

# Get Off Your Can And Vote, Vote, Vote

Tuesday is the day for University balloting, the day when the political life or death of aspirants and aspiring parties will be decided.

And the fate of aspiring politicians and political parties is incontrovertibly in the hands of the student elections toward lethargy and sit-on-your-can-and-not-vote-it.

Students have consistently failed to exercise their most priceless privilege, failed to come to the ballot box in sufficient numbers.

Political parties, as we have said before, have demonstrated an admirable enthusiasm during their nominating sessions. This spirit of enthusiasm should permeate the student body on election day.

Voting percentages in past elections have been little short of disgusting. When only 38 per cent of the student electorate goes to the polls, the entire elections process

— and a priceless American heritage — goes down the lethargic drain.

Such a percentage voted in a recent election. And even fewer numbers have voted in elections preceding this particular one.

The old cliché uttered somewhat hypocritically and without sincerity by many politicians: Vote for the candidate of your choice, any choice, fits the situation to a tee. And we are definitely opposed to straight-ticket balloting. Students should consider all candidates exclusively on their individual merit, without party consideration. Straight-ticket balloting most often leads to blind voting — voting without thought.

But, regardless of your consideration — or lack of it — place your can beside a ballot box come Tuesday.

There is no place for lethargy in student government.

# The Cavalier Daily And Missile Race Short-Side

After the launching of the first artificial earth satellite, Sputnik I, there was vast concern in the free world with the technological superiority of the Kremlin scientists. Now that the Russians have put a second, and far more impressive satellite into an earth orbit, there is again a furor of concern, but this time it is not over the magnitude of this accomplishment, but with the dog which has gone up with Sputnik II.

There is a very basic fallacy in this sort of "logic." The fact that the new satellite represents a feat which American scientists cannot begin to approach, does not appear to worry anyone, judging from the quantity of letters published in the Washington Post lambasting the fate of the big Sputnik's canine passenger. This is nonsense, not worth even a second thought. One need only reflect what the use of experimental animals has done to advance scientific knowledge in the past half-century to scoff at this sort of thing.

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, where it is published daily except Sunday, 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.

- Editor — NEIL BASS
- Coed Editor — ALYS VOORHEES
- Managing Editor — DOUG EISELE
- News Editor — BILL CHESHIRE
- Asst. News Editor — PATSY MILLER
- Sports Editor — BILL KING
- Asst. Sports Editor — DAVE WIBLE
- Business Manager — JOHN WHITAKER
- Advertising Manager — FRED KATZIN
- Librarian — GLENDA FOWLER

Business Staff — WALKER BLANTON, LEWIS RUSH

EDIT STAFF — Whit Whitfield, Nancy Hill, Gary Nichols, Curtis Gans, Al Walker, Gail Godwin, Harry Kirschner. Circulation Manager — SYD SHUFORD. Wire Editor — PAUL RULE. Subscription Mgr. — AVERY THOMAS. Feature Editor — BEN TAYLOR

NEWS STAFF — Davis Young, Ann Frye, Dale Whitfield, Mary Moore Mason, Stanford Fisher, Edith MacKinnon, Pringle Pipkin, Mary Leggett Browning, Ruth Whitley, Sarah Armstrong.

SPORTS STAFF — Erwin Fuller, Mac Mahaffy, Al Walters, Ed Rowland, Ken Friedman, Donnie Moore, Neil Lehman, Elliott Cooper, Carl Keller, Jim Purks, Rusty Hammond.

PHOTOGRAPHERS — Norman Kantor, Buddy Spoon.

Proof Reader — PEBLEY BARROW

Night Editor — PEBLEY BARROW

## CAROLINA CARROUSEL: Argument For Argument's Sake Purely

By GAIL GODWIN

Controversies seem to characterize the entire edit page of the Daily Tar Heel. The Readers' Repository is slowly but steadily blocking out more and more column inches. Letters to the editor and the answers to these letters are mushrooming into huge argumentative blobs which dominate the second page of our newspaper.

The latest blob is in the form of a segregation debate.

The leaders of this debate are, I believe, searching frantically through every history book, newspaper, congressional record, almanac, etc., and lifting any little word, phrase or clause that will justify their side and their side only.

