

Editor's Corner

# Bob Baynes

We have spent a good portion of this year's time and space as far as the paper is concerned pretty generally ripping the Honor System from one end to the other. We have found a lot of things the matter with the Honor System, and have attempted to point them out. An example of this was our recent support of the Honor System referendum.

Now we have a positive proposal as far as the system is concerned. Student Body Attorney General Jack Spain has just announced his resignation from that post.

He must now be replaced by an appointee. We would like to place in contention the name of Bob Baynes, currently a very member of the Attorney General's Staff. Baynes, being a junior, could gain invaluable experience in the next two months before spring elections. Already, though, he is, in our opinion, qualified and competent.

One thing which will keep Student Body President Charlie Gray from putting Baynes at the top of the list is the fact that the two of them are fraternity brothers. It is no secret that the PIKA's are already running a good many shows. For this, they have been roundly and unfairly criticized. We have yet to see one of them hold an office in which he did not do a competent job. Until we do, we will not join the bigots in condemning.

We hope Gray will overlook his fraternal connection with Baynes and appoint him anyway. There's nothing the matter with another PIKA in a key position if he can fill the job. And, Baynes can.

# Three Cheers

A&T is a Negro college in Greensboro, just 5 1/2 miles up the road. Currently the students at said school are waging a sitdown strike to obtain eating privileges at the F. W. Woolworth Store in Greensboro. Their efforts have gained more than a little bit of attention in the state and region. They have even been joined by some white college students from some of the female colleges in the area.

We sympathize with their efforts to obtain the service to which they are entitled. That their money is as good as any customer's is assumed. That they are entitled to equal facilities with white customers is being questioned.

In waging a fight such as this, the A&T students are displaying courage. It is the same type of courage which was displayed by the good Negro citizens of Montgomery, Ala. in their boycott of the city owned bus line, a fight we were privileged to see on several occasions during 1955 and '56.

The A&T students have been criticized for poor common sense in making such a public display of their desires. One paper suggested that they have a private meeting with Greensboro city fathers and the manager of the F. W. Woolworth Store in an attempt to settle the differences. This is hogwash.

They have a good fight going for them, one they can win if they stick to their guns. If they are tricked into giving up their fight, meeting with the various officials, they will end up with what they have now — nothing.

They must stick to their guns, publically.

Closing the gap between the races will take time, and peaceful perseverance such as the A&T students are showing is just part of the process.

We hope they win. We hope they win BIG and we hope they will SOON.

# Be My Valentine

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  
 Assistant Editor: RON SHUMATE  
 News Editors: DEE DANIELS, EDWARD NEAL RINER  
 Associate Editor: FRANK CROWTHER

# Charles DeGaulle

Mary Stewart Baker

In an attempt to tag a definition to the title "summit conference" on a recent television program, one panelist commented, "I would say that if President Eisenhower attended the meeting, it could be called a 'summit conference.'"

So DeGaulle might, in light of the supercilious attitude he has currently assumed, France has an inferiority complex and DeGaulle, arrogant bearer of the Cross of Lorraine, is taking France's pique and playing it to the best of his advantage. His tactics, thus far, have appeared rash and precarious.

DeGaulle says that France will play second to none in the Western alliance. These ambitious aims directly to the most current absurdities in the French (aim: 1) DeGaulle's attitude on the integration of Western defenses, and (2) the effort towards attaining first place in the nuclear race.

The steady and recent weakening of the N. A. T. O. Pact, say many United States opinions, as a result of the DeGaullean moves for a "reglorified" France. It also appears that DeGaulle is dragging the Chancellor of the German Federal Republic into the glory-filled pit with him. Such disunity in the Western alliance, and more specifically in Western Defense, is of the greatest concern to us all.

### DISUNITY IN DEFENSE

France's attitude toward Western military unity appeared definite December 28 when the last three United States Air Force units were ordered out of France. This move is apparently a result of a few French ruffled feathers (that President Eisenhower was unable to smooth in the pre-summit conference December 19.) DeGaulle evidently was rubbed the wrong way when America failed to support his latest plan for Algeria - a plan presented in the United Nations last month. The United States hesitancy in support of the plan resulted from the theory that sides should not have to take. Perhaps America should have stamped approval on the French plan; President Eisenhower has given public endorsement to the moderate DeGaulle formula for Algeria in the past, although the United States now chooses the silent path.

But the America action (or non-action) seems to serve as the prime explanation for DeGaulle's sudden indignation and emphasis on French independence from a unified Western defense. Morally, France must be overlooking the fact that the United States has already sacrificed herself twice for France in this century at terrific costs. Practically, how can Charles DeGaulle, a military strategist, even look in the direction of such disunity?

### NUCLEAR AMBITIONS

It's frightening to think that France may set off its first atomic bomb any day now. These tests have been planned for the Sahara. DeGaulle has been dreaming recently of becoming a first rate power in the nuclear field; the effects of his plans, in the way of tests, may very well be more dangerous than they appear. The most ruinous effects would be in Moscow.

