

# Election Interest Poor; Yet Slate Seems Excellent

Yesterday's total vote—approximately 34 per cent—of the eligible student electorate was far from encouraging.

While the total voters—2,461 out of an electorate of some 7,000, according to figures computed by Daily Tar Heel election analysts—was not particularly unfavorable as compared to totals in other fall elections.

But it was extremely discouraging. Student self-government, as we have said and reiterated, is only as strong as student voters make it, only as strong as the voter participation on election day.

Dormitory districts, as is frequently the case, turned out more voters than did town districts.

The unusual and astounding fact about the election is that 1,843 dormitory voters elected only 17 representatives to the Student Legislature, while only 627 town district voters elected 16 student legislators.

A possible cure for the exceedingly low turnout in town districts would be reapportionment of legislative seats after each election on the basis of voter participation in all districts. This action should definitely insure more voter participation on election day. It is an ultimatum, an alternative.

On the other hand, student voters should exercise their priceless voting privilege without any type of coercion or ultimatum from the Elections Board.

The Elections Board, under the chairmanship of Art Sobel, worked very effectively during the election and resulting vote tabulation. There have been no reports of voting irregularities which have plagued past elections and necessitated an intimidating overflow of run-off elections.

Chairman Sobel, assistant John

Minter and many other faithfuls on the board are to be heartily complimented for their conduct of the election.

The most discouraging and disturbing fact surrounding the election was the conduct of the polls in Town Men's IV District, Victory Village.

Last year's reapportionment of legislative seats and relocation of elective districts resulted in the creation of a separate district for Victory Village voters. Village dwellers were allocated two student representatives, and rightly so.

But Tuesday's election, in which two village candidates were disqualified due to failure to submit expense accounts to the Elections Board, and in which village dwellers failed to supply necessary poll readers so that only eight voters were allowed the privilege of ballot casting, demonstrates a most irresponsible attitude of the part of Victory Village voters.

The district is definitely entitled to legislative representatives. But the district should be reapportioned to lessen representatives if Victory Village voters can not offer more participation than was demonstrated during yesterday's election.

And if town district voters continue their dismal participation at the polls, some of their representatives should be reapportioned to districts where more voter enthusiasm is evident.

We shall look forward to spring elections with a fervent hope that students will respond more enthusiastically at the polls.

Officials elected appear capable and should advance student government far.

But voters should definitely demonstrate more effort and participation in all coming elections.

## VIEW FROM THE HILL: Constitution & Individualism Anathema's Rt.

By Curtis Gans

On June 17, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down four decisions which produced considerable outcry, and threatened to tear down much of the "legislation" related to the security of the United States. They also took the first step in a very long time towards the protection of individual rights under the first, fifth and sixth amendments of the Constitution.

These individual rights are central to any democracy, and are of utmost importance to American democracy.

Perhaps the most far reaching decision of the court was the action taken on the Smith Act. Here the right of individuals to espouse and teach communism and to assemble as a group was upheld. The condition was made, of course, that individuals or groups must not preach or incite to practice violent overthrow of the U. S. government.

In any democracy, if the government wants to protect the rights of all individuals, it must take the good with the bad. If American wants to preserve free speech, then it must let those speak whose views are anathema to democracy. For freedom of speech for all is not freedom of speech for the few who preach the line of the government currently in power. Moreover, it is to the good of the United States to have the Communist line exposed to the critical scrutiny of the press, the politicians, and last but not most important, the voters.

The right of people not to conform in thought and speech with the majority is one of the basic and little used rights of America, but if this right is not upheld, then the day may come when freedom of speech for only those who speak as the members of the government speak will be allowed. It would indeed be a sad state of affairs if this were to happen.

The right to join a group whose members espouse similar ideals is also a fundamental precept in American democracy, and is protected by Article One of the Bill of Rights. However, until the Supreme Court decision of June 17, the post-war Communist party was subject to the censorship of local laws.

Again America must take the good with the bad if it is to preserve its democratic ideals. The day may well come when either the Democratic or Republican party can set itself up, and with the censorship of the Communist party as a precedent, censor its rival. The result would be disastrous.

Perhaps the next important decision was the Jenck's verdict, which opened the testimony of two witnesses within the files of the FBI to the scrutiny of the defendant. It is well known that the sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States contains a clause whereby the individual has the right to face his accusers. Clearly if testimony of two witnesses is brought out in trial to the detriment of the accused without the accused being able to take recourse in cross examination, he is denied the right of facing his accusers.

The Supreme Court in upholding this right might have wrought a

little havoc with the secrecy of FBI files, but it protected the necessary legal rights of all individuals.

The other two decisions of June 17, upheld the rights of individuals under the fifth amendment. It vindicated two men who refused to answer questions in Congress and the New Hampshire State Legislature.

It has been a strange misconception in American judicial and political circles as of late to view any man who resorts to the fifth amendment as guilty. This is contrary to the spirit and letter of the law.