It just struck me as rather amusing. Because neither side will win. An argument is hopeless when it is one-sided on each side and when its sole purpose is to win just for the sport of winning.

Progenitors of these arguments remain glued stubbornly to one spot with their eyes glued stubbornly shut.

We might label them the "Blind Philosophers."

Their heaven lies in the terribly highbrow experience of looking up superior rhetoric and digging into deep and dusty philosophy for argumentative sport.

They simply neglect to look up both sides of a question, but pounce only on facts supporting "their side."

They forget that compromise is necessary in almost every argument. Where compromise is barred, reason may also be excluded. No?

Some very unusual statements have emerged from the present "blind philosopher" debate.

One of them is that there is no fourteenth amendment. This is upsetting. For the past two weeks in Poly. Sci. 41, we have been devoting entire class periods to cases dealing exclusively with the fourteenth amendment, how it nationalized the Bill of Rights, its famous "Due Process" clause, etc. I would hate to think the poor Supreme Court Justices have been basing their decisions on a non-existent amendment for 100 years.

And I would hate even more to think that poor students have been studying a historical fallacy in such detail. It is interesting to see what will come next.

The sad thing about all this is that this pugnaeous type of daily print is not enjoyed by readers who look to a newspaper for information, new ideas and insight.

The entire second page of our newspaper is becoming a battleground of conflicting personal opinions.

Are some of the contributors who write such hot little masterpieces simply trying to become well-known through the means of a newspaper?

Are the writers of such articles, whether staff members or otherwise, really championing a cause. Or are they just indulging in their favorite sport at the reader's expense?

Perhaps the real newspaper spirit of informing and enlightening is being undermined by the sport of arguing just for the sake of arguing and seeing it in print.



HEREBLOK ©1957 THE WASHINGTON POST CO.

FROM OREGON DAILY EMERALD:

## Concerning School Spirit And Channelling To Propriety...

It was no surprise that the campus erupted Saturday at the radio's last gasp finish to the Oregon-Stanford game. There was just too much hair-tearing, rolling-on-the-floor anguish in that one to sit back down at the study table and start worrying about Monday's midterm.

And it was no surprise that the post-game festivities took the form they did. There's the natural tendency after a listening party to get outside and share your joy with anybody—everybody on your side of the cause. But in this age of power and speed off as well as on the gridiron, this final gun search for togetherness becomes almost as loaded with anguish as the living room listening. And it is getting to be more dangerous than actually playing in the game.

We're not suggesting that you can control that immediate burst of enthusiasm that sweeps the campus living groups into the campus transportation so noisily. This is spontaneity—something rare in this campus in any true form. But the follow-up publicity, coupled with the continuing success of the football Webfoots, is making this sort of enthusiasm less and less spontaneous.

Saturday's outburst was quite naturally large and sudden. But we can't help thinking that if the Washington State post-game acti-

vities hadn't grown to such exciting proportions, perhaps the Stanford follow-up wouldn't have been so large and sudden.

And this leads us to believe that it wouldn't be quite so difficult to organize something along lines a little more safe and sane—on the ground type of activity. The brief intercession rally near the "Side" block in the midst of Saturday's car parade might approach it.

This wild, pile-em-on-the-car and drive-like-mad way of celebrating may be fun, but things like that can get dangerous. Even if we aren't concerned about the old women and small children trying to cross Willamette St., we might stop to consider what could happen if a couple of 10-men convertibles, victory bells and all, slammed together.

It may seem a little bit stodgy, we admit, for the Eugene police to crack down on a bell-ringing crowd in a slow-moving pick-up for "obstructed vision." And we certainly didn't approve of the way the "Side" street rally was "broken up" a week ago.

But we can't expect the police to hold traffic for too many more of these red light-running races to nowhere. They wouldn't be doing their duty to keep us safe—from ourselves.

We're bound to win more ball-games in succeeding weeks. And we're bound to have more spirit—

even spontaneous spirit. It's time for the Rally Board to use this spirit to good advantage—with some planned activity. The airport welcome was fairly well done, although the leadership had to come informally.

That school spirit stuff is growing this minute. And if the football successes keep that pleasant one step ahead in growth, we're going to see spirit they never dreamed could exist on this campus. But this long-sought stuff has got to be handled. Rally Board, we'll remind you again. We aren't too anxious about trying to photograph a running car parade the length of the Salem freeway this weekend.

