

## Attention Slow Profs! More Speed Is Wanted

Over in the Social Science Dept. there's a certain prof who seems to enjoy teaching extra classes between the hours of 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. during the last three days of Summer School. To avoid any question as to our friend's identity, let it merely be stated that he is the only one of the major domos who taught Social Science 1 during the first session.

We would like to say that we think it's wonderful that our Ph.D. friend has such unbounded, seldom seen initiative. It isn't often that our local educators demonstrate such devotion to their tasks.

Yet, it makes us greatly irritated when we suddenly discover to our utter amazement that said prof is holding these extra gatherings because he was so long winded that he just couldn't make it through his entire course in the prescribed time. Soooooooo, instead of his students being able to pursue such healthy activities as The Summer School Weekly, or Kessing Pool or the Tempo Room, they were forced into a littersmoke filled room in Saunders Hall for uninspiring lectures about Fulton's Steamer and the Opium Wars.

We will grant that the Social Science curriculum as currently presented is bad. Yet, profs in other depts. who are teaching equally messed up courses, somehow find time and talent enough to wind their ways through the summer's labors without subjecting students to needless "extras."

Profs have no right to require attendance at after hours sessions according to University regulations. If a class meets at 9 a.m. every morning, it can only carry on its legal business between that time and the perscribed termination point.

Thus, we have established that there is no such thing as an extra session with compulsory attendance. But, what about our subject in the Social Science Dept.? He knows the rules and says very simply to his classes, "tonight we'll have a three hour class. I am not enforcing attendance, but would highly advise that you come."

What kind of a play on words is this? Let's define the rules and set our academicians on the right road. If our friend can't make it through a course in a semester, let him find another place to display his ability. It should be the same with a prof as it is with a student.

### Guest Editorial

## Khrushchev, Blood Thirsty And Barbaric Murderer

Mr. Khrushchev must be in a grimly tight corner to have made himself four more ghosts. The execution of Imre Nagy, General Maler, and two other Hungarian Communists points irresistibly to a great crisis in the Soviet leadership. Nothing like it has happened since the months that followed Stalin's death. Then the "collective leadership" made short work of the security police by executing Beria and doing away with his underlings. Even this seemed in its effects like a liberation, for it put a snuffer on the police as the ever-present arbiter of life and death in Eastern Europe.

Since then the Soviet leaders, most notably Mr. Khrushchev, had avoided bloodshed in the domestic upheavals that from time to time packed some of them off to distant places. Mr. Khrushchev seemed to have opened up a new era within the party by turning back on the Stalinist error which he denounced at the twentieth congress. All that is over. The Hungarian leaders have been executed, not in the heat of repression two years ago, nor again after a show trial, but, like Beria, secretly, in hugger-mugger, without so much as a word of the indictment being breathed until the sentence had been carried out.

With this act the Communist leadership not only throws over any hope of presenting itself to the uncommitted as a sensible, cool, reformed body of men who have grown out of Stalin's barbarism; it throws over any hope among Communists outside Russia that they might be allowed some free play to meet local needs in their own way. This is a heavy price to pay for the execution of men at a time when the Soviet policy strives to present a smiling face abroad.

The decision to pay it can have come only from men who saw their power gravely threatened and who sacrificed all else to keep their grip over the party. What comes next is still in darkness; but it would be surprising if before long more ghosts did not appear at the Kremlin's table.

Hungary showed the rigid limit which the leadership set on any attempt to meet national feeling; it must not jeopardise the supremacy of the party or of the Soviet Union. These executions suggest that in enforcing the limit, the leadership cannot avoid sooner or later reviving its inheritance of blood.

Manchester Guardian

## Eisenhower And Dulles

As the week drew to a close, all was not quiet on the Western front, but on the Mid-Eastern sector of the World's battlefield, the Arabian Nights were a little cooler.

It would now appear that President Eisenhower's gamble of dispatching troops to Lebanon and Britains move in sending military force into Jordan has worked. Few if any of us now feel that World War III is an immediate threat.

However, the toughest job is now ahead. How can we win back our lost prestige in the region of the Fertile Crescent? Can we buy oil from the new Iraqi regime? Is Nasser a man that can be trusted? Will the Summit Conference in the U. N. be a success? Can we train technicians to go into the Middle East and show these people that we are concerned with their welfare?

These are questions that Ike and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles must answer and answer to the satisfaction of both sides. With constructive leadership, the world will survive. Without it, we will perish in a maze of radiation and fall out.

## Letters

Editor:

Having a limited background of experience with newspapers and after recovering from the initial shock of reading your July 25 edition of the Summer School Weekly, I consoled myself with the fact that you have a valid-even if not sound-basis for presenting the recent Student Government Poll in the manner in which you did.

I have argued this with several students already.

For instance, if the State Department conducted a national poll to determine if the American people preferred communism to democracy and 32.1 percent of the population voted for communism, I believe this would be extremely news worthy. However, I don't think that the 32.1 per cent would rate such a big headline and news story except, perhaps, in Pravda or the National Guardian. Not that I'm saying the Summer School Weekly has a "red tinge"—on the contrary. Where else could students print or read a paper and see editorials and news stories condemning their governments' policy? I just believe your mistake was in not confining the emphasis and your comments about the minority vote to the editorial page. Perhaps you don't realize it, but many students I talked to were those who had voted against action in Lebanon but just didn't like the way you wrote it up.

I wonder what the Russian student visitors will think of the paper?

