

The Daily Tar Heel

OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE CAROLINA PUBLICATIONS UNION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Published daily except Mondays, Examination periods and the Thanksgiving, Christmas and Spring holidays.

Entered as second class matter at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under act of March 3, 1879.

1941 Member 1942 Associated Collegiate Press

REPRESENTED FOR NATIONAL ADVERTISING BY National Advertising Service, Inc. College Publishers Representative 420 MADISON AVE. NEW YORK, N. Y. CHICAGO - BOSTON - LOS ANGELES - SAN FRANCISCO

SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$1.50 One Quarter — \$3.00 One Year

All signed articles and columns are opinions of the writers themselves, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the DAILY TAR HEEL.

For This Issue: News: WESTY FENAEHEN Sports: BILL WOESTENDIEK

ORVILLE CAMPBELL Editor SYLVAN MEYER Managing Editor WILLIAM SCHWARTZ Business Manager HENRY ZAYTOUN Acting Circulation Manager BUCKY HARWARD Associate Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD: Mac Norwood, Henry Moll. COLUMNISTS: Marion Lippincott, Walter Damtoft, Harley Moore, Elsie Lyon, Brad McCuen, Tom Hammond.

NEWS EDITORS: Bob Hoke, Paul Komisaruk, Hayden Carruth. ASSISTANT NEWS: A. D. Currie, Walter Klein, Westy Fenhagen, Bob Levin.

REPORTERS: Jimmy Wallace, Billy Webb, Larry Dale, Charles Kessler, Burke Shipley, Elton Edwards, Gene Smith, Morton Cantor, Nancy Smith, Jule Phoenix, Janice Feitelberg, Jim Loeb, Lou Alice Taylor.

PHOTOGRAPHER: Hugh Morton. ASSISTANT PHOTOGRAPHERS: Tyler Nourse, Bill Taylor.

SPORTS EDITOR: Harry Hollingsworth. NIGHT SPORTS EDITORS: Earle Hellen, Mark Garner, Bill Woestendiek. SPORTS REPORTERS: Ben Snyder, Stud Gleicher, Thac Tate, Phyllis Yates.

ADVERTISING MANAGERS: Jack Dube, Bill Stanback, Ditzzi Buice. DURHAM REPRESENTATIVES: Marvin Rosen, Bob Bettman.

LOCAL ADVERTISING STAFF: Jimmy Norris, Buddy Cummings, Richard Wiseberg, Charlie Weill, Betty Booker, Bill Collie, Jack Warner, Stan Legum, Dick Kerner.

OFFICE STAFF: Bob Crews, Eleanor Soule, Jeannie Hermann, Bob Covington. TYPIST: Ardis Kipp.

CIRCULATION OFFICE MANAGERS: Rachel Dalton, Harry Lewis, Larry Goldrich, Bob Godwin.

The Daily Tar Heel Editorial Page

Opinions Columns Letters Features

ROUND THE TABLE...

By Billy Britt and Bob Epple Bailey's Record

Tonight from the platform of Memorial hall, North Carolina's silver-haired senior senator, Josiah W. Bailey, will make his only public bid for re-election to the United States Senate from this state. Before his visit to the campus, it seems appropriate that we, the students at the state university, should examine carefully his record since 1932 and acquaint ourselves with the stand he has taken on major issues.

Senator Bailey has disagreed with most of President Roosevelt's domestic policies. Some of the New Deal measures, which he fought and voted against included the Supreme Court bill, the Government re-organization bill, the anti-lynch bill, the Wagner Labor Relations Act, the Crop Control Bill, and most all relief enactments. On the Relief Appropriation Bill of February, 1938, he was the sole dissenter, the Senate vote being 68 to 1.

Widely known as an orator, Sen. Bailey led the long filibuster by Southern Senators in 1935 against the notorious anti-lynching bill. Convinced that he was upholding "a cause worth dying for," the Senator threatened a split in the Democrat party. "I give you warning," voiced Mr. Bailey, "that no administration can survive without us. You still can do as you please in other states of the Union, but if you come down to North Carolina and try to impose your will on us, so help me God, you'll get a lesson no political party will ever forget!" After the filibuster a vote was taken, and the anti-lynching bill was killed.

Mr. Bailey is noted for his strong convictions—strong enough to cross swords with even the President. When President Roosevelt labeled the South as the "nation's No. 1 economic problem" in 1938, Senator Bailey came out with vociferous retortations. Speaking before a Young Democrats Club convention in Durham, he demanded that the South should be allowed to work out its own problems in the "Southern way" without outside interference.

