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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Every college generation is a product of its age. The momentous occurrence of its era from the wars and economic shifts to the elections and inventions of its times—give meaning to the lives of the individuals who live through them. They also serve to knit those individuals together by creating a collective memory and a common historic or generational identity.¹

The relationship between college students and institutions of higher education has not been static over time. As one traces the interactions of students and administrators from the colonial period to the 21st century, a dynamic pattern becomes evident. Some level of friction or contention is clearly seen throughout the pattern, ebbing and flowing during different eras. Kiendl described the two forces as follows:

Students by and large think that anything which restricts their actions is an infringement on their rights and freedoms. Faculties and administrations, on the other hand, are likely to take the pragmatic point of view that all rights and freedoms entail concomitant responsibilities.²

These restrictions and corresponding reactions can be viewed as a swinging pendulum. The movement of the pendulum is sometimes difficult to recognize and impossible to measure, but careful observers can sense change over time. While some administrators view their authority as continuously eroding,³ students may argue that their own autonomy has decreased. The change

---


can be described in terms of campus protests, perceptions of *in loco parentis*, current court cases concerning colleges and universities, or new student life policies. Changes in students, institutions, and society prevent the pendulum from having a smooth arc, instead exposing the volatility of the relationship.

The natures of both institutions and students change over time. Colleges and universities do not exist in a vacuum devoid of context and higher education is not immune from external influences, such as legislation, court decisions, and the general opinion of society. While students face similar challenges and development opportunities from generation to generation, they do so in the context of culture, politics, and current events. Schwartz wrote,

> Using history to interpret and analyze patterns and policy decisions in higher education can be equally valuable. Learning more about events, policies, institutions, and people from a historical perspective expands the base of knowledge and information that researchers and decision makers need to analyze and interpret contemporary events. Instead of being disconnected from the past, we can acknowledge and appreciate that much of current American culture and society is based on actions and events in the past. Social institutions, including colleges and universities, mirror those cultural values and history.⁴

This dissertation will examine the relationship between the institution and students through the lens of a specific era, including its economic, political, and cultural contexts.

The economic, political, and cultural contexts of an era form a campus climate made up of institutional and student reactions to realities within these contexts. Turning points or lynchpin moments exist within these eras and serve as catalysts to shift the pendulum in a trajectory reflective of the student and institution relationship. Higher education scholars have identified some of these revolutionary points of movement, including “the Land-Grant College Act of 1862, the introduction of the elective system, and the development of the conception of the

---

modern university.” These points in history exist within the economic, political, and cultural contexts of their time.

The G.I. Bill And Higher Education

Historians identify the period following World War II as a time of great transition in American higher education. While the literature provides attention to enrollment, facility, and curriculum changes that took place in the years following the War, little has been written about the changes that took place within the nature of the relationship between academy and students. Scholars ignore a vital source of information when they focus solely on curriculum, institutional governance, or administrative tasks to understand the collegiate experience. Rudolph proposed the “extracurriculum” as the “instrument of change, the instrument with which generations of students, who possess the college for but a few years, register their values, often fleetingly, yet perhaps indelibly.” The extracurricular, or co curricular, activities of students display their concerns, passions, and interests. The concept of the student as the primary change agent on campus makes an understanding of the relationship between the student and the institution essential. The importance of this understanding is amplified for the era following World War II when one envisions the students of the late 1940s and early 1950s as the administrators who shaped policy during the turbulence of the 1960s.

---


The period of 1944-1949 marked a time of transition on the University of Georgia campus. The early part of the decade brought turmoil and upheaval to the University System in Georgia with the temporary loss of accreditation of member institutions. This turbulent time had affected the campus in Athens by damaging morale and enrollment numbers, but the administration and students were finally finding a semblance of equilibrium at the time the United States began to prepare for the possibility of war.

In 1944, Congress passed the G.I. Bill in anticipation of the end of the War and the return of troops. The first veterans began to arrive in Athens that summer quarter. The University soon experienced a large increase in enrollment and culture shift as older, married veterans attended classes and became involved on campus. While numbers began to drop by 1949, the five years in between were exciting and transforming to the collegiate experience at the University of Georgia. A student captured the interaction between the institution and student during this era when he wrote, “Crowded conditions and overtaxed facilities on the campus during the past year has often led to bottlenecks and friction points between the administration and students. The spots have been easily located and often publicly criticized.”

These “bottlenecks and friction points” provided a discourse between the student body and the administration. An analysis of the discourse will define the relationship that exists between students and the institution.

Plan of Study

The purpose of this study was to use historical methods to examine policy or other University changes related to student life, student perspectives, and reactions to the policies and changes as a way of understanding the relationship between the college student and the University of Georgia between 1944 and 1949. The case study begins in 1944 with the arrival of

veterans on campus and continues through 1949. Five years provides time for an entire class to matriculate and continue through graduation.

A historical analysis of the relationship between the University of Georgia and its students will fill a void in the literature. Scholars have provided careful attention to the enrollment and facilities boom on campuses post World War II as well as changes in the student population during the era. Little attention has been given to the interaction between the two, an interaction that will define the relationship and how it changed in the era following the passage of the G.I. Bill. This study used historical methods to examine the relationship between the college student and the University of Georgia between 1944 and 1949, paying attention to the campus engagement of the veteran, as a catalyst for changes in this relationship. The research for this case study focused on the relationship on campus as viewed through the lenses of the economic, political, and cultural contexts of the era.

This historical research was conducted through the use of a variety of secondary and primary sources with the purpose of understanding the interaction between two groups, students and the administration, within the academy. Secondary sources are derived, or removed from the original documents. These sources include newspapers from the era. The Red and Black has served as the student newspaper for the University of Georgia since 1893, and was published weekly during this period. While the paper has been independent since 1980, the University


published it during the era to be examined in this study. *The Red and Black* provided coverage of
the veterans’ arrival on campus as well as campus activities in the years after the GI Bill.
Editorials provided insight to the views of students in the era about changes occurring on campus
and within the student body. *The Red and Black’s* captured student reactions to administrative
decisions within the University. Administrators used *The Red and Black* to communicate to the
student body through letters to the editor or printed statements. While the University published
the newspaper, the editorial board provided an uncensored look at student life on campus. In
1945, Dean William Tate grew very agitated with what he viewed as “sensational, controversial,
or specifically critical” articles in *The Red and Black*. Additional newspapers from areas
outside Athens and the University provided other interpretations of the events occurring on
campus.

The University Archives in the Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library contain a
variety of primary sources. In historical research, a primary source is told from the perspective of
an individual who experienced or witnessed an occurrence. The researcher examined student
conduct records from the years following World War II. The records provided strong examples
of direct institutional reaction to student behavior and challenges facing administrators as well as
the ingenuity and behavior of students during the era. Due to the sensitive nature of these
primary documents, the researcher clarified policies pertaining to these student records through

---

11 William Tate to John Drewery, August 1945, Harmon Caldwell Papers. Hargrett Rare Book
and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. Tate suggested to
Drewery, Dean of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism, that he might put guidelines into
writing to control the editorial staff. Subsequent editorials in *The Red and Black* continued to
show impartial, and sometimes critical, coverage of administrative decisions.

12 Robert A. Schwartz, “Historical Methods,” in *Research in the College Context: Approaches
and Methods*, eds. Frances K. Stage and Kathleen Manning (New York: Brunner-Routledge,
2003).
both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and The University of Georgia Office of Public Affairs. Care was taken to remove any identifying information and references from student conduct cases.

The minutes of the two rival literary societies at the University of Georgia were other primary sources. The Demosthenian Literary Society was founded at the University of Georgia in 1803 to promote public speaking and debate. The rival Phi Kappa Literary Society was founded in 1820. While both organizations closed their doors during World War II, debate began again as students returned to the University. Both literary societies have detailed minutes of their meetings. These minutes provided popular topics of discussion in the years following the war as well as any controversial items that were debated.

Two presidents led the University of Georgia in the period between 1942 and 1949. Harmon White Caldwell served as President from 1935 until he became Chancellor of the University System of Georgia in 1948. Jonathan C. Rogers had a short and controversial tenure from 1949 to 1950. The Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library at the University contains collections of papers from both presidents in the archives. These papers and correspondence provided invaluable access to the correspondence and notes of the senior administrators as well as glimpses into faculty relations and policy development. During this time period, faculty and staff members would often carbon copy the president on letters and memos. These copies covered a number of topics and were valuable to the research.

The University Archives contain the papers of Deans Stallings and Tate. Edith Stallings served as Dean of Women for the University of Georgia from 1948 to 1963. William Tate served as Dean of Men from 1946 to 1971. Prior to this position Tate served as Assistant to the President, Harmon Caldwell, and Dean of Students. His papers included administrative,
personnel, and correspondence files from his tenure at the University. Additional notes and correspondence from the deans were found in student conduct records.

Additional resources used in this research included faculty minutes, Annual Reports, University Catalogs, and the Pandora. The Pandora has been the University of Georgia’s yearbook since 1886. Its pages offer glimpses into student life during the period after the War, as well as an overview of participation in campus organizations and varsity athletics.

Once sources were identified, it was essential that they be subjected to internal and external criticism. Criticism allows researchers to authenticate sources and their meaning.\textsuperscript{13} External criticism establishes the genuineness of documents. When a researcher has established a document’s authenticity, internal criticism examines the meaning of the sources. This step is important to “ensure the validity of an interpretation made by a researcher analyzing a set of historical information.”\textsuperscript{14} The researcher took steps to subject sources to internal and external criticism. Multiple articles, letters, and documents allowed the researcher to identify the validity in sources.

A thorough review of sources revealed six areas of friction or discourse between students and the administration of the University of Georgia. These areas included a gubernatorial controversy, student government on campus, class attendance, academic dishonesty, student conduct, and student housing. The topics provided context to better understand the relationship between the student and the institution.

\textsuperscript{13} Brickman.

\textsuperscript{14} Schwartz, 105.
CHAPTER 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

The University of Georgia was founded in the late eighteenth century, when Abraham Baldwin, a graduate of Yale and a future United States Senator, drafted a charter for an institution of higher education in Georgia. Baldwin modeled the campus on Yale, but based much of the charter for the new college on the ideas of the Revolution and the Enlightenment.\footnote{Thomas G. Dyer, The University of Georgia: A Bicentennial History 1785-1985 (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press, 1985).}

The General Assembly incorporated the college on January 27, 1785, making the school the first state-supported institution in the nation. In 1786, the board of trustees elected Baldwin as the first president of the University at its first official meeting.

The first classes at the University were held in 1801 under the leadership of Josiah Meigs, Baldwin’s successor and another graduate of Yale. At the time, the institution was known as Franklin College and the curriculum consisted of the liberal arts. The college grew slowly as the predominantly agricultural state found little time to support its institution of higher education. Courses in law were added in 1843, and the next major change in curriculum did not occur until after the First Morrill Act in 1862\footnote{The First Morrill Act was also known as the Land Grant College Act. The purpose of the legislation was to introduce practicality to higher education by providing funds to institutions in each state to offer courses in agriculture and mechanical education.}. At this time, the University began to introduce agricultural and mechanical classes. Colleges and schools were added to the institution as follows: College of Arts and Sciences (1801); School of Law (1859); School of Pharmacy (1903); College of Agriculture (1906); School of Forestry (1906); College of Education (1908); Graduate School
(1910); College of Business Administration (1912); School of Journalism (1915); School of Home Economics (1933).\footnote{Harmon Caldwell, \textit{Program for Some Phases of the University of Georgia; Athens, GA}, 1944, William Tate Papers. Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.}

A new state constitution in 1877 gave the institution in Athens control of all education funds. The University began to expand across the state as branch campuses opened in Atlanta (1885), Milledgeville (1889), Savannah (1890), and Valdosta (1906).\footnote{Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, \textit{A Brief History: 1932-1972} (Atlanta, GA: Office of Media and Public Relations, 2002) Available from http://www.usg.edu/pubs/bor70th/BOR70.pdf.} These campuses would eventually become the Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia College and State University, Savannah State University, and Valdosta State University.

University Governance

In 1931, Governor Richard B. Russell Jr. proposed a plan that would create a governing board for the colleges and branches of the University of Georgia. This proposal was a part of sweeping state reform and the suggestion of a joint legislative committee charged with the reorganization of higher education. The General Assembly approved the plan for the creation of the Board of Regents, initially consisting of eleven members, which would go on to oversee the University system within the state. The plan gave the Governor the power to appoint the Regents. The Chancellor became the head of the Board of Regents, and the title of President returned to the leader of the University of Georgia. In 1943, Governor Ellis Arnall was able to
push through legislation granting the University System of Georgia constitutional status.\textsuperscript{19} The entire University system consisted of 18 institutions at the time of this case study.

Former University President Steadman Sanford became Chancellor of the University System in 1935. Sanford was an astute administrator and former President of the University. He was responsible for the consolidation of the various colleges in Athens under the flagship of the University of Georgia and continued his consolidation work as Chancellor, forming the University System.\textsuperscript{20}

When Sanford unexpectedly passed away in 1945, Raymond Paty was appointed as his successor. Paty, former president of the University of Alabama, was a well-respected scholar.\textsuperscript{21} His tenure only lasted two years, at which point he resigned to take a public relations position with a large chain of department stores. Harmon Caldwell succeeded Paty in 1948.

University Administration

Harmon Caldwell was President of the University of Georgia for the majority of the era researched. Caldwell was only thirty-six years old when he became President in 1935. Prior to his appointment, Caldwell had served as Dean of the Law School. In 1948, Caldwell accepted the position of Chancellor of the Georgia system, creating a void in the leadership at the University.\textsuperscript{22} After several months, Jonathan Clark Rodgers accepted the position of President of the University of Georgia. The sixty-three year old Rodgers had previously served as President at


\textsuperscript{20} Dyer.

\textsuperscript{21} Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, \textit{A Brief History: 1932-1972}.

\textsuperscript{22} Dyer.
North Georgia College. Rodger’s administration faced severe financial challenges as the number of enrolled veterans began to decrease, and he suffered through a year of internal turmoil with the Dean of the College of Agriculture before being relieved of responsibilities in May of 1950.

Cocking Affair

When Eugene Talmadge became Governor in 1941, a turbulent period was initiated in state higher education. Talmadge, a former state agriculture commissioner, had built his power base on the values of “anti-urbanism, anti-intellectualism, and racism” and used that power to win three gubernatorial elections. The Governor disliked radicals, both real and perceived, and attempted to rid higher education of those who did not share his views. Talmadge was distrustful of the University and higher education in general. He made no attempts to hide his feelings and began a purge of the University System that included faculty, administrators, and Regents. Dean Walter Cocking of the College of Education was at the center of the movement to rid higher education in the state of radicals.

Talmadge seized on an allegation that Dean Cocking intended to use his position to integrate an educational training school near Athens. Other rumors began to swirl around the Dean, including accusations of homosexuality and affairs with his African American cook. When his first attempt to fire Cocking failed, Talmadge replaced three members of the Board of Regents to make sure his demands were met. Cocking was dismissed at a Board meeting on July 14, 1941. The only testimony against the Dean was that of a disgruntled faculty member.

23 Dyer, 225.

24 Dyer.

Cocking had many supporters, faculty and students speak in his defense; but Talmadge’s Board had already reached it decision.

