions to this problem.

On December 19 Eisenhower journeys to Paris for three days of meetings with DeGaulle of France, Macmillan of Britain, and Adenauer of West Germany. The outcome of these meetings will be crucial. DeGaulle and Adenauer, still feeling slighted over what they consider lack of consultation with the Western powers, must be pacified and must be made to understand that they are considered links as important as any in the allied chain.

On December 22 the President closes out his trip with a visit to the King of Morocco in Rabat. This former French protectorate is now raising the issue of United States bases, and is desirous of removing them. This strategic country, located opposite the Rock of Gibraltar, is a vital key in our defense and must not be allowed to fall out. It can be retained only by friendship and offers of aid.

All of the countries which the President will visit have been, in the last ten or fifteen years, greatly dependent on United States aid. This is, for the most part, no longer true. They are beginning to be independent, self-sufficient nations which wish to assert this new-found strength, and it is the purpose of the President's trip to bring them more deeply into the international vendetta currently on stage.

In this age of transportation and communication the new diplomacy may be the only sane method of international relations. Dulles, father of the concept, used it sometimes wisely and sometimes poorly. He was a trailblazer, but his own indecisiveness was a major hurdle to his own success. If Eisenhower is to be successful in this venture he must remain constant in his views and in his intentions; if he wavers, as he and Dulles did in the past, the mission will have been a failure.

Also contingent upon the success of the mission is Eisenhower's place in history. Formerly a weak President, he has used the inability to run for reelection to do things which he had not dared to do before and has consequently raised the world's opinion of himself. This venture, if successful, could change his Presidency from a mediocre one to at least a good one.

Steel Strike Neither Black nor White, Mostly Shades Of Gray

Mary Stewart Baker

Norman B. Smith

The steel girders that appear to hold together the "health and safety" seams of the United States are slowly being dissolved by the binding steel strike. The situation, which should be of interest to us all, has already been given notable attention by Jonathan Yardley.

In order to augment Yardley's discussion, I think it is of the greatest importance that we all understand, in a broad outline, the Taft Hartley emergency injunction as applied by President Eisenhower in his approach to the steel problem.

The Taft-Hartley injunction itself and a review of its use in the past was included in a TIME MAGAZINE article several weeks ago. Time, then, has suggested to me the idea and necessity of discussing the law here.

Everyone should be fairly familiar with the purpose of an injunction; it serves as an interruption; it doesn't attempt to settle the dispute. The interruption provided is an 80-day period, during which time labor and management are offered the chance to work toward a new contract through special negotiations. During this time, strikers return to the mills.

When President Eisenhower invoked the Taft-Hartley device on October 9, he set into motion a law explainable most easily by three steps.

(1) After the President decides to use the emergency provision, he is first required to appoint a fact-finding committee to evaluate the effects of the strike and any possibilities for solution.

(2) If the appointed committee reports that there is no prospect of solution, the President then must send the Attorney General to a federal district court to obtain an issuance of the injunction from the court.

(3) If the court issues the "cease-and-desist" injunction, strikers are ordered back to their work for an 80-day period. During this time, while production is restored, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service attempts to bring some kind of agreement between labor and management. After 75 days, a secret election is conducted; this election gives the workers one last chance to accept the terms offered by management. If labor does not accept the offer, the injunction is lifted and the workers are free to resume their strike.

These three steps then are a dry outline of the so-called "interruption" provided for in the Taft-Hartley law. Now, let's turn to an exemplification of the steps as shown through the steel happenings of the past month and a half.

(1) President Eisenhower, invoking the law to protect "national health and safety" on Oct. 6, appointed the required fact-finding committee. The committee presented facts, indicating that no solution was in sight.

(2) The Attorney General was then sent to Federal District Court in the jurisdiction of the strike; this was the court of Federal District Judge Herbert P. Sorg in Pittsburgh. On Oct. 21 Judge Sorg agreed that the strike was impeding "national health and safety," therefore issuing the injunction.