The law is set up for the protection of individuals in order that they may not say something that may tend to incriminate themselves. This does not mean that these people are guilty or the statements that they would make are confessions of guilt. It means that they are able to protect themselves from being misconstrued and having their own words used against them.

The Supreme Court in handing down the June 17, decisions upheld the right of refusal to testify against one's self, and tore at the modern edifice of implied guilt which is coupled with the utilization of the fifth amendment.

Moreover, it set limits upon the field of investigation by congressional and state boards of inquiry, in saying that the questions that the two individuals in question refused to answer were far afield from the topic of investigation. Although no definite limits of Congressional investigations were set, there was a step made toward protecting the privacy of the individual. This was a step in the right direction.

The Supreme Court, after a lapse of several years of Congressional

"I Think We've Managed To Save His Face"



HERB BLOCK DIRECTOR THE WASHINGTON POST

CAROLINA CARROUSEL:

## Christmas Buddies Pale At Pastel Pistols

Gail Godwin

Today, we shall decide what to give to our Christmas buddies to make their masculine hearts jump for joy.

We have already left cufflinks, fountain pens, wallets, and linen handkerchiefs to the more conservative present-givers. Now we shall be original.

The type of man your Christmas buddy is dictates the type of gift you want to buy.

I thumbed through several magazines to get an idea of what is being offered this year, and I found that opportunities are better than ever for shocking your C. B. with your extreme originality.

For the man you "Cain't help lovin'," even though they tell you he's lazy, delightful Eastern type pajamas with kimono sleeves and oriental sandals to match will hit the spot. If, however, your mamma does not like the idea of giving your lazy C. B. such intimate apparel, substitute with a foam rubber pillow covered with material on which your name is printed in gay colors.

If your buddy likes his liquids, surprise him with an ice crusher with matching ice bucket - adjustable for coarse or fine ice.

If he is the continental cassanova

witch-hunting due to security scares, his again become the leading weapon in the struggle for the preservation of individual rights. It is a change to be hailed.

who roams the earth in search of adventure, slip a leather passport case under his Christmas Tree.

If you have been blessed with the outdoor type of Buddy, opportunities are unlimited. Three possibilities are: .22 caliber handguns in pastel colors, a smart looking leather-trimmed barometer, or deer-skin gloves with knit inserts and slit palms for greater agility.

If he is always go, go, going, buy him an electric shaver that plugs into any automobile cigarette lighter. Then he can drive and shave at the same time.

Has your C. B. always got his nose in politics? Then your search is over. Give him a jigger made like a gavel.

If he is one of this handsome, big, Viking type males with ruddy cheeks and muscles of steel, he would undoubtedly look even bigger in your Christmas present - a bulky-knit ski sweater in bold designs and colors. Several Vikings on campus are wearing them and they certainly turn the eye - or else blind it.

If he has everything and you want to give him something frivolous, manufacturers are now making Men's Jewel cases with fleur du lis designs and inlaid with bronze. Tiffany's has come out with a cute little pen and pencil set in solid gold for only \$175.

Whatever you decide upon, be sure and think hard before you decide, because it's the thought that counts, so they say.

## The Loss Of Coach Casey And Stifling Parsimony

The loss of Coach Leslie Ralph Casey has far more significance than meets the eye.

## 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
- 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
- Coed Editor — ALYS VOORHEES
- Librarian — GLENDA FOWLER
- Business Staff — WALKER BLANTON, LEWIS RUSH
- Circulation Manager — SYD SHUFORD
- Wire Editor — PAUL RULE
- Subscription Mgr. — AVERY THOMAS
- Feature Editor — MARY M. MASON
- EDIT STAFF — Whit Whitfield, Nancy Hill, Gary Nichols, Curtis Gans, Al Walker, Harry Kirschner, Gail Godwin.

NEWS STAFF—Davis Young, Ann Frye, Dale Whitfield, Mary Moore Mason, Stanford Fisher, Edith Mackinnon, Pringle Pipkin, Mary Leggett Brownning, Ruth Whitley, Sarah Adams, Marion Hays, Parker Maddy.

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

PHOTOGRAPHERS — Norman Kantor, Buddy Spoon.

Night Editor — PEBLEY BARROW

Proof Reader — PEBLEY BARROW

Popular Coach Casey, director of the University's outstanding swimming teams, will, of course, be much missed by his athletes and by students who admired him all over the campus. His loss to the Dept. of Physical Education will also be felt. Coach Casey was an assistant professor there.

But Coach Casey's justifiable reasons for resignation are strikingly significant. He leaves the University to accept a position at Southern Illinois University at a third higher pay.

The Daily Tar Heel has voiced sentiment over and over concerning the "intellectual migration" of professors from the campus.

The situation became more conspicuous than ever last year when numerous professors migrated from the campus to accept positions paying 50 per cent more salary—and even higher figures—at other colleges and universities. A case in point is outstanding and admired Dr. Bill Poter of the Philosophy Dept. —Dr. Poter was mentioned prominently for the chancellorship and supported and recommended by a large number of students—who resigned to accept another teaching post with much more salary.

