

To the STUDENT BODY... ... from the EDITOR

THE STUDENT BODY BECOMES THE STUDENT LEGISLATURE WEDNESDAY

Democracy is working this week at Carolina! Over five hundred students have petitioned the President of the Student Body to call a special election to over-ride a decision of the Student Legislature.

The Constitution of the Student Legislature gives the student body the right to make and recall laws. Here are the sections of the constitution concerning this provision:

ARTICLE III. POWERS AND LIMITATIONS

"All legislative powers of the student body shall be vested in the Student Legislature and shall be unlimited except to the extent that:

"Section (1) The student body shall have the power of initiative whereby laws may be enacted and constitutional amendments adopted by the student independently of the legislature. This power may be invoked by petition wherein the proposed measure shall be set forth at length. If the petition be for the enactment of a law, it shall be signed by ten percent of the student body; and if the petition be for the amendment of the constitution, the petition therefor shall be signed by sixteen percent of the students. The petitions thus signed shall be filed with the student body president, who shall in turn submit the measure thus proposed to the student body for their consideration not later than fifteen days after the date of filing. A favorable majority, with at least twenty-five percent of the student body voting, shall be necessary for the passage of such petitions. The same measure, in form or in essential substance, shall not be submitted to the students by initiative petition, either affirmatively or negatively, oftener than twice in one school year. Constitutional limitations as to the scope and subject matter of measures enacted by the legislature shall apply to those enacted by the initiative.

"Section (2) The student body shall also have the power of referendum which may be invoked, by petition, against any act or part of any act of the legislature. Petitions invoking the referendum shall be signed by not less than ten percent of the student body and filed with the student body president. Such petitions shall set out the title of the act against which the referendum is invoked, and in addition thereto, the act or section thereof involved. When the referendum is thus invoked, the president of the student body shall refer the same to the students for approval or rejection not later than fifteen days after the filing. A favorable majority, with at least twenty-five percent of the student body voting shall be necessary for approval."

Here is democracy in its purest form. Here is proof that the students are interested in their government. President McKenzie has announced that the polls will be open Wednesday when every student will become a maker of the law.

The issue at stake is an important one, involving principles which will be important in shaping the course of student government on this campus. An important right will be exercised. The right of the people to initiate laws puts so much power in their hands that even the framers of the Constitution of the United States did not feel that the masses were capable of properly exercising such power. Many states have provisions for initiative, referendum, and recall and often it has been demonstrated that the voters were unqualified to hold such direct power.

At any rate, we firmly believe that these rights which are guaranteed by our student constitution are well entrusted in a student body which by popular vote can express wise decisions. You have been given a democratic right which in many governments is denied—use it wisely!

THE CATAPULT WAS GOOD!

A number of NROTC students have brought to our attention the fact that the editorial of May 8 which praised the *Catapult* was misunderstood by some of the men in Old East and Old West.

In a letter to the Editor we were asked among other things to name the publications on the campus which can be classed as "extraordinary." The letter was signed by Herman W. Ashlaw, F. X. Gallagher, Joseph D. McMahon, George B. Stadter, George Brening, C. Wayne Canterbury, T. Robert Dungey, Philip J. Moskowitz, John A. Lord, and F. Earle Crawford, Jr. The answer is obvious: none of our publications are "extraordinary." For authoritative evidence of this statement, the reader is asked to consult the ratings given our publications by organizations like the Associated Collegiate Press.

We believe that the last issue of the *Catapult* made a good impression. The *Catapult* seems to have more enthusiastic backers than does any other campus publication. As all campus publications now stand (that is, none of them are called "extraordinary" by national critics), the *Catapult* and its able editor are certainly to be commended.

ATT: COMMANDING OFFICER

The commanding officer of the V-12 and ROTC units here has ordered that no V-12 sailor will be allowed to play in Freddy Johnson's campus orchestra.

This order came simultaneous with the refusal of the legislature to lift dance expenditure restrictions that would permit the hiring of expensive name dance bands to play for our dances.

There are six V-12 musicians and ROTC's, that form an integral part of Freddy's outfit. Unless this order is lifted, there will be little chance for saving the band. During Freddy's 10 years as a campus bandleader, he has been of valuable service to the school. Many times he has lost money on dances and walked away with his usual congenial smile.

The navy men playing with the band average higher grades than the V-12 unit as a whole. It couldn't be that the dance band, working four hours a week, has interfered with their studies.

We ask that the commanding officer reconsider this decision and allow the boys to return to Freddy's fold so that week-end entertainment will not disappear entirely from the campus.