He gave credit, not to the New Deal, but to "our forefathers who rebuilt the South after the Civil War." Later, in Chapel Hill, on an "American Town Meeting of the Air" broadcast, the Senator upheld the South's position in a debate with Dr. Frank Graham and John Rust, the Memphis inventor. Then he contended, "There is no nation's problem here, except the problem of a just national policy." For eighty years, he said, the national policy has favored other regions and been adverse to the South.

In regard to labor, the Senator has been a strong opponent of sit-down strikes. At the annual dinner of the National Metal Trades Association in New York on May 27, 1938, he declared that the Army and Navy should be called whenever needed to end labor trespassing, particularly in sit-down strikes. On the same occasion he asserted that business at the time was under attack as never before in its history. In March, 1941 he went on record "to eliminate all possibility of strikes against the security of the people of the United States." He begged for prompt action.

With the advent of the war in 1939, Senator Bailey, as Chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, worked hard in helping formulate and supporting the nation's foreign policy. Although he had favored the Arms-Embargo Act of 1939, he came out against this neutrality act in 1940, due to a change in foreign events. He fostered a bill authorizing the Maritime Commission to employ some of its construction funds in assisting shipping lines seriously affected by neutrality legislation.

When the much-debated lend-lease bill came up in February, 1941, Senator Bailey came to the rescue of the administration's foreign policy with his historic speech, "We Must Choose Now," ringing throughout the Senate chamber. The entire body came to the edge of their seats and paid closest attention. He outlined briefly the isolationist points and then tore them to bits. With his eloquent words he pictured the threat to our security and declared that our salvation rested in the hands of the British and Russian armed forces. Faced by a completely changed Senate at the end of his speech, the bill was passed with little resistance.

Later on in 1941, Mr. Bailey continued to fight for adequate defense

with a speech in favor of giving the President more power. He closed the speech by maintaining that "we cannot cope with totalitarianism unless and until our republic and its people show the capacity for total effort in unity under one leadership and without looking backward." In September of the same year, he fought for all-out aid to Russia in a debate with Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada. When McCarran accused him of sympathizing with Russia, Senator Bailey outspokenly admitted that he rejoiced everytime he heard of a Russian victory. In a politically courageous statement, he declared, "If that be treason, make the most of it. I'm not ashamed."

Although he was absent when the Senate Bill No. 4164 came up, he was in favor of the Conscription Act. The President of the Senate announced that "if present and voting, Bailey would have said 'yea.'"

In summary, it has been noticeable that our senior Senator has seldom agreed with President Roosevelt on his domestic policies. He has stressed the unconstitutionality and the waste of the New Deal measures and most times has been against them. On the other hand, he has favored, in most cases, the foreign policies of the Administration. This split in support leads to perhaps the most interesting characteristic of Mr. Bailey—his determination to stand and fight for what he thinks is right, regardless of the situation and regardless of the opposition. His strong convictions and his eloquent fights for them have won admiration from New Dealers and anti-New Dealers alike. Most people like to see a man in politics who admits, "All my life I have looked a thing in the face and argued it as it is."

Letters to...

To the Editor:

The stand that the Chi Omegas took when they refused to join with the sorority bloc has been misunderstood and misrepresented in the last issues of Tar an' Feathers and the Carolina Magazine. This stand was taken in the belief that if it would facilitate the removal of any feeling that is inevitable when a distinct sorority and independent bloc is formed. Chi Omega wishes always to support the issues they believe valid in any election rather than bind themselves to a political alignment.

Another fallacy in the Tar an' Feathers editorial was that the Chi Omegas broke with the sorority bloc to vote for Independent candidates, in exchange for Independent votes. There was no alignment between the Chi Omega sorority and the CICA; any assistance from them being purely voluntary on the part of any of the members of the Independent group. Voting for all nominees was left to the discretion of the individual girls in the sorority.

Thus we intend to make no issue but to clarify misrepresentation of facts coming from student publications.

Sincerely, Mary Lib Massengill Pan Peyton Jean Hahn

across the desk...

Chapel Hill's new night club has just opened up in the same spot where philanthropic Aggie used to sell beer until he tried to collect some of his accounts. The management prefers the name of Marley's, but the campus populace has already labelled it the "Porthole," because of its nautical motif, or just "Hole" for short. Here stray and lonesome coeds will have a chance to skulk and orientate unwary naval officers who continue to arrive at the Hill every day.