Talmadge may have felt that his purge was a success, but it had unintended and long-reaching negative consequences. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools had monitored the Governor’s actions, and launched an investigation shortly after Cocking’s dismissal. Their investigation and findings led to a loss of accreditation for Georgia's state-supported colleges for white students. In the face of national ridicule and criticism, Talmadge’s popularity began to plummet in the state and among students at the University of Georgia. His reelection campaign in 1942 was dominated by criticism of his tampering with higher education in the state. Talmadge’s attempt to make race the central issue had backfired, and instead he found himself defending actions that had greatly weakened the state’s University system. Students at the University of Georgia took an active role in the campaign and “likened Talmadge’s methods to those of Adolph Hitler, and even suggested that the Georgia governor strongly resembled the German fuhrer.”

Ellis Arnall, a graduate of the University of Georgia Law School, defeated Eugene Talmadge and took office in January of 1943. Talmadge’s loss fulfilled the prophesy of one angry student who offered his thoughts in a 1941 editorial for the Red and Black.

The Governor, after having backed down before unified student and state-wide protests, is beginning to flare forth again with some of his famous hell-raising tactics. These tactics will only make the honest, sensible people of this state realize more than ever the necessity of electing a new Governor in the next election. We can only hold Talmadge responsible for the things that have happened to our school system. If the University System is taken off the accredited list, Talmadge had better kiss the Governor's chair goodbye.

26 Dyer.

27 Dyer, 237-238.
He may have the idea that he is bigger than the people but when a man gets such dictatorial ideas, he is due for a rude awakening. The Governor will have a hard enough time being re-elected in the next election even if the University remains on the accredited list, but he will sink with the University which he has attempted to ruin if it is taken off the accredited list.

Governor Talmadge had better start thinking sensibly for a change and do his best to keep the University System on the accredited list, not only for the good of the people of the state but for the good of his own hide which is going to be scorching when election time rolls around next fall.

We are forced to warn ‘Dictator’ Talmadge that the students of the University of Georgia will never forget his political interference in their schools and have pledged themselves to do their utmost toward his defeat in the next election.\textsuperscript{28}

The new Governor took several steps to reform state government. His actions were successful when the Executive Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools restored accreditation in September of 1942.\textsuperscript{29} While the crisis ended in 1942, the consequences would continue to be felt by the University as it struggled to increase enrollment.

Women at UGA

Women fought an uphill battle in gaining admittance to the University of Georgia. The first women were quietly enrolled in the summer session of 1903, in an informal arrangement under Chancellor David Barrow.\textsuperscript{30} In 1916, the legislature, under pressure from the local suffrage movement, allowed women to enroll in the Graduate School. World War I and support from University administrators finally broke down the final barriers to women’s enrollment as undergraduates in 1918.

\textsuperscript{28} “In and Out,” The Red and Black, 14 November 1941, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
The State Teachers College in Athens was providing duplicate services once women were admitted to the University and was abolished in 1933.\textsuperscript{31} The academic resources from the Teachers College were merged with the College of Education and the dormitories were used to house first and second year female students.\textsuperscript{32} These women also took classes on what became known as the Coordinate campus. During this era, women were active on campus and played a major role in the relationship between the student body and the institution.

\textsuperscript{31} “President Sanford Opens New University Session With Plea for Leadership,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 23 September 1933, p. 1.

CHAPTER 3

THE SERVICEMEN’S READJUSTMENT ACT

The majority of veterans returning to colleges and universities after World War II had spent their early and formative years during the 1920s and 1930s. The impressionable years of the 1930s were shaped by the dark days of the Great Depression and the threat of war. Students during that decade were known for their activism directed to economic improvement and the antiwar movement. War became a reality on December 7, 1941 after the Japanese attack on a United States’ naval base at Pearl Harbor, HI. The conscription age was lowered to 18 when the United States entered the War. College campuses became ghost towns as students either volunteered or were drafted into service. The peace-movement had ended and the economy had improved by the time veterans returned home after their service. These men and women were looking for some semblance of normalcy and stability when they returned from overseas and somewhat feared a return of the turmoil of the 1930s.

G.I. Bill

During World War II and the years leading up to it, the government put into place three laws related to veterans: (1) the Selective Services Act, (2) Public Law 16, and (3) Public Law 346. The Selective Services Act was related to conscription, and enacted the first peace-time draft in the United States. Public Law 16 made vocational rehabilitation provisions for veterans who were injured in service, while Public Law 346 came to be known as the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, or GI Bill of Rights. Public Laws 1 and 346 provided opportunities for any


man or woman who served on active duty after September 16, 1940 and who was either in the service for longer than 90 days or received an injury while on active duty.

When examining the role the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act (G.I Bill) played in the massification of higher education, one cannot forget the original purposes of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Congress. The G. I. Bill addressed two concerns. First, World War II helped the country rebound from the Great Depression and the Bill was designed to ease the transition to a postwar economy and prevent the collapse of the nation’s work force economy. Industries would need time to shift production lines from tanks to automobiles. Second, the nation’s leadership remembered the postwar demonstrations of veterans after the First World War and wanted to prevent a similar situation.\textsuperscript{35} After World War One, the Bonus Army, a collection of veterans, marched on Washington to demand payment that had been promised to them by the government. The Bill was an attempt to protect the economy from an inundation of unemployed veterans by providing them with the opportunities for upward mobility and better lives. United States citizens could remember the horrible morale after the veterans of the First World War protested their treatment, a memory captured in an editorial from the Athens Banner Herald prior to the end of World War Two.

Let us hope that conditions will continue as they are now and that no returning service man will be unable to secure work, it will be remembered that the veterans of World War I found the country demoralized. One of the greatest panics that has ever been visited upon this nation, Thousands of these veterans were forced to hitch-hike from place to place in an effort to secure employment and few of them succeeded.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Michael J. Bennett, \textit{When Dreams Came True: The GI Bill and the Making of Modern America} (Washington D.C.: Brassey’s, 1996).

\textsuperscript{36} “Returning Disabled Soldiers,” \textit{Athens Banner Herald}, 26 June 1944, p. 4.
Athens residents and University faculty and staff remembered those dark days and were committed to preventing their return.

The G.I Bill may be best known for its educational opportunities, but it contained many other important provisions.37 Veterans were able to receive one year of unemployment pay, consisting of 20 dollars per week, from the government upon their return to civilian life. Veterans could also apply for low interest home loans with no down payments. These new homeowners expanded the middle class in America and began the growth of suburbs around larger cities.38 These provisions were considered the main tenants of the Bill, and the educational components were late additions and slowed its passing until 1944.

The educational provisions of the Bill were last minute additions to the Bill and were only included because of intense lobbying by the American Legion.39 These provisions were transferable and automatic for qualifying military personnel attending federally approved institutions:

The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full time or part time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: Provided, That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year: Provided further, That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: And provided further, That if any such institution has no established tuition fee, or if its established tuition fee shall be found by the Administrator to be


38 Bennett.

inadequate compensation to such institution for furnishing such education or training, he is authorized to provide for the payment, with respect to any such person, of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed $500 for an ordinary school year. While enrolled in and pursuing a course under this part, such person, upon application to the Administrator, shall be paid a subsistence allowance of $50 per month, if without a dependent or dependents, or $75 per month, if he has a dependent or dependents, including regular holidays and leave not exceeding thirty days in a calendar year. Such person attending a course on a part-time basis, and such person receiving compensation for productive labor performed as part of their apprentice or other training on the job at institutions, business or other establishments, shall be entitled to receive such lesser sums, if any, as subsistence or dependency allowances, as may be determined by the Administrator: Provided, That any such person eligible under this part, and within the limitations thereof, may pursue such full time or part-time course or courses as he may elect, without subsistence allowance.  

A soldier received one year of college tuition for serving 90 days in the armed forces. The returning soldier would then qualify for one month of education for every month served in active service. A stipend of up to $500 was paid to the veteran’s higher education institution for books and supplies. Those veterans attending college also received a monthly living allowance dependant upon their marital status. These stipends were $65 for single veterans and $90 for married veterans.  

Enrollment  

Colleges and universities had seen their enrollments and subsequent tuitions drop during the Second World War and were eager to bring students back to their campuses. Due to the fallout from the temporary loss of accreditation earlier in the decade, the University of Georgia had seen even steeper decreases than those of their peer institutions. The G.I. Bill provided an

42 Dyer.
opportunity for institutions to increase enrollment and take advantage of the funds offered by the federal government. Many colleges and universities created programs and marketing tools to invite veterans to consider higher education opportunities, specifically the ones they offered. For example, Harvard actively recruited servicemen overseas before they even returned to the states. Their brochures, entitled *What about Harvard?*, were targeted at men who may have not have considered furthering their education without the benefits of the G.I. Bill. Administrators at the University of Georgia sought veterans’ tuition dollars and fees as well. The 1945-1946 Bulletin printed by the University contained a section aimed at veterans that read more like a commercial marketing campaign than an explanation of programs offered. Veterans considering attending college in Athens had an opportunity to peruse the *General Catalog*, which contained a section on veterans. The section read as follows:

Many veterans must now decide where to continue their education. Those who had already begun their college work at the University of Georgia will probably return there. Even they do not know the whole story of the University’s preparations for them. The men and women who have never enrolled at Georgia can have but little conception of how admirably the University is to present a wide and varied program.

Those who have planned for the veterans feel that only programs with real content will satisfy men and women who have participated in this war. The University is, hence, not presenting or permitting haphazard college work. There is no desire to promote the ‘country club approach’ in the postwar world. For veterans who wish to do work of college grade, the University is prepared to modify its regular degree requirements to meet fairly in the specific needs of each individual student.

New students may be surprised to know that despite the size of the University, there is here a keen interest in the individual. Many counselors serve in the various schools and colleges in the University as a part of the Veterans’ Division, devoted exclusively to the needs of veterans.

The veteran need not be conscious of being somewhat older than the average college student as men and women in the freshmen class range from sixteen to sixty. He will not be subjected to the traditional freshman hazing.

---

43 Thelin.

44 The University of Georgia General Catalog 1945-46, 45, no. 7, 32-33.
The institution promised a commitment to the individual student and an educational experience tailored to the veteran that would not include the hazing and other activities expected of other first-time students in Athens. Administrators wisely had a difficult time envisioning war veterans in rat caps participating in shirttail parades.

Veterans took advantage of the educational opportunities offered by the G.I. Bill. As many as 70% of the students enrolling in colleges and universities after World War II were returning veterans.45 These numbers caught many administrators off guard, as they did not anticipate veterans to enroll in such high numbers.

Campuses welcomed two types of veteran in the years following the passage of the initial G.I. Bill.46 The first type of veteran had served the longest, but had the earliest discharge. This former soldier was older and probably had some type of work experience prior to his service. The first type of veteran may have completed some coursework in college before joining the service. The lure of a paycheck was strong for this student and he or she was more likely to return to the workplace and turn down the government stipend and educational opportunity.

The second type of veteran was closer in age to the traditional college students and had entered the service straight from high school. Since this student may have gotten married or have a child during his or her college experience, the commitment to complete the process was strong. This student was more likely to complete his or her education and earn a degree. Research has shown that younger veterans were more likely to take advantage of the educational benefits of

---

45 Bound and Turner.

the G.I. Bill.\textsuperscript{47} The literature that does exist on the college experience of this population portrays the new, veteran student as a marginalized, singular-focus individual.\textsuperscript{48}

Enrollment at the University of Georgia grew in proportion with the overall enrollment at institutions across the United States. The following tables show these numbers. There is a large spike in enrollment after World War II and an increase in the number of veterans on college campuses. The numbers began to plateau in the years at the end of this case study.

Table 1. Enrollment in Higher Education Institutions\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline
Year & Total Enrollment & Veteran Enrollment \\
\hline
1945 & 1,676,851 & 88,000 \\
1946 & 2,078,095 & 1,013,000 \\
1947 & 2,338,226 & 1,150,000 \\
1948 & 2,403,396 & 975,000 \\
1949 & 2,444,900 & 844,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}


\textsuperscript{49} Keith W. Olson, \textit{The G.I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges} (Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1974), 44. Olsen did not included data related to 1944. The following year, 1950, saw a decrease in the total enrollment to 2,281,298 with the veteran enrollment dropping to 581,000.
Table 2. Enrollment in the University of Georgia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Veteran Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>4935</td>
<td>3744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>7214</td>
<td>4277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>7846</td>
<td>3662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>7780</td>
<td>3296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students looked forward to the veterans’ arrival on campus, but were also aware of the challenges facing the institutions. Their caution is evident in a 1944 editorial in *The Red and Black*:

Throughout the University professors with vision are preparing for the reception of the men who will come back to college after years of military training. New courses are being planned while old courses are undergoing modernization. Housing is being studied as continual improvements are made to the physical plant of the University. The "G.I. Bill of Rights" provides free tuition and $50 per month for room and board for all students.

---


51 “Enrollment Up To 1,774 Total; 60 G.I.’s Enter,” *The Red and Black*, 29 September, 1944, p. 1.


54 The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947.

55 The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1948-1949.

veterans who wish to continue their education, if they were under 25 years of age when they were called to the services. University officials are doing well to lay plans for a part of those 10 million men. They hope that a large number of the thousands of former Navy Pre-Flight cadets will return to the campus that has impressed them during the war. Students will do well to prepare for the return of the veterans to colleges, but their preparations should be in another direction. They should prepare themselves by earnestly applying themselves to their classroom work in order to be able to stand in the stiff competition for jobs after the war.\footnote{Planning for Veterans,” \emph{The Red and Black}, 29 September 1944, p. 4.}

This traditional student anticipated the maturity and motivations of the veterans and challenged his peers to rise to the level that would be set in the classroom.

**Administrators’ Fears**

Many college officials had concerns about the G.I. Bill and its potential impact on their campuses.\footnote{Fears of this nature are common in the history of higher education. For an overview of this topic, see Harold S. Wheeler, “An Academic Gresham’s Law: Group Repulsion as a Theme in American Higher Education,” In \emph{ASHE Reader on the History of Higher Education}, eds. Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler, 529-544. Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Simon and Schuster Custom Publishing, 1989.} Some administrators longed for a return to normalcy with traditional age students and a campus culture similar to the one in the 1930s.\footnote{Thelin.} They felt an influx of older, combat-experienced students might alter this experience.

Administrators also feared potential tension between the traditional students beginning college directly from high school and older, more mature or cosmopolitan veterans.\footnote{Gary L. Hylander, “The Educational Features of the G.I. Bill and its Impact on Selected Boston Area Universities” (Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1985).} Would the veterans who had experienced battle in the trenches be able to share classrooms with students fresh from the care of their parents? The leaders on some campuses feared the older students would marginalize themselves and not enjoy or contribute to the collegiate experience. This fear
was fueled by friction that existed on some campuses between military training cadets and students during the war. At the University of Georgia, the editors of *The Red and Black* chastised the cadets from the Pre-Flight School for their behavior at a football game in 1943.\(^{61}\) Dean Tate briefed President Caldwell on the matter after the editorial ran in the paper.

I realize that the editorial in the Red and Black may have added fuel to the flame, but personally I felt that the editorial was very conservative and fair. It expressed appreciation of the courtesy of the Navy Band in playing for us but quite logically called attention to the fact that the two student groups did not very well merge in the same cheering section, a state of affairs that would exist wherever two student groups under separate administrative control and with separate educational purposes were thrown together helter-skelter. It was an editorial asking for cooperation and not carrying specific criticism.\(^{62}\)

Some administrators considered segregating the returning veterans from their younger classmates. They felt that the two different groups of students might be best served by two distinct curriculums or separate lectures covering the same material. This approach may have been motivated by a fear of potential tension and classroom disturbances. Some educators felt that veterans would water down classroom discussion with cynicism or hostility toward authority. One faction of the academy felt that veterans would simply slow down the educational endeavor with restlessness or laziness.

