

# The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publication Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is issued daily during the regular sessions of the University by the Colonial Press, Inc., except Mondays, examinations and vacation periods, and the summer terms. Entered as second-class matter at the post office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price: \$8.00 per year, \$3.00 per quarter. Member of The Associated Press. The Associated Press and AP features are exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news features published herein.

**Editor:** DICK JENNETTE  
**Business Manager:** C. B. MENDELHALL  
**Managing Editor:** CHUCK HAUSER  
**Sports Editor:** TAYLOR VADEN  
**News Editor:** Roy Parker, Jr. | **Aide Manager:** Oliver Watkins  
**Desk Editor:** Zane Robbins | **Bus. Office Mgr.:** Ed Williams  
**Special Editor:** Christine Bruner | **Natl. Adv. Mgr.:** June Crockett  
**Photographer:** Jim Mills | **Assistant Sports Editor:** Larry Fox

**Editorial Staff:** Jack Brown, Bill Keenan, Mike McDaniel, Tom Wharton, Charlie Gibson, Joe Seykora, Vestal Taylor, Al Johnson, Charlie Joyner, Dave Smagay, John Strump.

**Business Staff:** Neal Cadieu, Don Stanford, Boots Taylor, Bill Brain, Ruth Dennis, Marie Withers, Ruddy Shiver, Charles Ashworth, Mary Tomlin, Dick Magill, Jim Lindley, Branson Hobbs, John Poindexter, Carolyn Harrill, Lila Robinson, Beverly Serr, Bruce Bauer, Joe Nelson, Leonard Rawls.

## Letters

### To the Ed

**Editor:**

The open letter of Saturday's edition has been yeasting in my thoughts. This, as reminder, was the one where "Signature Withheld" cited specialized and time-consuming endeavor, such as Tar Heel work, as an almost certain bar to the Order of the Old Well, through the latter's point-based admission.

This sort of letter hits me where I live: I've spent a long time in the thankless chore of publications.

The basic question prompts me to wonder whether the average student appreciates the degree of all-out effort (by so few) that goes into the making of his campus newspaper.

Contrary to certain misconceived opinion, the Tar Heel isn't produced by anyone's waving of a wand. Neither do the elves bring it. Instead, the thing comes out by gist of darned hard work.

I am in good position to see such work. This is because of my night-shift job at Colonial Press where the Tar Heel gets printed. Much of it, at times, trickles through my own fingers before it hits the press.

Therefore I think I know the Tar Heel well; its virtues, its faults, its targets for correction. In the latter I have faith because I know the thoughtful study for improvement that is now going on from within. My own suggestions, as a shop-man, have been solicited; I like the trend. The story has not yet broken; it's not yet ready. It may not break at all if today's election swings the other way.

This Tar Heel is no New York Times; that's granted. But as strictly a collegiate effort, a sideline show put up by amateurs, it stands up well in the wash.

I, myself, wouldn't take a Tar Heel editorship for all the tea in China. Here are some reasons why:

1—An "outside" newspaper is thankless enough, but its field is broader (and perhaps a bit more mature) than a self-contained parish like a campus. Here, conversely, the readership is a close-knit bundle of TNT with controversial interests. The editor cannot escape. He must buck right through his job (and friends) with the stamina of a mule. It takes nothing short of "years to learn the ropes" to survive the ride.

2—On an "outside" newspaper, the editor gains his post through sheer hard work and merit. It takes about 15 years to get bridge-wise enough to make the grade. Then he produces, or he's fired. Here, conversely, there "ain't no firin'" if the deal pans wrong, and to get the job at all it's a straight-out case of the "mostest friends on the right election date."

3—An "outside" newspaper has plant and staff facilities to shut out crackpots, thus to let the staff do its work. Here, though, the Graham Memorial office is a catch-all and a goldfish bowl where you can't tell the staff from the kibitzers. Tain't right. As example, did you ever try to cope with a mis-conceived "crusader" who wants his two-bit item captioned with a front-page streamer? — one who threatens to yank the Alpha Zeta Pooch bloc-vote if his interest isn't gained? It happens daily at the Tar Heel.

The dubious elements here expressed would not exist three minutes on any other kind than a campus paper. The rush for deadlines would not let it.

I could argue into the night—but what's the use? The answer comes up that somebody is pegging life-blood for the Tar Heel, and strangely, "for the love of the thing." It's simply in the blood.

Because the chore gets done at all, I think the Tar Heel staff, all-out, deserves a vote of confidence and thanks.

