

Dear Editor:

To be an independent, critical observer of the status quo is an important function of an editor. To be an effective critic the editor must be balanced and accurate in his criticism. Recent comments in the Campus have been neither balanced nor accurate. When the administration gets the blame for student apathy at a pep rally it shows only that the editor is an "aginner" whose reasoning is notable by its absence.

The criticism that the trustees should have built a dorm instead of a chapel conveniently ignores the obvious fact that the chapel was begun from a \$200,000. gift which could be used for no other purpose. Ye editor blames the administration for the delay in building the new men's dorm yet says nothing of the fact that the loan so necessary to construction was held up in Washington.

Intelligent editorial criticism we need. When we will get it may also just be a matter of time.

Horton Presley

P. S. Please proof-read the whole paper—spelling was lousy in the last issue.

Dear Dr. Presley

Upon "careful" reading of the editorial in question I believe you will find that I did not blame the administration for the construction of the chapel, on the contrary I was very much in favor of it, however, I do blame the administration for the lack of foresight in planning the student population. The need for a new mens dorm should have been evident many years ago. Preparations should have been started then so there would be no time lost in Washington or anywhere else. Having to run back and forth each day to the North American "Hotel" is not my idea of an atmosphere conducive to study.

I agree with you completely,

What we do need is some "intelligent" criticism.

**Your Humble Servant
Ken Fisher**

P.S. As for spelling, anyone who could do a better job with the capabilities at hand may throw the first stone.