These critics in higher education of the inclusion of veterans on campuses were countered by another group of faculty and administrators who felt the veterans would be strong assets to their campuses. The educators saw benefit in the returning soldiers’ “added maturity, increased

---


\(^{62}\) William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, October 11, 1943, Harmon Caldwell Papers.
initiative, greater sense of purpose and social consciousness, and wider experience." In truth, no one could predict what would happen when veterans arrived on campus and in the classroom.

The deluge of veterans on campuses created another harsh reality for administrators. For the first time, they had to compete to recruit and struggle to retain their faculty members. Other institutions were poaching professors from the University of Georgia. The promise of higher pay and the shortage of potential housing in Athens were challenges for the deans at the University. Dean Tate was forced to set aside 30 temporary trailers to house new faculty members who could not find housing in Athens.

G.I. Bill and Underrepresented Populations

Any treatment of the G.I Bill must consider the effect on underrepresented populations on campus. In 1994, some journalists marked the fifty-year anniversary of the G.I. Bill with a retrospective in which they referred to the Act as the “great democratizer” and the United States’ “greatest single piece of social legislation”.

While the legislation did help change some perceptions on college campuses and improve access for some socioeconomic groups, it did not bring the sweeping shifts that some scholars believe.

African-American veterans were eligible to take advantage of the G.I. Bill’s academic benefits. Unfortunately many found that they did not have the academic preparation required to

---

63 Keith W. Olson, 23.

64 The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947.

enroll at institutions.\textsuperscript{66} These veterans were not able to attend the University of Georgia until the institution was integrated in 1961.

The years following World War II saw a stall in the number of women attending colleges and universities around the United States. With men returning to campuses, fewer women were admitted because males now filled their spots in the classrooms. Schwartz wrote,

> From the perspective of social advancement, war had been good for American women. Women were able to gain footholds on college campuses when men went to war, beginning with the Civil War and continuing through World Wars I and II. Ironically, it was the common military experience of war and the overwhelming male presence on college campuses after World War II, due to the G. I. Bill, which restored and almost exclusively ‘male’ college culture to American higher education, a condition which had not existed since the antebellum years.\textsuperscript{67}

Women veterans did take advantage of the benefits of the 1944 Bill, but in much smaller numbers than their male counterparts. Female veterans represented “less than 3 percent of those in armed services”, and “by 1956, 2, 232,000 veterans had been educated under the GI Bill, of whom 64,728 were women”.\textsuperscript{68} These small proportions were surprising considering the prominent roles women had on campus during the War.

While some historians and higher education scholars believe the G.I. Bill served as a major key to open the gates of colleges and universities to a more diverse socioeconomic population, others feel that the legislation helped those who would have attended college


\textsuperscript{68} Barbara M. Soloman, \textit{In the Company of Educated Women} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985).
regardless of government assistance.\textsuperscript{69} Even if the statistics do not show an increase in the diversification on campuses, attitudes did change. Administrators perceived a change in access to higher education and the necessary mobilization of the war and battlefield experiences began to minimize class differences on campuses.\textsuperscript{70} Returning students found it difficult to look down upon their fellow soldiers, regardless of their backgrounds.

\textsuperscript{69} Olson; Scott Gelber, “Pathways to the Past: Historical Perspectives on Access to Higher Education,” \textit{Teachers College Record} 29, no. 10 (2007): 2252-2286.

Chapter 4
The Veteran at the University of Georgia

The first veterans reaping the benefits of the G.I Bill of Rights entered the University in June of 1944 for the summer school quarter.\textsuperscript{71} About 60 veterans began attending classes at the University of Georgia in September of 1944, increasing campus enrollment to 1,774.\textsuperscript{72} The addition of former soldiers to the student body was noticeable. The \textit{Pandora}, describing the scene on campus for Freshman Week, September 18-26, read, “World War II veterans galore. Some of them were one-armed, one legged. Others limping from battle wounds.”\textsuperscript{73} The student body was going through a transformation.

The returning soldiers were neither anonymous nor ignored by the student body. These men and women were minor celebrities; the Student Council asked them to be introduced as the guests of honor at an assembly for the War Loan Drive on campus.\textsuperscript{74} While the veterans appreciated the recognition and tolerated the celebrity, the novelty would soon wear off as former soldiers would become a common sight in Athens and students would strive for some semblance of normalcy.

A striking juxtaposition existed between the horrors of war and the relative tranquility of campus life. This difference was not lost on the student body. The editor of \textit{The Red and Black}  


\textsuperscript{72} “Enrollment Up To 1,774 Total; 60 G.I.’s Enter,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 29 September 1944, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{73} 1945 Pandora, Volume 58, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{74} “University Sets War Bond Goal at $30,000; Navy Band Plays For Rally In Assembly Tuesday,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 23 June 1944, p. 1.
invited two returned Marines to his office one night to watch the staff work on the next edition of the newspaper. After reflecting on the evening, the editor wrote,

These weren't just Marines, they were veterans of the famed First Marine Division, veterans of Guadacanal, Cape Gloster and a dozen other major engagements – they were men among children. Men who had seen the most horrible war that animals can conflict against each other. Men who had seen their friends writhe in agony as a Jap dug his bayonet into their intestines. Men who had seen buddies scream with agony and roll in the dirt as a magnesium bomb ate the flesh away from the bones, and men who had cried when they heard that the Japs had dug out their corpsmen’s eyes, cut out their tongues, and turned them loose in the Jungle to starve. These men watched civilians spend a pleasant evening ‘composing’ The Red and Black.75

While the veteran attempted to downplay the differences in experiences between themselves and their traditional student peers, neither group could ignore that differences did exist.

Veterans Division

In 1944, after the passage of the G.I. Bill of Rights, President Caldwell organized a Veterans Division at the University of Georgia. Institutions with large influxes of veterans received federal funds to establish administrative offices to aid the returning soldiers. Caldwell selected Robert M. Strozier, Associate Dean of Students, to provide leadership to this new Division.76 Strozier had served as Director of the Army Specialized Training Program during the War and had experience working with this student population. The Veterans Division provided oversight to the bureaucracy of the G.I. Bill, met the various needs of veterans on campus and provided programs for the general public. A former soldier’s first connection with the University was through this Division, as veterans wishing to take training courses or seek a degree at the University of Georgia picked up applications from Strozier’s office in the Academic Building.


before submitting them to the Veterans Administration Office in Atlanta. The Division continued to work with veterans throughout their time at the University.

The Veterans Guidance Center was housed within the newly created Veterans Division. President Caldwell charged the Guidance Center with the tasks of helping veterans establish career plans, administering exemption tests for coursework, and meeting veterans’ various counseling needs. Weekly discussion groups were offered to assist veterans with the transition to civilian life. These groups were facilitated by faculty in the psychology department. Students went to the Center in Baldwin for a variety of reasons; including career guidance, tutoring, and counseling for depression. All veterans could make use of the programs and services with no charge to their student accounts. Veterans in Athens and the surrounding area could take advantage of the career guidance opportunities offered through the Center, even if they were not students at the University. By October of 1946, over 2000 veterans from the University and northern Georgia had visited the Guidance Center.

While the Center was able to assist many veterans, the administration did not always run smoothly. University staff often clashed with the representative from the Veterans Administration. The two groups had different philosophies and objectives. The differences


78 Dyer.

79 “Guidance Center Designed To Help Veterans Choose Their Profession,” *The Red and Black*, 8 February 1946, p. 6.


81 Dyer.
were resolved and the Center continued to offer assistance to veterans. The administration was cognizant of the replication of services that was taking place in various areas of campus. This awareness was evident in the following excerpt from the 1946-1947 Annual Report.

The Veterans Division serves as a liaison office between the University and the Veterans Administration, and between the University and the veterans enrolled at the University. The work of the Veterans Division is very closely coordinated with the office of the Comptroller, Registrar, Dean of Students, and Guidance Center. Much of the work of this office is similar to the work performed by the director of admissions.82

The staff spent much of their time directing students to the correct office and trying not to overstep their responsibilities. The University watched peer institutions centralize counseling on their campuses, combining services offered to veterans and the general student body. In the spring of 1947, the services of the Guidance Center in Baldwin Hall were opened to all students.83

The Division sponsored or co-sponsored various educational opportunities for the general public. Many of these programs provided the public with information on how to assist veterans with their transition to civilian lives. Staff members also brought in speakers from outside the University to facilitate workshops on topics relevant to veterans’ lives. In November of 1944, the Division invited to campus prominent speakers from around the nation for a three-day conference on returning veterans. University faculty offered assistance to this conference by leading round-table discussions after the major speakers gave their presentations.84

82 The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947.

83 “All Students Welcome to Use Baldwin Hall Guidance Center,” The Red and Black, 4 April 1947, p. 20.

84 “Post War Problems To Be Discussed in Conference Here,” The Red and Black, 9 November 1945, p. 5.
While the Veterans Division at the University was very active, it lacked consistent leadership. Three different individuals lead the Division in its first two years of existence. Kenneth Williams, Dean of the College of Education was the director after Strozier took a leave of absence. Glenn Sutton, a faculty member in business administration, succeeded Williams. In the fall of 1945, Thomas Askew took over as director of the Division after his release from the Navy. The turnover in leadership presented administrative challenges to students served by the Division.

Veterans wanted a more streamlined process as they felt they were often given the runaround when they sought answers to their problems or explanations of their benefits. The Veterans Division turned down the offer of an additional staff member in an effort to reduce the bureaucracy for students. Dean Tate felt that a smaller office could meet student needs with greater ease. Askew led the Division for the next three years until he was promoted to University Registrar. The student body supported this move and felt an admiration for the new registrar. This admiration was evident by an editorial in *The Red and Black*. The editor wrote,

> We think the Board of Regents made a wise and happy choice in its selection of Dr. Askew, who has done an excellent job as head of the veterans division. He and his staff have made the veterans office a refuge of friendly, helpful service to many harassed student veterans. The attitude of the office has always been one of pleasantness and politeness. This stands in sharp contrast to some offices on the campus.

---

85 Dyer; Strozier would complete his doctorate degree at the University of Chicago during his leave of absence. He never returned to the University of Georgia, but did go on to serve as the President of Florida State University.


87 William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, June 1946, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

Students felt that they often navigated an unfriendly, bureaucratic maze and appreciated the effort made by Askew and his staff to reduce confusion and offer a friendly face.

Veteran Organizations

Veterans wasted no time in forming student organizations based on their common experiences and needs. Returning servicemen and women wanted to be viewed as normal students, but realized they had specific challenges and interests. In October of 1944, a group of 50 World War II veterans met in Demosthenian Hall to form the University Veterans' Association. Unlike later veteran organizations, this group was primarily focused on social events for returning soldiers at the University.

The Mangleburg-Elrod Post No. 175 was the first American Legion Post established on a college campus in the south. The post, chartered on January 18, 1945, was named for the first University graduates to lose their lives in World War II. While the Post was coed, it consisted of mainly male veterans. Only one female student belonged to the Post, and she served as historian of the organization. Both she and her husband were students and veterans of the War. The American Legion post was not an official campus organization, as it was not subject to the policies governing other organizations. Members were frustrated by the perceived lack of interest in the Post, as seen in this letter from a member.

---


90 1945 Pandora, Volume 58, p. 75. The Post was the first on a university campus in the south and the third in the nation. Other colleges and universities turned to the University of Georgia Post for information on how to organize.
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To function properly it requires the support of the faculty, student body and above all, all veterans on our campus. This, however, seems to be lacking considerably . . . It is therefore hoped that this matter will be given some very serious thought, and that all veterans will do their utmost to attend all meetings in the future, as it is essential that we have full support of all those that are eligible for membership to this post. The fact that there is a great deal depending on the success of the Mangleburg-Elrod Post cannot be stressed too much.93

The University chartered the League of Women Veterans on January 24, 1946. The members were initiated in a ceremony “featuring lighted candles, soft music, the reading of poetry, and group singing.”94 This organization provided social, support, and service opportunities for women who served in the military. The Marine Corps League came to campus and provided opportunities for veterans of that branch of the service. The League at the University of Georgia was the first chartered on a college campus in the United States.95 According to the Pandora, these organizations became very active on campus, mirroring similar veteran organizations outside academia, which were growing around the nation.96

The most active of these campus organizations was the Student Veterans Association, which was founded in February of 1946.97 The Student Veterans Committee on campus, with the support of the Veterans Division and Thomas Askew, recommended that a group be created to merge the identities of veteran students. When voicing his support for the new organization, Askew noted, “I believe that a veterans club is needed and I believe this organization should be

---

93 “Letters to the Editor,” The Red and Black, 6 July 1945, p. 2.
97 Dyer
primarily a student organization rather than a veterans organization as the average veteran
prefers to think of himself primarily as a student rather than as a veteran.”
Askew’s comments mirrored those of veterans on campus. The Student Veterans Association would become an
integral part of campus culture, taking an active role in improving the conditions of student
housing.

Criticism of Veterans

Veterans at the University of Georgia garnered the attention of state leaders shortly after
their arrival on campus. General Sandy Beaver, a member of the University’s Board of Regents,
was critical of the veterans’ performances in the classroom. He argued that returning soldiers
were loafing on campus and not focused on their scholastic responsibilities and that increased
government funding would only exasperate this problem. Beaver felt the housing shortage would
improve if veterans were more diligent in their scholastic work. The Student Veterans
Organization did not ignore this challenge, and its president attributed Beaver’s remarks to an
educational leadership philosophy that was outdated and “on the decline in Georgia.” Dean
William Tate stepped in as peacemaker and stated, “Although the influx of veterans has lasted
for such a short time that no definite statement can be made, my personal opinion as a teacher
and my official opinion as Dean of Students both indicate that the veteran is behaving better,
attending class more regularly, and making more satisfactory grades than the other students.

98 “Veterans Meet For Two Fold Purpose Feb. 4 In Fine Arts,” The Red and Black, 1 February
1946, p. 1.

99 “Returning Veterans Dislike Questioning,” The Red and Black, 9 February 1945, p 1; “Don’t

100 “Veterans Blast Sandy Beaver,” The Red and Black, 19 April 1946, p. 1.
Tate’s defense of the veterans displayed a growing respect he had for this student population. He had been impressed by the maturity and discipline displayed by the students since their arrival in Athens. President Caldwell shared Tate’s assessment of the new student population. At a faculty meeting in 1946, Caldwell “pointed out that in our student body now we have more mature students among the veteran group and insisted that all courses in the University be of highest quality” to challenge the capable students. Current students also noticed the veterans’ contributions to the University. One student wrote, “Classrooms have swelled with the entrance of former servicewomen and more and older men . . . there is a keynote of maturity, masculinity, and seriousness of purpose that has been lacking in many of the wartime classes.” The success of veterans on campus was not only anecdotal; the results were also evident in the classroom. According to Dr. Askew, Director of the Veterans Division, “The veterans, being more mature, are generally more serious-minded and make a slightly higher percent age of A's and R's than do other male students.”

This maturity and sense of purpose was on display when a group of 43 veterans visited with Tate in his office in August of 1945. The representatives from the American Legion Post voiced five grievances they had with the institution. These grievances included the housing problem on campus, the general attitude of Chancellor Sanford and the Board Regents,

101 Faculty Minutes of the University of Georgia, April 3, 1946. Caldwell’s appraisal of the veterans mirrored the earlier predictions of a “more mature and diligent student body” from Chancellor Sanford in 1944; Dyer, 251.
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accusations of demeaning statements by University officials, treatment by faculty and housemothers, and treatment by fraternities. Tate, while not agreeing with all of their frustrations, felt the group shared their grievances in a calm, articulate manner.

