

An Important Thing . . .

Friday is the deadline for entries in the intramural debating contest, being sponsored by the Debate Council. Winning debaters will be awarded individual cups, and a rotating cup will go to the organization sponsoring the best team.

Lewis dormitory took the cup last year . . . but wait, more important than the cups are the other possibilities. Extra points on courses are possible for debaters in such related courses as political science. Intramural house points can be gained by fraternity men. And top debaters will have a better chance to operate on the varsity teams.

Debating is not exactly a lost art, but competitive debating exists here on a very small scale. The Di and the Phi encourage competition among their members, and the debate squad meets teams from all over the country. However, intramurals have been sorely neglected by the students.

The opportunities in the fine old art of oratory still abound, for those willing to take advantage of them. The skill is one much needed by (literally) most college graduates. We would like to see a hearty revival of interest on the occasion of the second annual intramural debates—deadline, Friday, April 4.

. . . In College

A new book on the stalls . . . this one of more than usual interest to Joe and Josephine College. It is called "They Went to College," and represents the statistical (and humanized) Joes and Josephines who clutched degrees in their hot little fists from 1884 to 1947.

The story of the book is almost as interesting as the book itself, and the book is a fascinating study of American higher education. "In 1947 Time Magazine asked college presidents what they wanted most to know about their graduates. They sent in more than 800 suggestions like: 1) does a course designed specifically for job preparation help more in later life than a liberal arts education? and 2) to what extent are graduates participating in community affairs?"

To quote further from the advance publicity: "After a committee of experts had framed questions to bring out the answers to these and other points, we prepared a 13-page questionnaire and mailed it to graduates from the octogenarians class of 1884 to the fledgling class of 1947."

Dr. Robert Merton of Columbia University handled the statistical job of correlating earnings with age, religion, and a dozen other factors, and the construction of the book became the doctoral thesis for Mrs. Patricia Salter West, both of the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia.

What these two individuals turned out was an exceedingly readable book with such entertaining chapter headings as "A Lot of Buildings Have Ivy," "Mortarboards Come in All Sizes." Under Part Two—Portrait of the Old Grad (Masculine Division), come such matters as money and marriage, and under Part Three—Portrait of the Ex-Coed, come "The Ubiquitous Spinster," and problems of career and marriage.

It is easy to relate this university to the composite, to see where it stands nationally. Of particular interest to a university partially supported by the state, for instance, is the fact that almost 2/3 of the graduates who go away to school are lost to the home state, and again almost 2/3 of the graduates who stayed in the state for education remain after graduation. However, graduates in science (particularly in engineering), are much more likely to move to a different area after graduation.

College graduates rate their educations according to salaries they receive; when asked whether they regretted their choice of major, those who specialized in college were more pleased with their selection than those who did not specialize. But almost all men were glad they went to college, felt it had helped them in later life. Only 2/3 of women graduates felt college had been of use to them.

The majority of graduates vote as their fathers did, and where they vote differently, the shift has usually been from Democratic to Republican! This may surprise those who live in the closed community of the South, where proselytizing is apt to go the other way.

The best students in college prove to be the best source of political Independents; those who took a broad general course tend to be less prejudiced, more interested in social and political questions, and more often listed as independent voters.

College graduates have more children as they have more money—directly opposite of the figures for the general population where the poorest groups have the largest families.

Success after graduation bears some relation to grades, but little or none to the degree of participation in extra-curricular activities . . . success again being measured in terms of salary.

The wealthiest graduates finished at the wealthiest colleges, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton producing the most affluent graduates. Jewish graduates find and hold better jobs than any other religious group, Catholics falling behind both Jews and Protestants. Negroes earn less than all others, but the Negro graduate does not blame this on his education.

"Self-help" students—those who had to earn all or part of their college expenses—have lower incomes than students who were supported through college, although average earnings of graduates who worked during college are considerably above the national average.

Most graduates would attend the same college if they had it to do over again.

Letters To The Editor

Madam Editor:

In the beginning the IFC was formed so that the fraternal organizations on the campus could be treated as separate entities and prosecuted for actions detrimental to the University. Prior to this time there was no legal way to prosecute the organizations as a unit. The only way in which this legal power could come into being was by the delegation of authority to a central court by the organizations concerned. In accordance with this program laws concerning the treatment of pledges were passed whereby fraternities could be prosecuted as entities for violation of said laws. Incorporated into these laws were three main definitions of hazing: (1) public display, (2) physical abuse, and (3) scholastic interference. In the recent case concerning the Phi Gamma Delta fraternity, the IFC found that the charges brought against the fraternity were not a violation of the IFC statute as it reads at the present. Henry Bowers in a recent statement has insinuated that the IFC was negligent in not convicting the fraternity in question. He has asked that the IFC convict the fraternity on the basis of a law which does not exist. Is it the practice under a democratic form of government to convict on the basis of unexisting laws?

