

The Daily Tar Heel

In its sixty-ninth year of editorial freedom, unhampered by restrictions from either the administration or the student body.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is the official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina.

All editorials appearing in THE DAILY TAR HEEL are the personal expressions of the editor, unless otherwise credited; they are not necessarily representative of feeling on the staff.

March 27, 1962 Tel. 942-2356 Vol. LXIX, No. 125

The Editorship

The race for the editorship of this newspaper has this year been a violently, often viciously, contested race.

From this vantage point, it looks as if the race has narrowed to a choice of two possibilities, a Wrye-Clotfelter ticket opposed by write-in candidate Mike Mathers.

It appears that these two are both running ahead of the third candidate, Ernest Stepp. Although elections have a peculiar quality of unpredictability on this campus, odds are far better than even that either Wrye-Clotfelter or Mathers will be elected, possibly only after a run-off election.

We have worked closely with Wrye, Clotfelter and Mathers. Perhaps it would be appropriate to point out now that the Wrye-Clotfelter ticket was not conceived as a political maneuver designed to offset some of the wrath incurred by Clotfelter with the popularity enjoyed by Wrye. The ticket is a dual one in every sense of the word. Wrye should temper some of Clotfelter's irrepressibility and contribute strongly both as an organizer and an editorialist. He will not, we believe, be the lesser influence of

the co-editorship. Clotfelter has written more news, features and editorial page material than anyone now on the staff. He would continue, we think, to put in long hours in the paper's production. With Wrye as a steady influence, the combination could easily be the most effective since the days of Ed Yoder and Louis Kraar.

Mathers has been easily the best advertising manager to work for the DTH in many years.

His organizational ability is unquestioned, his own work near-perfect. Politically, he could probably be best characterized as moderate, with the balance tipped toward conservatism. Most of his work has been with the business staff, but he has made contributions to the editorial page. He would, we feel, be an effective and efficient organizer, fair in his treatment of editorial material and a steady and dependable editor.

Wrye and Clotfelter would put out the more stimulating paper, we are confident. We are equally confident that Mathers would put out a solid one.

The choice is yours.

Hang The Rules

One of the more difficult feats for a campus politician to pull off is to ride into office on a write-in vote. Not only must he make his name so well-known that a majority of students will remember it, but he must also make his position so strong that voters will buck the printed ballot and write in his name.

The psychological disadvantages of this are almost overwhelming. Never, to our knowledge, has a major office been won by a write-in candidate. However, there is perhaps no right more basic to representative democratic government than that of the voter to cast an effective ballot for the candidate he feels is most qualified.

Recently, the chairman of the Elections Board ruled that since

the Student Constitution does not provide for write-in balloting, and the Elections Laws make it mandatory for a candidate to attend a compulsory meeting, turn in a petition, etc., before he can officially be considered in the running, write-in votes would not be counted.

Here, as in another recent case involving the Elections Laws, the decision was reached through pointing to the letter of the law, without real consideration of the intent. The purpose of the regulations concerning candidacy is to insure proper filing and guarantee that campaigns will be run on an equitable and honest basis. The intent is clearly not to deprive a candidate of the right to enter a race late in the campaign, nor to shut out a candidate whom the electorate chooses.

Electioneering on this campus can, and often does, reach a fever pitch. The regulations covering candidacy and campaigning, in general, serve effectively in keeping candidates from translating political zeal into fraudulence. In this, they are both proper and desirable. But, when interpreted so rigidly that they block open elections, they become antithetical to their own purpose.

According to five sections of the Elections Law, the Student Constitution and the by-laws of the Publications Board, write-in candidates for Editor of the DTH will not be considered official candidates.

But none of these regulations are worth the paper they're printed on if they deny the campus the basic right of choice.

Vote as you like, and the rules be hanged.

'80 Pct. Rule: A Vile Inequity'

An Open Letter to Clifton Kreps, Chairman of the Faculty on Fraternities and Sororities—

Sir, there exists on this campus an inequity so vile, a blemish so repugnant, that it defies true description. I am speaking of the so-called "80% Rule." It has existed beyond any realm of logic, and it must be disposed of before any sensibility returns.