The Tar Heel

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE PUBLICATIONS UNION
SERVING CIVILIAN AND MILITARY STUDENTS AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

ROBERT MORRISON Editor
BARRON MILLS Managing Editor
BILL HIGHT Associate Editor
BANKS MEBANE, CHARLES WICKENBERG Editorial Advisers
DAVE KOONCE Desk Editor

REPORTERS:

W. H. Hipps, Jr., Pat Kelly, Marianne Browne, Dave Koonce, Dave Lilienthal, Fred Flieger, Marjorie Jordan, Mildred Krennik, Gertrude Walton, J. C. Lacker, Roy Thompson, Elaine Pearlino, Angela Hardy, Betty Edwards, Ruth Whitson, Marjorie Ezelle, Lois Clarke, Olive Ann Burns, Catherine Sloan, Peggy Case, Sara Spratt, Jim Dillard, Laura Parker, Ann Thornton, Mary Hill Gaston, Bill Crisp

CARROLL POPLIN Sports Editor

SPORTS REPORTERS:

Irwin Smallwood Johnny May
LINDA NOBLES Society Editor

SOCIETY ASSISTANTS:

Bobbie Wyatt Carolyn Rich
BETTIE GAITHER Business Manager

OFFICE STAFF:

Billy Seig Arthur Budlong

SALES STAFF:

Lois Clarke Mary Pierce Johnson Alma Young Mary Louise Martin
Martha Faison Jane Fairley Ginny Freeman Juanita Anderson

HARRISON TENNEY Circulation Manager

CIRCULATION STAFF:

Bill Jernigan Julia Moody

Published Tuesday and Saturday except during vacations, examinations and holidays.
Deadlines Thursday and Sunday. Entered as second class matter at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Member of ASC and Nat'l Adv. Service, Inc.

Witch-hunting Charge Hit By Douglass Hunt

To the Editor of the Tar Heel.

Dear Bob:

When you once break over the traces and write a letter to a paper you seem to become the victim of some sort of disease that forces you to keep on and on. Nonetheless, the issue seems sufficiently important; and, since the campus ought to have all the available information before it makes up its mind, I thought I ought to contribute what I have been able to find out—by careful investigation—about the Friederich case.

I was invited to the meeting of Chapel Hill citizens who protested Dr. Friederich's appointment by the OWI, but was unable to attend. Since all the furor has been created on the campus I have carefully accumulated all the information I could about the case by talking to the people on both sides most intimately concerned. I have read Dr. Friederich's pamphlet written in 1938—the one which contributed so many quotations taken "at random and out of context" to both sides. My impression was that it very definitely attempted to make a case for Hitler and Mussolini. I do not base that impression on any miscellaneous quotations, but on a careful reading of the entire pamphlet. Admitted that the pamphlet was written in 1938, admitted that others, more sympathetic, might have received a different impression, I submit that anyone who believed that the pamphlet bespoke those views had an obligation to act. Numerous persons in Chapel Hill did act.

As early as April 2, Prof. W. A. Olsen wrote to the OWI. On April 10, according to a letter written by Dr. Friederich to Paul Green, the OWI had decided, on the basis of protests registered by two Chapel Hill professors, to reopen his case. Who the other professor was who wrote before April 10, I do not know. So far as I know—and I have talked to a large number of the persons who signed the citizens' petition—to Dr. E. E. Ericson, Prof. W. A. Olsen, Dr. Raymond Adams, Mr. William Daniel, Dr. E. J. Woodhouse, Mr. W. T. Couch, Mr. Paul Green, and members of the Tar Heel staff most intimately acquainted with the case—the name of the other professor is not generally known. Nonetheless, the charge is made that Dr. E. E. Ericson is the "witch-hunter" behind the whole plot. It is known—and it was a matter of record in time for Mr. Couch to have withdrawn his letter to the Tar Heel—that Dr. Ericson's letter to the OWI was dated April 19, and mailed April 20, ten days after the OWI had reopened the case. It is also a matter of record that neither Dr. Ericson nor Prof. Olsen knew that the other had acted until the night of April 24, when the group of citizens met at Graham Memorial to discuss the affair. And, more than that, Prof. Olsen did not know that Dr. Ericson had written a letter of his own until last Thursday morning—the day the investigation of the Tar Heel's first story took place.

