

The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publications Union of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where it is printed daily, except Mondays, examinations and vacation periods. Entered as second class matter at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price is \$6.00 for the college year.

Complete Leased Wire Service of United Press

ROBERT MORRISON Editor
WESTY FENHAGEN Managing Editor
BILL HIGHT Associate Editor
CARROLL POPLIN and BILL WOESTENDIEK Co-Sports Editors
BILL SELIG Business Manager
CLIFFORD HEMINGWAY Circulation Manager

FOR THIS ISSUE:

JACK LACKEY Night Editor
CARROLL POPLIN Night Sports Editor

STUDENT LEADERS FACE GREATER ENEMY THAN EACH OTHER

The students to whom this editorial is primarily directed will not read it, but perhaps those who will read it will become more aware of what Thursday and Friday's balloting proved to be a major danger in student affairs.

The constitution of the student body passed by a 66.79% favorable vote (at least 66.67% was required for ratification). This constitution represented over a year of work by the foremost student leaders, elected by the student body. This constitution was hotly debated and many times amended by almost a month-long session of the student legislature, and was finally approved by an overwhelming vote of that "representative body." An overwhelming majority of the student leaders approved the document, and with one or two exceptions no elected student leader actively campaigned against it.

Even with this powerful array of support, the constitution was passed by a hair-line margin. Of those voting, 624 voted against ratification. Does this demonstrate that almost one-third of the campus is totally out of sympathy with its leaders, and totally out of sympathy with both of its political parties? We think so, but we do think that our leaders are very representative of those students who are vocal and active in student affairs. It might be said that our leaders are representative of the more social-minded students, and of those who are interested in the welfare of the University. To substantiate, let's examine some facts:

During the constitutional convention, there was little or no vocal objection to having a constitution. The students who disliked the idea of a constitution did not attend the meetings, and did not express their ideas in the student press. When the constitution came up for campus ratification, all students were begged to vote. Ballot boxes were even taken to their dormitories and placed in convenient public places. Those who kept the polls often called to passing students to come and vote. The result was that even the uninformed, the uninterested, and the socially ignorant found little difficulty in checking a ballot.

From actual observation of activities around the polls, we think that those who voted against the constitution can be classified as follows:

- 1) Those who were well informed, but reactionary or of the belief that some particular part of the document was disastrous to better student government. Students like Wallace Murchison, legislature representative from the law school, are in this category. We do not blame them, we admire them for expressing their sincere convictions in the face of strong opposition from their colleagues. This group does not include more than a few dozen students, and they were not particularly influential in changing other students against the document.
- 2) Those who were totally ignorant of the provisions of the constitution, and would not have voted except for the fact that the poll keepers made it convenient for them. They just chanced to vote against ratification; as many like them voted "yes." This group we pity more than blame. They should have attended a meeting of the constitutional convention or should have at least read the DTH's printed copy of the constitution. If familiarizing themselves was physically impossible, they should not have voted.
- 3) Those who were fooled by some of the vicious rumors which were circulated by anonymous persons. This group voted against ratification because they ignorantly thought that the constitution would break down the honor system, or cause their fraternity or sorority to be controlled by the legislature, or make coeds subsidiary to men in student government, or put fraternities into power, or they believed other such erroneous propaganda. This group is a danger to democracy, for they believe without reason or investigation.
- 4) Those who are suffering from some anti-social or inferiority complex. Many members of this group envy the student leaders who planned the constitution, but do not possess the initiative or ability to become leaders themselves. They form the potential criminal class in our democracy, and want to tear down anything which is scholarly or masterful, and which offers a threat to their own mediocrity. This group started the rumors which the second group believed.

The first group mentioned is the smallest of the three, and is a valuable asset to our democracy. The last three must be converted by social reforms, educational programs, and contact with leaders.

Student leaders must spend less time fighting among themselves and recognize the common enemy represented by groups 2, 3, and 4, for those elements always retard our progress, and on occasion they accept the leadership of the fourth group and rise in a revolution, smashing the culture of the Roman Empire, robbing banks, electing senators like Theodore Bilbo, and destroying painfully constructed student constitutions.