Fraternities have been put into a separate category, and the mem-

bers are now designated differently than other students. This author realizes that this is not the expressed intention of the Rule, but it is implicit in its existence.

For the privilege of living together a fraternity must sustain a certain average; one which is higher than the campus average; one which is higher than that which any athlete must obtain to participate in athletics. As a matter of fact, the number of student organizations for

a member must sustain a minimum average is extremely small.

Why is this discrimination allowed to exist? Is there, as has been whispered, a conscious effort on the part of the faculty to rid the campus of fraternities?

The writer is forced to ask "why." There is no logical reason behind this banality. All reason rebels against the shackles so arbitrarily fastened.

Faculty members questioned on this say that this Rule will only be replaced when the Interfraternity Council comes up with a better plan. But the writer is impelled to ask WHY any plan is necessary. Are fraternities so hedonistic in nature that they must be curtailed and harassed? Are there no other sources of trouble on campus that the onus of guilt must be borne by fraternities?

Let us assume that the IFC does arrive at a plan accepted by all the principals. Does this solve the scholastic problems of the campus? Of course not. It merely puts a check on a group which constantly has an average higher than that of the campus average.

The writer doesn't dispute the right of the administration to set up a minimum scholastic average for participation in extracurriculars—if this included ALL extracurriculars. Through some twisted variation of logic, it appears that a decision was reached whereby fraternity membership is the only activity so burdened. To placate the conscience of a system too lax in its scholastic regulations this "stranglehold" was applied to fraternities. This is akin to cutting off one's nose to spite one's face.

Further, one must ask why the entire house is penalized for a small minority who fail to make their grades. If sixty young men constitute the membership of a fraternity, the failure of only twelve will suffice to veritably "clap them all in irons." Regardless of the house average, which a majority is above 2.0, a house is put in scholastic disgrace

due to the actions of a few. Regardless of the number of men on "Dean's List," or in scholastic honorary societies, they are all condemned to an academic "Devil's Island."

Why "Devil's Island?" For like that infamous prison isle, rush probation makes it quite hard to recover, let alone ever return. Those that do return are extremely hard-pressed for existence. This hardship is one that no other student group must undergo, no matter how low their mean average is.

Is this fair? Reasonable? Even logical? If the basis for this Rule is that the house should be responsible for its members, scholastically, this writer would like to propose a parallel plan to this. Is it reasonable that 80% of the faculty must produce research work or novels in a limited time, or the entire faculty is held irresponsible and inefficient? As ridiculous as this idea is, so is the plan of the administration to handicap fraternities.

Sir, this writer would like an answer to the above questions; an explanation to this outrage. The mind cries out at such a perverted system of thought that squelches individuality and encourages a schism in the student body.

—Ken Toppell

'We Have Our Own Little Alianza'



S.P. Recalls U. P. Record

To the Editor:

Several people have questioned the statistics presented in my first letter to the editor, in which I stated that over the last four years, the Student Party had introduced 77.7% of all legislation passed.

Bills introduced by legislators who were double-endorsed are included within the statistics of both parties. The party assignment was made according to the true party sympathies of the legislators as demonstrated by party membership and attendance at party meetings and caucuses. For instance, bills introduced by double-endorsed legislators Joe Oppenheimer and Pete Thompson were included within the statistics given for the University Party, those introduced by Bill Whichard, Bruce Welch, and Bill Miller are included within statistics for the Student Party.

During the debate in Cobb, Inman Allen raised this question and stated that all candidates endorsed by the UP had to be members of the party. Fortunately, Bill Whichard was present to contradict this statement.

And speaking further of legislative records, it is interesting to note that the UP big four candidates, as legislators, voted against several items during the past year which appear in this year's platform. When the Carrier Current bill was introduced by the SP during the 30th Assembly, Representatives Inman Allen and Judy Clark voted to keep the bill in committee and not allow it to ever be discussed on the floor. In the 31st Assembly, Inman Allen, Judy Clark, and Bill Crisswell (Larry McDevitt was absent) voted against the program of paid intramural managers which was proposed by the Student Party.

