

The Word From The Chancellor

Chancellor House's statement read this way: "The contract between the University of North Carolina and its head football coach, Mr. George Barclay, is a three-year contract with another year to run. There has never been any issue between Mr. Barclay and the University over the terms of the contract in any way."

Translated, Mr. House's announcement served notice to win-happy alumni and everybody else who listened that the University is not going to be pressured into cancelling employees' contracts. Nobody—not even football coaches—gets thrown to the lions before his time is up.

A glance at next year's football schedule suggests Barclay's time may be up soon. But the Chancellor, as the leading actor in this annual drama, has acquitted himself and the University well. We probably stand to lose some alumni contributions, but that shouldn't have made Mr. House bat an eye. And it didn't.

Mr. Hoover & Academic Freedom

A letter from FBI chief J. Edgar Hoover has assured the editor of the student paper at the University of New Mexico that the FBI "would never engage in any activity which might result in stifling academic freedom."

This sane note may help silence the trumpets blasting against collegiate debate of the Red China admission issue. Hoover, who lost the faith of many people by what seemed to be a partisan attitude toward the Harry Dexter White episode, has done by this letter a good turn both to his agency and to the colleges.

It adds up, we'd say, to a stinging smack at Representative Robeson of Virginia and others like him. Mr. Robeson has written a Duke debater that what he said in debate might be used against him in later life.

This is the last measure of thought policing. The mode of the second Big Red Scare is to hold one responsible today for what he said and thought 20 years ago.

"A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little men," Emerson wrote, and that's still true. The right to change one's mind and to hold unpopular opinions seems self-evident, but it is being threatened. It is good to see Mr. Hoover affirm that it still exists.

Ode On A Grecian Riot

An ambiguity of American foreign policy has now resulted in a burst of anti-Americanism in Athens. Students at Athens University, marching through the streets about 4,000 strong, raised havoc over American support of British control of Cyprus.

Cyprus is vital: it is the focal point of British command in the Middle East. Has Greece gone downhill since she rose under the Truman Doctrine to slap Communistic aggression in the face? We doubt that the Grecian attitude results as much from a change of face toward Russia as from a change of face toward American foreign policy.

The U. S. State Department knew it had to support British control of Cyprus several months ago. But from one corner of its mouth it uttered imposing talk about "liberation" behind the iron curtain. If we advocate liberation in the iron curtain countries, we must naturally support national determination in all European countries. Otherwise we are guilty of what Adlai Stevenson called "hollow moral pretensions."

Determination on one side of the curtain plus support of colonialism on the other adds up to inconsistency. That, we suppose, is what disturbs the Athenian students.

The problems of resurgant nationalism and anti-Americanism in Europe are volcanoes. Unless our foreign policy shows to a consistent line (as it has not on the question of colonialism and self-determination) the volcanoes will spit with frequency and damage.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Monday, examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter at 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 CHARLES KURALT
 Managing Editor FRED POWLEDGE
 Associate Editors LOUIS KRAAR, ED YODER
 Business Manager TOM SHORES
 Night Editor for this Issue Bob Dillard

Carolina Front The Dean May Be A Good Fellow, But...

Louis Kraar

DEAN FRED Weaver, who for years has been listening to students tell what's wrong with the administration, told Student Party members the other night what was wrong with student government.



There was nothing pessimistic about the dean picking that topic. The students who invited him to their meeting chose it for him, and Dean Weaver admitted that "I'm here because I was fascinated by the title suggested."

After a half hour of qualifying statements, including a warning that "the dean's word is not to be taken as gospel," Dean Weaver got down to the nitty-gritty of student government.



"FIND OUT the justification for the Honor System," the dean told some 20 students who attended. He cited the lack of understanding the Honor System among students.

"There's a jurisdictional confusion on campus in enforcing the Honor System and Campus Code," Weaver said, referring to the cluttered court system.

