

Political Propaganda: Nothing But Hogwash

Election time in Chapel Hill is more confusing than the panic scenes in Ernest Hemingway's "A Farewell To Arms."

Suddenly, candidates become publicity crazy and their anxiety is further augmented by the so-called question-answer forums which various groups on the campus must conduct during the campaign.

The *Daily Tar Heel*, more than any other group or institution on the UNC campus, feels the full brunt of this helter-skelter activity which characteristically describes elections in Chapel Hill.

For instance, of a total 229 news inches on pages one and three in the *Tar Heel* on Tuesday, approximately 112 inches were devoted exclusively to material involving the upcoming elections—about 50 per cent of our total news space.

The figure would be much higher if we discounted pictures used on both pages and the space occupied for "heads" which precede all stories. Surely, the amount occupied by campaign and election material then would be well over 60 per cent, maybe as high as 70 per cent.

We point this out not because the *Tar Heel* plans to refuse campaign propaganda between now and April 1, but to show that, by and large, our aspiring candidates are now hastening to exert in a week's time a hoped-for respect for themselves which a year has been unable to produce.

That is the tragedy in elections at the University of North Carolina—the fact that student candidates seemingly rely on a period of one or two weeks in which to present themselves favorably to a student body which should have been forming opinions throughout the year.

It would, indeed, be better if, when election time rolled around, our political aspirants could rest on their records of a year's service to the student body—a period in which respect for the politicians could be moulding—instead of relying almost solely on the campaign propaganda which they have printed in the *Tar Heel*.

We have not witnessed such extensive, free political advertisement—and that's all it is—in any of the numerous other college newspapers which find their way into our offices. Nor do we see this mad influx of campaign material into other papers in our state and nation.

But when election time rolls around at UNC, if this campaign propaganda can be used as any yardstick, it appears almost as if scores of unknowns thrust themselves onto the political scene with hopes that *The Daily Tar Heel* will lead the blind to the ballot boxes—and, particularly, that the blind, once there, will know which way to vote.

We do not resent this purpose which we are supposed to be serving. But we do resent the implications of it—that without *The Daily Tar Heel* no candidate in a political campaign would have a prayer against his more publicity-crazed opponent.

If our political aspirants cannot win without *The Daily Tar Heel*, they do not deserve to win. If they have not gotten across to the student body in a year's time what they attempt to cram into a period of 14 days, they're not worth a majority vote.

In a word, if it takes endless shouting in a campus newspaper in place of proven leadership and long-standing respect to win a political election, there's hardly a candidate at UNC deserving of the office which he seeks.

WISE & OTHERWISE

Election Time For Russians: Nobody Loses

By WHIT WHITFIELD

On the inside pages it passed unnoticed, but it was there nevertheless. We're speaking of the Soviet election returns of last week.

The local political factions might do well to investigate some of their methods, for it seems that they have devised a method whereby the candidates do not have to campaign. There is no wasted effort and no defeated candidates are frustrated.

Communist leaders nominated 1,378 candidates for 1,378 seats, and 1,378 pieces of red machinery were "elected." This must be an indication of the excellent administration the Kremlin is offering this year. What else?

No one can say that Soviet Russia is not democratic, for 133 million voters or 99.97 percent of those eligible cast their ballots after due consideration. The fact that .03 percent did not vote at all would seem to some western observers an indication of civil strife and unrest in the Soviet Union. Nyet! says the Kremlin. The same opinion was voiced by Sergei Striganov of the Soviet Embassy who was visiting in Chapel Hill at the time. His comment was, "the Party is doing well." He felt it unwise to comment further.

(Note: Soviet ingenuity is incredible. A rather time-saver for the electorate: Printed ballots which merely have to be folded and placed in the ballot box. (saves money on marking pencils too.)

While we're on the subject of Russian ingenuity it might be interesting to note that the Satellite race is tied at two apiece now. The question which naturally arises is what are the Russians up to now?

Although we can claim no authority in the matter, we submit that the Russians are not sleeping, and that they have something up their sleeves to stun the world. Since the alleged experts in such matters variously disagree as to what it is, we would hasten to conjecture that maybe they'll use a real satellite next time. The question is, who goes first—Poland or China? Or maybe they'll send Egypt to the Moon.

Some one brought to our attention that one of our columns was reprinted in the Greensboro Daily News last Thursday. We were pleased but quizzical, so we called Mr. H. W. Kendall of the News to inquire the reason. He informed us that circulation was off somewhat, so that it didn't make any difference. We thanked him and hung up. We'll still not quite sure what he meant.