(3) The final step in the Taft-Hartley device — that of bargaining — is in the process now. It is not my intention here to predict the outcome of the negotiations.

My route to church takes me on a muddy track through the new housing development. It used to be a path through the woods.

Gaudily in the sun reflected plastic coverings over piles of lumber and insulation, unnatural, gaudily and unseemly as the bleach-haired, rouged, spangle-dressed carnival wench. Mud, mud, the blood of wounded soil clung to my feet, struck on as stubbornly as swarms of leeches. Gone the woods!

Power equipment docilely awaited the work day tomorrow, resting there on haunches seemingly surveying cuts, roads, ditches they had consumed and fills, dirt piles they had excreted. From beneath the ditch-tops issued periodic metallic pings, complaints of newly laid waterlines.

I paused long, trying unsuccessfully to translate a dialogue being carried on between the bobbing and swishing trunk of a lone sapling, mangled and rudely bent over because it had grown there in the way; between it and the dribbling of now useless underground water being diverted by a concrete drain tile. The two conversants faced each other across the length of a rock-walled ditch. Much in common had they, these two elements of the woods — tree and spring — both unwanted in the housing development. Bewildered and sympathetic, a bird remained to listen when I turned and walked on.

KEEP OUT say hurriedly painted signs nailed against doorways of the new apartments. Chains and flammable block the roadways, too. A young couple tiptoed round one of the units, trying to peer through windows, dust laden, opaque by putty stains and glued-on papers. They and I should have known better, for there was no welcome there. The woods would have invited you in, with gentle noises and soft configurations of leaves or bare limbs. It would have discriminated not, friend to all who wanted its friendship. But when it is divested of its trees, has its soil torn off and gouged out, is covered with abrupt and unyielding buildings, then its identity changes and it belongs to someone who wants to keep people out until he is good and ready to have them come in, and then they have to pay; not only that, but live by his rules or be sent away.

These apartments, though, will have within their weatherstripped interiors thermostatic heat, ovens, refrigerators so the food can be just right, soft beds and chairs, entertaining worry-dispelling television sets, all sorts of really unnecessary but extremely comfortable paraphernalia. And the forest doesn't offer that. It only offers to share its heat and cold, hunger and fullness, wetness and dryness with you.

Sign up for one of those nice apartments soon if they aren't already taken; even so, you might get a good position on the waiting list. Don't feel badly about this. Our ancestors from further back than we can trace have been trading freedom for comfort. Except the hermits that go off and live in dirty, cold old caves and such places, and they, of course, are insane.

Essay Contest

Subject: "What is wrong with America and what can we do to correct it?"

Requirements: All essays must be typewritten, double-spaced and signed by the author. Name, address and phone number must be included. Length: 500-1500 words.

Prizes: There will be eight (8) prizes:
 1st Prize—one \$25 RANCH HOUSE Steak Certificate
 2nd Prize—one \$15 RANCH HOUSE Steak
 3rd Prize—one \$10 RANCH HOUSE Steak Certificate
 4th through 8th Prize — one RANCH HOUSE Buffet Certificate

(These prizes have been donated by Cactus Ted's RANCH HOUSE of Chapel Hill, one of the South's most distinctive restaurants. The certificates may be redeemed as meals at the RANCH HOUSE on or before March 15, 1960.)

Eligibility: All students, faculty members and employees of the Consolidated University of North Carolina and/or any member of the Chapel Hill community, excepting staff members of The Daily Tar Heel and Ranch House employees.

Judges: Dr. Alexander Heard, Dean of the Graduate School, UNC; Davis B. Young, Editor, The Daily Tar Heel; Frank H. Crowther, Associate Editor, The Daily Tar Heel. The decisions of these judges are final.

Deadline: All manuscripts must be received or postmarked not later than midnight, December 1, 1959. The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to print any or all essays. Winners will be announced on or before December 19, 1959.

Send all essays to: Daily Tar Heel Essay Contest, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