Groups 2, 3, and 4 do not run for student offices, they are poorly represented in our legislature and councils, but they constitute a constant threat to student government. The balloting on the constitution made us more aware of this; let's not forget a lesson learned at the price of a several-vote margin from the overthrow of the work of many unselfish workers.—R. M.

Now Hear This

Columnist Calls for Better Officers Under Constitution

By Jack Lackey

The University of North Carolina has long been noted for its student self-government. Ever since the doors were first opened here at Chapel Hill the students have been given a great deal of the responsibility of governing their own conduct. At first, since all the students belonged to either the Philanthropic or Diabetic Literary Society, the rules of these clubs were used to govern the whole school.

Later an Honor Council was set up which was for many years the whole government, in itself. Not many years ago a student legislature was created, which gradually had more and more authority given to it. Until recently no one was quite sure just what on the campus this legislature did not have control over.

Besides these two groups, the students had, over the years, created a Publications Union and a Publications board, a Debate Council, Dance Committee, House Privileges Board, Inter-dormitory Council, Interfraternity Council, and many, many other small governmental bodies. When coeds started to attend the University, they too set up an Honor Council and developed a system of government which was almost as complex as the one which the men had set up.

All these groups on the campus derived their authority from the same source, the students, and were recognized by the school administration. Since both the Honor Council and the Legislature had authority from the same source, it was never quite clear where the jurisdiction of the one left off and the

other began. This situation prevailed all through the student government setup and gave it a tendency at times to be very inefficient.

Student leaders have realized this for some time, and there has been movement on the campus for over fifteen years to write a constitution, a constitution which would eliminate these differences and clarify the situation.

By the narrow margin of less than 1/6 of one per cent over the required two-thirds vote, the students have at last ratified a constitution. The proponents of this document have called it a great step forward. Its opponents have declared that it will mean an end to the Honor System and that it will ruin student government here at Carolina. Now that it has passed let us hope that its proponents have been right.

In a few weeks the officers who are to work under this Constitution will be selected. They will have a greater responsibility than any of their recent predecessors have had. Whether or not this new plan of government will work is largely up to them. Let us hope that the men who can do the job best are selected. Over a hundred and fifty years of student freedom are at stake.

SP Attempting to Regain Former Campus Supremacy

By Roland Giduz

Some townspeople, faculty, and old timers on the campus such as Joe Travis, Jimmy Wallace, Turk Newsome, Pete Pully and a few others remember the days back in the 'roaring forties' when the Student Party swept the annual campus elections by a landslide, walking off with 90 per cent of the major student government posts.

According to 'old timer' Jimmy Wallace, the present Student Party was organized in 1938 to provide some competition for what was then thought of solely as a fraternity group, the University Party. In contrast to the liberality of the present party, which is open to all individuals, and opposed only to 'block' membership and voting, the old group was supposedly "in direct opposition to fraternities and sororities."

Mitchell Britt, now a UNC law student, was one of the charter members of the party, and was elected to its chairmanship in 1940. "The party was then based on an organization of the lower quadrangles," stated Jimmy Wallace, who came to the campus as a freshman in the fall of 1940. "Leaders had the party well arranged with district chairmen, dormitory chairmen, floor chairmen, and many lesser ward heelers talking the party up so that the campus was completely covered. Membership, however was always completely wide open."

Spring elections of 1941 turned well for the incumbent Student Party with their candidate Truman Hobbs winning the presidency of the student body, and W. T. Martin, also SP, taking the vice-presidency spot. In one of the most hotly contested races in many years Orville Campbell won by a very narrow margin over UP candidate Louis Harris for the editorship of the Daily Tar Heel.

Many veterans recall the terrific mud slinging campaign of 1942, when the Student Party fell into a slump which lasted through the war years. Bert Bennett, UP, was elected president in that campaign, followed by another University Party candidate, John Mose Robinson, in 1943.

When dormitory organization was injured due to the coming of the V-12 and Pre-Flight programs, Student Party activities virtually lapsed due to the impotence of their organization. The opposition party was hurt little by the war, due to the retention of fraternities which formed a nucleus for organization, whereas the Student Party, with only Steele dormitory as its headquarters, was faced with the difficult task of organizing the town vote.

Third parties, including the Carolina, United, and United Carolina Parties, sprang up and lapsed, during the declining war years of the SP. "The V-12 and ROTC vote went almost solidly UP through the influence of Navy fraternity men, who influenced most of the unit to play follow the leader," stated Jimmy Wallace, summarizing U P growth from 1942-46.