"If You Get It, Remember I Mentioned It"



HERBLOCK ©1958 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

LETTERS TO EDITOR

Letters On Lenoir, Middle East

To The Editor:

In view of Mr. Hamad's "unselfish, truthful, and realistic" viewpoint, which appeared in *The Daily Tar Heel* on March 21, I would like to present several facts. Mr. Hamad speaks about the negligence of the West toward Jordan. In his article he neglected to say that his artificially created country of Jordan, which until after World War II had not even existed, was brought into being by Britain, one of the Western countries against whom the Arab world is presently at odds, as a gift to the late King Abdullah. I might also add that Jordan was maintained by the British at a rate of \$33 million per annum until the autumn of 1956. General John Baggot Glubb, an Englishman, founded and directed the Arab Legion, which was supposed to have been the best army in the Middle East. The gratitude that General Glubb received for this was to be dismissed by the Jordanians after many years of service in that country.

If Mr. Hamad will recall the events of the autumn of 1956, he will remember that it was largely through the efforts of the United States, who broke with her long-standing allies, that Nasser's neck was saved during the time that Egypt was under attack. Also, as I am sure Mr. Hamad will recall, the United States, by sending her Sixth Fleet to the Mediterranean, played a large part in preserving the independence of Jordan last spring. Since then the United States has been more than generous with aid and weapons to the Jordanians.

Concerning the poverty which Mr. Hamad speaks of in Jordan, one would think that a king of a certain Arab country who receives unlimited wealth and still permits slavery in his country would help his brethren instead of spending his money to maintain huge harems and to give away Cadillacs for gifts. Also until 1956 King Hussein of Jordan ran all over his country in sports cars and planes, letting the British run his country instead of giving his money to his poverty-stricken subjects.

Perhaps Mr. Hamad should re-consider his viewpoint before criticizing the country whose hospitality he is enjoying.

ROBERT M. SCOTT

Tax On Script

To The Editor:

I had occasion to spend some time in Chapel Hill this past Saturday and noticed two letters to the editor which concerned themselves with an income tax question. I believe it involved students working at Lenoir Hall whose letters to you seemed to

imply that no income tax liability were incurred if meal tickets, rather than cash, were used to remunerate services rendered.

Perhaps there is a ruling to that effect by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with which I am not familiar and which would dispose of this question.

Normally speaking, however, there is little difference as to tax liability between cash and script payments. Both of them are fully taxable to the employee. I feel fairly safe in stating that even if meals were furnished to employees at Lenoir Hall for services rendered without any script being issued, the value of such meals would have to be reported as taxable income.

One provision of the Code deals with meals furnished for the employer's convenience. Perhaps a showing under this provision could lead to exempt status. However the facts contained in these letters would lead me to believe otherwise.

May I suggest that the students concerned request a clarification of this question through the office of Mr. James Williams at the University. His decision should be given considerable weight by all involved.

I enjoy reading your fine paper from time to time.

PETER H. GERNS
Charlotte, N. C.

THE SMITHFIELD HERALD

Realism, Truth Needed: They Finally Said It

U. S. business has been aware of the economic slump for months, but public use of the words "slump" or "recession" has been taboo until now. Business writers have been hesitant about calling the slump what it is, as a bather unaccustomed to the surf is hesitant about getting into a cold ocean.

Here's the way the gradualists among business writers let us in on the bad (or should we say "unwelcome"?): news:

September 15—"The mood among businessmen who look to next year is one of caution. Now nobody is alarmed. Some of the economic signs are just uncertain."

October 15—"Business is in a leveling-off period. We are not having a recession, as some say."

November 1—"Eisenhower's economic advisers are not convinced of a downward business trend. They only note some weaknesses as well as strong factors in the economy. This is an adjustment, not a recession."

November 15—"Business is slightly off. No bust. No recession. It's just that there is nothing in the offing to lift the level of business."

December 1—"Business leaders agree that we are in for some decline in business. Whether the decline will last six months or 12 months is not certain. But this is still not a recession."

January 1—"The business decline will likely continue for at least six months. It's to be worse than any decline since before World War II. But no depression. Hardly a recession."

January 25—"The slump is the real McCoy. It's not a bad recession. But the boom is over. And the news will get worse before it gets better. Prepare for the shock."

The business writers, at long last, reluctantly, have given us the ugly facts of economic life, and their version of the facts runs a bit contrary to the somewhat rosy estimate of the economic situation promulgated the other day by President Eisenhower.

Well, what the country ought to have is the truth. Neither false pessimism nor false optimism will serve us. Realism should be a strong ally in warding off any threat of real depression.

UCLA DAILY BRUIN

Insurance For The Day After Tomorrow

The day was tomorrow when an atomic bomb fell on my house. I heard the noise and came running home from the supermarket two blocks away, where I was buying some milk.