While Dean Tate attempted to create peace between the veterans and the Board of Regents, the tension never completely dissipated. Some administrators in the University system viewed the Veterans Organization as a pawn for political pressure. At a meeting with veterans in 1947, Frank Healy, Director of Budgets for the University system, said, “The University Administration has never condoned the attempted use of political pressure or the attempt to use the Student Veteran Organization as a sounding board through which to inflame the students of the University against the Board of Regents.”

His words were in response to a rumor that funds paid by the government for veterans’ fees were being sent to other institutions. Veterans at the University were quick to protect the monies they felt should only be used for programs and facilities in Athens.

The Veteran Experience

When veterans began to arrive in Athens, they had some residual frustration from the student body to overcome. Most of the frustration came from the relationship students had formed with cadets at the Navy’s Pre-Flight School. This frustration was evident in the before-mentioned incident at the football game. While trivial, some friction existed when the conversation turned to matters of the heart. At least one student felt his dating opportunities had been limited by the cadets, who garnered the majority of attention from the women on campus.

When asked why they are taking this drastic action, the young ladies reply to the effect that the male students are too young, or that the boys never ask the co-eds for dates
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and the cadets do. These arguments are weak Maybe the boys would be more eager to date the co-eds if they were acquainted with them, and how can they become better acquainted than at an open house? As to the argument about the age of Georgia students that's a poor excuse, unless the co-eds are definitely seeking matrimony. In that case, the cadets can have all the invitations.

One girls' dormitory has already become blacklisted by the male students for holding open house excluding University boys. Lots others fall victim to the same mistake there are two or three things the young ladles and their housemothers should remember.

If the Navy moved out today the co-eds would have to turn to University boys for dates, regardless of the ages of the young men. Also, there will be many occasions arising in the future where the cadets may not be invited. Most important, for the benefit of the "gold diggers" who go with cadets for the money they are able to spend—remember, the war can't last forever and the cadets will soon leave.106

As veterans became acclimated to campus life, they were able to identify common frustrations in their interactions with their civilian classmates. One veteran took it upon himself to offer advice to traditional students on how to interact with him and his fellow soldiers.

‘Don't ask too many questions!’ is the first request that veterans of the University ask of civilians. During an orientation clinic conducted by University administrators, the ex-service men (and one woman) agreed on these points:

Civilians should not be over-sympathetic to the wounded soldier. Talk about things of interest to him and probably not about the war.

Too much publicity is being given to veterans. They would prefer that things be done more quietly but effectively.

Learn to recognize discharge buttons and other veteran insignia. Look for them and don't ask, ‘Why aren't YOU in military service?’107

Conversations with female students provided a different set of embarrassments and frustrations.

One veteran wrote a letter to The Red and Black to discus conversations with females on campus. His advice to the coeds included the following:

Here’s a tip for the University co-eds. Please, when engaging in conversation with a veteran, don’t slip up and call him “sir” as if you were addressing an elderly person.

---
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Those “crow feet” you sometimes see around a veteran’s eyes shouldn’t be mistaken as a sign of middle age. Actually, they were probably acquired from long hours of squinting at the sun from the cockpit of a fighter in the South Pacific.

Veterans want to feel young, so remember this, and don’t call to a veteran friend “sir”. It’s very discomforting to say the least, and particularly so if he’s angling for a date.108

These statements from veterans share one common theme. The older students craved normalcy, and did not want to be treated any different than their younger classmates. While their experiences made for interesting stories for classmates, they were not eager to relive battles or lost comrades. They wanted to enjoy the educational and social opportunities the University had to offer.

Chapter 5
Gubernatorial Controversy

Ellis Arnall, elected in the wake of the Cocking affair, served a four-year term as Governor of Georgia, the first such term in state history. After instituting a series of reforms in the state, Governor Arnall wanted to serve another term. He was prevented from doing so by the state constitution. Arnall handpicked James V. Carmichael, a businessman from Marietta, to run as his successor and continue his “New-Deal” administration against former Governor Eugene Talmadge whose state-rights platform was built primarily on the ideas of states rights and white supremacy. Arnall had worked hard to overcome the fiasco that the former Governor had made higher education in the state and did not want to see his reforms undone by an apparently unchanged Talmadge. At a rally in Greene County, Talmadge told supporters, “The Negro hasn’t any respect for the white man who goes to his home and sits on his front porch. I believe in keeping the races separate.” Comments like this one at rallies around the state showed that his philosophy had not changed after it earlier cost Georgia’s higher education system its accreditation. E.D. Rivers, another former Governor, also sought the 1946 Democratic Primary.

---


Politics on Campus

In 1943, Georgia allowed eighteen-year olds to vote in all local, state, and federal elections for the first time. This change in suffrage had major implications on college campuses in the state and was applauded by students, faculty, and administrators. President Caldwell wrote, “It seems to me that the fact they have the right to vote would lend to make the students more interested in state problems. Those courses which students have been studying in political science and history will change from an academic interest to a practical interest.”

The 1946 election was the first time that the majority of college students would play a role in the selection of state leaders. This new opportunity and the sense of national pride after World War II caused students to show up in mass at state rallies, where they were often the most vocal participants. The University administration anticipated a contentious election with much student involvement. In a letter to an alumnus, William Tate wrote,

President Caldwell, of the University has permitted the students to actively take part in politics, even having the different candidates on the campus to speak; consequently things are more warm than ever before. As Dean of Students and responsible for discipline, I am always worried over what may be happening from time to time. Also, we are having a race much concerned with personalities and the racial problem, so it is going to be a hectic campaign at best or worse. Since students between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one can now vote, we are, of course, expecting a great deal from them in one way or another from their activities.

Tate was more transparent in his displeasure with Caldwell’s decision in a letter to his trusted friend and former staff member, Robert Strozier at the University of Chicago. He wrote, “A letter from Mr. Caldwell to me changes the policies of the University, to permit gubernatorial

---
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candidates to speak on the campus; consequently, I expect hell itself to break loose as one candidate after another appears here. Lord help a sailor on a stormy night like that.” Tate felt that student conduct would suffer as candidates riled up their supporters with stump speeches and propaganda. He did not see a way to keep unruliness off the campus as the campaigns came to Athens.

Tate and other administrators worked very hard to make sure the institution remained neutral during the election. In allowing candidates on campus, Caldwell had stressed, “The University must not, however, discriminate against any candidate; every candidate must have the opportunity, if he wishes, to present his case to the students.” Dean Tate realized the difficulty in this directive, and continued to plead his case to the President. He cited lack of maturity and discipline concerns as the main reasons students could not handle the responsibility of attending peaceful rallies on campus.

Tate was aware that the ire of most students would be directed at Talmadge, who won few friends on campus after his role in the Cocking affair. While Tate remained neutral in his professional role, he personally supported Talmadge. Growing up in Fairmount, GA, Tate’s family had supported Talmadge. Eugene Talmadge would stop at the Tate home for cold buttermilk when he was on the campaign trail. In retirement, Tate reminded Herman Talmadge, “yours is the only full political loyalty of mine—that is, I vote for you come hell or high water. I don’t anticipate you getting into trouble or really having political competition of significance but
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remember that I am with you, even when the going is rough.”

Tate knew that the campaign of the candidate he personally supported would be treated badly on campus. It is possible the Dean did not want to see the campus attacks on Talmadge carried around the state in newspapers.

Tate’s fears of student misconduct were not unfounded, as both experienced and new voters on campus were passionate about the election. Veterans returned to Georgia after exposure to their fellow soldiers from around the country and citizens from around the world. They had experienced ridicule from their fellow soldiers about the behavior of Eugene Talmadge and the negative coverage he had earned the state in the national press. After defending the right for democracy and clean government, they were reminded of their state’s reputation for voter fraud and questionable ballot boxes. The intense dislike for Talmadges on campus led to an attempted hanging and burning of an effigy of Talmadge outside Joe Brown Dormitory. Dean Tate stumbled upon the prank and prevented it at the last minute.

Not all of the candidates’ visits resulted in protests or shouting contests. The Gridiron Club on campus hosted current members E.D. Rivers and Eugene Talmadge, and new member James Carmichael at a meeting in May of 1946. This meeting resulted in civil speeches and Talmadge championing his platform. When questioned about white primaries, he answered, “This is a white man’s country, and if I can’t get elected by white men and women I don’t want

---
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the office.”122 These types of comments served as fodder for the anti-Talmadge students on campus.

University students quickly took sides in the elections. Each candidate developed a following on campus, and each group of students took an outspoken position for its candidate’s qualifications.123 A group of students organized a new organization on campus during the 1946 campaign; The Student Voter’s League stood in direct opposition to Talmadge’s candidacy. In a letter to *The Red and Black*, the president outlined the group’s philosophy when he wrote:

Georgia students are thoroughly familiar with the issues which were at stake in the gubernatorial race of 1942. Many of us were here at that time and we then observed that as long as Eugene Talmadge remained Governor of Georgia political interference in our University System would not be corrected. For that reason we pledged him our uncompromising opposition. Because students here at present believe that the danger to Georgia education would exist if Talmadge should again be elected and because we believe that a Rivers victory would present other fundamental dangers to our State, we have organized the Student Voters league. The League is unalterably opposed to both of these candidates.124

Students in support of Talmadge formed the Young Statesman’s Club. This organization kept its membership roster secret in order that no discriminatory measures may be taken against them in view of the fact that Mr. Talmadge has such extreme opposition in some quarters on the campus.”125

The majority of veterans supported Carmichael “because his platform advocating fiscal conservatism, industrial development, agricultural diversification, improved education, and a

---
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positive national image reflected their own vision of what constituted ‘good government’.”

His reputation among the veterans was strengthened when he promised to improve their housing conditions in stump speeches. Carmichael was aware of the potential power in the votes of the recently franchised men returning from the war and actively courted their support. At a speech from the Moultrie, GA courthouse, Carmichael said, “There are no persons in Georgia more interested in seeing decent and honest government than the young men and young women who served in the armed forces. War veterans are not interested in avoiding work and they do not want to be made wards of the state.”

A number of student organizations at the University of Georgia supported Carmichael’s campaign. These organizations included the Student Voters League, the Inter-Fraternity Council, Woman’s Student Government, and the Woman’s Student Veterans. In fact, Carmichael won over 85 percent of the votes in a straw poll conducted on campus by several honor organizations at the request of the Student Voters League.

Three Governors

James Carmichael had served as an executive assistant under Governor Arnall and was in charge of the State Revenue Department. His experience, the backing of the current Governor, and the anti-Talmadge movement in the state gave Carmichael an apparent lead in the state. In
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the primary, Talmadge took only forty-three percent of the popular vote.\textsuperscript{122} Carmichael won the popular vote, but lost the primary and governorship for two main reasons. A controversial county system gave an advantage in elections to the rural areas of Georgia instead of the metropolitan areas. E.D. Rivers name on the ballot split the anti-Talmadge vote between himself and Carmichael. Talmadge did take the majority of the county unit votes and won the election in November of 1946.

The celebration for Talmadge supporters was short-lived, as the newly elected Governor died on December 21, 1946. The state was suddenly without apparent leadership. Eugene Talmadge’s death created a controversy that garnered national attention.\textsuperscript{133}

After Talmadge’s death, different factions made claims to the governor’s seat. Ellis Arnall supported the claim of newly elected Lieutenant Governor Melvin E. Thompson. The Governor said he would resign from his position and turn power over to the newly elected Lieutenant Governor as soon as Thompson was qualified.\textsuperscript{134} Recent changes to the state constitution did not provide for the ascension of the Lieutenant Governor to the position of Governor, and the power to select the next state leader was in the hands of the legislature.

During the campaign leading up to the Democratic Primary, Talmadge’s supporters had noticed his apparent failing health. The normally charismatic orator struggled to keep his focus at stump speeches and would lose his train of thought. His appearance grew gaunt as the election
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approached. Talmadge’s faction had orchestrated write-in votes for the former Governor’s son in case the elder Talmadge’s health continued to fail. The General Assembly chose Herman Talmadge, son of the deceased Governor based on the number of write-in votes he had received in the general election.\(^{135}\)

Arnall was not happy with the selection of the son of his bitter rival and refused to acknowledge the legislative vote. Instead, he resigned as Governor once Thompson was sworn in, allowing Thompson to take his position. During this period, Talmadge locked Arnall and Thompson out of the Governor’s office. To prevent further bedlam, the Georgia Supreme Court ruled that Thompson was to serve as Governor until the 1948 general election. The students took sides as the Talmadge coalition and Arnall battled for control of the Governor’s office. Over 500 students signed a petition issued by Talmadge supporters. The petition read,

> We, the undersigned students of the University of Georgia, want to take this opportunity to express our thanks, and show our confidence, to the members of the legislature of the State of Georgia. We know that the legislators have had a trying session, such as has no precedent in the history of the State of Georgia. We believe that you have done your legal duty in electing Herman Talmadge to be governor for the next four years. We don’t claim to represent all of the students of the University of Georgia, but there are over 6,000 of us. Neither can the authors of other resolutions claim to be ‘the students” of the University.'\(^{136}\)

A smaller, but perhaps more vocal group, led by members of the Student Voter’s League, issued their own petition:


The undersigned students of the University of Georgia, representing various groups on the campus, congratulate you on your courageous fight for law and order in Georgia. It is our firm belief that the General Assembly has no Constitutional authority to elect a Governor. We deplore the riotous manner in which the supporters of the pretender to the Governorship have attempted to establish mob rule to thwart the will of the people. We recall your fight in 1942 and remain ever grateful for the restoration of our credits, through your efforts, by action of the 1943 General Assembly.\textsuperscript{137}

In January of 1947, around 50 students from the University of Georgia traveled to Atlanta to participate in a demonstration against Herman Talmadge. At this demonstration, protestors carried swastikas to represent the accusations against the newly elected Governor. Dean William Tate issued a statement about the protest. In his statement, he wrote, “As far as the administration knows, there has been no election by any student group of an official delegate for such a purpose.”\textsuperscript{138} Tate went on to stress that the students were acting as individual citizens, but were responsible to the University for any misconduct.

Students remained active in politics through the 1948 election. In July of that year, Ellis Arnall campaigned in Athens in support of Melvin Thompson. Over 2,550 students and residents attended his stump speech.\textsuperscript{139} While the majority of people in attendance were Thompson supporters, some Talmadge hecklers were in the crowd. Despite opposition, Herman Talmadge emulated his father’s style and embraced his platform en route to an overwhelming victory over Thompson.

The campus continued to offer a variety of political organizations and clubs. A satirical editorial in \textit{The Red and Black} described the political scene on campus at the close of the 1940s.
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We might say that we got politicians to burn. As a matter of fact, some of them probably will burn eventually. We got Talmadge men and their opponents, individuals who are placed on campus by the corporation and big-money interests, Rosenwald spies, etc.). Then, we got Democrats, after a fashion; Dixiecrats, after publicity; and Republicans, after a forlorn hope.

We did have a few Wallace men until the Communist witch-hunts scared them all into the underground last spring. As it stands now, the idealist from the corn belt ain't got a grain of a chance.¹⁴⁰

Students were engaged in the political process in the state and national levels. This energy did not transfer to attentions to matters at the University. With the variety of political affiliations and student involvement, the administration hoped students’ energy would transfer to a student government on campus.

