

The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor

Bill Staton, Business Manager



Dale Gibson, Managing Editor
Rebel Good, News Editor
Joe Sanders, Features Editor
Owen Davis, Sports Editor
Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor
Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager

You're 21 And Can Vote —So What?

If you're 21 you get to vote today—for what that's worth this election year.

In a year when Americans are anxious for the opportunity to express their opinions on the war, the draft, and urban problems by the ballot they are being forced to choose between two candidates who have set no strong claim to any clear position on these three issues and a third whose stands are soaked with race hatred.

Rather the two major choices have left their options so wide open as to tempt liberals into thinking that there is a chance that if one of the two is elected he might really make radical changes with regard to our war policy, the draft, or our urban crisis.

Most liberals had a candidate they wanted to see get the nomination, whether it be Nelson Rockefeller, Bobby Kennedy, George McGovern, or Eugene McCarthy.

Most of these liberals feel that candidates who represented their views failed to get the nomination because of trickery on the part of the establishment in the party.

Now they looked at the efforts of Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey to pull in liberal support by leaving all their options open as just another attempt to trick the liberals—this time to trick them into voting for themselves.

Of the liberals involved here two types can be delineated; those that have fallen for their trick and those that have not.

The first type are the ones that are going to vote today. They are going to vote because of some irrational faith in the American political system.

While the actions of the Democrats in Chicago and in state conventions across the country prior to that convention would give the impression that control of the political system is in the hands of a few unresponsive power brokers, these liberals linger within the fold of the political system believing that somehow it will prove itself responsive to the needs and feelings of the country.

We must count ourselves amongst this bunch in view of the fact that we recommended (not endorsed) Hubert Humphrey as the best alternative in today's election.

On the other hand there is the group that recommends that voters stay away from the polls today or if they do go, that they vote for Eldridge Cleaver or Dick Gregory.

These people will stay away from the polls as a protest of the highhanded way that the parties

have forced candidates on the country. They feel that to vote for any of these candidates would be to align oneself with a very immoral political system that seeks a perpetuation of its immoral policies in Vietnam and in this country (the draft, city problem, etc).

This group has been attacked for not planning to vote. Failure to vote has been cited as an unAmerican thing to do, as an immoral shirking of responsibility to take part in the decisionmaking processes of America.

This criticism of the liberals who refuse to vote is unfounded. These people have just as much right not to vote as to vote if they think that by voting they will be participating in an immoral action. Likewise, they are not obligated to endorse the candidates or the selection process, which is what they would be doing to a degree by voting. These people have a clear right to express their discontent with the current political system by abstaining from the election.

No, the only just criticism that might be made of them is that they are too cynical, but in this year, with all that has happened politically, cynicism is not unjustified.

Whether one votes today or stays home, and whether he goes to the street party tonight and gets drunk because the American political system is not his, today needs to be marked off as a bad dream, the type of day that should never happen again.

Liberals, or whoever is disgusted with what the political system has laid before them as candidates today, have to start building for the next election to see that their voice is not stifled by the political establishment.

Beginning now, and regardless of much the next president tries to curry favor with them, liberals must see to it that in 1970 or 1972 they have some control over the political system. Power has to be wrested from those that are responsible for today's nightmarish election. They must do this starting at the precinct level and working up and never hesitating to resort to the streets, as they did at Chicago.

American liberals must learn to match parliamentary skill with the establishment politicians and match muscle with their policemen, if necessary, in order to realign the country, to set it in the direction of fulfillment of those political concepts we have learned about in high school civics books but since found to be ignored in real political life.

Good-Bye Class Officers

The action of the two campus political parties in declining to nominate anyone for class officers this year is a welcome relief from the intense politicking that usually takes place at this time of year and which usually results in the election of a handful of persons who do nothing.

One of the most important things about their decision, however, is not that we will no longer be plagued with class officers, but that it shows a great deal of maturity on the part of the parties.

Last year the class officers were almost eliminated by student legislature; however, at the last minute some politicians were able to save the system.

The ostensible reason for keeping it was that class officers provided some benefits to the students. The real reason was that these politicians wanted the

opportunity to test their political organization in preparation for the spring elections.

They figure that in the contest for class officers they could find the weak and strong parts of their organization and find the weak and strong political personalities in time to make adjustments before the spring elections.

The recent move by the parties of not offering candidates is proof that this year they are no longer just interested in what steps can be taken to insure that their party wins in the spring. Rather, it stands as proof that they want to accomplish something useful to the campus this year without wasting time on class officers.