Certain of our "witch-hunters" have also neglected to mention the fact that neither Ericson nor Olsen knew the contents of the letter written by Mr. Daniel of the Psychology Department, who was not in any way connected with the group which met at Graham Memorial. Nor did they know of the action taken by Dr. L. O. Kattsoff of the Philosophy Department before the April 24 meeting. And these persons had not known of Dr. Raymond Adams' personal letter to the OWI.

Furthermore, in all the witch-hunting which has resulted from the furor over Friederich, very few people have known that the meeting of the group of Chapel Hill citizens took place on the night of April 24, and that the OWI had, to use the words of its Assistant Director, Mr. Edward Klauber, "with-drawn the tender of appointment" earlier that same day.

What is the conclusion? It is simply a fact that the requests to the OWI that Dr. Friederich's case be reopened—and that is all any of the letters I have seen asked for: none of them branded Dr. Friederich a Nazi—it is, I repeat, a matter of record that no one instigated any plot to smear Dr. Friederich. The protests arose spontaneously from persons who had read Dr. Friederich's pamphlet and who felt that the OWI should consider again before sending him on the very delicate mission to Germany for which he had been picked. None of these persons whom I have mentioned branded Dr. Friederich a Nazi; none of them demanded that he not be given a job in this country; none of them demanded that he be ousted from the University. As a matter of fact most of those to whom I have talked have themselves suggested that he should resume his place here on the faculty. And Chancellor House has stated that there is no reason why he should not be able to come back at once. He has not lost his job. He is merely on leave of absence.

Neither the individuals nor the group which protested felt themselves to be judge and jury for Dr. Friederich's case, and in no wise did they act in that capacity. The very first amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees their right to do precisely what they did: "petition the government for redress of grievances." Whether they had a case—which is the real issue—each person on the campus must decide for himself. And the OWI, which had hired Dr. Friederich, had to decide in its own case. That is what the citizens requested it to do. And that is what it did. Mr. Klauber, in a letter to one of the persons who protested, declared that although Dr. Friederich displayed convincing evidence that he had recanted his previous views the OWI "must decline to appoint him" to the very delicate position in Germany for which he had been chosen.

I do not know enough about the OWI to defend or condemn its actions in this case. But I do know that the record displays convincing evidence that much of this controversy need never have happened. And it disproves enough of the weird assertions made in Dr. Friederich's behalf to show that those who defend him need to make their defense on the issues: 1) Do citizens have a right to protest to their government? 2) Is the OWI right in not sending to Germany a man who has held strong Pro-Hitler views, however long ago he held them, for the delicate job of re-educating the German people to decency and honor? 3) Has a government agency a right to correct its mistakes?

Sincerely,
Douglass Hunt.

TAR and FEATHERS

By Charles Frank Benbow, Jr.

For the first time in a long time legislators voted as individuals. Those who love democracy would have thrilled at the spectacle presented last Thursday night. The Dance Bill was discussed pro and con most eloquently. Party pacts, friendship ties, fraternity bonds, and sorority seams were discarded as the representatives voted the dictates of their own conscience. The subject matter of the arguments ranged from the casualty list of Okinawa through juvenile delinquency to the story of Cinderella.

Those legislators voting against the bill were: Alexander, Barwick, Chapman, Davis, Edwards, Ficklen, Fulton, Kelly, Lilienthal, Mann, Robinson, Saunders, Traynham, Wallace, Walton, Warren, and Dawson.

Those legislators who voted to lift the limitations on dance expenditures were: Adams, Burke, Brinkley, Dupes, Jaffe, Koonitz, Pannill, Pully, Prince, Smith, Stonebraker, Thompson, Tuthill, Walker, Wolfe, and Hunt.

The comments on the legislature's action have been varied. Many students feel that (with all due respects to the consciences of their duly elected representatives) the majority of students were in favor of Clive Thompson's bill. Some feel that the nature of the bill demands the expression of all students. They are going to exercise their right of initiative and referendum which is given them in Article III, sections 1 and 2 of the Constitution of the Student Legislature.

Since ten per cent of the student body has signed a petition to have the issue put to a popular vote, there is opposition to the action taken Thursday night. The issue is before the student body. Every student is now a legislator and is duty bound to vote Wednesday (i.e., TOMORROW).

A year ago this columnist spoke before the legislature in order to help defeat a bill to lift the limitations on dance expenditures. Since then he has observed the hypocritical situation which now exists. We students have limited ourselves on what we shall spend

Veterans Ask For Rights

May 13, 1945

Dear Editor,

We as veterans of World War II ask no pity or special consideration; we ask only the rights given to any CAROLINA man, among which is an equal voice in campus affairs.