There are two reasons why someone could vote NO on a proposal. It could be because the proposed program was not broad enough, or it could be a reflection of a negative attitude toward the whole proposal. However, it is interesting to note that in the above cases, UP never tried to amend either bill, or to introduce any counter proposal. They simply voted NO.

—John Randall, Parliamentarian of the Student Legislature

Editor Blasted; U. P. Scored

To the Editor:

As I begin, let me state my purpose as criticizing editorial policies of the DTH; otherwise I fear this point might be obscured through the very policies I am attacking. Surely you agree that I have every right to expect that it might be. On March 19 I delivered to you a letter to the editor which, when it finally appeared on March 22, was not printed in its entirety. You shortened it at your discretion, but made no mention of these impositions to the reader.

The letter concerned your poorly-written editorial on March 17 entitled "A Candidate . . ."

My primary purpose was to point out the injustice you did a certain candidate. Where your argument should have been directed at what you considered a faulty elections law, you turned rather to assail an individual. Then after saying you believed one thing about his intention, you implied another, namely that he was unethical. If anyone appeared to display a lack of ethics, I think it was clearly you in your editorial.

This purpose I stated in the obvious place for it, second only to a brief introduction designed to catch the reader's eye. How could anyone with your editorial wisdom omit my purpose statement?

As I write this, only four issues of the DTH remain before the campus elections, and you apparently have not yet encouraged or allowed a policy statement by any party-endorsed Big Four candidate. No student can say that he has been assisted in making a wise voting

decision by anything that has appeared in the DTH. Is this what we spend \$25,381.74 and pay you personally \$630.00 for?

Since the above incident is proof enough to me that everything I read in the DTH may well be altered and slanted by the editors, I feel compelled to warn my fellow readers that, especially in the season of politics, we can not be too careful about placing faith in what we read in the DTH. What a tragedy.

Trusting that this letter will be printed in its entirety, I remain a reader.

—Robert E. Sevier
114 S. Columbia Street

U. P. Rehashed S. P. Platform

To the Editor:

A copy of the University Party platform was slipped under my door the other night, and it seems to me that the UP is merely advocating things that have already been done and is increasing the duplication and bureaucracy in Student Government.

For instance, the UP advocates dormitory libraries. The Student Legislature passed an SF-sponsored bill just this past Thursday to begin such a program.

The UP advocates establishing a Commerce Committee. The functions of this proposed committee are already being handled by the Campus Affairs Board and the Bad Check Committee.

Also the UP advocates establishing a Committee for Physical Development. The proposed functions of this committee are presently handled by either the Campus Affairs Board and the University Traffic and Safety Committee or are to be handled by the Dormitory Improvements Committee established by the Legislature Thursday night.

In addition, two other points in the UP platform are things that the UP voted against last year in the Legislature: a paid intramural manager program and carrier current.

—Bill Collier

About Letters

The Daily Tar Heel invites readers to use it for expressions of opinion on current topics regardless of viewpoint. Letters must be signed, contain a verifiable address, and be free of libelous material. Brevity and legibility increases the chance of publication. Lengthy letters may be edited or omitted. Absolutely no one will be returned.

Reflections

Campaign promise made by a Cobb legislative candidate: "Two Girls in Every Cobb Room . . . Next Year."

Wrye And Clotfelter Endorsed By Baker

Dear Fellow Student,

Having considered the eligibility of all the candidates running for editor of the Daily Tar Heel, we want to call your attention to Chuck WRYE and Jim CLOTFELTER.

As officers representing all phases of campus life, we are very interested in seeing the most capable leadership given to this important position.

We recognize the primary qualifications for the editorship as being experience, strong ability in every aspect of putting out the paper, and the recognition of the Tar Heels' role as an independent entity, free from control by special interests.

Wrye and Clotfelter are the only official candidates who have held staff positions on the Tar Heel, and in these offices they have worked actively and effectively.