It's one thing to "dream" a good Tar Heel; another thing to make it stick. Does the very complexity of this job occur to you? In technical aspects alone, the tar is lost at the start. It takes weaning long in overtime just to bring him up to scratch.

(See EDIT, page 4)



Distributed by King Features Syndicate by arrangement with The Washington Star

## Ready For Fall

### Orientation Planning

By Bob Clampitt

During the past year, we've seen a number of films that have reflected certain social problems of the American scene. Films like "Gentleman's Agreement", "Home of the Brave", and "Pinky" have brought those problems to the attention of the American public. Once again Hollywood has come out with a film that by reason of its quality of successfully reflecting certain social and political phenomena stands out as a distinguished example of film production. Such a film is "All the King's Men", which has just been awarded the Academy Award for the best picture of the past year. Robert Rossen, as producer and director, has fashioned his screenplay from Robert Penn Warren's Pulitzer Prize-winning novel of the same name.

"All the King's Men" could

be taken as the story of the many political machines which, while winning the support of the "people" with public works and private favor, thrive and feed themselves on graft, corruption, and the destruction of any force or individual daring to stand in opposition. Actually, the film is a thinly disguised version of the Huey Long empire, which thrust itself onto the American political scene in the thirties.

In recounting the rise and fall of the Louisiana "Kingfish", Mr. Rossen has done a very good job in this respect: he has made the moving picture of history a fixed and still tableau, while retaining the live elements of drama. In telling the story of Willie Stark—from the time he started as a sincere naive do-gooder, uneducated and fighting

a battle he didn't understand, to the time he is assassinated in the lobby of the ornate legislative hall which he built as a living monument to himself—the picture never gets down to a point where it seems to be preaching, warning, or moralizing. In fact, it's this quality, plus the excellent acting of Broderick Crawford as Stark, John Ireland, and a newcomer, Mercedes McCambridge, that gives the film its strength.

Stark is the small-time politician in a losing battle against the local interests of crime and corruption. When a school building collapses, killing some of the children and confirming his accusations of grafted construction contracts, his political career is launched in earnest.

He attaches himself to a disillusioned newspaperman, John Ireland, who serves as his hatchet man, and builds himself as the savior of the people. Sweeping all before him, Stark becomes governor, involves prominent individuals and their families in the political cesspool, grows powerful with the Hitlerian rationalization that he is merely a Robin Hood for the masses—stealing from the rich to give to the poor—and keeps himself in power by his private army of police that destroys all opposition. His career reaches a climax with the impeachment proceedings. However, he rides out this storm by bullying and blackmail but is murdered by a member of a prominent family he destroys.

Broderick Crawford's playing won for him the Academy Award for the best actor of the year. His portrayal of Stark is both sympathetic and forceful, never for a moment leaving any doubt that even well-meaning persons can grow into dangers to society. Miss McCambridge, as Stark's aide-de-camp, also won herself an Academy Award as the best supporting actress. In her first screen appearance, she shows talent, color, and looks.

In the cast, also, in an important role, may be seen Shepperd Strudwick, former student here at the University of North Carolina who was prominent in the Carolina Playmakers. The rest of the cast, including Joanne Dru, John Derek, and Anne Seymour, complement the leads perfectly.

It occurs to me that this film is coming to Chapel Hill at a time when this campus is settling certain political offices and political questions, and certain words like "graft" and "corruption" have been bandied about quite freely. "All the King's Men" will give you a good idea of what these words can mean.

**DREW PEARSON**  
ON  
**The WASHINGTON**  
**MERRY-GO-ROUND**

**Wheat Will Be Next**

The Department of Agriculture argued that no more peanuts were necessary, but peanut acreage was increased by 100,000 acres anyway.

At this point, the wheat lobby also wanted to increase its acreage, but Congressman Cliff Hope of Kansas, ranking Republican, agreed to put wheat in another bill. He made it plain, however, that the wheat farmers would expect to get theirs too.

Meanwhile, last year's wheat carryover was 307,000,000 bushels; the cotton carryover was 5,287,000 bales; the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles these surpluses, has exhausted its funds, has had to remove handles on pork and will need an additional borrowing authority of two billion dollars. Its total loss on price supports for the year ending June 30, 1949, was \$254,762,000.

All this was why Truman's economic adviser urged him to veto the cotton-peanut bill. They argued that crop acreages must be held down, not increased; that if peanuts and cotton were increased, other crops would have to be increased, and that not even potatoes could be cut.

At first, the President was all set to veto. Then the biggest guns in the Democratic Party unlimbered for action, including some of his best friends.