¹⁴⁰ “Clutching for Culture,” The Red and Black, 15 October 1948, p. 4.
Chapter 6

Student Government

Student governments did not emerge on college campuses until the early part of the twentieth century. One of the first examples of governance by students was on the campus of the University of North Carolina when the president of the institution recognized a student council in 1904.\textsuperscript{141} Student governance was common on college campuses by the 1920s and grew exponentially during the period after World War II. The maturity and decision-making ability of returning veterans contributed to this growth.\textsuperscript{142} Across the nation, returning students were eschewing the activism of college generations and turning to student government to change their circumstances.\textsuperscript{143} A fully representative student government did not exist at the University of Georgia during the era covered by this case study.

Women’s Student Government

A Women’s Student Government was very active on the Coordinate Campus of the University. William Tate wrote, “The University has some aspects of student government-including a Student Council for Women’s Government, which has the privilege and responsibility of regulating certain conduct in the dormitories.”\textsuperscript{144} Women on the coordinate campus had a student government responsibilities including discipline of their peers, but
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administrators sometimes limited their power by altering decisions made by the group. In one example, a female student went in front of the Women’s Student Government for a violation of policies. The group followed its process and decided not to suspend the student. They instead sanctioned her to campus, prohibiting travel and providing a strict curfew. The administration did not feel this sanction was sufficient, and strongly recommended that the student leaders change their decision. The group reconvened and suspended the young lady upon the recommendation of the Dean of Women, Edith Stallings.

In January of 1948, the administration created the Office of the Dean of Women. Under this office, the Women’s Student Government saw an increase in their responsibilities. The House Directors’ job descriptions changed, eliminating the majority of their rule enforcement responsibilities and emphasizing their roles as hostesses. The members of the Women’s Student Government now helped enforce the policies they created, electing monitors to oversee conduct in the residence halls and sorority houses. In addition to enforcement responsibilities, they also heard all cases involving rule infractions. The administration commended the Student Government for the way they handled their new responsibilities. In the 1947-1948 Report of the Office of the Dean of Women, Edith Stallings wrote,

> In my opinion, the Council has exercised exceptionally good judgment. They have tried each case on its own merits and have been impartial and just in their considerations. They have recommended suspension in one instance which was upheld by the Administration. They are rewriting their rule book at this time with great care and effort to justify each rule. The attitude of the women students as a whole to this new responsibility is most commendable and although, as anything quite new, it will take time to perfect the

---
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legislative and judiciary functions, they have been wise in seeking advice and using it to advantage.\textsuperscript{147}

In some ways the Women’s Student Government had more power and responsibility than many student governments on today’s college and university campuses. Since the student government handled conduct issues, staff members in the Office of the Dean of Women were able to spend their time focusing on planning and counseling.

Proposals and Constitutions

Male students on the main campus did not have a student government, but some men felt this type of organization was essential. Students felt a self-governing body would be a sign of maturity to those in the state who did not take the college experience seriously.

Georgia has become known and a place of play and little discipline; of crisp courses, and abbreviated substance; a place where students like to be called men and women, but none-the-less refuse to grow up and accept the responsibilities which are associated with the term.

With each passing day, the failure of the students to comprehend the significance of what is really taking place argues ill for the future development of the University. This condition will continue to exist until we decide that we are willing to pay the price that maturity of thought and action demand.\textsuperscript{148}

Prior to the arrival of the veterans on campus, there was a movement for community government. This type of representation included representatives from all groups on campus; including students, faculty, and staff.\textsuperscript{149} Community campus governance emphasized students’ participation in decision-making and campus involvement. The concept was reflective of the
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World War II attitude that each person had a responsibility to contribute to the well being of the community.

A very controversial student council did exist on campus, but the organization was highly dysfunctional. This group of student leaders was comprised of the heads of the clubs and honor organizations at the University of Georgia. The administration often turned to the student council for a better understanding of students’ perspectives on matters related to policy or budget. Students who were not involved in co-curricular activities did not have representation in the student council, a point often emphasized by critics of the student council. Members of the council felt that they had very limited powers, related specifically to campus elections and campus war bond drives and philanthropic initiatives.\textsuperscript{150} The group was often hampered by in-fighting and power struggles. Dean Tate, as was his custom, addressed the student body about the matter through a letter to \textit{The Red and Black}.

In the long view of student affairs on the University campus, it seems clear that we need and should have an over-all all-campus organization to represent all students. Despite the recent bickering in the Student Council, I trust that organization or some similar organization can be so modified that it will nerve this function. I cannot believe that with our general good Georgia spirit that the groups cannot ultimately bury minor group difficulties when there is some program that only a campus-wide support can achieve.\textsuperscript{151}

The students and the administrators seemed to be ready for some new type of governing body on campus.

Members of the student council began to put together a proposal for a new student government on campus. Students were interested in the new proposal and hoped that its ideas would eliminate the petty politics that had taken over the student council, which often found
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organizations fighting for their own interests and losing the perspective of the greater student body.\textsuperscript{152} Once the proposal was debated and amended, it was to be submitted to the administration for approval. A two-hour debate resulted in the proposal being tabled for further discussion after the student council could not come to agreement on language. The administration never had the opportunity to offer its input or suggestions on the matter.

Students opposed to a student government on campus gave several reasons for their negative opinions of the proposed organization. Some students felt that representatives would have to neglect their academic pursuits if they hoped to truly represent students. Another argument was built on the belief that incoming veterans would never agree to be lead by younger students, leading to an all-veteran student government. The main objection to the new student government was the proposed disciplinary responsibilities of the elected students. These critics “asserted that the student court will be responsible to the families of defendants in the event they were convicted and that no student will wish to make enemies in that way.”\textsuperscript{153} This argument, primarily from fraternity men, was similar to the one that killed a proposed honor code at the University in 1944. The debate became so heated at one meeting of the student council that half of the students in attendance walked out in frustration. The faculty noticed the dysfunction of the group and its inability to agree on a common interest. One faculty member, when asked for his comment on student government responded, “‘How can I express an opinion about something


which, apparently, is not clear to the students themselves? The administration did not understand why students found it difficult to clarify what they wanted in representation.

The student council was too large a group with too many vested interests to come to any agreement that satisfied all factions in the student government debate. The proponents of the movement continued to work, as they felt success would improve campus morale and increase student involvement with campus activities. A group of students developed a proposal and constitution for a self-governing body and submitted it to President Caldwell and Dean Tate in the spring of 1946. The administration approved the proposed constitution and it went before the student body for a popular vote that March.

Prior to the vote, both sides articulated their arguments in letters to the editor and in various campus debates. Handbills from both sides of the argument flooded students at the University. The referendum for a new student government was defeated with 1210 votes against the proposed constitution and 652 votes in support of the measure. Turnout was high for the election, with four-fifths of the students body casting a vote. With that many students voting, apathy was not the reason behind the failure of the motion.

---
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Interest in student government began to increase again in April of 1947. Dean Tate called an open forum in the campus chapel to discuss the matter, after he was approached by a group of students and faculty. Tate, a former student body president at the University, wanted to see a successful and active student government on campus. His Director of Student Activities warned him that there would be tension between the Greek students and the non-Greeks. At this meeting, a committee was put together to study systems used at other colleges and universities. The veterans on campus took an active role in the development of the plan, but the committee chose to operate without a faculty advisor. Students felt they were capable of producing a feasible plan without the assistance of the administration. Eventually momentum began to dissipate and the process was abandoned.

When the topic came up again in January of 1948, students were cautious. Having seen past movements fail, one student offered sound advice in a Red and Black editorial.

The administration has offered to give a duly elected student government control of student affairs short of dismissing persons from the University. Inevitably, however, any student actions will be subject to approval by the president, the chancellor, and the board of regents. A student government need not be merely a rubber stamp, but neither can it be expected to create a country club.

Among the student affairs in which all students should have a more active voice are these: control of student elections; distribution of student activity funds; coordination of charitable fund-raising drives; sponsorship of social events, including Homecoming and Little Commencement; and setting standards of conduct and discipline.

The most careful planning will be fruitless if the student body is not convinced of the need for student government and the workability of the plan. Any government without the confidence and support of its people is already dead.

---
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While the students wanted to see a student government on campus, he urged caution in avoiding the mistakes made in past proposals.

The Director of Student Affairs supported a student government and entertained a group of proponents in a brainstorming session at his home. While the Director did not want to force this new leadership on the student body, he saw three major benefits. The Director believed that involvement would be a crucial part of a student’s education, would provide context as to why certain decisions are made by the administration, and would provide the administration with ideas of what students needed and wanted. President Caldwell also supported the initiative. He went so far as to provide a list of powers he was willing to turn over to a student government.

1. All the powers necessary to unite the students of the University of Georgia in a self-governing body.
2. Legislation over matters necessary to the supervision and coordination of student activities.
3. Establishment of a judiciary system for the enforcement of disciplinary regulations.
5. Sponsorship of meetings, celebrations, etc., for extraordinary occasions.
6. Appointment or election of representatives to the electoral boards of student publications.
7. Preparation of the annual budget of student activities for submission to the Director of Student Affairs.

To increase awareness of the student government initiative, the members of a national service fraternity sponsored a contest to determine the best definition of “student government.” Their plan backfired when they received no submissions, leading many on campus to believe that apathy was growing as students wearied of the argument. Critics believed increasing apathy
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would stand in the way of the plan.\textsuperscript{164} The apparent apathy on the part of the student body came at a time when the administration was attempting to shift some powers to students. William Randall, Director of Student Affairs, had changed the plan used for selecting rings for graduating seniors. A group of students protested what they viewed as a loss of their voice in the selection process. President Caldwell agreed with the students and told Randall that he needed to turn the procedure back over to the senior class leadership and Interfraternity Council.\textsuperscript{165}

While the debate continued on the main campus, the Women’s Student Government continued to operate on the coordinate campus. This group was concerned that a few female students were over-burdened with leadership responsibilities in organizations. To better distribute these leadership opportunities, the women’s government voted to implement a point system.\textsuperscript{166} Leadership positions were assigned points and divided into two groups. The student government would keep track of point totals and asked student organizations to aid them by self-regulating.

The Women’s Student Government took on an even greater role in conduct regulation that year. The housemothers in the dormitories and sorority houses were relieved of disciplinary responsibilities.\textsuperscript{167} Elected women in those halls would begin to enforce policies through a series


\textsuperscript{165}“President Proposes To Leave Ring Sales in Students' Hands,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 5 March 1948, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{166}“Women’s Student Government Puts Point System into Effect,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 7 May 1948, p. 4.

of warnings and demerits. Once a female student accumulated a certain number of demerits, she would be restricted to the campus for one week.

Women were included in the main campus student government debate as well. One point of contention was whether they should be allowed to participate since they had a self-governing body on the coordinate campus. When Alpha Pi Omega, a service fraternity, conducted a poll on interest in student government, a larger percentage of women took the time to complete the survey.¹⁶⁸ Female students had seen the value of self-government and wanted to see it spread to the main campus.

The students at the University of Georgia were not ready for a self-governing body. When the student newspaper from Yale sent a letter suggesting an exchange of ideas with The Red and Black, the editor had a telling response.

The letter from Yale mentions something about comparing "various forms of student government." They got us there. We'd be happy to send them all the details of our "vacuous forms of student government." but beyond that we can't do much. Student government at Georgia has been dead a long time and save for a periodic editorial re-embalming, we've been content to ghost along on the memory.¹⁶⁹

Students were becoming increasingly numb to the repeated failed ventures to implement this type of government. They were aware of the major stumbling blocks, and cynically identified them as “apathy and indifference on the part of the students, and opposition—both open and


¹⁶⁹ “Clutching for Culture,” The Red and Black, 15 October 1948, p. 4.
hidden—by selfish and narrow-minded entrenched political factions.” The two major factions were the IFC and the Grand Old Party (G.O.P.) men on campus.

G.O.P. is the organized group of camps men at the university. No fraternity pledge or active member is allowed to join G.O.P. or to participate in any of its functions or social activities. The purpose of the group is to assure all campus men a chance to reach the top in activities on the University campus. G.O.P is not interested in the money or position that a student’s family might have. It is interested only in the potential talents of its members. Each year G.O.P. elects a Campus Leader and vice Campus Leader to carry out the work of the organization, and to act as a direct contact between the group and other college organizations.

A tension existed between the Greek and non-Greek students on campus, and both sides were afraid that a student government would potentially give the other group control over the campus and funds.

The faculty’s good will and patience began to dissipate as the students continued to bicker. The willingness to trust students with important matters disappeared in a meeting in which some faculty and staff members balked at turning financial matters over to students. The debate was concerned with the division of student activity fees, and the board overturned a decision by former President Harmon Caldwell. Students, while unable to come to a consensus on most things, were angered by the faculty’s actions.

The period covered by the case study ended with no resolution to the debate over student’s self-government. Planning groups continued to meet, but these small committees could

---


171 The GOP Party was founded at the University in 1933 to elect a campus leader and provide leadership opportunities for non-fraternity men. The original constitution for the organization can be found at “Constitution Adopted by G.O.P.,” *The Red and Black*, 3 November 1933, p. 7.
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do little to end campus apathy and bickering over the matter. The administration had grown tired of the continuous cycle and appeared to have disengaged from the possibility. The campus was still in the hands of separate factions, mainly the Interfraternity Council and the Grand Old Party.

While students were unable to reach a consensus related to the need for student government on campus, they did share some common ground on other issues. The next two chapters will examine student movement to bring a shortened class week and an honor code to campus.
Chapter 7

Class Attendance

Students attended classes from Monday through Saturday during the period of this case study. Class attendance was a point of friction on campus, as the topic frustrated students, faculty and administrators. While tardiness and absences were always frowned upon, faculty did not always take a proactive approach when it came to enforcing policy.

Absences

Absences became an issue in the minds of students when veterans arrived on campus, greatly increasing enrollment. Prior to the veterans’ arrival students felt they could get away with missing classes. With enrollment low at the University, their tuition was necessary and the administration was reluctant to remove even repeat violators from class rolls. With students returning to campus, faculty became more diligent in their scrutiny of students’ attendance.\(^{174}\) The new emphasis on enforcement corresponded with new rules associated with absences, drawing criticism from students.

A new policy was enacted which required students to meet with Dean Tate’s office when they had more than one absence in a class. After his or her conference with the Dean’s office, the student’s parents were notified of the problem. If a student missed more than two class meetings, the professor had the right to drop the student from the class.\(^{175}\) The faculty supported the new attendance policy.\(^{176}\)

---

\(^{174}\) “Dean Tate Would Scrap Co-eds for Batch of Fine Husky Males,” *The Red and Black*, 6 October 1944, p. 4.

\(^{175}\) “Dean Tate to Stop Illegal Absences,” *The Red and Black*, 8 November 1944, p. 2.

\(^{176}\) Faculty Minutes of the University of Georgia, February 21, 1945, Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.
Meetings with students about missed classes constituted a considerable portion of the administration’s workload. In a letter to a faculty committee on absences that had been appointed by President Caldwell, Dean Tate wrote, “at least three-fourths of the time of my staff is devoted at times to absences and excuses . . . One of the great advantages of an absence system is the counseling of a student before he is too involved in trouble, and counseling cannot be done when too many students have to be interviewed in a short period of time.” Tate, perhaps correctly, felt that quantity of meetings over quality of educational conversations during meetings would have a negative impact on students.

