

The Clarity of Books

Latest puzzle confronting University veterans seeking an education has arisen over the matter of unauthorized books. The story is one of veterans, the majority of whom have acted in good faith and on seemingly sound advice, who now find themselves owing money for books they assumed were paid for by the Veteran's Administration.

Veterans who purchased such books as a dictionary of synonyms, law dictionaries, medical handbooks, and other parallel reading material, all of which proved helpful in their studies, are now being told that they must either return the books or pay for them.

When he first buys his books, the veteran must sign a contract with the VA which states that the VA will pay for only those books used by all students in a course and those authorized by the instructor. It also states that the veteran must pay for unauthorized books purchased.

The meaning of the above regulation is understandable. It is unfortunate that it was not complied with sooner. To the contrary, veterans were not only allowed, but were urged, to purchase extra and valuable books for their work in past quarters. A sign was hung prominently in the veterans booketeria which invited all veterans to come in and browse around, implying they were free to buy any books they considered helpful.

Ritchie, manager of the vet's booketeria, told us yesterday that the Book Exchange had been wrong in selling the books to veterans. He admitted his error in doing so. He added that the University had also been acting in good faith, however, in allowing the students to buy all the books.

While this is true, the fact remains that the veterans committed absolutely no wrong in their eyes when they bought the books, and they cannot be blamed for any kickback from the VA. Actually, the veterans have been amazingly cooperative in returning the unauthorized books and most of them have already done so.

Naturally, a few veterans have fantastically abused the book privilege and purchased many books irrelevant to their work for reselling and for friends. These men, of course, should be made to pay for their actions, but the great majority of the veterans have always acted honestly and in good faith in buying their books.

We also believe the Veteran's Administration is being too strict in its interpretation of necessary and authorized purchases. Such books as the dictionary of synonyms, some political science books, and many, many others were recommended to the students by professors who told them they could get them under the GI Bill of Rights. These books are of great aid to the students in their work. They are used constantly along with and besides the regular textbooks in many courses. Provided the veteran stays within his monetary limit and purchases books vital to his work, we feel that the VA should allow such books to be included on its bill.

Ritchie also told us that, while yesterday some students were not allowed to go through the present book line until they returned or paid for their unauthorized books, such practice has been discontinued and no veterans will be prevented from buying any of his books for the current quarter. But he added that the books must be paid for or returned.

Many veterans have raised the question as to whether or not the University has any legal right to make them pay for books they bought in good faith. The legality of this cannot be ascertained immediately.

However, the refusal to issue books until past accounts are adjusted is illegal. It would be possible for the University to refuse to register a student who owes it money. Nonetheless, once registered it has no right to deny the veteran rights granted by Public Law 346, the GI Bill of Rights. To do so would be illegal.

Basically, the present chaos seems to have been provoked by a misunderstanding on the law by the University. This situation—which could have been cleared easily by a frank explanation—was clouded into a controversial issue when the alternate course of trying to frighten the veterans into returning books or paying for them was adopted.

It is unfortunate that the veterans were not taken into confidence and treated as intelligent adults, rather were treated as broken-field runners eluding the arms of Tackle John Law.

The Daily Tar Heel

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

Member
Associated Collegiate Press

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is published daily, except Mondays, examination and vacation periods; during the official summer terms, it is published semi-weekly on Wednesdays and Saturdays. Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price: \$5.00 per college year; \$3.00 per quarter.

COMPLETE LEASED WIRE SERVICE OF UNITED PRESS

The opinions expressed by the columnists are their own and not necessarily those of The Daily Tar Heel.

BILL WOESTENDIEK Editor
ROLAND GIDUZ Managing Editor
IRWIN SMALLWOOD Sports Editor
BILL SELIG Business Manager
BURTON MYERS Circulation Manager

FOR THIS ISSUE:

NIGHT EDITOR: Barron Mills

SPORTS: Morty Schaap

Strictly Detrimental....

University Wins by Default Battles for Regimentation

By Jud Kinberg

The University administration has won its biggest battles to regiment education at UNC, won them by default.