**Smart Lobbying**

Organizer of the Key West pressure was Georgia's astute Sen. Dick Russell. Though not being an intimate of Truman's, he was smart enough to stay in the background, let recognized Trumanites do the lobbying. Instead, Senators Lister Hill and John Sparkman of Alabama, Olin Johnston of South Carolina, and Frank Graham of North Carolina, all southern democrats engaged in fighting the Dixiecrats, sent messages to Key West.

But most effective of all was Vice President Barkley who made a phone call to Mr. Truman, in effect warned him:

"If you veto this bill, there will be an explosion that will rock the Democratic Party. A veto would torpedo the Fair Deal and play into the hands of the Dixiecrats and the Republicans."

The President was also told by various friends that veto of the cotton-peanut bill might cost votes on Marshall Plan money, might lose support in puncturing the "Communist-bogey" set up by Senator McCarthy. On the other hand, increasing cotton and peanuts acreage would buy solid Southern Democratic votes for the State Department and its foreign policy.

Mr. Truman listened, worried, signed the cotton-peanut bill.

That's one reason Sen. Lyndon Johnson is so confident that he will also sign the Kerr Bill; also why the Republicans are getting so confident about next November.

**GOP Gets Cocky**

Here's what happened regarding cotton and peanuts that makes the Republicans so cocky. The cotton-peanut acreage bill started out to be a good bill. Some such legislation was necessary in order to rectify injustices in acreage, especially cotton. But when the bill got into the House Agriculture Committee, the steam-roller cotton lobby managed to increase cotton allotments by 1,000,000 to 2,000,000 acres. This, despite the fact that the taxpayers have already shelled out \$601,133,844 to pay for surplus cotton, which is many times the amount of the potato bill, though receiving a lot less publicity. Potatoes, for instance, cost Uncle Sam only \$50,000,000 this year.

Several Congressmen opposed this increase, including Cecil White of Fresno, Calif., once one of the biggest cotton growers in the Central Valley; also Stephen Pace of Georgia, who knows more about agriculture than most Congressmen; and W. R. Poage, from cotton-growing Texas. The Department of Agriculture also opposed any increase, said that cotton acreage should be 18 to 19 million acres.

But a coalition, led by Dixiecrat Tom Abernethy of Mississippi, overruled them, fixed the acreage at 22 to 23 million.

Once the cotton bloc had upped its acreage, Congressman Pace, who represents a great peanut-growing district, demanded the same treatment for the Georgia "goober."

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12					13				14	
15					16				17	
	18			19		20				
21	22					23		24		
25					26			27		
28				29				30	31	32
			33					34		
35	36	37				38		39		
40					41		42			
43						44		45	46	47
48				49				50		
51					52			53		

**HORIZONTAL**

- Manila hemp
- lofty pasture
- strike
- designator
- wave
- armpit
- accustom
- ingredient
- of nails
- sound
- scholar
- shake
- chaff-like bract
- hard animal substance
- celestial being
- container
- aloof
- Buddhist column
- palm
- mixture
- point in an orbit
- rodder
- grass
- more
- daring
- cape in Alaska

**VERTICAL**

- Floridian bird
- prohibit
- laughable
- thick ointment
- field
- inquire
- sediment
- wall

**9. amount of assessment**

- bring into line
- devilish
- term in civil law
- baracks
- warp-yarn
- Tibetan gazelle
- pass
- bit
- magazine
- of the side
- tough wood
- of thee
- officer attending President
- deference
- shame
- type of bear
- glide
- grinding tooth
- network
- rust
- highway
- some

**Answer to Saturday's puzzle.**

ABET	RAPS	ROC
PALE	OCAS	OVA
TAEL	ARRESTED	
	GLAMOR	EARS
ADA	VESSEL	
MENDERS	DELTA	
INCURS	MINION	
DEEMS	PALETOT	
	BERATE	ALE
ROSE	ORISON	
IMPRIMIS	GIVE	
TEA	LEAS	LEAR
ERR	LONE	ESNE

Average time of solution: 27 minutes.  
 Distributed by King Features Syndicate

## A Tragedy to Be Forgotten

The serenity of a peaceful Easter weekend in almost deserted Chapel Hill was broken abruptly Friday afternoon by the murder of George Lemuel Bennett, Jr., in his study room. And while Police searched frantically for the assailant, Len Broughton Smithey, Bennett's room mate who had been seen leaving the room a few minutes after the death shots were fired, wrote finis to the case by taking his own life in the wooded area back of the Forest Theater. The combined murder-suicide will go down as one of the most grotesque events in the history of the University.