The student body recognized the strain the absence policy placed on the Dean’s office, and was aware that these conferences took time away from other services to students. The attendance problem continued into the next academic year, and the policy was revised again to assist the University in meeting administrative expectations of the Veterans Administration. While the nuances of the attendance policy changed over the years, the University was clear in its expectations of students. The University’s Student Handbooks included the reminder that “regular attendance at class and laboratory is a student obligation and the unexcused absence or ‘cut’ is not recognized as a student privilege.”

177 William Tate to Faculty Committee on Absences, June 1947, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

178 “Faculty Sketch,” The Red and Black, 2 November 1945, p. 5.

179 “Absence Regulation Changed by Faculty,” The Red and Black, 24 October 1947, p. 1.

180 Rule Book of the University of Georgia, 1943-1944, p. 3; The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1947-1948, p. 6; The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1948-1949, p. 7.
The Director of Student Affairs felt some responsibility for the absences fell on the shoulders of faculty members who haphazardly enforced policies. A student could miss one class entirely and not be held responsible, while another professor may count a student as absent if she or were ten minutes tardy. He felt a consistent approach from professors would send the correct message to students.

Students did not have a shortage of excuses for their absences or tardiness from classes. The Athens bus system was one way a student might attempt to explain his or her empty seat in a classroom. The bus schedule did not match the chapel bell’s signal to change classes. Even if the schedule was similar and students were able to make it to their stops on time, the buses were often late. If the buses were on the same schedule as the bell and were on time, students complained that they could not hear the bell, or they did not have enough time to travel between classes.

Students did not believe they had sufficient time or transportation to travel between campuses for classes. Often, they would hitchhike to make sure they were not late. Male students felt they were at a distinct disadvantage. At least one tardy male expressed his frustration in a letter to The Red and Black.

As long as the group waiting for rides is all male, the unwritten law of hitch-hikers (first come, first ride) is usually followed, but let one specimen of the flower of Southern womanhood appear on the scene, and God help the males!

She assumes that any car which stops in the vicinity has stopped for the express purpose of taking HER to HER destination. If her assumption is not home out by the boys stepping aside to allow her the first ride, it brings out the Amazon in her.

---


182 “Cross Campus,” The Red and Black, 19 April 1946, p. 3.

183 “Letters to the Editor,” The Red and Black, 20 October 1944, p. 4.
For all practical purposes, we assume that the Georgia co-ed is a lady, but her ladylike qualities are seldom demonstrated in this situation. She will elbow, push, shove, and jump ahead of any one to exclaim. "Oh, Thank you. I'm in SUCH a hurry."

It has not come to my attention that women students are required to be in classes in advance of others. To the contrary, it appears that they are rarely penalized for tardiness when they smile sweetly at the professor.

I am for extending every courtesy to the weaker sex when it is deserved, but are these tactics necessary?

Perhaps these femmes in their Ivory towers don't realize the fact that we males also are due at classes. If this is the case, I certainly hope that someone tips them off, but soon\textsuperscript{184}

The transportation problem reached its most difficult point in the fall of 1947. The Athens bus transportation system went on strike, causing students to walk, hitchhike, or pay for cabs in order to get to class.\textsuperscript{185} Luckily for students, the strike only lasted for eight days.\textsuperscript{186}

Five-Day Week

During this era, classes at the University took place six days out of the week. Student attended classes on Saturdays, the day with most overall absences. A large portion of the student body, including veterans through their Veterans Student Organization, pushed for a five-day week, and felt that this change would decrease the number of absences in the classrooms.\textsuperscript{187} The movement for a shorter class week had begun before World War II but had lost steam during and immediately following the conflict. Students returning to the University after the War remembered the initiative and pledged to use their new veteran classmates as support for their

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{184} "Hitch-Hiker Harried," \textit{The Red and Black}, 1 November 1946, p. 4. \\
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argument. One student wrote, “With hundreds of returning veterans who necessarily have more personal business to attend to, free weekends are needed more than ever.”\textsuperscript{188}

The faculty outlined their concerns related to shortening the academic week as early as 1944. The first of these fears was the message a shortened week would provide to Georgia taxpayers.\textsuperscript{189} Legislators in Atlanta had already shared their thoughts that students loafed and did not take their academic responsibilities seriously. Providing students with an additional day off during the week may perpetuate this bias. Faculty also felt that parents could not afford to pay to have their students return home on weekends. This fear presupposed that students would want to leave campus if classes were not in session. Finally, the Dean of Faculties was concerned that a shortened week would make scheduling impossible given the curriculum demands of the quarter system.

Students felt that these concerns were antiquated or ill-founded and that the administration was dismissive of their requests to have Saturdays off for rest and recreation. In an editorial, a student wrote,

There are a number of reasons why we still pursue our antiquated system, as: some feel that youth is wild and going to the dogs, they feel that University students would only get into mischief if they were freed from classes on Saturdays. This argument can be ignored, for any person using it is a mental adolescent. Others say that Athens business would suffer. We don't believe it would, but even if the business index might fall, there's no valid reason why the University students and faculty should suffer the stupid "off" day arrangement.\textsuperscript{190}

Some students supported the current system, but regardless of the opinion of the student body, the administration refused to take a firm stance on the five-day week or provide information

\textsuperscript{188} “Five Day Classes,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 4 April 1946, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{189} “Opposition to Off Saturdays,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 20 October 1944, p. 4.

related to the process to change the system. Students grew tired of being kept in the dark about the matter and did not understand the need for secrecy, nor the lack of interest in hearing the student voice on the matter.\footnote{“Five-Day Classes,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 19 April 1946, p. 4; “Five Day Class Week,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 6 December 1946, p. 4.} The topic became central to many editorials in \textit{The Red and Black} and election platforms for campus leaders.

The student movement for a shortened class week had some success in 1947. The administration gave its support to a trial of the system for the summer quarter.\footnote{“Five Days a Week,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 27 June 1947, p. 4.} Students and the faculty in classes had to agree to the change in meeting times. Other campuses that had adopted the shorter week complained that students skipped Friday classes to allow for longer weekends. Aware of this problem, the editorial board of the student newspaper asked students to attend all classes to make sure the test quarter was a success. During the summer quarter, the Student Veterans Organization held a meeting at which they passed a resolution urging the administration to permanently adopt the five-day week.\footnote{“Student Vets Call for Action To Combat High Living Costs,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 4 July 1947, p. 1.} The State Legislature did not offer anticipated opposition, and the Speaker shared his thoughts on the matter, “As you no doubt know, the Legislature rarely, if ever, works over a five-day week . . . it is my personal opinion that there will be no repercussion in the Legislature for any arrangement between the students and the Board of Regents concerning a five-day class week that does not affect the efficiency or
the scholastic standing of the students. All signs seemed to point to a change in the scheduling policy.

The issue came before the University Council in late July of 1947. After months of debate, the Council voted to defer the decision. The deferment meant that classes would continue on Saturdays in the upcoming academic year. Many factors lead to University Council’s decision, but none more than the expected record enrollment. The Campus Leader, an elected leadership position on campus for the Grand Old Party, promised to continue the push for changes. “I have been assured of the full cooperation of the Inter-fraternity Council and the Student Veterans Organization, which together with the Grand Old Party comprise an overwhelming majority of the students on the campus.” Students were furious with the decision of the faculty, and dealt it a great deal of sarcasm in an editorial in *The Red and Black*.

Georgia students have once again swelled the Oconee with tears shed in crying for a five-day class week. The flood stage of this receptive stream is never reached and the tears flow down to the sea to join other tears shed in past quarters.

The long standing desire of the student body is always met with a suave academic "maybe" and the promise of further consideration and investigation. "Yes" and "no" are unscholarly one-syllable words . . .

It would seem from conversations with various persons on the campus that nearly everyone wants the five-day week but no one will take the necessary steps to get it.

Our smartest and most intellectual faculty members are meanwhile concerning themselves with the investigation. It is commendable that our administration should have the intellectual curiosity to conduct a campaign of research stretching over a period of six years.

---


Where other topics during this time period were divisive on campus, the entire student body supported the five-day week initiative. In the spring of 1949, The Interfraternity Council and the Grand Old Party co-sponsored a rally to increase awareness about the issue. Faculty and staff members spoke at the rally, which displayed general support for the initiative. Administrators encouraged students to continue their work. This encouragement was ill founded. Shortly after the rally, an administrative council of the faculty voted unanimously to oppose the five-day week.

Despite hard work on the part of the student body, they were never able to convince the administration to enact a five-day week in the 1940s. This struggle was very similar to the failed effort to implement a student government on campus. The campus would witness a similar challenge when students and administrators attempted to confront an increase in academic dishonesty after the return of veterans.


Chapter 8

Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is not new to higher education, but it has changed over the years. The Internet and other forms of technology have provided the means and the ease to prepare essays and papers with little original work, and students take advantage of these developments.\textsuperscript{199} There is a perception that the problem has recently increased because today’s college students have a sense of entitlement or need for perfection.\textsuperscript{200} This perception is incorrect, as cheating has existed since the earliest records of examinations.\textsuperscript{201}

Cheating

Cheating can be defined as “intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise”.\textsuperscript{202} Academic exercises can include take-home assignments and in-class tests or exams. The most common forms of cheating fall into obvious categories:


Altering or forging an official document; paying someone else to write a paper to submit as one’s on work; arranging to give or receive answers by use of signals; getting questions and answers with or without the other person’s knowledge, completing assignments for someone; plagiarizing; and padding items on a bibliography.\textsuperscript{203}

The University of Georgia has never been immune from academic dishonesty in its many forms. Students in the 1940s were troubled by the perceived increase in cheating on campus. The student handbook was clear on the matter: “Lying, cheating, stealing, or dishonesty of any sort renders a student liable to disciplinary action”, and the administration took cheating very seriously.\textsuperscript{204} During the 1948 -1949 academic year, the administration dismissed 10 students from the University for cheating and assigned 16 students failing grades for academic dishonesty on tests or assignments.\textsuperscript{205} Many proactive students came to President Caldwell to discuss the academic dishonesty problem. They felt that they were at a disadvantage in the classroom because they refused to cheat and believed they were ethically obligated to confront the problem.

After talking to students and discussing the matter with his staff, the President sent a memo to faculty members asking them to address the problem. He encouraged professors to talk to students about ethics and discourage cheating, take precautions to protect their exams, and supervise students closely during exam periods.\textsuperscript{206} In an address on campus improvements, Caldwell remarked, “The general conduct of the great majority of students is excellent, but the


\textsuperscript{204} The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1947-1948.

\textsuperscript{205} Discipline Report, July 1, 1948 – June 8, 1949, Student Conduct Records; Dismissals for Cheating, August 3, 1949, Student Conduct Records.

\textsuperscript{206} Harmon Caldwell to Faculty, June 1948, Harmon Caldwell Papers.
actions of a few students – on such matters as cheating tend to give the whole University a reputation it does not deserve.” While the President did not believe the problem was widespread, he realized it put a dark blight on the campus and the reputation of the faculty at the University.

Dean Tate knew the cheating problem was not unique to the University campus. He often consulted with his peers at other institutions about problems in Athens. In the 1946-1947 Annual Report, he wrote, “Perhaps the worst problem on the campus by far is the one of cheating by students on tests and examinations. I have talked to several men in positions similar to mine who have readily admitted that this problem is a serious one on all campuses today, a disgrace to our system of higher education but a logical aftermath, I presume of our crowded conditions and our failure to assimilate such rapid enrollments into the codes of college life.” Tate recognized that the spike in enrollment following World War II had created condition conducive to academic dishonesty.

A faculty member shared Tate’s concerns in a letter referring a student to the Dean of Students for cheating. The faculty member wrote, “The class is large and, even when they are scattered maximally, the chairs are fairly close together and cheating is easy.” In that specific class, the professor took up exams and gave zeros to students he saw glancing at other papers. With the influx of students, professors began to give more true or false and multiple-choice

---
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examinations due to the ease with which they could be graded. These types of examinations made it easier to cheat on exams with a sideways glance than the essay tests faculty no longer had the time to grade.

Students during this era were innovative in their methods of seeking shortcuts and unfair advantages on exams. Faculty across the state shared generic exams with their colleagues on other campuses. In one instance, someone stole an examination from a storeroom at the University of West Georgia in Carrollton, Georgia. The stolen humanities test was found later on campus in Athens. While investigating a case of academic dishonesty, Dean Tate found one student in possession of a key to faculty member’s office and an exam the professor planned to give later in the semester. One enterprising janitor at the University’s press sold mimeographs to exams instead of burning them as instructed by a faculty member. Some students waited until after grades had been turned it to change grades. At least one student was permanently dismissed from the University for altering grades on a transcript from another institution that he submitted when transferring to Athens.

Dean Tate took these incidents very seriously and would sometimes hire groups of security guards to position around academic building on the nights leading up to examinations to catch students trying to steal tests. Students found in the building during these times of scrutiny

---
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faced repercussions from the University and the state. President Caldwell ordered Dean Tate to suspend any student caught breaking into a faculty member’s office to steal an exam and to inform the Solicitor of the Superior Court so the case could be prosecuted through the legal system.213

Student organizations took it upon themselves to identify the scope of dishonest academic practices on campus. The cheating problem became clear when the Blue Key Club and *The Red and Black* co-sponsored a campus poll on the matter. Over 2,100 students participated in the multi-question survey. The results were both shocking and sobering to the student body, faculty, and the administration. Over half of the anonymous students who participated in the poll admitted to academic dishonesty of some type.214 One question on the survey asked students to share their thoughts on cheating. The majority of students who completed the survey wanted to see something done to prevent or reduce academic dishonesty at the University.

The administration continued its proactive approach to the problem and sought methods to better understand the student perspective on the culture of cheating. In February of 1949, Dean Tate provided the faculty a report compiled by Blue Key. The report shared the observations and recommendations of a committee of students and faculty, and supported the earlier assumptions of Dean Tate and the faculty. The committee felt that “cheating is often part of a much larger problem – crowded classes, poor physical facilities, lack of counseling, a relationship with the high schools which requires us to admit any graduate of an accredited high school, and many other recommendations.”215 Tate made a more direct point to the president in an earlier private

213 Faculty Minutes of the University of Georgia, April 3, 1946.
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memo about the cheating problem. Tate sent Caldwell some newspaper clippings and a copy of a
Blue Key survey related to academic dishonesty on campus; he included the following
observation with the clippings:

Two of these clippings and also the attached summaries of the student poll on cheating
indicate that the students feel that some of our teachers, both here and at Tulane, are
unable to put the subject matter across. Often a man with a Phi Beta Kappa key and a
Ph.D. degree is a gentleman and a scholar, but he may be a poorer teacher than one with a
simple bachelor or master’s degree. The University of Georgia in Athens is primarily an
undergraduate school, and our reputation will be based on how well we teach the
majority of our students, and of course, most of our students are candidates for the
bachelor’s degree.216

Tate held the opinion that faculty were doing a poor job in the classroom and that their poor
performance was contributing to the problem.

Even with multiple surveys and recommendations from committees, the administration
had a difficult time grasping the complexity and size of the cheating problem on campus. Dean
Tate believed that some faculty members would deal with small issues of academic misconduct
in their classrooms and not notify his office of the behavior. This lack of information made it
difficult to know if students were repeating the behavior in other classes. Tate explained this
conundrum in a letter to the Dean of the Law School.