With fraternities at their peak in 1944, the United Party, which was essentially the old Student Party was defeated ignominiously, with Snooky Proctor, head cheerleader, their only major candidate who was elected. And Proctor promptly pledged the

Letters To The Editor

Moore Thinks Parties Here Are Artificial

Dear Bob:

Here's the way the stink raised over Pete Pully's nomination looks to a newcomer. (Incidentally, I don't know the man.)

The party leaders of both major parties here seem to think that Pully was either a good man or a good candidate. Party loyalty is much more important than school loyalty it seems; otherwise the Student Party candidate might have been an endorsement of the University Party's candidate.

Political parties are ordinarily based upon differences of opinion or policy. Either the line of demarcation here is purely artificial or the party leaders don't examine the ideas and viewpoints of candidates before trying to nominate them.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. Moore.

Watkins' Phi Attack Is Unjust Says Giles

Dear Bob:

Martin A. Watkins attacked the Phi Assembly yesterday because, he said, eighteen members and visitors voted for a bill which stated that labor unions were a detriment to the nation and to the South.

Regardless of whether the Phi would favor such a bill or not, the attack was entirely unjustified since the Phi never passed the bill he referred to. The only bill the eighteen voted for, and presumably the one he referred to, was a substitute resolution asking that union power and union "gangsterism" be abridged by appropriate legislation.

It seems a little strange that Mr. Watkins, a labor organizer, waited nine days, or just long enough for most of the student body to forget the wording of the bill, to make his attack.

John Giles.

Abernethy Criticizes Farrell; Lauds Swalin

Dear Sir:

Mr. Charles Farrell's comments concerning the orchestra's alleged inability to rise above what he termed a "generic third-class" status and his reasons for making this statement were totally fallacious as far as the criticism of Dr. Swalin went. In maintaining that the quality of the latter's conducting handicapped the orchestra, the "critic" totally overlooked the fact that the most significant progress made by the orchestra has been made through the efforts of Benj. Swalin and that the evidence of this fact lies in the approval accorded him by the public and by the critics, alike. Witness comments in *The Musical Courier*, *Stars and Stripes*, *The Charlotte Observer* and numerous others.

Hall Abernethy.

Money Cannot Support Pully for President

Dear Editor:

I have noted with some interest the statement made by Chuck Heath concerning Pete Pully's changing his mind to accept the UP nomination.

This digs a new low in campus politics. Mr. Pully, who was once a member of the UCP, which stood for high standards, and was at one time Delegata of the Grail, which also stands for all that is commendable in campus activities, according to Mr. Heath's statement, scraps all standards of honorable conduct to hop on the winning wagon. This seems to me a flagrant violation of the Honor Code. If we believe it fair to kick out an ordinary Carolina student for cheating, surely we can not approve the nomination of a man of Mr. Pully's calibre to enforce our Honor Code.

I invite the attention of the Honor Council to this matter.

C. O. Money.

America Should Establish Colleges Abroad, Says Prof.

By United Press

An American college professor recently returned from a teaching tour at the GI university at Biarritz, France, wants the U. S. government to establish American colleges in Europe on a permanent basis.

Dr. Charles R. Wilson, head of Colgate University's history department, said the foreign institutions could be supported either by Congressional appropriations or through operation of an endowment fund from the sale of American surplus property abroad.

Such universities, he said, would be welcomed in foreign countries and would assure greater international understanding and cooperation. "What I envision are American universities abroad with American students, staffed by American faculties and based upon the American plan," he said.

He expressed opposition to a pending Senate bill which would authorize the use of \$2,500,000 annually from the sale of war surplus goods to provide scholarships for American students in any one foreign country.

"I have seen too many foreign students in American universities," he said, "not to realize that, except in unusual instances, language handicaps, strange educational techniques and a general feeling of being uprooted combine literally to overwhelm the students."

The professor said that establishment of the institutions would aid in "building a backfire to what may prove to be a prairie fire of isolationism when the rank and file of the troops get home."

Father: "What's the idea of going out with that soldier half-dressed?"
Daughter: "Don't you know everything is 50 per cent off for servicemen?"