Fortunately for the school there was no gambling, drinking, or fighting, connected with the incident. Thus the University's reputation should not suffer. There was no earthly way by which the tragic episode might have been avoided, and perhaps we have been lucky at Carolina in having so few incidents resulting in the death of a student or students. There is some question being raised now as to why Smithey was released from the Veterans Hospital in Fayetteville, over the protest of a psychiatrist. Smithey had been diagnosed as a paranoid case. Yet no one could foresee the dire consequences which have resulted from Smithey's release. This hospital case can be written off as no more than a bad error in judgment on the part of someone.

There is no lesson involved in the weekend incident. A completely innocent student was murdered by another obviously deranged student. The parents of the two boys have the sympathy of the entire University and state. The murder-suicide of Easter 1950 must be listed as a tragedy—and forgotten.

## Get Up and Vote

A long week of anxiety comes to an end for four students today—Don Van Noppen, John Sanders, Chuck Hauser, and Graham Jones. They have been sweating it out all week waiting for the student body to decide today just who will be the next president of the student body and editor of the Daily Tar Heel.

So today is the big day—the payoff day for the two most important offices held by students on campus. Yes, most of the offices for 1950-51 were elected last week in the general elections. But just who is elected today will determine who will have the biggest say-so in student government and campus activities for the year. Thus it is the duty of every student who voted in the primary election last week to vote today—along with the thousands of students who did not see fit to go to the polls before.

The president of the student body must first be someone well versed in the functions and practices of student government. Student government may well be said to revolve around him, particularly through his appointive powers. Then secondly, the president of the student body is the representative that you, the students, send out to represent this school in public affairs. He is the official delegate of the students at conferences and meetings, and must take the lead in welcoming visitors to this campus and in participating in other ceremonies.

The editor of the Daily Tar Heel might well be said to be the spokesman of the campus. The DTH is sent to alumni and other people all over this state. Its editorials are frequently considered to express the opinion of the entire campus—for the editor is the only person on the staff elected by the student body. He should be representative of the students and reflect the opinion of the majority as nearly as is possible. The job of editor of the paper is a daily grind also—always there are editorials to be written and the general responsibility of seeing that the paper appears each day.

Thus the students that are elected to these two key positions today will have a heavy burden to shoulder for the next year. It is imperative then that a large number of students turn-out to the polls to express their opinion on who really is the students', not the politicians', choice for president and editor.

There have been charges and counter-charges throughout the last two weeks. But fortunately the mud-slinging has been down to a minimum recently, and the students should be able to cast their ballots intelligently without a host of rumors and reported scandals drifting about.

Just because you voted in last week's election doesn't mean you have done your duty. The positions at a stake today are far the most important. Make the men elected today truly majority candidates.

## Clear Those Bulletin Boards

With the exception of the races for president of the student body and editor of the DTH, the campaigning came to an end on campus exactly a week ago. Yet the bulletin boards around the school still remain cluttered with political posters, exhorting students to vote for this or that—all issues which were settled last week. It's high time that these posters were taken down. Each student who ran for office should see to it that the posters in his immediate area are taken down, and janitors in the buildings should be instructed that elections are over and that they may now clear the bulletin boards in the main class buildings over the campus.

## Letters

### To The Editor

**Editor:**

It was with a great deal of amusement that I read a column in the Sunday edition of The Daily Tar Heel entitled "Viewing the Candidates." The author indulges in several very broad generalizations from which he draws specific conclusions. He also makes seemingly contradictory statements which I would like to have explained. For example, he states that "Jones is not the Student Party candidate," but that the party urges all students interested in an "independent newspaper" and an "independent editor" to vote for Jones.

Mr. Kimerling, if Jones is not now the SP's candidate, who's candidate is he? What does he promise except vague abstractions which are a politician's stock in trade? What do you mean by an "independent newspaper?" Hauser has for three years presented unbiasedly, all the news the DTH could hold. No other candidate can make that claim. "Hauser has run his campaign on the basis of experience; in this field he outstrips Jones." What other field is there?

He goes on to say "the 1,600 plus students who voted against Hauser could not have had such intimate contacts with him." Of course not! I think however that a large number of these votes were a product of the attempt to beat Hauser by slander and accusations that have not and cannot be proved.

If Mr. Hauser is such a poor journalist, why does he have the whole-hearted endorsement of the DTH staff? Mr. Kimerling, when you answer this question, mark your ballot accordingly.

George Rodman

# Election Runoffs Today—Cast Your Ballots