As Dean of Men, in dealing with disciplinary cases, I give much weight, as a general
policy to the recommendations of teachers, based upon their observations of a student’s
work and conduct in class. I do feel, however, that all such cases should be reported to a
central office where, in my case, I can keep an eye on the general conduct of students.
When a boy has had a second irregularity under separate teachers, then I feel that I should
be concerned with it as an ‘over-campus’ problem. This means that no teacher is
responsible for penalties beyond his classroom and his own knowledge of the boy’s
conduct, yet it gives me, as the official disciplinary officer, the responsibility and
knowledge necessary to discipline chronic offenders.217

---
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Tate hoped the faculty would allow his staff to deal with matters related to discipline, and would instead focus on the courses they were teaching.

Students readily admitted that cheaters were responsible for their own actions. However, they also felt the faculty held some responsibility for the growing dishonesty problem, and even made suggestions to help reduce incidents. Students suggested faculty stop curving exams. They felt the bell curved created an environment where students had to cheat if they suspected their classmates were being dishonest with their work. Students recommended professors create exams that matched what was taught in their classes, and stop relying on departmental exams. Some student organizations took it upon themselves to offer guidelines to faculty. The women’s Student Government Association considered cheating to be a very important topic and felt they had helpful recommendations. Prior to fall final examinations in 1949, the group sent the following memorandum to the faculty:

In the interest of fairness to all students on this campus, and in promoting high ideals in the pursuit of our studies, we, of the Workshop of Women’s Student Government wish to urge all instructors to make an extra effort to keep all final examinations in safe hands until the day they are to be given, in order to insure that they will not fall into the hands of those few students who would take advantage of them. It is also recommended that previous exams not be reused, since this encourages last minute cramming rather than overall preparation of subject material.

These suggestions put the onus on professors to protect the integrity of their exams.

Honor Code

During this period at the University, students in Blue Key introduced a potential

---
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honor code to campus at a meeting of the Inter-Fraternity Council and at a later faculty meeting.\footnote{“Meeting of Student Council Called for Consideration of Honor Code,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 21 July 1944, p. 1. A draft of the proposed honor code can be found in “Honor System Requires Student Support,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 7 July 1944, p. 2.} The University’s Law School operated under its own honor code, which required alleged violators to go on trial before a panel of their elected peers.\footnote{“Lumpkin Law School Elects New Honor Court Members,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 10 October 1947, p. 2; “Murphy Made Chief Justice: Law School Elects Class and Honor Court Officials,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 8 October 1948, p. 1} Undergraduate students felt this system could be easily replicated. \textit{The Red and Black} supported the initiative, but wanted students to have the power to enforce and make decisions related to the code. Faculty agreed with the editorial board and felt that the only way to make sure the code was successful was to let the students develop it and self-enforce their policies.\footnote{“Faculty Thinks Students Cheat, Survey Reveals,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 7 March 1947, p. 1.} The G.O.P., the Demosthenian Literary Society, the Voluntary Religious Association and the faculty supported the code. Dean Tate’s advisory group, the student council, also supported the initiative.

Fraternity men voted down the honor code at their meeting, but supported the principle behind the code. Without the support of the Interfraternity Council, the proposed code referendum would never pass a popular vote on the campus. \textit{The Red and Black} responded with frustration to this action.

It was argued that a boy couldn't turn in a close friend of his to the honor board. This may be true, but that boy would talk to his friend, and ask his friend to live by the University's code of honor. If the friend cheated again, the friendship between the two would certainly end. But this situation would rarely occur; our point is that although there will always be some who will cheat, their number will be reduced to a handful. Final exams will quit selling for $25 each, tests won't be stolen, and students will learn something besides how to cut the angles. We'll admit that the proposed constitution isn't perfect; BUT AN
The honor code conversation began anew in the spring of 1948. The faculty asked the Committee on Student Conduct to consider the creation and implementation of a code. The Committee responded to the request with recommendations instead of an honor code that could be voted on by students. The recommendations asked professors to pay special attention to the spacing of desks, the proctoring of exams, and the security of test questions. The administration never took steps to directly address the cheating problem or implement changes suggested by the students. This lack of attention to the matter frustrated many in the student body, as demonstrated by this editorial from *The Red and Black*.

A few steps have been taken to remedy the situation and for all practical purposes the faculty still regards the student body as an untrustworthy group of adolescents who are not to be trusted, but who are nonetheless smart enough to outwit the wariest professor during examination week.

Students could not shift all blame to the faculty. When an honor code was vetted through the student body, groups on campus could not come to a consensus on the matter, allowing the proposed code to not reach a popular vote.

While an honor code was never passed at the University, the attention given to cheating did have a positive affect. In December of 1949, Dean Tate thanked a faculty member who turned a crib sheet over to him. In the letter, he wrote, “I am happy that a larger number of

---
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teachers are helping with the problem of cheating in classes, and that we may be making some headway in curbing it. After all, the integrity of a course primarily depends on how well tests are conducted."

Dean Tate appreciated the cooperation of faculty in dealing with dishonesty in the classroom. He and his staff were also responsible for dealing with conduct outside the classroom. The next chapter will examine the administration’s responses to conduct matters as well as student’s and parents’ concerns and roles in the process.

---
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Chapter 9

Student Conduct

The University of Georgia had clear expectations for its students. These expectations were made clear in the Student Handbook received by students at the beginning of each year.

A student is expected to show under all circumstances a proper respect for order, morality, and the rights of others, and such sense of personal honor as is demanded of god citizens. The University reserves the right to exclude at any time students whose conduct is deemed improper or prejudicial to the interested of the University community.228

The handbooks contained policies on conduct, attendance, registrations, housing, and other topics of interest to men and women enrolled at the University. The administration viewed student conduct as an important responsibility of the Dean of Men and the Dean of Women. William Tate was often the voice of the University when policies needed to be changed or more stringently enforced. The years covered by this case study offered many examples of students testing the bounds of expectations and the University’s proactive and reactive responses.

Policies Related to Female Students

While the University of Georgia did not see a benefit in separating veterans from the general student body, the administration did have some concerns about how the G.I. Bill and the resulting change in student population would affect conduct on campus. Tate expressed his concerns to the President when he wrote,

We must have supervision of our somen [sic] students and both of us realize we can be severely criticized if we do not have quite a bit of supervision, if we are not already being criticized. The presence of older boys on the campus (I think simply because they are older boys and not because they are veterans) means a great deal of pressure on our social policies, and especially pressure as the older boys introduce their ideas onto our campus.229


229 William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, May 1946, Harmon Caldwell Papers.
Tate seemed specifically concerned about the safety of female students on campus. The Committee on Student Conduct shared his concern, as demonstrated in their annual report to the faculty.

In view of the fact that during the war we had a large Pre-Flight School, a Signal Corps unit of the regular Army personnel and other military units in Athens, the University has been fortunate in not having some sensational sex case. The insistence that girls must be in the dormitories at a required hour and diligence on the part of officials has been helpful.\textsuperscript{230}

Both statements portray a view of the veteran as a source of moral temptation and corrupter of student values. It is important to note that these views were based solely on assumption and not on any actual incidents.

In another inter-office communication to President Caldwell, Dean Tate wrote, “In the supervision of our women students, it seems to me most necessary that we expect the girls not to be absent overnight from the dormitory without our knowing where they are. It is the least thing that a parent can expect of us in the maintenance of any standard of supervision.”\textsuperscript{231} Tate’s comments portray a strong sense of \textit{In Loco Parentis}. While Caldwell did little to dispel the parental tone of Tate’s and the Committee on Student Conduct’s approach to conduct, he did view students as actual participants in the development of culture on campus. Caldwell appealed to students for their cooperation in the matter of campus discipline. The President asked for “the assistance of students in improving the ethical standards of campus.”\textsuperscript{232}

\begin{flushleft}
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The University allowed the Women’s Student Government to administer conduct regulations, but placed some responsibility for the behavior of women on male students. Although any woman out of the dormitory is on her own responsibility, the University expects any gentleman with her to assume responsibility for her safety and not to connive at the violation of any University regulation. When an escort knows that a girl is violating a University regulation, he can be given joint responsibility with her.\textsuperscript{233}

A male student could face two violations if he and a female were violating a policy together.

Tate and his staff took steps to shape policies to protect the campus from any negative impact of the older students. In a memorandum to President Caldwell, Tate shared, “We are conscientiously trying to tighten down on social life of our students. One of the major problems has been the reluctance of the faculty to chaperone these events, particularly the ones going far into the night, or to report any disorder.”\textsuperscript{234} Tate asked the Committee on Student Social Affairs to increase the responsibilities of chaperones at dances and other social events. He also requested that the number of chaperones be increased and that the chaperones be required to provide detailed, written report after the events.\textsuperscript{235} The University Social Life Committee also called upon organizations to police their functions and report any improper behavior to the faculty chaperones in attendance.\textsuperscript{236}

Veteran Conduct

The administration’s concerns of a large negative contribution to campus by veterans were largely incorrect. In fact, Tate became a champion for and defender of the veterans on

\textsuperscript{233} The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1949-1950, p. 9.

\textsuperscript{234} William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, May 1947, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

\textsuperscript{235} The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947.

\textsuperscript{236} “Committee Requests Student Cooperation in ‘Student Conduct’,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 31 January 1947, p. 1.
campus. He felt that the newspapers gave unfair and unfounded publicity to the older students. After one particularly scathing newspaper article, Tate responded with a letter to President Caldwell. He wrote,

First, the average veteran at the University is not the problem child that he appears from our unfortunate publicity. As you know, I talk to students almost constantly all day, and I find a good attitude among the veterans. Their attendance in class is good; their grades are high; and their academic seriousness is commendable. There are, of course, problem members in this group. But the group is a wholesome addition to our campus, and the average veteran is in every way fair and sensible. Second, certain leaders among the students are getting more publicity and raising more Cain than the group is. We should not feel at all that the statements of some of these self-appointed leaders should be the criteria by which we judge the whole group.”

In addition to defending veterans against negative stereotypes and bad press, he also turned to this group of students to assist in shaping campus culture. In a letter to Frank Myers, President of the Student Veterans Organization, Tate wrote,

You can realize how much I appreciate the efforts of you veterans to help me with discipline, for you can do much to prevent isolated cases of heavy drinking among the veterans or among the regular students. I am not insinuating that the veterans are drinking any more than other students, for they certainly are not, but they are boys who are older, more definitely fixed in their habits, and probably more conscious of their rights to decide behavior. I hope very much that your organization will prevent any such event that I must recognize as official and consequently take discipline action.

Both the President and the Dean of Students felt veterans could have a calming effect on the rest of the student body. By partnering with the Student Veterans Organization, the administration hoped to be proactive in preventing conduct problems.

Suspensions

While the administration took proactive steps to prevent misconduct, students were suspended for a variety of reasons during the period of this case study. The following lists will

237 William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, November 1945, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

238 William Tate to Frank Myers, May 14 1946, Box 35, William Tate Papers.
display the various offenses that resulted in students being separated from the University or some period of time. The length of the suspensions varied dependant upon the egregiousness of the violation and the time during the academic year the violation occurred.

Suspensions From 1945-1946\textsuperscript{239}

Three suspended for leaving town without permission.

One suspended for being out of the dormitory at night without checking out.

One suspended for stealing and selling books.

One suspended for stealing billfolds.

One suspended for deliberately breaking “campus”.

One suspended for looking in windows of girls’ dormitory.

Two suspended for medical reasons.

Three students were refused permission to register one quarter for being consistent troublemakers.

Two students had their diplomas held up for one quarter, one for being drunk and disorderly and one for being out of the dormitory at night without permission.

Suspensions From 1946-1947\textsuperscript{240}

Four girls suspended for being out of dormitory at night with boys.

Four boys suspended for keeping girls out of the dormitory at night.

Two girls suspended for being out of the dormitory without permission, breaking campus.\textsuperscript{241}

\textsuperscript{239} Committee on Student Conduct Report, November 4, 1946, Student Conduct Records.

\textsuperscript{240} Report to Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, November 6, 1947, Student Conduct Records.
One boy was suspended for fighting in the dormitory.

One boy suspended for molesting young girls.

Two girls suspended for drinking.

One boy suspended for drinking and attempting to enter office at examination time.

Two girls suspended for being out of dormitory at night without proper authorization.

One boy suspended for insulting a University employee.

One boy suspended for keeping a girl out very late.

Two boys suspended for stealing books.

Two boys dismissed from ROTC Camp for disorderly conduct and AWOL.

Suspensions From 1947-1948242

Two students suspended for drinking and going AWOL from ROTC camp.

Three students suspended for theft of football tickets and ticket scalping.

One student suspended for theft of laundry.

One student suspended for ungentlemanly conduct to female employee of the University.

Four students suspended for taking examinations illegally.

One student suspended for theft of fog lights from a car.

One student suspended for drunkenness and disorderly conduct.

One student asked not to return to the University as the result of a mental case.

Two students suspended for theft of books.

One student suspended for thefts on Emory’s campus.

---

241 Female students who were sanctioned to campus, were not to leave campus for any reason. They were to go to class, meals, and back to their rooms.

Two students suspended for entering professor’s offices at night and being “general nuisance”.

Suspensions From 1948-1949

Four students suspended for secret marriages.
One student suspended for changing fee card to register illegally.
Four students suspended for alcohol related violations.
One student suspended for sexual abnormality.
One student suspended for theft.
One student suspended after arrest for a “morals charge”.
One student suspended for being a “peeping tom”.
Six students suspended for academic dishonesty.
Two students suspended for stealing a tank and damaging it.
One student suspended for having “women of bad reputation” in his trailer.
One student suspended for being a consistent troublemaker in the music department.
One student suspended for mental illness.
One student suspended for rape.
One student suspended for taking bribes.

While the sanction seems harsh for some of the violations, many of the issues faced by the administration during that period are similar to those conduct problems faced by administrators in the present.

---

Alcohol

The University of Georgia had a clear and strict policy related to alcohol: “No student shall bring or cause to be brought on the University campus, or into any dormitory, fraternity house, sorority house, or other premises subject to University jurisdiction any alcoholic beverages.” The administration had zero tolerance for alcohol on campus or inebriated students returning to campus.

The community presented a challenge to the campuses’ policies related to alcohol. Tate outlined this problem when he wrote,

> We have a regulation against bringing or causing to be brought alcoholic beverages into any University building or any building subject to our jurisdiction; but the legalizing of beer and light wines has brought certain border-line cases of discipline constantly to our attention. Beer can be bought at three places within sight of my office window and in four places within sight of President Caldwell’s window. Several places around town are definitely working toward student trade in the sales of light wines and beers, particularly beers.

The availability of alcohol in Athens provided both temptation and opportunity for students.

Alcohol related cases at the University varied in terms of seriousness. A sampling of disciplinary cases dealt with by Dean Tate included drunken destruction of property, driving while intoxicated, simple possession of alcohol, and “making homebrew in boarding house room”. Numerous conduct cases during the era made reference to beer being purchased elsewhere and consumed at “The Chicken Shanty”, a popular eating establishment for

---

244 The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1949-1950.
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While this establishment did not sell alcohol, it was common knowledge that it was a safe place to bring your own flask or bottle.\footnote{248} Students would get in trouble for breaking bottles, being loud, or fighting at The Shanty.

Dean Tate felt strongly that alcohol had a negative affect on campus and contradicted citizens, expectations of their state’s flagship institution. He wrote, “I do not feel that the University, when we are subject to Southern mores and certain social beliefs in the State, can permit any major act of disorder when a student is drinking.”\footnote{249} Tate did see a culture shift on campus related to the consumption of alcohol. He believed this shift was reflective of an increase in social drinking around the United States.\footnote{250} As alcohol became socially acceptable, student consumption was increasing.