Name withheld by request

Editor:

I noted with interest the article in Jim Harper's sports column which you wrote. It was very interesting. I suggest you might stick to sports. The fourth page in this college newspaper is, of course, slanted—and justifiably so. Students of this university want to hear of UNC sports, and want to hear of them favorably. However, your front page editorial was in very poor taste. Your five-column banner screaming that 32.1 per cent of the student body agreed with your former editorial was a bit misleading. In the first place, fewer than 30 per cent agreed. You feel it significant that this group supported you. Is it not also somewhat indicative that 65 per cent disagreed? And that this "large segment of our campus" is, indeed, in what might be termed Washington's "majority camp?" And why was President Gans' statement shoved to the very bottom of the page? Has he fallen in your disfavor?

You state on page two—the proper place for slanted articles—that God and the world are opposed to this intervention. You also state that "this paper shall always represent the views of the (cap) Editor, regardless of public opinion." This was an oversight, I am sure. You meant to say, of course, that this paper's editorial page shall always represent the views of the editor, etc. This is a very fine sentiment, indeed. Very noble. And, regardless of the opinion, it should read as the editor chooses. But the news pages should not, necessarily. This sort of thing somehow brings back unpleasant remembrances of last year and one Neil Bass. Please, Mr. Editor, play fair. Don't let your "power" go to your head. Keep your opinions out of the headlines. Or go back to sports.

Wally Kuralt

### Reader's Repository

## Former Tar Heel Staffer Ben Taylor Takes A Long Pot-Shot At Summer Editor

Dear Editor:

I can no longer sit back and see you, Mr. Editor, take the Summer School Weekly and mould the entire paper into a mouth-piece for the opinions of one august individual . . . yourself.

Your July 25 edition of the Summer School Weekly made me realize what your position means to you . . . a chance to use the power of the printed word to cram your own opinions down the throats of summer school students.

You don't exist to serve the student and neither does the paper, anyone who reads your editorial of July 25 will realize that. Your very words prove my point . . . "However, if 00000% had supported us, we would still stick to our guns. This paper shall always represent the views of the editor, regardless of public opinion." Perhaps the editorial page shall mirror your opinions, but never the entire paper!

Now I ask you, Mr. Editor . . . since when does any media of communication — radio, television, newspapers, magazines, or what ever — conduct its business and its presentation of the news with absolutely no regard for the reader?

When you conduct your Summer School Weekly with the attitude that the opinions or ideas of the 3,000 or more readers of your paper don't count worth a damn, then I believe that it is time you reconsider your position and the responsibilities it carries.

According to the poll conducted recently by the Student Government Board, 333 out of 508 people participating believed that President Eisenhower had acted justifiably in his decision to send Marines into Lebanon. Now, I'm no mathematician, but I believe that most everyone would say that the figure constitutes a majority. But the very slanted news story which appeared on page one didn't exactly give the impression!

But did the front page lead story of July 25 scream out that the majority of UNC students felt that way? No, it did not. Instead, it revealed the fact that slightly more than a fifth of the total number of students queried did not agree with President Eisenhower's actions. Is not the reason for this slanted account of fact embedded in the fact that you, Mr. Editor, are among that minority fifth and that your convictions were so strong that they impeded you greatly in performing the most direct task of any journalist . . . presenting the facts as they are.

The Summer School Weekly could . . . and indeed, should . . . have presented the facts as they were . . . simply that the student body was 2-1 in favor of the action taken in Lebanon. This was a gross mistake. And if the Summer School Weekly can so distort one story, then I fear for the remainder of the Summer School editions.

You have done one of two things, Mr. Editor. You have either grossly misunderstood the ethics of journalism and the accepted practices of a profession long noted for its diligence in presenting the facts as they are and conducted the story about the results of the poll in the manner you did out of ignorance . . . or you have revealed to the Student Body that the Summer School Weekly in its entirety, is yours and shall continue to reflect your views, "Regardless of student opinions." Admitting your abilities as a journalist, I can only conclude that your fallacy lies in the latter proposition.

You have greatly overstepped your legal bounds as Editor, Mr. Young.

Ben Taylor

## Editor's Answer

After considerable thought and after talking to many students, I have come to the conclusion that I owe some sort of an explanation to the readers for last week's issue of The Summer School Weekly.

Wally Kuralt, in a letter addressed to me, called our front page story dealing with the poll a "front page editorial." He is partially right. It is very debatable whether I should have attached a lead headline dealing with a minority of the campus. We admit our strong feelings on the U. S. Mid-Eastern intervention policy, yet also admit that the handling of this story is justifiably open to criticism from readers.

Now, to the criticism of our editorial page statement that, ". . . if 00000% had supported us, we would still stick to our guns." This paper shall always represent the views of the Editor, regardless of public opinion." Kuralt is absolutely right that this should have read "editorial page" rather than "paper." We apologize for this slip and chalk it off to too many Bufferins. On the other hand, we were trying to make a valid point: So many Editors and political leaders consult the Gallup Poll before taking their stand that the result is the kind of insipid journalism and policy which has led to our present crisis. We have (in the words of the Declaration) "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind," but we shall never REPEAT NEVER allow any "Poll" to dictate the editorial policy of this paper. Is that quite clear, Gentlemen?

And speaking of "power mad" people, have you guys talked with the bartender at the Tempo lately. Here is a man with real power. We envy him, especially the way in which he has captured our staff.

We have little objection to the comments appearing in these three letters, with one BIG exception. In the letter appearing at the top of the second column there is a very sly and nasty remark about this paper having a "red tinge." We will not attempt to make a cute rebuttal. Our only comment is "not no, but hell no." Any red tinge we have is better known as sun tan.

Chalk off last week's mistakes to youthful exuberance and have our assurance that we shall not make them twice. Thanks for the letters Wally, Ben and blank. Filling the editorial page this week was a breeze.

—EDITOR