Two of the most pernicious bits of sabotage to student freedom at Carolina followed hard on the dirty heels of one another. First, the administration inaugurated its own pet registration program, whereby choice of hours and instructors was sacrificed to vague promises of "efficiency" and no wait, no stoop, no squat. The Daily Tar Heel fought a losing rear-guard action against the new plan, but lack of student support made it impossible to swerve the administration from its chosen path.

Well, the men who are taking courses they never dreamed of, due to the defects in Lanier's Lottery—probably have faint praise for the new plan. Nor could those who wasted yesterday and today trying to get courses changed be called enthusiastic supporters of registration a la Rube Goldberg.

Then, with that curve ball barely over our bald plate, the Administration wound up and struck out quite a few veterans. With the hot breath of Veterans' Administration auditors on its neck, Mr. Ritchie's Book Exchange started sending out short notes to many veterans. Gist of the message was, bring back the books you unwittingly "stole" or you'll get no more, white trash.

The story behind this development seems to be brilliantly hued with the color of gold. Although Ritchie must have known that the VA would pay for only authorized texts, he loaded the Veterans' Booketeria with volumes having no possible relationship to any conceivable course. I remember thumbing through a copy of "Terry and the Pirates." I defy Ritchie to relate that to any class, or even general culture. Yet, the signs all invited the vets to browse around and the lax policy of checking made it evident that you were welcome to buy any volumes which struck the fancy.

Now, Ritchie demands that such extra books be returned before the veteran can procure the texts for spring quarter classes. Yesterday's story on the DTH front page is an example of weaseling of the worst sort.

"H. R. Ritchie denied reports that the Veterans Book Ex was refusing to issue books to student veterans who had failed to return books which they received without authorization last quarter."

No, they're not refusing to do it, they're just NOT doing it. The veteran with a book bill has to pay it or drop out of line, get the offensive books and return them before he can get new texts. If that isn't denying new books until old bills are paid, Ritchie or I need a course in grammar.

But it is not the attitude of the administration, but that of the student body which deserves the most bitter condemnation. It is a nasty

and clear fact that we knuckled down in these two important instances. We accepted the registration system, made no protest when fellow students were deprived of needed courses or forced to wait in line for an entire afternoon merely to change one class.

The veterans, faced with their problem, acted like good little boys and proceeded to pull Ritchie chestnuts out of a pretty hot Veterans' Administration fire. In both cases the University was in the wrong, blatantly so. Both errors had come about through a desire to benefit the University and not the student. Yet, no concerted protest was made, no mass voice even pipsqueaked. In the second case, that of the Great Book Robbery, action here at UNC is in direct contrast to that of a northern university student body which is reported to have refused to bring the books back or to pay the bills. The administration there paid the cost of being very wrong, something which we obligingly made unnecessary for the smiling boys behind South Building desks.

If the mistakes had been done in good faith in an attempt to aid the students, I could countenance student obeisance. But it seems all too evident that both the registration plan and the book-rob could rebound to the ease, convenience and financial well-being of the University to a far greater degree than to students.

The conclusion is obvious. We have all the paraphernalia of student self-government, but we have surrendered the spirit of it to the administration by default. Our duly-elected student leaders took only weak positions or none at all on both questions. Our students merely allowed themselves to be herded along the administration's runway, like very docile cattle being led to slaughter.

In themselves, these incidents are important enough. The negative results they brought from the student body, makes them catastrophic. It may be too late to stop the harm done, but we should make it quite clear—and by that I mean nothing less than mass-meeting protest—that we will countenance no more of the mucked-up registration system, nor of the blackjack method of collecting old book bills.

Letters To The Editor

All letters must be typewritten, double-spaced, under 300 words in length, and signed by the writer. Writer's name will be withheld on request, but letters must be signed. The Daily Tar Heel reserves the right to present the letters as it wishes and to delete all matter it considers libelous.