He avers that the court should have tried the case on the basis of a North Carolina statute concerning hazing. The IFC is not in a position to try any cases on these grounds inasmuch as its powers are only those delegated to it by the fraternities and it is not "the faculty or governing board" of the University. However, there is no doubt that a resolution will be brought up to cover moral abuse and cases of this type.

We contend that the Honor Council has no more right in trying an organization for an infraction by one of its members than a court would have in trying a corporation for a crime committed by individuals in its employ. He has stated that the power of trial should be transferred to the honor council. Due to the fact that the prerogative of prosecuting the individuals concerned is already open to the honor council, we feel that Henry Bowers is again using the DTH through his office to belittle the IFC for his own political usage. The IFC, an organization born out of the initiative of the fraternity system, has taken tremendous strides in advancing charitable, scholastic, and social standards on the campus. We fail to see where his administration has done as much.

Names withheld by request.



Madam Editor:

This campus has seen some slimy campaigns, before but nothing to compare with the smear technique that has gripped the election this spring.

The smear has become increasingly useful as a stepping stone to the office on the national scene. One has only to review the tactics used in the 1950 Congressional races to witness the effectiveness of negativism and smear in achieving office.

The lesson to be learned from these elections has not been lost on some students who aspire to office on this campus. The smear and negativism have been the dominant themes of the publicity put out recently by certain candidates who have never offered constructive ideas about student government and have no better reason for running than the mere fact they want to be elected. The best qualification for office seems to be to have no qualifications at all!

There is an old rule in politics that says it is better to be against something than for it. Furthermore, in the absence of achievement on your own part, damn the achievements of others, or create a whipping horse and beat it to death.

This is exactly the principle that is being applied in this campaign. The UP has lost three consecutive presidential elections because they never answer student's questions as to what they had ever done once they were in power. In order to avoid this fateful pitfall this time, they decided to smear certain students who have been recognized locally and nationally for outstanding leadership in student affairs, trying to identify them as a sinister "clique" plotting ill for the Student body. By using this tactic they hoped never to be forced to state what they themselves had accomplished in the past or what they planned for the future.

That the "clique" was a simple device to be used to create a false issue is clearly evident from the fact that the UP leaders can't even decide who compose it. The first charge, by candidate Horton, included Murphy, Warren, Kerley, Wallace, and Milledge. The second, by UP Chairman Roberts, dropped Warren and Milledge and added Bowers and Sanders. Evidently the "clique" isn't so cliquish, and has a rather flexible membership.

Anyway, what about their domination of student government? They must have super-human political power, for in the past four years political control in student government has been about as evenly divided as it could be. In fact, this has been its major deficiency. Besides dominating the class offices and other lower echelons of student government, the UP has consistently controlled the Legislature and frequently the Student Council as well. How does one dominate student government when the opposition controls two of the three branches? Black magic of course!

Then there is the charge that student participation in student government has been diminished by the "clique." The utter absurdity of this charge is quickly seen when one makes a comparison of the number of students participating in student government today with the number four years ago. Despite a decrease in total University enrollment, the number of students taking part in student government has increased by nearly a hundred. Candidate Horton should check his facts before he begins his smear.

Finally, there is the old standby which has won year after year. Certain office seekers claim they should be elected because they are against professional politicians. Note that, in the case of UP candidate Horton, this comes from a politician who has devoted his entire campus life to serving as a party wheelhorse. Every elective position he has held in student government has been gained as a candidate of the UP, and this year he was the handpicked candidate of the party regulars.

In the case of the "independent" candidate for the vice-presidency, Frankel has belonged alternately to both the UP and the SP, and now sits on the Student Council by virtue of election on the SP ticket. He participated in selecting SP nominees throughout the current campaign.

Such are the people who now declaim against professional politicians! If they aren't, who are? The real test of the professional politicians is the use of professional political tactics, such as those described above.

It is really insulting to the intelligence of the student body to think that such tactics could be successful. Intelligent voters should not be deceived by the use of the term "clique" as a cloak for a record of negativism and smear.

This is particularly insulting in view of the records of the students whom candidate Horton has tried to smear. A more distinguished body could hardly be found on any campus in the country. Golden Fleece has recognized four of them for distinguished service; all have high scholastic standing and three are members of Phi Beta Kappa. At least three have been honored by student government nationally for distinguished leadership. One is the only student representative to the United Nations, and is Chairman of the National Interim Committee of the National Students Association of America. Another was the Chairman of the founding group of that organization. One is the second person ever to serve both as President of the Di and Speaker of the Phi. Two have served as President of the Student Body, one as Chairman of the Honor Council, and another as Attorney General.

What a disreputable group! (ED's Note—Miss Wheeler is an Independent serving on the Student Council.)

Winn Wheeler