We are glad to see the two parties take this action and hope it won't be the last time the parties do something in the interest of the students.

Juking it up with the Chapel Hill bohemians: Political morality, poetry, music & good food reign supreme

Fall leaves, Run naked thru disappearing billows etc...

Hate white cops... the f man'll get yuh if yuh don't watch out

The military-industrial complex—bad!

Is this wine '66? It tastes like '65.

Like I mean zank out towards reality thru inner subconscious inhibitions release...

L.B.S. drinks blood!

STRAIGHT DAILY TAR HEEL



Erica Meyer

One Ballot—1000 Protests

The other day I cast my first vote in a Presidential election. I checked the appropriate boxes, sealed the envelope and sent it back to Hall County, Georgia.

Bobby Kennedy was my candidate; he is dead. McCarthy or McGovern or even Nelson Rockefeller were acceptable; they were not nominated.

But not vote? Voting is my duty, my right and my privilege.

Many have said that they will not exercise this right. This, I suppose, is their way of saying, "The system is bad. The candidates are inadequate. I quit!"

But, silence means consent and cowardice. Silence would imply that I have no voice. But I do not consent. I'm no coward; I have a voice and I will be heard.

There are arguments, perhaps, for not voting. The candidates are far from ideal,

the electoral system leaves much to be desired. These factors are, however, outweighed by the realization that the man selected today will fill the world's most uncomfortable, influential position. He must unite a torn country and pacify an angry world.

I voted for a man with a chance of gaining the White House. I cast an objective ballot for a man presented within the framework of the current election process. He can win—the others cannot, though even a futile write in is better than no vote at all.

My beliefs accepted a compromise out of the knowledge that the system can only be improved from within itself. It now rules, invincible. It can be changed only if we penetrate as concerned, responsible, realistic citizens who understand the influence of a valid public

opinion.

Copping out when your country asks for your opinion denies every young, idealistic promise. While they are listening, speak.

It is unfortunate that ballots are not printed with a "no" box. A place to check if you are dissatisfied with the choices offered and realize the futility of a write-in. As things now stand now there is no way to differentiate between a lazy non-vote and an objecting non-vote.

Wake up. Sitting on your right to vote could cost you that right in the future. It is up to you to maintain a government that can be lived with.

So even if Humphrey is too happy, or Nixon too tricky, or if George Wallace is Rosemary's Baby—vote. One counted, valid ballot is worth one hundred anti-everything protest signs.

Of course I voted. How could I not?

Letters To The Editor

Editor:

As the moon rockily rode the night clouds and sleeping students' electric alarm clocks purred midnight, a short, heavy-browed figure hunched over a boiling cauldron in a deserted Alabama pasture.

Leering demonically, the figure pranced around the pot three times with short, mincing steps, stopping only to fling ingredients into the boiling essence while chanting in a high, drawing sing-song:

Demons in my midnight brew Rise and make my dreams come true.

Throw I in the sacred slivers Of Texan's gall and nigger's livers, Now add scent of Daley's Mace And tear-gassed hair from hippy's face.

Throw in oil from unions' spleen And one torn bill of Federal green. To thy infernal hopes I sing Grant that I may soon be king. Stir in blood of heckler's brains And squelch the sounds of their refrains.

Rise, O Southern voting masses And let the North choke on your grasses.

Chop the elephant and ass And sacrifice them to the mass. Lastly, if thou lovest me, Crunch the bones of UNC.

Then, drinking deeply of the potion and stepping back through the lowing herds of faithful supporters quietly asleep in the master's shadow, the obscured figure slouched in the back of his shiny black Cadillac with the painted stars and bars on the hubcaps, and drove home to rest, to sleep, perchance to dream.

Ken Ripley

Football Game

Seen End To War

Editor:

I offer the following solution to the Vietnamese War: Due to the topical coincidence of the Olympic Games and the fresh initiatives toward peace, it is herewith suggested that the victor of the war should be decided by a game of professional football to be played between the North Vietnamese and the Americans. In the interests of fair play, objections to the inclusion of the Vietcong would be waived.

Misguided moralists will claim this final solution is grossly unethical; that is, the Olympic Games should not be blemished by nationalistic or partisan politics. However, it is evident that all men regardless of nationality desire an end of the war. This solution would undoubtedly bring the war to a happy and propitious end (as well it would

provide ample entertainment for a Sunday afternoon). Therefore, all men regardless of nationality would subscribe to such a solution because it would end the war without degrading the Olympic spirit.