In exercising such a right we should like to take a definite stand on the question of limiting dance expenditures on dances given for and by the students.

We want the limitations lifted. We have followed our country as servicemen, and we can follow it equally as well as civilians. Our government recently lifted the curfew on night-clubs and the ban on race tracks.

If the people who oppose this action claim it will affect the morale of our fighting men overseas, then let them first consult the servicemen and discharged veterans on this campus who wholeheartedly approve any measure to return this campus to normalcy. By this we would realize our constant dream to return to what we left.

Sincerely,
Robert P. Osborne, L. B. Johnson, Jr., Allan Pannill, James R. Todd, Jr., H. S. Anderson, Fred H. Chamberlain, Whit Osgood, Art Adams, Jenks Tripp, J. W. Hedrick, Marriotte Stewart, Reeves Hawkins, Charles W. Creech, William L. Smith.

Dorm Men Disapprove Source Of Fragrance

Dear Editor:

Chum, we have a bitch coming. Now, mind you, we're as much in favor of beautifying the campus as the next guys, but, ye gods, is it *sine quo non* to dump last year's bumper crop of fertilizer underneath our window? Why not just let the grass grow by itself—like most grass does?

Signed: Jack Youngerman, Bill Thomas, Art Lamb, Tom Gorman, Jim Regan, Kent Roberts, Herb Long, Pete Lilly, Randy Thompson, John T. Gregory, and all of South Bay, Old West.
P. S.: Phewwee!!!!

for one dance, but we have disregarded total expenditures. Not only that, but we have been entertained by Clyde Lucas and Don Redmon. (The limitations are hypocritically lackadaisical.) The student body's total expenditures on wartime beer week-ends crammed full of sloppy dances are higher than the total expenditures of an average peace year. Thursday night this columnist spoke before the legislature in order to help get a bill passed which would lift dance limitations.

The students know that the present situation is hypocritical, and the students know that the situation can be remedied by lifting the limitations.

Schartle Wants Issues Brought Into The Open

May 12, 1945.

The Editor
Tar Heel
Chapel Hill, N. C.
Dear Bob:

It is regrettable that Mr. W. T. Couch in his letter to the editor of May 8, consumed considerable valuable space in singling out victims for his personal animosity, rather than presenting evidence in defense of Dr. Friederich as ably as did Dr. Jente and Dr. Lane.

The Tar Heel had every right to present a legitimate news story on the Friederich affair, but in all fairness to Friederich, it is equally essential that both sides of the issue be represented. No one wants Dr. Friederich to suffer an injustice, and few object to his returning to the University in a teaching capacity; however, if there is any question as to Friederich's pro-nationalist leanings in the past, he could be placed in a more advantageous position than the reeducation of nationalists to democracy. Perhaps Mr. Couch would be willing to give former pro-Nazis or Lindbergh isolationists "a chance" to reeducate the Germans, but others of us are not in an experimenting mood.

I am puzzled by the admission of Couch that Friederich in 1938 was "Pro-Hitler" as opposed to Jente's statement that Friederich never "expressed or implied the least sympathy with Nazi ideology and methods" . . . which of the defenders has the facts?

There was no necessity for an attack on Dr. Ericson, who was not the sender of the first letter to the OWI, and who has every right as an American citizen to protest an appointment which he feels unjust. No one, I feel sure, foresaw the so-called "smear" in the Tar Heel or the subsequent local fiasco; on the contrary, it was a matter of individual concern over the placement of Friederich in a strategic position outside of the U. S.

It seems to me that the issues should no longer remain hidden away on either side but be brought into the open without petty, inconsequential attacks so that the public may have the opportunity of drawing its own just conclusion.

Sincerely,
Pat Schartle.

Exchanges



By Beverly Eisenberg

V-12's are bound to be pretty much the same all over so this in THE DAILY CALIFORNIAN is provoking: "The perfect sailor: doesn't borrow money, doesn't drink, doesn't give girls a line, doesn't exist." Certainly we at Carolina can claim to know a little of this species and from what we've noticed we must disagree. From direct observation even on the first Wednesday of the month in front of Swain Hall, there's no one to borrow from after deductions, donations, and Danziger's. The drinking is out too . . . it's too expensive and anyhow it isn't healthy and as to giving the coeds a line . . . an authority from Pettigrew says such is superfluous in Chapel Hill.

Not to get in a rut but in THE OBERLIN REVIEW this question is conspicuous: "Have you said a kindly word to one of our paddle-feet lately?" Seems it's "Be Kind to Sailors Week" at Oberlin.