Khrushchev has given his promise to the United States that the Soviet will refrain from nuclear testing as long as the Western powers do the same. But DeGaulle has insisted on rapid nuclear development in France.

Even though DeGaulle himself has stated several times that France would go along with the United Nations agreement outlawing nuclear arms, he has made it clear that France will not be bound by any United States-Soviet agreements.

Besides the international trend in favor of disarmament, DeGaulle is up against other problems in his nuclear glory-seeking. To add a touch of realism, France does not have any money to accomplish such a nuclear goal.

We hope that the DeGaullean moves, as rash and selfish as they appear to the Western world, will not cut France short. If DeGaulle falls now, France will fall with him.

Many times Charles DeGaulle has proved that he is "the spirit of France." As autocratic as his administration is, as stubborn and conceited as he appears, may he still be able to integrate that "spirit" intelligently with the West, for that is the only manner in which he can carry his country to safety.

# "Well, The Enlisted Men Aren't The Only Ones With Problems"



# Perspectives By Yardley

Jonathan Yardley

An incident is in the making. The fact that this incident is taking place in Greensboro, North Carolina, is no credit to the most progressive of Southern states.

Negro students of A&T College, tired of having to seek restaurants in Greensboro that would serve them, decided early last week to try to force the local F. W. Woolworth store to serve them. In order to do so they decided to conduct an orderly, quiet sitdown strike in which they would occupy all the seats at the store's long counter and thus by cutting off all business, make the store concede to their wishes.

The intent of this action is excellent. It is ridiculous that a city as vital as Greensboro should allow nineteenth century practices to remain in a highly accelerated twentieth century community. City officials probably realize this, but also must realize that years of prejudice and blindness cannot be overcome in a day. The Negroes do not seem to realize this. The only tangible result of incidents like this, or the Montgomery bus fiasco, or the Little Rock affair, is that bitterness arises where before there was apathy, and violence eventually erupts.

The militant white element in this strike seems to be the teenage group. Gangs and individual hoodlums, taking the fellows in Little Rock as their examples, have decided that they are the ones responsible for maintaining the myth of white supremacy. They cling to the outskirts of the Negro group, hands in their pockets, cigarettes dangling insultingly from their lips, tight levis suspended beltless from points south of their navels, leather jackets dangling from seemingly impotent shoulders. Suddenly one of these figures moves slightly, a knife whistles out of his pocket and somebody has caught the sharp edge of the white man's burden. Matters in Greensboro have not reached this point, but they may if someone

does not bring the situation to a conclusion.

If these Negro students want to be served at the Woolworth counter, and they have every right to expect this privilege, they should petition to do so in a less conspicuous manner. It is no good reflection on the Negro peoples that they should continue to attempt to make advances in such noticeable ways. No one has stated whether or not the N.A.A.C.P. is behind this current movement, but it seems quite possible, judging from the overall character of earlier N.A.A.C.P. instigations. The organization and its emulators do not seem to understand that diplomacy comes before action, violent or otherwise. Instead, they seem to be anxious to make a great impression on the public (and international, incidentally) mind by the outspoken character of the actions they take.

Needless to say, incidents like this are of no great help in this country's effort to avoid incidents which reflect badly upon the nation and its people. Race incidents are food for Communist propaganda, and the Communists look for them as diligently as we try to avoid them. This latest one will not go unnoticed.

The fact that neither Woolworth's nor the Greensboro city management has done much about the strike indicates a complacency about matters of segregation which is deplorable. They are the forces which are in the best position to clear up this mess and allow the city of Greensboro to return to what Warren G. Harding used to call "normalcy."

It is to be hoped that nothing violent or unpleasant arises out of this little incident. It is still in its bidding stages, though a bomb threat Saturday afternoon indicates that matters may be getting out of hand. If the Negro is to exist on equal terms with the white man in this "land of equality and opportunity" he must be prepared to approach his dilemma with more maturity and common sense than has been exhibited in the past few years. We admire the intent of such actions, but cannot condone the manner in which they are being carried out.

# Reader's Repository

Editor:

I would like to make a small protest, not to you or the members of your staff, but to the library. It seems that the Daily Tar Heel is the best means through which I can lodge this protest.

Although some graduate students will question this statement, nevertheless it is true that it is necessary for undergraduates to do what is called by some professors "outside reading." It is admitted quite readily here that this reading in no way compares to the reading done by the graduate student. However, that the undergraduate must do some reading "outside" the textbook is a fact—that is, if the undergraduate wants to pass.

My protest concerns the use of books by graduate students in carrels. It is nice and, yes, convenient for graduate students to be able to keep books in their carrels, but it is also inconvenient for the undergraduate (who accepts his inferior status) if the graduate student keeps and keeps "wanted" books in carrels. I do not complain about the use of books by graduate students in carrels for a reasonable length of time, but when I must read some article, or wish to read some article, and I find it in a carrel, in the same carrel, for weeks, it is quite disgusting. Yes, I am quite aware that the undergraduate student is encouraged by many graduate students to "sit in my carrel and read the book." But, of course, the time must be arranged to suit the graduate student's schedule. Too, if the undergraduate decides to read the book in the graduate student's carrel without first making some sort of arrangement with the graduate student, the undergraduate not infrequently finds himself reading the book in the carrel when the graduate student walks up.

