

# The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed in its editorials. All unsigned editorials are written by the editor. Letters and columns reflect only the personal views of their contributors.

ERNIE McCRARY, EDITOR

## Another Botched-Up Vote

The validity of yesterday's constitutional amendment vote is, at best, highly questionable.

Temporary Elections Board Chairman John Winborne predicted a light turnout of voters. He did not predict the light turnout of poll tenders.

At least two of the most important polls were untended throughout the day and scores of people were unable to vote. Students must vote in their own district. If the polls in that district are closed, they cannot legally vote.

Y-Court and Carolina Inn were the two major untended polls. Winborne said a representative of Phi Kappa Sigma fraternity, which was responsible for manning the Carolina Inn poll, called him the morning of the election and said there would be no volunteers there.



Untended Y-Court Poll

Winborne said his only alternative was to place a sign in Carolina Inn directing those who came there to vote to go the poll at the Scuttlebutt.

Chi Psi fraternity was responsible for manning the Y-Court ballot boxes. At 4 p.m. yesterday no tenders had appeared, despite at least two calls from Winborne to the Chi Psi Lodge, and not one vote had been cast at what is normally one of the busiest polls.

A freshman who lives in Alexander Residence Hall reported to the DTH that the polls were not open there.

Several students from Morrison Residence College said that poll tenders there neglected to mark identification cards when they voted, even though some voters reminded the tenders of the requirement.

The election laws were violated on at least four counts.

1. All polling places were not open the same hours and all were not open for the required minimum of seven hours.

2. Each polling place was not attended at all times.

3. Presentation of identification cards was not required at all polls.

4. Some students voted at polls intended for use of residents of other districts.

The district-hopping in this vote is irrelevant because of the nature of the election. No district candidates were up for election, so voting by district was not important.

Nevertheless, if this is a preview of things to come in next month's spring elections, it ought to be called off. If that voting takes place under such haphazard conditions every defeated candidate will appeal and chaos will be upon us.

Similar problems have arisen for years, and the DTH urged changes in the voting system after elections last November. Student Government took no action to ease the situation.

Yesterday the DTH asked SG President Paul Dickson to appoint an individual or committee to study the problems and find solutions before the March 22 elections.

He agreed.  
Now is time for the work to start.

## Don't Fence Us In

The Athletic Department wants a fence.

A four-foot-high chain link fence . . . In front of our \$1.8 million showplace, Carmichael Auditorium.

The DTH is of the opinion that four-foot-high chain link fences are ugly, and such a fence would detract considerably from the appearance of a new campus landmark.

Athletic Department officials agree that a hedge along the roadway next to the parking lot would be much more desirable . . . someday.

One of the greatest assets of this campus is its beauty. It impresses every visitor and comforts every resident.

We would like to hang on to every scrap of that beauty we can, as the campus is being swallowed by steel and concrete monuments to architects' imaginations.

Until that hedge can be planted, a simple cable or chain fence, like those around campus sidewalks, would do everything a chain link fence could do.

Except look so ugly.

And cost so much.

# The Daily Tar Heel

72 Years of Editorial Freedom

Second class postage paid at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year. Send change of address to The Daily Tar Heel, Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Co., Inc. The Associated Press is entitled exclusively to the use for republication of all local news printed in this newspaper as well as all AP news dispatches.

"A Daily 'Tar Heel' Is Out Of The Question!"



Barry Jacobs

# War Will Be Political Issue

In a nation such as ours, every war becomes not only a military, but also a political issue. Would-be leaders have a chance to make a name and gain a following for themselves by making the correct decision as to whether to support or oppose the war.

The opportunity to make political hay from the Vietnamese War is greater than from any other war perhaps since the War of 1812. The current conflict may or may not be the most unpopular war this country has ever fought. It is certainly one of the most unpopular, and the strong opposition has evoked equally fervent defenses of our involvement. The polarization of feelings provides a ready forum for any politician who takes a stand on either side of the question.