The "jurisdictional confusion," according to the dean, delays handling of "many important matters" as well as "paralyzing initiative."

"Let's get a real Student Council," Weaver suggested. "If it (the Student Council) is not going to manage the Honor System, let it be something great. Forget that it ever had anything to do with trying cases... and let it be a general, overriding executive group."

Exactly what Dean Weaver meant by making the Student Council an "overriding executive group," I'm not sure. But apparently, like many student leaders, he thinks that the Student Council should do more than hear appeal cases from other courts and rule on the constitutionality of laws.

Right now the Student Council is a group of student leaders who rarely meet and whose talents could be much more fully utilized.

"WE DON'T give enough attention to foreign students here," the dean said. "Student government ought to support foreign students."

Weaver suggested that several industrial and educational groups would probably be willing to foot the bill, or part of it, if student government took the initiative.

This reporter is reminded of Weaver's remarks on foreign students last spring at the All-Campus Conference. He suggested then that fraternities might take in foreign students as a campus service.



CONSERVATIVELY dressed, but acting less conservative, Dean Weaver appeared candid and at ease as he spoke.

Perhaps his classroom experience this term teaching social science accounts for that. At any rate, one felt that Dean Weaver was enjoying the talk, and his humor at many points was refreshing.

"The dean is not a student," Weaver said in one of his many qualifying remarks. "The dean may be a good fellow, slap you on the back, drink with you in fraternity court—drink coffee, that is—but he can't be a student."

Before he said what was wrong with student government, Dean Weaver said that there were several "specific rights about it." They included the preservation of student freedom, the work of the Carolina Forum and Inter Dormitory Council, and the activities of the political parties.

Despite Weaver's warning that the dean's word should "not be taken as gospel," this reporter feels that his suggestions on the courts, Student Council and Honor System will keep the campus politicians busy for the rest of the year.



The Knowland-Nixon Break

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — President Eisenhower has made one important concession to military advisers who have been pushing him to take strong steps in China. These military men are chiefly Adm. Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Gen. James Van Fleet, the Korea commander whose letter on troop-training contributed to Ike's election.

What the President has agreed to is the use of the U. S. Navy to seize Red Chinese merchant vessels if the United Nations fails in its attempt to free the 11 American airmen and two American civilians.

Eisenhower's concession on this point came only after a long series of debates inside the National Security Council and the White House. During most of these debates the President leaned over backward against his military advisers.

The man who chiefly backed him up was General Matt Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, who has so emphatically disagreed with Eisenhower on reducing the strength of the Armed Forces that he will probably be retired on his birthday in March. But, on the question of getting bogged down in a possible war in China, the two spoke the same language.

Admiral Radford, however, is one of the most charming and persuasive military men in the Pentagon. Very much in the doghouse with the Truman Administration because of his open battle against the Air Force, Radford sweet-talked himself in to Ike's good graces during one short hour when Ike's plane refueled at Iwo Jima during the December, 1952, trip to Korea.

Ike then took Radford on the rest of the trip and he's been with him ever since.

Easy To Seize Reds Radford, therefore, was able to talk Eisenhower into a promise that the U. S. Navy would be used to seize communist China shipping if the U. N. negotiations break down. He did this in part by showing how easy it has been for Chiang Kai-Shek's navy, reinforced by N. S. observation planes and using former U. S. warships, to capture Red Chinese shipping in the Formosa straits.

Red shipping has to pass through the relatively narrow waters between the Chinese mainland and Chiang's Formosa, where it is easy for Chiang to lay in wait and pick off ships almost at will.

Thus, without a blockade, Red China would not be able to communicate between the vitally important seaports of the South

and those of the North, about the same thing as cutting New York—Philadelphia—Boston off from Baltimore—Norfolk—Miami—New Orleans.

NOTE Ike was of the opinion that the U. N. mission would succeed and that a showdown with the Red China navy would not be necessary.