## Rameses XXI:

Old Rameses sees a certain amount of collusion in the present ignominious recall movement.

The negative bill being debated by the Di and Phi Monday night comes — not from an objective member of the debating societies — but from a spirit of opposition and political opportunity manifested by certain members of a certain fraternity on campus.

The Ram thinks, definitely, that conscientious members of the debating societies will reject this brand of what the editor calls "negativism."

## READERS' REPOSITORY:

# Reader Explains Edit Situation

EDITOR:

I follow with interest the conflict that you are presently having with members of the University's student body. In my opinion, editors of University newspapers hold unique positions on campuses. I suppose it is very difficult to satisfy the pseudo-student politicians and the administration, but as you are now having a taste of such, it perhaps would be superficial, indeed, to give advice to an editor whom I personally think is doing a tremendous job.

As a student member of the Board of Publication (the governing agency for all student publications) and a former editor of the Colorado Daily, the student newspaper of the University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, I have at times been placed in a similar position in which you find yourself today.

I've been reading The Daily Tar Heel since I have arrived at NYU, where I am presently a student at the Law School. (The paper was supplied by Jim Eskin, a former student at UNC). The paper, in my opinion, does not have the polish nor the coverage of the New York Times, but it does have the polish and coverage of a good college daily. One forgets that putting out a newspaper everyday is not easy — it is not difficult to criticize the editorial policy of the paper (and who ever wholeheartedly agrees with an editor), but in my opinion the charges of incompetency leveled against you have no basis in fact — unless the people asking for your recall are ready to provide for a highly-paid skilled journalist.

A college newspaper is just that. No more, and no less. It should not try to emulate a great city newspaper. On the contrary, it should strive to describe to the reading public, the academic and student activities that are being held on campus. Above all, it should fairly represent the University, and not just a segment.

This is hard. On all pages, an editor attempts to do that. Without a competent staff, an editor is hard put to accomplish the goal. If students are interested in reforming content, then their interest should be manifested in coming to the newspaper and working on the staff.

As for the editorial page. This is your page — and solely yours. It is here where the idea of freedom of the press is maintained on the highest level. I suppose, that when an editor writes an editorial, he tries so hard to be correct in factual statement and in his comments on the subject. It is easy to get emotional and use the wrong approach or words in discussing an issue. This is a weakness which you and all editors of any paper have and will continue to manifest. We are human. But, if it is a weakness, it can be corrected. This is not to say that one should tone down the tenor of the comment, but simply to point out the varying possibility that one might state phrases so as to make the reader read attentively and not be revolted by the statements of the editorial.

I certainly have the highest esteem for the paper, and regard it as an outstanding daily. With the help and comment of the student body, and administration, the paper can even be better. Petty arguments will only hinder and prevent advancement.

The University of North Carolina should be proud of the paper. It would indeed be a shame to continue the conflict that is presently on campus.

Joseph Fontana

## STAFFER SPEAKS:

# Edit Freedom & Crowd Pleasing

EDITOR:

I believe that the only legitimate consideration in the recall election is whether you have abused your editorial freedom.

I feel the charge of incompetency to produce a newspaper is poorly grounded as the Tar Heel has continued to come out and has been gradually improving.

You seem to imply that editorial freedom gives you the right to print anything. I cannot agree; I think editorial freedom has been traditionally limited by truth and good taste. The students of the University of North Carolina have the right through a recall election to judge whether you have exceeded these bounds.

I think that some of your remarks and the manner in which you have expressed yourself have been in poor taste; however, I do not feel that you have yet seriously abused your freedom, certainly not enough to justify your recall and the election of a new editor.

Unfortunately, there is a minority of students who would wish to limit editorial freedom for any editor. They do not consider the question objectively, only emotionally. They do not want any editor at any time to be anything more than an anxious crowd pleaser. They would deny the editor the right to criticize or to speak against what they believe.

Should these students by themselves prove to be strong enough to oust you, the next editor will hardly dare print a controversial opinion, for, if he should, these unthinking students will place him in your present position. Editorial freedom of any sort will be dead.

Pringle Pipkin

## L'IL ABNER



by Al Capp

## POGO



by Walt Kelly