Despite what any of the anemic campus males spitefully assert to the contrary, the navy men are already causing a mild furor among the female population. The bleached, starched uniforms—they look uncomfortable as hell to us—elicit shrill feminine comments like "Isn't it handsome" or "Isn't he white?"

Recently weather has been so eccentric that it almost justifies itself

among the damned...

With Damtoft

After Poppa Lou Harris gave us a good verbal spanking in a letter to the editor published last Thursday, we traipsed up to his office to see just how unfair we had been to the OSCD. We did so want to know the facts because everyone had taken a cue from Mr. Harris' letter and started calling us Ignorant.

After chatting for a while with Harris, we realized that we had been a little unfair in our column about the OSCD, that our indictment had been a little too broad. We found out that Mr. Harris was right when he accused us of presenting only one-fourth of the case concerning the OSCD and basing all our accusations on that part.

There are four parts of the OSCD: Morale, Civilian Defense and Protection, Post-War Planning, and Curriculum Committee. We had criticized the second of these but according to Mr. Harris, the OSCD's main claim to fame is derived from the other three. We apologize for making such a blanket accusation and withdraw it in regards to every branch but Civilian Defense and Protection. We take Mr. Harris' word that 50 or 60 students have been doing good work in the other three branches.

But to get back to Civilian Defense and Protection. What has been done about that? Very little. Yes, very little has been done in spite of the fact that the great majority of the more than 50 students who enrolled in the OSCD expressed a desire to work in that branch. The only thing that that division has done is to start a ham radio course, sponsor a first-aid course, and give some training in the duties of an air-raid warden. Nothing has been done to give any instruction to those students who wanted training in the following: Auxiliary Fire Fighters, Drivers and Motor Corps, Fire Watchers, Production Corps, Messenger Service, Rescue Squad, and Auxiliary Police.

The other divisions have been doing a lot of work outside the state in morale building by conducting discussions and panel forums but what about morale at Chapel Hill. There are a great many students who want to take part in Civilian Defense but are probably not suited for public speaking in the morale program. These students have been led to believe that the OSCD would give them something to do, particularly in the seven divisions mentioned above. Nothing has been done, however, and it is going to be a tough job for the OSCD to enroll new members next year when it will probably be more equipped to offer such training, for the general reaction this year has been that the OSCD got a big build-up and failed to do anything.

The principles of the OSCD are indisputably good, but it has made a bad mistake this year in that it did not come out and frankly state that it could not offer training in the branches that the greatest number of students desired. It has been a well-organized plan, but it has had nothing to administer that would affect very many students.

No, we weren't trying to meet any deadline when we wrote about the OSCD. We were merely trying to set down an expression of how a great many students we had talked to felt about the OSCD.

We take back our suggestion that the OSCD be abolished. Instead we suggest that every effort be made to open the Civilian Defense and Protection division in order that the large number of students who enrolled in that branch may be given something to do in the war effort, and that in future months we may point to the OSCD as one of Carolina's contributions to the war effort, a contribution that has the work of 500 boys behind it instead of 50.

as an inevitable topic of conversation. Attire yourself for spring at 8 o'clock and by 12 you freeze. Dress for cold weather and you lose three rounds by noon. Until the climate steadies down, we'll have to postpone Cigar Henderson's suggestion that the college male start a fad of shorts to conserve textiles.

...IF WE WIN...

(We here reprint an editorial by Captain Eddie Rickenbacker, air hero of World War I, which appeared in the New York Times of May 4.)

I come to you with a message that is the result of a fifteen thousand mile flight throughout the United States in an Army transport at the request of General H. H. Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces.

This flight gave me the opportunity to survey and talk to all our combat units from ocean to ocean and border to border. I talked to air crews and ground crews—pilots and bombardiers...

What did I find? I found—and I say this in all sincerity—that the young men of the Army Air Force are as full of fire and spirit today as were the Minute Men of Concord and Lexington.

They are learning how to fight—American style—the way men fought at Trenton in '76—at Gettysburg in '63—or at the bloody struggle at Verdun...

Despite anything you may have heard, the training of these young men in aerial warfare is the last word. Our combat pilots are being trained in the finest planes America can produce, and they are being taught by Americans. They are free fighting men. By comparison with our pilots of 1917 and 1918, they are veterans before they leave this country for the theatres of war...