Washington Pipeline

The State Department has drawn up a secret list of 526 missing Americans—472 servicemen, 54 civilians—who have disappeared behind the bamboo curtain. The State Department is morally certain many are alive in communist prisons, has asked Central Intelligence to locate them. If our agents in China can find proof these men are alive, Uncle Sam will make a vigorous protest in the United Nations, then follow up with military pressure if necessary.

The French are missing 20,000 troops that the Reds were supposed to repatriate under the armistice agreement in Indo-China. The recent East German elections revealed that the number of voters has dropped by 238,181 in the last four years. Most are refugees who fled to the West. The administration is quietly trying to arrange for Chief Justice Earl Warren to address a joint session of Congress. The Federal courts are in such urgent need of increased appropriations that a personal appeal from the Chief Justice is considered necessary to dramatize the need.

For example, the Chief Justice—second most important official in the land—doesn't even have a limousine. He must either rent one or hail a cab to attend formal functions. Yet minor assistant secretaries, attending the same functions, drive up in official government limousines. Ike and Mamie have four plush Presidential limousines between seven. Maybe they could loan one to the Chief Justice.



SEN. KNOWLAND ... out for the top job

posed to repatriate under the armistice agreement in Indo-China. The recent East German elections revealed that the number of voters has dropped by 238,181 in the last four years. Most are refugees who fled to the West. The administration is quietly trying to arrange for Chief Justice Earl Warren to address a joint session of Congress. The Federal courts are in such urgent need of increased appropriations that a personal appeal from the Chief Justice is considered necessary to dramatize the need.

Knowland's friends swear this is the main reason the big, obstinate majority leader voted for McCarthy. It was Nixon, for example, who appointed the Censure Committee, including its Senate Chairman, Utah Sen. Arthur Watkins. Afterward, it was Nixon who persuaded Ike to congratulate Watkins.

This public endorsement of Watkins, plus Ike's press-conference remarks opposing Knowland's views on China, was interpreted by Knowland as a double-barreled public rebuke, engineered by Nixon.

Knowland has always resented the fact that Ike's chief liaison with the Senate has been through Nixon, rather than him. In the past the Vice President has been more of a figurehead, with the Senate majority leader the chief contact with the White House.

Mr. Nix Vs. Mr. No

The inside story hasn't been told, but Bill Knowland's break with the administration isn't a personal split with President Eisenhower. It's resentment against Vice President Nixon.

Those who know Knowland know he's so bitter against his fellow Californian that he will automatically oppose anything Nixon favors. Since the Vice President is the "Voice-of-Ike" on Capitol Hill, this has the psychological effect of putting Knowland at odds with the administration on almost every issue.

Also at the back of Knowland's mind, his friends say, is an ambition to succeed the late Sen. Robert Taft as spokesman for the GOP conservative wing. If Ike declines to run again, Knowland is convinced the Republican Party will give its next Presidential nomination to the most promising conservative candidate. This explains why Knowland declined comment recently as to whether Ike should be drafted.

Or, if Ike does try for a second term, he may be forced to choose a conservative running mate for the sake of party harmony. In either case, Knowland would like to be the most available choice.

Vice President Nixon, as the tail to the Eisenhower kite, is obliged to go in the same direction as the President. Nixon does his best to determine the direction and guide the President. Frequently he has. It was he who for months laid down the appease-Joe policy. But, once the policy is laid down, Nixon faithfully follows the Eisenhower line. And once the White House lined up positively against McCarthy, no one worked harder behind the scenes against McCarthy than Nixon.

Knowland's friends swear this is the main reason the big, obstinate majority leader voted for McCarthy. It was Nixon, for example, who appointed the Censure Committee, including its Senate Chairman, Utah Sen. Arthur Watkins. Afterward, it was Nixon who persuaded Ike to congratulate Watkins.

This public endorsement of Watkins, plus Ike's press-conference remarks opposing Knowland's views on China, was interpreted by Knowland as a double-barreled public rebuke, engineered by Nixon.