Signed, Pere Ubu

Gardner Supporter Beamed In Letter

Editor:

An Open Letter to a "Leading Tar Heel Citizen:

I hate your narrow conservatism, your self-appointment as guardian of our morals, and your attempt to intimidate the university administrators.

Kudos to Chancellor Sitterson and Dean Cathey!

Ulcers, gray hairs, and ingrown toenails to Jimmy G.!

Sincerely, Gail Hutchison

No Practice View Irritates Alumnus

Editor:

As an alumnus of the University of North Carolina I have always believed that the institution held itself open for any of us, who from time to time enjoy reminiscing by walking familiar paths that we once tread in the years past, until today.

Today I had the opportunity to watch Coach Bill Dooley's football team preparing itself for the upcoming game with the Air Force for almost ten minutes. I had seated myself along the dirt bank that runs by the new law school building and was prepared to watch the Tar Heels work out. Immediately one of the campus policemen spotted me and informed me that I was not allowed to watch that or any practice session. I am still trying to understand why the football coaching staff would take such steps to close off all of its practice sessions.

As a past member of the University of North Carolina's football team (1960-1963), I remember it was always encouraging to find a number of the professors, students, and town's people standing by and taking an interest in what we were doing. I think Coach Dooley needs all the support he can muster right now—whether on the practice field or in the stadium on Saturday. Forbidding fans to watch and take an interest in the team's practices is hardly the way to gain that support.

Sincerely, M.D. Lasiter P.O. Box 250 Morehead City

Andy Schorr

'Time-Out' A Success

Before last Tuesday many people felt that "Time Out Day" would be a flop. But I'm convinced that enough members of the UNC community developed and exchanged ideas about national and campus issues to make the program successful.

As I walked from booth to booth in each crowd I noticed students who had previously told me they were apathetic towards such discussions. On the fringes of many groups some students became involved in emphatic discussions of their own.

Many thousands of students and most faculty probably never heard about "Time Out Day". Some just thought it a legitimate way to cut classes. But for others it was a valuable break in the routine at Carolina in order to evaluate some issues (dorm visitation, drugs, etc.) that were important to them.

I remember from last year that there were many campus issues in the past that were either pigeonholed by the administration or forgotten by the students themselves. Many students became or perhaps remained apathetic.

Last year most student leaders were written off by many of their peers as "politicos". But this year could be different. "Action Government" seems sincerely to want the participation and ideas of any student who has anything to say. "Time Out Day", I believe was along those same lines. It was only a beginning, but students began to talk and argue with the administration and each other more vocally and adamantly, than in the past.

Tuesday's effort at campus discussion of issues that are important to the students here will be successful only if those students who discussed and argued so enthusiastically continue to do so three or four weeks from now.

It could all be forgotten quite easily, and then progress in areas where the students seem to want change could only come more slowly.

At UNC we do have an administration that is willing to listen and work with the students on their proposals. These men all eagerly participated in "Time Out Day" along with students and faculty members.

There might never again be another "Time Out Day", but if students at this university will not hesitate to discuss problems they find here with student leaders, other students or administrators, there will be no need for one.

Otelia Connor

Otelia Assesses UNC

I sat with a new student at Lenoir today. As usual, I tried to bring him out, to get him to talk about himself. He said he was a candidate for a Morehead Scholarship, but was not a Morehead Scholar—he missed it by about 20 points out of 1135 points, on the aptitude test.

But he was president of the Student Body in High School. He was Editor of the High School Newspaper. He was Captain of the football team, and advertising manager on the Year Book Staff. He was an all round individual.

His attitude towards life was so positive I told him I thought he deserved the scholarship, and should have received one. But that is irrelevant now. What is of interest is why he chose to come to UNC when he would have been admitted to any other college in the country?

His answer—Because of the freedom at the University. He wanted to be his own man—to choose how he would spend his time, the things he would do, and not have his life regulated from above. So he chose UNC! That doesn't mean that there are no standards, and no guide-lines here. He is required, in addition to passing his work, to live up to the honor code, and to be a Carolina Gentleman, both on the campus and wherever he is. That, of

course, is the *sine qua non* of remaining as a student at UNC. This student had very courteous manners.

Every year I think my students have the best manners of any college in the U.S. Then every fall I am shocked at the careless ways of many of the new students. To make matters worse, they never heard of Otelia Connor.

It is a big job to reach several thousand new comers every year. But I always have in the past, and I am always optimistic about the future.

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations.

Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news—933-1011; business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514.

Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C.

Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.