The problem is acute. The five per cent raise in state employee's salaries which went into effect this year is wholly inadequate. And additional salary kick-ups, awarded on individual merit basis, is again wholly inadequate.

Additional salary increases is imperative if the University is to continue and perpetuate its academic reputation, its outstanding record of scholastic achievement.

The intellectual migration from the University's classrooms must be halted.

Higher—10 per cent or more—salaries awarded by the state General Assembly in 1959 would eradicate part of the deplorable situation.

But more immediate remedies should be sought.

### L'IL ABNER



### POGO



by Al Capp



by Walt Kelly



## READERS' REPOSITORY:

# Staffers Speak On Edit Freedom

EDITOR: I write this letter not necessarily in defense of your editorial policies, but rather to assert your right to have them.

You were elected last year in a campus-wide election. You were selected to run at the discretion of a bi-partisan board for the position you now hold and reached the pinnacle of your present success by virtue of true democratic practices.

A recall has been an integral part of the system of checks and balances of our system of government for over 40 years.

However, there are times when our checks and balances are badly abused. We believe that this is one of those times. We do not mean to accuse those who are connected with the recall of sour grapes or of motives designed for personal gain, but rather we are somewhat afraid of the precedent this action will establish.

Under Amendment 1 of the Constitution there is a guarantee of freedom of the press. If the recall is successful in your removal from office, Mr. Editor, we think that from that day on there will be a cloud of fear in the office of the DTH. The paper will be afraid to speak out on pertinent issues concerning the student body.

Nobody can doubt your right to take sides on an issue. Mr. Editor, for it's not only your job, but your obligation to those who elected you. Are the voters to seek a new editor merely because they disagree with the personal opinions of the man whom they elected a few months ago?

This is certainly not consistent to us, for it does not personify the Carolina way of life. In Chapel Hill we have a great tradition of the voice of the students. Student organizations have long expressed their opinions without fear of persecution.

However, these other organizations cannot give the campus that which The Daily Tar Heel can. The Daily Tar Heel is the only effective means of communication that reaches the students as a group. This certainly does not mean, though, that it must only speak on popular issues.

Editorials are the voice of the ELECTED EDITOR. Page two is his, while pages one, three and four belong to the students. The only obligation which The Daily Tar Heel has to the student body is to present a fair and representative coverage of campus news.

Mr. Editor, those of us who have worked in close conjunction with you realize that you agree with us that The Daily Tar Heel is the most important and potentially powerful single function on campus. However much we may disagree with some of your editorials, we will not deny your right to print them.

The following members of The Daily Tar Heel staff have signed this letter and pledge that they shall not support your recall.

- Author — DAVIS YOUNG
- News Editor — BILL CHESHIRE
- Advertising Manager — FRED KATZIN
- Asst. Sports Editor — DAVE WIBLE
- Edit Staff — GAIL GODWIN
- Edit Staff — WHIT WHITFIELD
- News Staff — STAN FISHER
- News Staff — RUTH WHITTEY
- Sports Staff — RUSTY HAMMOND
- Sports Staff — ELLIOT COOPER
- Sports Staff — ED ROWLAND
- Photographer — NORMAN KANTOR
- Coed Editor — MARY ALYS VOORHEES
- Asst. News Editor — PATSY MILLER
- News Staff — ANN FRYE
- Librarian — GLENDA FOWLER
- Business Mgr. — JOHN WHITAKER
- Feature Editor — MARY MOORE MASON

## Selection Board Method Upheld

EDITOR:

As a member of the Selections Board for the State Student Legislature I question the wisdom of choosing delegates by election as Mr. Braxton proposed in Tuesday's Tar Heel. The Selections Board, which is composed of past delegates to the S.S.L., interviews people who try out and considers their qualifications and interests. These candidates are given a test on current events. The Selections Board tries to pick people who have a certain amount of poise, who speak well, who are well informed, interested in the job, and willing to work. In my opinion, a fine group of delegates was chosen this year.

With all due respect for Mr. Braxton I feel that popular election would not insure the same high type of delegation. The individual student cannot possibly know personally all the candidates and their qualifications. The average student has not worked closely with the S.S.L. and could not have a thorough knowledge of what being a delegate entails. I submit that popular election is not feasible. I also think it would be a mistake to stop sending delegates to the S.S.L. because the University of North Carolina is a state-supported school and is widely known and respected throughout the state. The University should take part in such a program as this.

Mr. Braxton said that students who do not reflect the campus views should not be sent as campus representatives. This is quite correct in theory, but how can you find out the campus views? The delegation has always been made up of some of the most outstanding leaders on campus. Student leaders are the best spokesmen for student opinion that I can think of because the students have entrusted them with this function.

It is unfortunate that most of the state newspapers have ignored a great deal of commendable action done by the S.S.L. and have played up two rather sensational bills which were introduced by two other schools and voted down by the Carolina delegation. I would like to thank the Editor for mentioning the inadequate coverage of the S.S.L. by these newspapers.

ALICE ELLER