Knowland has always resented the fact that Ike's chief liaison with the Senate has been through Nixon, rather than him. In the past the Vice President has been more of a figurehead, with the Senate majority leader the chief contact with the White House.

Battle On 'The Rim Of Hell' President Vs. War Hawks

Chalmers M. Roberts

In The Reporter

Changes in foreign policy are sometimes heralded in major pronouncements by a President or a Secretary of State. More often they come gradually, almost unnoticed. The second kind of change has been taking place in Washington in recent weeks.

The shift has been from the top down rather than from the bottom up, and that has made assessment of the change more difficult. There has been no cranking out policy papers, which then work their tortuous way up through the bureaucratic levels to the National Security Council and finally to the President.

The change, to be precise, has taken place in Dwight D. Eisenhower. But because of the way the change has come about, the result has been uncertainty within the Government, especially at the two key operational departments, State and Defense. And if there has been uncertainty in Washington, there has been confusion throughout the nation.

What has happened is that the era of "instant retaliation" and "more bang for a buck" has been giving way to the "good partners" concept with our allies and to an intensive search by the President for what he has called a *modus vivendi* with the Communist world.

There is not going to be any dismantling of the Strategic Air Command, of course, nor will we stop putting our major dependence on the ever-growing "family" of atomic weapons. The President has not stopped believing that the long-range Soviet goal is world revolution and world domination, as he told a recent press conference.

The 'Middle Road'

What the President says about peace or atomic war at his press conferences may sound platitudinous in print, but if you are actually there the words take on an intensity that can only come from the deepest personal conviction. He seems to be thinking out loud, and in the process he reveals a lot about himself. That was certainly the case in his remarkably eloquent talk at the December 2 press conference, when he gave his clearest exposition thus far on his determination not to be swayed from that "middle road" between appeasement and belligerence in the search for peace.

One has occasionally the feeling—meaning no disrespect—that the President's reactions are almost visceral. He is groping for a way out of the dilemma of our times, he is convinced there must be a way out, but no one has shown him just what it is. Considering the hysteria over Communism of the past two years it is a tribute to Mr. Eisenhower that he has somehow thrown off those who would drive him into a dead end from which war would be the only escape. This is also a reflection of his innate caution, of his feeling against extremes, of his ability to gauge the temper of the mass of Americans and the masses elsewhere in the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

But it is not enough merely to say that he is seeking a way out of the dilemma of our times, for he has sought that from the day he took office. The difference is that he has now begun to act—and that he has come to some conclusions about the nature of nuclear war.

But Will He Keep It Up?

The issue today to many in high places in Washington is put in the form of a question: Given a nuclearweapons stand-off, is the United States willing to fight a "small war" if necessary? That the question has been in Senator Knowland's mind too is clear from his statement on the Senate floor: "We might have the desired (military) strength; but it as a matter of national policy the American people were not prepared to support the use of that strength... that strength on our part would not necessarily constitute a restraining influence upon the Soviets."

This was a polite way of asking whether the President was "prepared" to use that strength. There is divided opinion on this matter in Washington today. One official bitterly tells a reporter that "The golf club has replaced the umbrella" as the symbol of appeasement, while another official says confidently, "I think we will make the decision to fight the little wars." But nobody really knows. For the President, in the last analysis, has to weigh all the conflicting claims and make the decision himself.

Some months ago a friend said to Mr. Dulles, "The President certainly leaves foreign affairs pretty much up to you." "Yes, I suppose he does," the President, vastly impressed by Mr. Dulles's detailed knowledge of diplomacy and of the intricacies of the world's problems, has given his Secretary of State perhaps more power than has been exercised by any other man who ever held that office. But in the Quemoy crisis, Mr. Dulles discovered himself on the wrong side.