For the Jury

To: Mr. Davenport and the Students
Your article in yesterday's issue of the Tar Heel has placed the Campus Party in the position of plaintiff in the case of Heath versus the Student Party. As chairman of the Campus Party, sir, may I point out to you that Mr. Heath has never been a member of the Campus Party; therefore, the Campus Party cannot assume responsibility for Mr. Heath's statements concerning the Student Party and the manner in which it is operated.

To further clarify the position of the Campus Party and its present membership, may I also state that the Campus Party did not originate as the result of a split in the Student Party. It was formed only after a meeting of a group of individuals who are interested in doing something constructive in the improvement of Student Government at Carolina. Upon a decision being reached by this group that the time has come when something must be done to eliminate the inefficiency in the present student government, the Campus Party was formed. Its present membership consists of only six of the old Student Party members. This same membership has representation from every section of the Campus. We believe that we are the most representative group of any of

the political groups now in the Campus.

We cordially invite everyone who is not a member of another political party to drop by for our meetings and participate in the discussion on our party policies and platform. We want YOU to help us select and then elect the best qualified slate of officers. Only through you, the Student Body, can this be done. Your cooperation is earnestly requested.

Johnny Jones,
Chairman, Campus Party

Easy to Complain

To the Editor:
I wish to congratulate Mr. Nicoud on his letter, "A generation of parasites..." which must certainly have met with unanimous disapproval from the majority of veterans. The primary reason given by students for demands of increased subsistence is a simple one. Sixty-five dollars a month is insufficient to maintain a decent living-standard. No one denies this. It is not difficult to convince one that he should have more money. But this logic makes one vicious assumption—the government is completely and solely responsible for the comfortable maintenance of its veterans.
Some, more conscientious veterans,

Editorially Superior

Best Mag of Year Features Excellent Photoword Story

By R. Haskell Hamilton

From a standpoint of make-up, attractiveness and editorial competence, the best Mag of the year hit the campus yesterday with the publication of the March issue. Superior make-up and stability of lay-outs do much to lift the current issue out of the mediocre category, and into the class alongside some of the better Carolina Mags Chapel Hill has turned out.

I found the feature "What Makes Sammy Run," the best photoword story in the mag all year. Sam Beard's MOONGLOW program is certainly of wide and popular interest in Chapel Hill, if his mailbag is any indication; and the talents of Jud Kinberg and Gerald Conrad are perfectly blended to give the reader the "inside" story on one of Tar Heelia's current, popular disc jockey characters.

'Mademoiselle' Sponsors Short Story Contest

The editors of Mademoiselle magazine have announced prizes of \$500 each to the two winners of a short story contest for women undergraduate students in American universities. Stories must be typewritten, double spaced, on one side of the paper only, with contestants name, college and home addresses and academic year clearly marked.

Manuscripts should be from 3,000 to 5,000 words in length, and must be submitted to College Fiction Contest, Mademoiselle, 122 E. 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y., before midnight May 1, 1947.

Checks Postal Ruling Clarified by Bourne

Clarifying the new postal ruling of forwarding of veterans' subsistence checks, Elliott G. Bourne, local training officer, announced yesterday that the ban on forwarding continues in effect where it will necessitate sending checks to another city or postal delivery area.

have attempted to rationalize further and have declared that money invested in the education and well-being of veterans is money invested in the future. This may be true. But is our future to be determined only by veterans? If the federal government is to assume the responsibility of making higher education available to its citizens, what right have the veterans to ask that the privileges be limited to them alone? What could be more against the underlying thesis of the AVC, "Citizens first, Veterans second?"

The G. I. bill is intended to aid veterans in reassuming their places in civilian life. Those who fought, suffered, were wounded and maimed, deserve all that can be done for them. The rest of us (a large majority) are receiving more government benefits than the veterans of any other war at any time in history (excluding a few individuals such as Nelson and Wellington). The present law makes it possible for any veteran who so desires to get an education. It may not be easy if he's broke, but if it was done before the war, it can certainly be done now. It's easy to complain. If the reader is not satisfied with the present tuition and subsistence allowance, at least let him be thankful that he didn't start his university education ten years ago. Let us place more responsibility on ourselves rather than become indifferent and unthinking wards of the government.