Nothing said here should be taken to imply that politicians got us involved in Viet Nam for political gain. This is obviously not so. We became involved through a series of well-intentioned miscalculations and blunders. Now that we are at war, though, several groups and individuals stand to make political advances because of it.

First, of course, there is the Republican party. This is an election year, and the GOP has several ways to use the war as a campaign issue. They can criticize the way President Johnson is conducting the war and call for either increased force or a scaling down of the fighting. Most Republican leaders, however, have supported the President's conduct of the war; so this line of attack seems generally closed. Other avenues, though, remain very much open.

The Republicans can take issue with the President for not keeping the American people informed, as to the situation in Viet Nam and the part the United States is playing there. Administration secretiveness is a valid campaign issue. The President has not really confided in the people concerning our role in this war.

The highly publicized "peace offensive" is certain to be lashed in some quarters as merely a grandstand play on Johnson's part. Critics will say that the wide publicity given the diplomatic missions to various parts of the globe effectively ruined whatever slim chance of success the peace drive may have had.

The biggest Republican issue related to the war, though, is sure to be inflation—Johnson's determination to have guns and butter. The President has announced that the domestic programs of the Great Society will continue only slightly abated, despite the ballooning expense of the war. In so doing, he has left himself open to charges that his program will lead to dangerous inflation. If the President yields to labor pressure for a much higher minimum wage, the Republican artillery will be furnished with extra ammunition.

The opposition party is not the only group that can gain politically from the war. Dissident members of the Democratic party now have an issue on which they can sincerely differ with the President. While this could spell trouble for some, it also gives ambitious Democrats a chance to get out from under the long shadow of the President. The most obvious example, of course,

is Robert F. Kennedy.

Few men doubt that the Senator from New York has his eye on the White House. That he and Johnson are not exactly bosom buddies is no secret either. It is unlikely that LBJ would pick Kennedy as his successor.

The Senator is basically more liberal in his beliefs than the President, but Johnson's adoption of many liberal programs has left him little ground for opposition on domestic policy. The war, though, is one area in which the two have fundamentally different positions. Kennedy underlined his

## Dickson Commended

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

Paul Dickson is to be commended for the responsible role he played as leader of the student body of the University of North Carolina in advocating that Aptheker and Wilkinson be allowed to speak on the UNC campus. It is indeed sad that an institution less than eight miles away from the Hill has the freedom of speech and discussion so necessary especially in the academic context that UNC lacks.

It would seem, regrettably, that the speaker ban law has been amended only for the sake of expediency and that the intellectually stifling principles upon which it was based are remaining in operation not even covertly but overtly; however, being a realist, I had previously assumed that this would be the situation upon hearing of the amendment of the law.

Not only each student but also each citizen should be "greatly disturbed" by this state of affairs. Certainly one should be perturbed when a society which professes to be politically democratic takes steps to curb freedom of speech and inquiry, steps which bear resemblance and close affinity with the tactics of totalitarianism.

With the crisis of Viet Nam currently agitating the nation and the world (here I shall dismiss discussion of whether the position and policy of the United States in the affair is moral and just) and in view of the marked rise and renewal of the Far Right with its elements of fascism in this country in the past few years which makes of the Communist a modern bogey man, it is imperative that the Communist position be heard and understood. Yet this necessity is second to the basic premise that all

ideas, social, political, ethical, theological—whatever they may be, deserve to be given a forum and to be intelligently examined in an atmosphere of freedom, or as Dickson worded it—with my additions, one must exercise—and fight for the freedom in which to exercise it—"The right to listen and inquire . . . to make our own judgment."

Quite contrary to the statement of the honored governor of North Carolina at my own commencement ceremonies at UNC last June in which he stated (I paraphrase but believe I do not distort the Governor's words) that the people of North Carolina support the speaker ban law and thus the law, as it then stood—and in force, it has not changed in spite of amendment—should be respected by the academic community, there must be no compromise in fundamental principles of a free, democratic society, such as the freedom in question, in order to appease the inhabitants of the state.