Surely, it does not take a century (excuse the exaggeration) to use a book. But it seems to me that some graduate students keep books in their carrels that long. I wonder if the library could not make some attempt to limit the time that a graduate student can use a book in a carrel. And I don't mean a time limit of a month. A week seems much more reasonable to me.

Conrad Holcomb  
 2 Cobb Terrace

# Gems of Thought

Courteous driving on the highways is a virtue some people expect others to have.

It'll pay you to remember that the cost of experience has gone up like everything else.

Food for thought is the only kind that hasn't been affected by the high cost of living.

The man who tries to please everybody shows little respect for his own way of thinking.

Slow down—the man in a hurry always passes up more opportunities than he catches up with.

The man with money to burn is usually the kind who keeps up the payments on his fire insurance.

Nature seldom makes a fool—she merely furnishes the raw material for a do-it-yourself job.

Some people are winning to lend a hand if they think they have a chance of borrowing two later.

It's always open season for the man who didn't know it was loaded, or the man who rocked the boat.

# Foreign Affairs

## THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND THE NATIONAL PURPOSE

(This article is the concluding part of a study made recently by the Council on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate—Ed.)

The American people participate in foreign policy through their influence on the rest of the world, at a time when foreign relations go well beyond official diplomatic contacts between governments, and through their influence on the policies of their own Government and the support which they give to those policies.

The impact of America on most other nations is made not solely or even primarily by official diplomacy but by the massive contact between peoples and cultures that is characteristic of this age: by the expansion of trade and other economic relations; by high-level visits and tourism on the grand scale; by the influence of the press, radio and motion pictures; by the exchange of professors and students, books and ideas across national frontiers; and by the way in which America lives up to the ideals which it sets for itself, for example in respect for human rights and for the principle of nondiscrimination.

These contacts and influences affect public attitudes in foreign countries and sometimes official attitudes and policies as well. They put our own society on display and on trial as it never has been in the past, before millions all over the world. They will certainly have a bearing on the success of American foreign policy over the next decade. Above all, it is the conduct of American society itself which creates the image of America that is projected abroad and which affects our prestige and leadership.

Much of this nonofficial influence is, of course, beyond the power of the competence of the Government to control. As a free and pluralistic society America speaks not with one voice but with many. Not all its voices will be consistent with the policy of the day. In some ways that is a demonstration of our strength as a free society. In others it raises questions as to whether, as a nation, we know what we want and where we are going. Where the Government can give guidance to this multiplicity of contacts, it should emphasize basic objectives and policies and also standards of personal and international conduct. Where it can properly do so, it should restrain or discourage these elements of the American impact abroad which are clearly harmful to relations with countries important to us or inconsistent with the requirements of leadership. For the rest it will have to depend on the knowledge and self-discipline of the American people themselves.

Even more important than the projection of an image of America abroad is the role of the people in relation to the making of basic policy and in giving it their support. The double series of challenges which this report has described, the Communist threat to the free nations and the manifold problems of a changing world, which at many points fuse into one, will make unprecedented demands upon the United States. However difficult it may be, a democracy such as ours must have the necessary foresight, the ability to organize its policymaking process, and the willingness to commit resources to policies the end results of which are far from clear and certainly unattainable in a short time. It must learn to expect some setbacks and losses, and not to be diverted by them from steady pursuit of the basic objectives. And over the long run the Government must obtain the continuing support of the American people for these objectives and for the policies that they demand—which points up the need for greater public understanding of our world position and for a deeper sense of national purpose.

Through the working of our democratic institutions the people can make their voices heard and heeded on foreign as on domestic affairs; indeed, the two have become inextricably bound up together, and there are now few significant domestic measures which do not affect our foreign relations. Obviously, the people have only indirect and occasional control over the conduct of foreign policy, but the major decisions, at least in their broad outline, are subject to the normal political process and require congressional and public sanction either before or after they are taken. The Government must be generally responsive to public opinion. It cannot get too far ahead or too far behind. It works under a great handicap if the public is ill informed on the significant issues or if political leaders choose to play domestic politics with them.

Even with greater understanding of foreign affairs, however, will the American people support the necessary policies at the cost of greater sacrifice to themselves? There can be no doubt, we are convinced, of the need for the United States to devote more of its resources than in the past to purposes related to its objectives and its responsibilities in the world. There will be a need, as well, for adjustments in popular thinking, for a greater emphasis on general free world and regional aims rather than the more strictly national ones. Are the American people, now so absorbed in maintaining and enjoying their own material well-being, prepared to support such efforts and to make the necessary adjustments? Are they sufficiently aware of the threats to the Nation's future? Do they have a sense of great purpose, such as the Nation had at earlier critical periods of its history?

(To Be Continued)