Sincerely,
HOWARD TURNAGE

There's some poignant and realistic fiction by Ken Rothwell and Don Justice. The former's "Chain of Command," accentuated by B. Helfrich's illustration is to my mind a superior war episode. Rothwell manages to vividly relate the futility, the clash of personality, and some of the weary miserableness of many phases of Army life. The writer's club selection "The Pink Rosebush and the Peachtree," by Don Justice is the best story Mr. Justice has had to represent his work so far, this year.

These two pieces do much to atone for the undistinguished work of Alan Smith in his "You Were Just Born," which is too unbelievable and sugary for my consumption. For my money, it's strictly "True Romances" stuff. Doris Meriwether's story while on an unusual theme, is contrived and a trifle too slick to make interesting reading. Margaret Whitney's "The Last Day" completes the fiction offerings with a poignant story that sometimes creates an exceedingly sympathetic mood.

The poetry page is on a par with last month's excellent writing. Dick Stern, Paul Ramsay, Curtis Butler, Bill Robertson and Lorraine Bothard combine to offer representative, modern American poetry of the better grade.

The editors have eulogized Stan Croner's photo work more adequately, and more highly than I would care to. Croner is good, very good; but he's got a long way to go to be a Weegie, or a Steichen, or even a Hugh Morton. The center spread on a touch of Venus suffers from poor engraving. Sloppy cut outs make the edges of the pictures look like last Sunday's newspaper and contrast in color tone is lacking to make the spread an outstanding piece of work, instead of the ordinary good-idea-gone-wrong; which it is.

All told, however, the March Mag is about the best of the current crop and should prove interesting, rewarding, and entertaining to all. If the editors can keep up this pace; there'll be no kick coming from this quarter or from anyone who is sincerely interested in a readable Carolina Magazine.

It Happens Here...

- 8:00—Dialectic Senate, 3rd floor, New West.
- 8:30—Margaret Leinbach Kolb, piano recital, Hill hall.
- 8:30—UVA open house for Me-Iver coeds, UVA clubhouse.

Crossword Puzzle

ANSWER TO PREVIOUS PUZZLE

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			44
45			46				47			
48			49				50			

ACROSS

- 1—Poverty
- 5—Steady, slowly
- 9—Artist's creation
- 12—A's from wild
- 13—Fruit
- 14—Oil house
- 15—Fruit
- 16—Carpenter
- 17—Away from center
- 18—Sincere
- 19—Fast food
- 20—Joan
- 21—Camp for breath
- 22—Part of 'to be'
- 23—Tale excitedly
- 24—Servant
- 30—Phipps
- 31—Sherwood Forest
- 32—Drew
- 33—Stain
- 34—Man's nickname
- 35—Low German (tab)
- 36—Kind of fruit
- 37—Wait for
- 38—Girl's name
- 39—Latin
- 40—Oriental
- 41—Slangy animal
- 42—Price fixer
- 43—Liquid measure
- 44—Grow's cry
- 45—Shut mouth
- 46—quarry
- 47—Seize
- 48—Possess
- 49—Ancient city

DOWN

- 1—Pale
- 2—Wing
- 3—Not positive
- 4—Tellurium
- 5—Attacks (symb)
- 6—Mr De Valera's country
- 7—Author of "Paddy in Slane"
- 8—Prefix down
- 9—Separate
- 10—Went back
- 11—Low card
- 12—Eat
- 13—Biggest part
- 14—Location
- 15—Magical stick
- 16—Wax painting
- 17—Insensibility to pain
- 18—Follow closely
- 19—Duo
- 20—Symbol of office
- 21—Cry in pain
- 22—What divorce days
- 23—Observed
- 24—Cloak of camel's hair
- 25—Dish
- 26—Noah's ship
- 27—Part of chain
- 28—Daybreak
- 29—Quiet to warm
- 30—Steer ship wildly
- 31—Perfect golf score
- 32—Money
- 33—Prefix with "Street"