And yet there are very few men to whom Mr. Eisenhower can turn for advice and support. Mr. Dulles has a direct telephone line to the White House from both his office and his home, and he is in and out of the Executive Mansion almost constantly. But it is "all business," the Pre-

sident's associates say, between the two men. They do not play bridge together—Mr. Eisenhower seeks relaxation with men of lesser intellectual capacity than Mr. Dulles.

The President appears to have handed down at Denver only a rather generalized statement: Nothing shall be done to involve the United States in nuclear war, though we must remain strong enough to fight one if it is forced upon us. Meanwhile, the problem is to find a way to deal with "coexistence" over what looks like a long period of peace ahead.

Secretary Dulles and others who have now caught the spirit of the President's new outlook see the "long-haul" program this way: continued advance in weapons, continued improvement in continental defense, a search for a way out of the Indo-China morass, a leash on Chiang, and—this last is new—a massive economic program for the underdeveloped nations to convince them that Communism is neither the only nor the best way to raise their standard of living.

The Change

Among the seemingly logical outcomes of what Mr. Eisenhower has set in motion would be an eventual "two Chinas" policy. And yet Mr. Eisenhower is still moving slowly and cautiously. He is fully aware of the opposition at the Capitol, especially within the Republican Party but by no means absent among Democrats. He is fully aware of the attraction of the Radford doctrine that the Communists must not be allowed to consolidate their hold on the mainland.

The President has a tendency to play things by ear. What Moscow and Peking do—as in the prisoner-of-war issue—will greatly affect what he does. Quemoy and the other Nationalist-held islands off the mainland could still set off an explosion if the Communists go too far.

There is change under way in Washington. But it is not occurring in the traditional manner of policy changes, often the work of some anonymous expert deep in the labyrinth of government framing an idea that finally works its way to the top. Rather, it is Mr. Eisenhower at the summit of government who is generating the change. This in itself is a contradiction both to the normal ways of government and of the Eisenhower staff-work approach, the product of his long military career. Yet this is what is happening, as is clear to all who take the trouble to look behind the platitudes.

One Washington official has likened Mr. Eisenhower's actions to "the awakening of Gulliver, who is now sitting up, rubbing his eyes, and breaking the strings the war hawks had tied around him."

The President, it seems to me, is seeking to pull away from the bellicose spirit of the first eighteen months of his Administration, to get away from the hysteria and negativism of anti-Communism, and to find some positive way to express and to advance the American conviction that mankind, given a decent choice and a helping hand, will choose freedom.

So far it has been pretty much of a one-man show. But that one man happens to be the President of the United States.

Quote, Unquote

The Year It Happened

"Will future generations (weird, stunted little creatures that survive) remember 1955 as the year the automobile was invented? And the race started its long downhill glide back into the primeval ooze?"

To judge from the ecstatic moans, sighs and gasps of the advertising men, 1955 will indeed be remembered as the year the automobile was invented. All that has gone before was as nothing. Everything is new, new, new. New concepts. New dimensions. New even the metal is in motion when the car is standing still. The gearshift is on the dashboard, the trunk is large enough to install air-conditioning and a crew's quarters, and the power of 250 horses is under the long, long, long hood.

Windshields are wrapped around. Bumpers are wrapped around. Some windshields are more wrapped around than others. And tail-lights? Until this year of grace there never really were tail-lights. Twin jet tail lights. Twin column tail-lights. Fish-tail tail-lights and gun-sight tail-lights.

And low! So low a body can see right over top of them. See what? Why the other side of the universe, the sight that has hitherto been blocked by the roof which was so high that a body might sit upright with ease and comfort beneath it. Not any more, though.

How sad, too, it is to think of all the poor people, the sadly misguided people, the stubbornly old-fashioned people who still own last year's models. Those ungainly old things with their unwrapped windshields, their dully smoldering tail-lights, their feeble 245 horsepower. Why not even the metal is in motion in those antiques. Automobiles? Not they. For the automobile was really and truly invented in 1955, the year the advertising men stopped breathing air and took up pure oxygen.

—The Greensboro Daily News