

not accomplish much. However, working, yes, working, will allow prestige to shine upon you.

I am not running a popularity contest. Yet S.G.A. elections are turning out to be popularity contests. However, I enjoy working in the S.G.A. for its rewards in seeing things being done. If there are any who wish to work in this capacity, the elections in the winter term will allow you to do so. We should have many people running for office. Also, don't feel bad about losing an election. Do not be affected by the way others think. Do something. Don't give the impression of doing. Don't show but create. Above all give your honest opinions.

What do you suppose we do? If you have any suggestions bring them forth. S.G.A. meetings are generally open to all students.

On the Collegian

The first edition of the Collegian has appeared somewhere on campus. Of course, we can't thank the editors and personnel who made this possible. They "forgot" to put their names somewhere in the paper. Is it a propaganda sheet or a newspaper?

I wish to thank all involved in the Collegian for their fine job of reporting. They seem to have just sat on their haunches and wrote what they felt, not what was really the truth. No newspaper should expect news to come into their office. They must seek news. They reported that there was no word official or unofficial about the road. Yet they neglected to ask S.G.A. or Mr. Kostos. I wonder why? I quote from the last issue of the Collegian, "We intend not only to report, but to comment." So far they have commented a lot and reported little. Ah, so, the way of the new Collegian.

Reply

The Collegian agrees with the above letter when it states that the student apathy is deplorable, but we must raise some questions about S.G.A.

The S.G.A. is to some degree responsible for the present condition at Highcross. The writer points out that we must either vote or take what we get. Yet, we haven't been getting anything. Candidates for the S.G.A. run on idealistic platforms that seem to be divorced from reality.

The writer states also that more people voted in the Mock election where their votes meant nothing than in the S.G.A. election where their votes did mean something. The students obviously are more interested in demonstrating their opinions, no matter how ineffective, on something which does effect them rather than underwriting the complete nothingness of the S.G.A.

The S.G.A. should demonstrate the leadership for which it is responsible before complaining about student apathy. The student apathy is at least the partial if not complete result of the S.G.A.'s lack of effectiveness.

Our first comment to the second portion of this letter is that the writer doesn't practice what he preaches. The letter was submitted to us omitting (sin upon sins) a signature). We don't mind criticism from one who supposedly is in a position to criticize, but the criticism seems to be hypocritical.

On the statement that research for the facts was not undertaken, our reply is that such effort was made, but was met mostly with "I don't know" If some information was given, it was usually followed with "Don't quote me." This lack of information seems to be the cause behind the "I don't care" s.