That their training is superb is proved by the headlines of our newspapers. The mere handful of pilots that we have in the Far East has succeeded against overwhelming odds. These men are blasting the Japs out of the skies on their first trips out. And may I say there are thousands more, competent and courageous Colin Kellys—Colonel Chennaults—and Butch O'Hares in training—preparing to go. I talked with them—I ate with them—I flew with them. I know whereof I speak...

I have been in aviation for a long time. I want to praise the inventive geniuses of America for the development of the use of non-strategic materials. They have proved what Yankee cunning can do and they are going to do more. One new bomber has forty plastic parts. Two of our newest training planes are made of plastics. A new cargo plane is all plywood. Many new transports will be made of plywood, thousands of which will be produced to carry men, guns, engines and supplies to far-off combat areas. We will make thousands of gliders. For modern war is war from the air—and in the air—it's war everywhere... This will be a nation of wings!...

Do you realize what this means? It means you and I will have to work harder to give them planes to fly—equipped with guns to rid the skies of our enemies. It means that to meet the schedule of sixty thousand planes this year, and one hundred and twenty-five thousand planes next year—one finished plane must leave the production lines every eight minutes during the coming months—and in 1943—one every four minutes!...

Whether we like it or not—whether we face it or not—the next six months will tell the story, whether we are to remain free men and women or are to become slaves—like the French, Belgians and all other conquered peoples.

It means the morale of the civilians of this country must be changed.

Morale is a bad word. When you have it—you don't talk about it. When you talk about it—you don't have it.

I can assure you the young pilots whom I contacted on this trip have morale of the fighting kind—and an abundance of it. But—that can not be said of the people back home. We've got to do more than buy bonds—or ride in the bus instead of a Buick.

But I have the feeling, after my long flight,

that something has not yet happened in the American heart that needs to happen. And we're all hungry for it...

I would like to hear from Washington. I would like to be told to forget Pearl Harbor—but do something about it! I would like to be told the facts as they happen, no matter how bad—instead of waiting for weeks—for we the American people can take it if given a chance before it is too late.

In my opinion, we must have, as a nation, a new combat spirit to win this war. Our pilots have it—we must have it too.

We must come to realize we will have the shaping of a new world in our hands. When we realize this historic opportunity, then indeed, we will have the finest fighting morale.

We have a rendezvous with destiny—if we win this war. If we but recognize this fact, we shall be a long way on the road to victory—won with clear heads and stout hearts...

Unfortunately, many Americans still have no conception of the serious problems facing us. That holds true for many of our leaders.

They have been coddled into thinking that this war will be a short one through optimistic reports of our handful of combat troops in the field—and that it can be won. A year ago they were "going to sit this one out."

Now they are trying to win it—in their spare time.

We pride ourselves on being free men—but we can become slaves through our own stupidity. It can happen here!...

Hitler means to conquer the world. We did not believe it when he said it. Must we have him do it to be convinced?

I say we, as a nation, must work as we have never worked before—or we will all be slaves.

Many of us still do not understand that we can lose this war. Not only can we lose it—but we are losing it. We have been losing it every day, every week, and every month since December 7th.

I have heard it stated that the war will be over in two years. This is true—it may be over in two years, if we keep on losing it.

We must stop losing the war before we can start to win it.

Too many of us have the gimmes—gimme this, and gimme that. What can I get out of this war, in rank, privileges or money?

Instead, we must say, "What can I do?" and "What can I give?" to save a little of what I have.

We must learn to put some of our liberties—and our standard of living in escrow now, in order to win a total victory—and have a little of what we have left...

The passage of time does not necessarily favor the democracies. It is typical of all our selfishness that we expect a clock to do a day's work—instead of recording it.

If you would see the price of failure—look at the plight of France, Belgium, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, Hong Kong, Singapore...

How much is it worth to us to be free men?

The boys in the Army—on the high seas—and our air forces at home have no punch clocks—they are working the clocks around.

They don't ask—"Where do I come in?" They give their lives for freedom. The least we can give is every ounce of our time, effort, and devotion...

Now all of us are soldiers. All of us—whether we realize it or not—are making history. We are not only living during this war—we are partners in the making of history. Every word we speak—every act we do—helps or hinders victory.

We are fighting a war that millions in future generations should speak of in admiration and wonder—if we win...

Let not posterity point the finger of scorn at us—this generation—for having crucified the flower of our manhood on the altar of indifference, selfishness, greed or politics.

"Islandia," "Only One Storm," "Flight to Arras" Read These New Books At THE BULL'S HEAD BOOK SHOP BROWSE—BORROW—BUY