Forum Meets, Discusses Platforms, Candidates In Presidential Race

By REED MARTIN

The second meeting of the Forum, this Wednesday night, was in the form of a debate on Parties, Platforms, and Candidates. Dr. Roy Talmage and Ken Carr spoke for the Republican position and George Williams and Sid Nathans upheld the Democratic.

Dr. Talmage of the Biology department outlined his views as an outgrowth of heredity and environment. With missionary parents, he is familiar with the problem of religious freedom and the possibility of oppression. He stated that although he sympathizes with Kennedy's position of political freedom although he is a Catholic, the Catholic church as a political and religious body would not let a President alone and would eventually influence him.

DR. TALMAGE came to this country in the middle of the depression and has since been wary of extreme federal economic intervention that saps initiative. Because he feels the stated policies of the Democratic candidate tend to this extreme government regulation, he is a confirmed conservative and Republican.

Mr. Williams began by pointing out that Chancellor Adenauer and President DeGaulle are both Catholic and free agents in the leadership of their democratic nations. He went to the dictionary to define Dr. Talmage's conservatism as so resistant to change as to be static.

POINTING OUT that the rest of the world is going by, he suggested that the democratic government interventions are as necessary now as they were in the depression to do everything possible to accelerate the position of the individual and the economy as a whole.

Ken Carr took the podium against federal intervention with the basic promise that although Kennedy describes his platforms with various new phrases it all tends toward socialism. Enumerating several socialistic trends that have been accepted under the guise of democratic liberalism, he reiterated the danger of excessive state intervention and the attendant sapping of individual initiative.

IN ANSWER to remaining various arguments, Carr supplied documentation for his Republican position on private growth versus government enforced growthmanship, tight money policies, and whether basic problems of the last seven years were initiated by the present administration or inherited from the previous one.

Syd Nathans, speaking last for the Democrats, presented the Democratic position of the Quemoy-Matsu problem more lucidly than Mr. Kennedy has in his "Great Debates." Both parties realize, said Nathans, even if Nixon does not, the indefensibility of these islands and also that appeasement will not work in dealings with dictators.

If the Republicans do not draw a definite line of defense with a guaranteed automatic and positive response to aggression, then in the case of an attack, we would seemingly withdraw under gun point, for we could not defend the islands.

UNDER THE question of growthmanship, Nathans suggests we must have a firm national growth and relation to dynamic social forces or we will seem to lose direction. He stated that Nixon's feeling of non-intervention in any troubled areas as Cuba or the Congo is a negativistic philosophy that leaves the ground open to Communistic exploitation.

In the main, our Great Debate seemed to reflect the basic political positions in a campaign year; that the incumbent party claims we will do even better although the record is good enough, while the opposition party claims we are standing still in most areas and regressing in the important ones.

The debate was an excellent supplementary presentation of ideas that we have all been hearing for the past few months and it is unfortunate that the general student tendency to ignore these forum presentations allowed only a small crowd to participate in the question and answer period.