In commending Dickson, I am also commending the students who supported him and, in turn, the students whom he represents. Were I still a member of the student body at the Hill, I should be backing him also.

Myron Blackwelder  
University of Wisconsin

## Taking Advice

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

One of your correspondents, Mr. Cecil Long, has raised the interesting question whether a graduate student would remain in residence at the University when he finds himself opposed to the practices of North Carolina's political leaders.

In my opinion, Mr. Long is right, and I myself am doing exactly as he suggests. It is my opinion—based on about three years' acquaintance with the situation—that political dogma has determined the curriculum to such an extent that I do not want to be burdened for the rest of my life with the title, "Ph.D., University of North Carolina."

I am not angry with anyone about this, since it is in an obvious sense the privilege of the people of North Carolina to do what they please with the institution (although I am vexed at their insistence on calling this place a university when they do not want it to be a university and could not tolerate it if it were one).

On the other hand, however, Mr. Long is undoubtedly aware of the damage I could do by remaining in residence and earning a doctorate here. I have a family; I even have a teaching job at another branch of the University. And every day I am heard and seen here, I help to give people the idea that a man can be a tolerable and responsible sort of person in spite of failing to feel any need to keep the Negro in his place.

This may not sway Mr. Long's beliefs, to be sure, but it may weaken other people's convictions and thus make the leaders' jobs more difficult and less pleasant.

Bullies depend on their pals, their gangs, to follow blindly and not feel doubts. And in the same way, the Southerner's fondness for violence depends on his conviction that his neighbors will approve and applaud. So if my being here and demonstrating that liberals are not monsters serves to weaken the confident beliefs of the pals and neighbors, why, then to that extent I'm pulling the claws of the leaders. That's why my continued presence in Chapel Hill would do damage to the Southern Conception of Life.

And that's why I'm sorry I don't have the nerve to stay. Mr. Long is right in a sense, but he is wrong, too. The burden of being known as a UNC graduate is nothing compared to the joy of knowing that one has done something to weaken the rock-like faith Southerners have that every rational man feels the way they do.

Yours sincerely,  
James F. Perry  
102 King St.

## Need A Walk

Editor, The Daily Tar Heel:

We need a sidewalk, and we need it now. Batman couldn't even walk to class from Morrison.

Ken Brown  
1011 Morrison

## The Collegiate World

# Gov. Moore Plays Dual Role

Old Gold and Black  
Wake Forest

Governor Dan Moore felt the pull last week of his dual role as Governor of the State and chairman of the University of North Carolina Board of Trustees. In what was all too obviously a political move "to maintain the continuing confidence and trust of the members of the General Assembly and the people of North Carolina," Moore and the trustees denied Herbert Aptheker and Frank Wilkinson the use of University facilities.

Moore could have avoided the charge of "political interference in academic affairs" by delegating the authority for applying the amended Speaker Ban Law before the need for application arose. He did not do so, and with his Board of Trustees, had to apply the condition of the amendment himself.

His application, contained in remarks Thursday, made the nightmares of many seem to come true: the law, in effect, has not really been changed—only the faces of its enforcers are different.

Moore's remarks revealed the same misunderstanding of education which prompted the law, only slightly tempered by a respect for science and diplomacy. Said Moore, "The University does need the freedom to host national or international scientific conferences which would be attended by communist scientists or to head the ambassador or official representative of a communist nation."

But for theorists like Aptheker, whose concern is with ideas, Moore has little use. For him, education is test tubes and international politics—not what goes on in men's minds.

We hope that when the trustees eventually pass authority of regulating speakers' appearances to those who do understand the educational process, political pressure of the State's higher educational system will cease. But as long as the Governor of the State is also the chairman of the Board of Trustees, we fear that the University will be subject to recurrent pressure from men of good will but of little understanding.