While Chuck was broadening the scope of the sports department by his work there, he also received valuable experience in every step of the paper's production from the print shop to writing for the editorial page. Since his freshman year, Jim has served as news editor, assistant to the editor, and has

been a regular editorial columnist. Their work in student government, the athletic department, and divergent phases of student activity will give them the broad base of knowledge necessary for responsible news coverage.

We have talked to the candidates and find that their experience, combined with their proposed programs and ideas, warrant our endorsement of them as the most qualified leadership for the Daily Tar Heel.

- Signed:
- Earl Baker, President, Young Republicans Club.
 - Harry Bloom, varsity swimming.
 - Larry Brown, Vice-President, Junior Class; varsity basketball.
 - Thompson Mann, varsity swimming.
 - Harrison Merrill, Treasurer, Freshman Class.
 - Hank Patterson, Vice-President, Student Body.
 - Mike Putzel, President, Young Americans for Freedom.
 - Fran Roth, President, Pan-Hellenic Council.
 - Donnie Walsh, varsity basketball.

Robinson's Ramblings

Last week I thought Jim Clotfelter and Chuck Wrye had some newspaper sense. After reading their statement in Sunday's DTH on how they want the paper to have its own printing plant, I know positively that neither of these fellows are fit to be dog catchers, let alone editors of a newspaper.

They said a down payment on a press would be \$7,000. True. But it takes a heck of a lot more to run a newspaper than a press. Things like three dozen sets of different type at \$500 a set; linotype machines at \$28,000 each; an engraving machine; a headline making machine; a casting furnace and a suitable building to put all these machines. Total \$150,000. And at that it would be a shoddy printing plant.

Then there is the small matter of getting printers to run these machines. A minimum of three men are needed, so this would cost about \$450 every week of the year. Yes, they'd have to be paid even when the DTH wasn't printed, because it's impossible to employ printers only when school is in session.

"The campus would get a better paper at less cost," they said. This is absurd. To spend \$100,000 and more on a hare-brained idea like this, is to foster a putrid farce on the student body.

Not that they would do it deliberately, but whether a farcical goal

is sought for good or bad motives the result is still the same: a farce.

If these so-called responsible candidates could come up with such an ill-founded impractical scheme on short notice, then what kind of ideas could their astigmatized minds produce in a year of running the DTH?

Another reason that makes their idea so ludicrous, is that write-in candidate Mike Mathers, as a Publications Board member, has been chairman of a committee to look into the feasibility of the DTH having its own printing plant. Wouldn't he have used this issue if there had been some substance to it? Certainly, he has the facts which Clotfelter and Wrye are desperately in need of.

Mathers is cool headed, efficient, fair minded and most important he has the facts at his command before he acts.

This brings us to the challenge by Dave Buxton, chairman of the elections board, that Mathers' candidacy is not legal. This is pure bunk. Since when does an appointive student government official set himself up as God Almighty in order to thwart democratic processes?

If Mathers gets the votes, he will be the next editor. This is a fact. And Mathers should get the votes because he is clearly the best man for the job.

—Mike Robinson

The Daily Tar Heel
EDITORIAL STAFF

WAYNE KING.....Editor
MIKE ROBINSON.....Associate Editor
HARRY LLOYD, HARVE HARRIS.....Managing Editors

LLOYD LITTLE.....Executive News Editor
JIM CLOTFELTER, BILL WUAMETT.....News Editors
JIM WALLACE.....Photography Editor
CHUCK MOONEY.....Feature Editor
ED DUPREE.....Sports Editor
CURRY KIRKPATRICK.....Asst. Sports Editor
GARRY BLANCHARD.....Contributing Editor

BUSINESS STAFF

TIM BURNETT.....Business Manager
MIKE MATHERS.....Advertising Manager
JIM EVANS.....Subscription Manager
JIM ESKRIDGE.....Circulation Manager

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is published daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations. It is entered as second-class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant with the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.
The Daily Tar Heel is a subscriber to the United Press International and utilizes the services of The News Bureau of the University of North Carolina.
Published by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.