Only my house was destroyed—nothing else—just a big crater remained. Well, I got kind of excited about the whole thing, ran around screaming and such, but there was nothing to get upset about. Nobody was in the house when the thing dropped on it. So I relaxed. Didn't even think of all my possessions lost, or why the bomb didn't destroy the city.

A huge jet bomber flew around overhead, cruising and circling, wagging its wings once in awhile. That inanimate object looked nervous, and well it might, because one of the neighbors said that it had dropped the bomb, which was disarmed so that only the TNT went off.

"Only the TNT?" I said. "Well, I guess that puts a different light on things!" I suppose I was a little angry at the Air Force.

Things happened fast after that. I stayed at my aunt's place that night and took a few phone calls. One call came all the way from Washington and I spoke to the President. He said he was sorry it happened. I thanked him. He was very kind about the whole thing and offered to pay the damages. I graciously said no, you don't have to pay, I'll charge the government.

Well, I got a few thousand letters and telegrams, too, and my name was in all the papers. People I had forgotten about wrote that they were glad I was safe. Some wrote that they were sorry I was safe. I forgot about THOSE people again.

With all the attention I was getting (some guy in Texas offered to replace everything I had lost), I didn't have much time to really think deeply about what had happened to me, or why it had happened. No, as a matter of fact, I once thought that the Lord sent me to the supermarket that day. But that was all.

Then I got to thinking about it, about whether those planes should be flying around up there like that. And in spite of all the trouble the accident caused me, I figured that maybe this A-bomb-carrying is a good thing, after all. Because maybe someday a bomb will drop and destroy not a house, but a whole city—and it won't be dropped by OUR Air Force.

I want to be sure they don't get away with it. And as long as only the TNT went off, and this accident business doesn't hurt anyone or happen very often, I figure that insurance up there is worth all the trouble.—UCLA Daily Bruin

GUEST EDITORIAL

Lay The Soul Bare

Each passing day and week a distressing note rings louder around the nation. This note comes not from any single internal disturbance, it has arisen from the nation as a whole and reflects back to the nation as a whole.

What is the note? A fact readily agreed on in any rational circle is that the two armed camps in the world are running a race for supremacy. Herein is the disturbing factor, the race is not being run on different paths, it is being run on the same one. The evil is not in the running, it is in the way of running.

Communism infiltrates free countries, Russia sends up a satellite; democratic revolution ends a dictatorship, and the United States sends up a satellite. And so the race goes.

Communism and Russia use propaganda, they spread stories about the evils of capitalists and capitalism. They guard their secrets carefully, make plans for new weapons, new tactics, and new revolutions.

Democracy and America use propaganda, spread stories about the evils of communists and communism. The Pentagon selects its press releases with care, holds back information about new weapons and tactics, while the state department keeps our foreign policy enclosed in the midst of a dark cloud.

Kruschev drinks, smiles, kisses babies, and shakes hands. Eisenhower plays golf, smiles, and shakes hands.

The people in Russia are ignorant of their government and its plans; they are told what to do and they follow blindly, under threat of physical ostracism.

The people in the United States are ignorant of their government

and its plans. They are not told what to do, yet they follow blindly, under threat of social ostracism, which follows from complacency and conformity.

The government does not cry out, and the people do not cry out; they only follow, and follow along the same path as their enemies.

Can it be that the blind are leading the blind? Is not democracy fighting fire with fire, and becoming enveloped in it? With complacency, conformity and ignorance ruling the people, and bureaucracy ruling the government, is not America absorbing that which it believes it fights? The only answer is "yes."

The question now arises—if fire cannot be fought with fire, how must it be done? The answer lies in the opposite. Cold destroys heat, and democracy can destroy communism. But wait, America is a democracy. But no. It is no longer a democracy. What then is a democracy?

Communism relies on or is founded on strictness, or adherence to the set order. Democracy must then rely, or must be founded on, looseness, on freedom. What looseness and what freedom? No propaganda, complete revelation of plans and actions, and above all, new ideas. This is democracy and this is the way to fight communism. New and plentiful ideas and new and plentiful actions from the ideas is the answer. And these must be laid open, exposed. Unbounded democracy can beat bounded communism. In short, the nation must lay bare its soul.

If ideas and complete revelation of these ideas are the answer, the path on the other side of the fence, from where will these ideas come. The answer to this is education. What kind of education? Not the narrow and limited education of the Communist kind, of science, and science, and science. But education with science, and philosophy, and art, and religion, and history, and languages. The soul of the nation is in its education, and when that is laid bare, then the soul is laid bare.—*The Cavalier Daily*.

PEANUTS



L'IL ABNER



POGO



by Charles Schulz

by Al Capp

by Walt Kelly

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 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.