Ticket Scalping

The administration identified scalping of football tickets as another discipline problem during the late 1940s. Selling football tickets for above their value provided students with easy money. Prior to the game against Georgia Tech in 1945, Tate wrote a letter outlining his expectations for the game, and the letter was published in \textit{The Red and Black}.\footnote{251} The letter

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{247} William Tate, August 1945, Student Conduct Records; William Tate to Parents, November 18, 1944, Student Conduct Records.
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\item \footnote{250} William Tate to Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, November 6, 1947, Student Conduct Records.
\item \footnote{251} “Dean Tate Warns Against Scalping of Tickets,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 23 November 1945, p. 2.
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warned students to not scalp or trade tickets to the game. The tickets were non-transferable, and were designated as tickets for male students and tickets for female tickets. If a student tried to pass a ticket that did not belong to him or her, the student would not be able to enter the game and would be referred to the Dean of Student’s office for discipline. Students were identified as imposters based on the small photographs at the front of ticket books.

Tate expected the scalping problem to worsen as football became more popular on college campuses.\textsuperscript{252} He wrote, “Since the stadiums about the country will be filled for some time to come at big games, and since students are making appreciable money at this racket, we can expect the evil to increase rather than decrease unless we take steps to remedy it. The tickets issued to the football players, I believe four each for each game, are reported to always get into this avenue of sale.”\textsuperscript{253} The Dean was especially frustrated with players who sold tickets designated for their families and friends. He did not foresee an easy solution to the problem since students were able to make a considerable profit from selling tickets.

One case of tickets scalping gained attention from the administration and the student body when it resulted in three University students being indicted by a Clarke county grand jury. This scalping incident was not isolated as the involved students had been stealing and selling tickets for some time. The students sold thirty-six tickets for a profit of $360.00, and admitted to selling smaller increments of tickets on past occasions.\textsuperscript{254} One of the students, a former sports

\textsuperscript{252} William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, Wallace Butts, John Broadnax, and John Bolton, November 9, 1946, Student Conduct Records. Faculty were aware of the ticket scalping problem and discussed it at a Faculty meeting in 1947, as seen in Faculty Minutes of the University of Georgia, October 17, 1947.

\textsuperscript{253} The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947,

\textsuperscript{254} Statement from Student to the Office of the Comptroller, November 17, 1948, Student Conduct Records.
editor of The Red and Black, worked for the athletic association. He used his position to acquire groups of tickets that he could then give to his friends to sell.

The University dismissed the students, who were well known on campus, with no explanation. Students had questions about the removal of the campus leaders from the University. During the investigation of the matter, the administration shared little information with the student body. As a result of the lack of accurate information, rumors swirled around campus. One rumor called into question the business practices of the student newspaper, since one of its editors was suspended. An editorial in The Red and Black criticized the administration for keeping students in the dark. The editorial stressed that students deserved the facts, and that hiding information from public scrutiny only led to false accusations of innocent students.

Secret Marriages

The implementation of the G.I Bill brought with it an increase in the number of married couples on campus. The older and mature students were eager to start families and many either married prior to arrival on campus or were married while enrolled. Almost half the veterans taking classes after World War II were married, and this influx of couples and families began to change the patterns of collegiate domesticity.

Just as GIs transmitted their seriousness about the business of education, so they also established new patterns of collegiate domesticity; almost half the veterans returning to school were married. The presence of domestic couples on campuses was contagious, with female undergraduates seeking to ‘catch’ a husband. To some the immediate goal of matrimony outstripped the value of a college degree. Although colleges increasingly


permitted wives to enroll as undergraduates, those who were married (often to veterans) tended to leave school\textsuperscript{257}

Administrators at campuses around the country realized that services and programs had to expand to accommodate these changes. For the first time in the history of higher education, presidents and chancellors were in discussions about topics previously foreign to the Academy. George Lynn Cross, President at the University of Oklahoma during the period of the veterans’ return captured this new paradigm when he wrote,

It was clear that the University of Oklahoma-and for that matter every other institution in the country-faced responsibilities other than academic on a scale that no one would have thought possible-or even thought of at all. There would be need for preschools, kindergartens, public health nursing, educational programs for student wives, free clinical medical services for expectant mothers, and perhaps even obstetrical services.\textsuperscript{258}

The University of Georgia was no different than other institutions, as it saw an increase in marriages on campus.

The University disapproved of secret marriages by its students, and suspension was the sanction for this violation. The Student Handbook provided clear expectations for students on this subject.

In most cases it is unwise for students to marry while in college. If a student contemplates marriage, he or she is advised to secure the counsel of some faculty member; the University insists that a student marry only with the consent of parents. In order to discourage secret marriages the following regulations are enforced: Any student, man or woman, who on registration conceals the fact of his or her marriage, or who, while in residence as a student mails and fails to give written notification of the marriage to the University authorities within twenty-four hours after return to the campus will be suspended from the University. The duration of the suspension in such cases will depend


\textsuperscript{258} George Lynn Cross, \textit{The University of Oklahoma and World War II: A Personal Account, 1941-1946} (Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 203.
upon the circumstances but will usually be not less than one quarter from the date when the facts became known.\textsuperscript{259}

Tate explained the University’s stance in a letter to a student who was suspended for a secret marriage. He wrote, “The University has no objection to a couple getting married, although we do all possible to discourage hasty or illogical marriages while students are still in school. You can understand why we do not permit couples to be secretly married while the boy is staying in one dormitory and the girl in another.”\textsuperscript{260} The student body did not appear to have a problem with this policy, as there was no mention of secret marriages in the student newspaper and no strong arguments made by suspended students or their parents in student conduct records. The University did not have a problem with students marrying as long as they informed administrators of their change in status.

The University took an interest in the moral conduct of all students. In one instance, Tate met with a veteran who lived with his wife in a “Boom Town” trailer. The veteran’s pregnant wife was out of town, when her husband was found in their trailer with two women of bad reputation. Tate met with the student and discussed his expectations for improved conduct.

In another instance, Tate suspended a student for fornication. This type of indiscretion was viewed as being outside acceptable conduct at the University. In this incident the Dean took a firmer approach with the student because the conduct involved interracial dating. The administration often received notification of student arrests in cities outside Athens. In this instance, a male student was arrested for fornication with an African American woman in the

\textsuperscript{259} The University of Georgia Student Handbook, 1947-1948.
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backseat of his car. In a letter to the clerk of court in the town in which the student was arrested, Tate shared his thoughts on the case:

I think you will agree with me that this is one of the most heinous offenses that a college student could commit, aggravated by its racial complexity. I do not know the extent of [the student’s] suspension, but I have no sympathy with his case. Certainly the University cannot tolerate his conduct without a long period of suspension, and I feel rather sure that he will have to work out his destinies somewhat aside from the possibility of graduating from the University.  

The Pandora Controversy

During this era the Pandora, the University’s student yearbook, was an integral part of campus tradition. A selection board consisting of faculty and students elected individuals to fill leadership positions on the editorial board. These elections were competitive since the positions were prestigious and respected on campus. In 1949, a controversy arose around the Pandora and its leadership. In June, the editor and business manager vacated their positions with no explanation. Since they had worked hard to be elected, their sudden departure raised questions on campus.

The faculty advisors for the publication appointed students to fill the open positions. The new appointments delayed the publication of the yearbook, as the incoming editor was not in Athens over the summer. Students protested the appointment of the new officers, as they felt their peers and not the University’s faculty and staff should select the leaders. They were also frustrated by the potential delay in the publication of the yearbook. The administration responded with a letter to The Red and Black.

The opinion of this office and the board, in which we hope you will concur, is that the release of a statement for publication which would contain full information, would be
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detrimental to the best interests of the University. Your responsibility to information is thereby conditioned by an additional consideration: shall the University needlessly jeopardize its best interests by publicizing problems which can best be solved by proper authorities in an atmosphere conducive to their solution?  

The University clearly did not see a benefit to sharing information about the *Pandora* situation with students.  

The administration responded to the students’ demands by asking the original election panel to affirm the student appointments. They explained the initial lack of student participation as the product of timing. Students were away from campus at ROTC camps or at home for the summer, and the administration did not see the need to bring them back to campus.  

The administration eventually revealed to students the details behind the need for new leadership for the *Pandora*. Atlanta printing firms had contacted the Regents informing them that the contract for the 1948-1949 yearbook had gone to an out of state printer. The resulting investigation revealed that the past editor had received payment from the firm with the winning contract. That student was expelled from the University and the new editor was dismissed from the University for making a similar arrangement with the publishing company.  

Students were still not happy with the information they received from the administration or the coverage the issue received from the student newspaper, and the Summer Campus Leader shared his frustration in a letter to *The Red and Black*.  

In last week’s Red and Black, the issue involving elections of Pandora staff members was not reported in its true light. The coverage was insufficient and inaccurate. While the explanation was “lack of space,” the editor, in the same issue, wrote at length on the self-sufficiency of the Red and Black through advertising.

---


I suggest that, when allotted funds are available, the editor sacrifice advertising income to give a true and accurate picture.\textsuperscript{265}

While the students were venting their frustration at campus publications and the administration, Dean Tate was dealing with the students involved in the \textit{Pandora} payments. When Tate suspended the editor from the University, he also ordered him to repay to the publication all remunerations or rewards he received form the publishing company. He explained his position on the incident.

The officials of the University feel very strongly that the recent happenings were not in accord with the best practices and were not at all creditable to the University or to you. We feel quite definitely that this ‘rebate’ was not in accordance with our understanding of the relationships and that we cannot tolerate in your case or in the case of any other student such conduct.

I believe that you realize now our attitude on this situation, and I hope very much that this will be a lesson to you to avoid any dealings like this in the future. You have shown yourself a very capable boy on the campus, and I rust that your talents hereafter will be used in such a way as to be without reflection on you and without the embarrassment that has come to you and the university because of this recent happenings.\textsuperscript{266}

Tate received multiple letters from the parents and friends of the families of the students involved in the incident.\textsuperscript{267} One parent wished to meet with the Dean to discuss the possibility of reducing his son’s sanctions. Tate made it clear that a meeting would not change the University’s decision.

\begin{flushright}
I cannot tell you that a trip is advisable, but I shall be glad to talk to you if you wish to come up. The decision about the PANDORA was made by a group. I am responsible for individual disciplinary cases on the campus and theoretically any disciplinary step of major importance starts as a recommendation from me. I do not feel personally that your son is being given a heavy penalty and my interpretation of his act
\end{flushright}
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may be more in line with University policies than business procedures. We are not at all happy over the entire incident.

If you decide to come up, I shall be glad to talk to you; but the penalty seems to me to be reasonable under my concepts of what should be the relationship of students with the publishers of the PANDORA, was reached in a group meeting with five other members of the administration, and I do not believe will be readily modified.

We regret very much that this incident has taken place. Even though we know of specific violations this year and last, still there have been many years when the bids moved smoothly and above criticism.\footnote{William Tate to Parent, June 20, 1949, Ibid.}

Baseball Beating

The spring of 1948 was a busy time on the University of Georgia campus. Activities took place every weekend, and students were attending them in high numbers. Their attendance may have come as the result of a failed joint initiative from the Campus Leader and the IFC Presidents to institute a fine system to punish freshmen who did not attend campus events.\footnote{“Proposed Fine to Enforce Freshmen Meets Rejected,” The Red and Black, 10 October 1947, p. 1.} The administration put an end to the idea after some consideration, but upperclassmen had some fun with the activity, establishing “rat courts” in some residence halls that fall. Theodore Molnar, a freshman, was led to believe he faced stiff punishment for missing the selection of his dormitory’s representative for the campus beauty review. The punishment turned out to be a kiss from the winning beauty queen from Milledge Hall.\footnote{“Separately, What Are We?” The Red and Black, 24 October 1947, p. 4.}

Molnar was in attendance at a baseball game against Furman the next spring. When a student at the game refused to return a foul ball to the umpire, Coach Charlie Trippi had the student removed from the stands. Students, including Molnar, booed Trippi for this action. The
team was able to identify Molnar and visited his dormitory the next day. They forcibly removed him from the building and beat him with belts outside Milledge Hall.  

After the flogging, the captain of the baseball team asked Dean Tate not to investigate the incident and to allow the team to provide him with the culprits. The captain then informed Dean Tate that the entire team was responsible. Tate eventually placed 22 members of the team on conduct probation and required the team captain to resign from his position as leader of the squad. The team sent letters of apology to Molnar and his father.

The Stolen Tank

Occasionally, the administration would be stunned by the ingenuity and creativity of student pranks and adventures. Two students were suspended from the University in April of 1949 in a unique case that brought the Federal Bureau of Investigation to Athens, GA. These two males broke into the armory on campus on an early Sunday morning and took a tank without permission. After a witness observed and reported the tank’s suspicious and “unauthorized maneuvers” to the police, six law enforcement officers surrounded the tank on the outskirts of Athens. The police officers were unable to stop the tank, which left the road to cut across a field in an attempt to escape. The tank eventually tipped over into a gulley and burst into flames. The students escaped the burning tank with no injuries, but were quickly arrested. Students saw the humor in the incident and attributed the actions to alcohol, as evidenced by this editorial:


Despite Rod’s own dull, ‘dry’ weekend, it seems that some folks defied convention by doing things up brown. Gone are the good ole days when River Road was just another lovers lane and a fellow could put in a decent hour of "necking time" with his best gal ... now you gotta take the chance of running into motorized warfare by the enemy! \(^{274}\)

The administration did not take the same light attitude toward the matter and suspended the two students for “breaking into a University building, taking out a U.S. Army tank under our auspices, and wrecking it”. \(^{275}\) The FBI, pending an investigation, also filed charges against the men. After serving their suspension and paying $675.67 to repair damages to the tank, the men were allowed to reenroll at the University. \(^{276}\) Once the students returned to campus, Dean Tate checked in on them from time to time. They struggled academically and he referred them to campus resources for assistance. In one letter, he took on a very paternal tone as he offered the students the following advice:

In evaluating this incident in your lives, please be conscious that you do not face the same moral problem that many of our boys face in being suspended for a while. You were not injured physically, yet today I have two students partly paralyzed and in the hospital as a result of accidents over the holidays, and I have another boy blinded in one eye by a college prank. You were not hurt, and you hurt no one else, and that is good. Also you do not face the moral implications that boys face for being suspended for cheating, stealing, or other moral irregularities. Twice in the last year I have talked to parents whose boys had picked up a liaison with a girl whom the family could not accept. When you have gotten your diploma and ten years have gone by, you can look with more humor on this incident than the student or parent in many another disciplinary problem ... Both of you have shown that you are good citizens of the community and that you could face this problem without letting it conquer you. I hope that you have learned from it what every young man should learn from trouble of any sort – Don’t get caught using similar lack of judgment in the future. \(^{277}\)
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The administration of the University, Dean Tate in particular, often took this view of student conduct.

Challenge and Support

The University administration held students accountable for their actions, but were willing to work with students who accepted responsibility for misconduct and accepted the disciplinary sanctions issued. Dean Tate had little patience with students who made excuses or who refused to work within the policies and procedures outlined by the institution. In a letter to the parent of a non-responsive student, Tate wrote,

> Although your daughter has a right to act as she sees fit and accept the responsibility for her conduct, still the University cannot run their programs to suit her wishes, nor can I sit aside University programs and policies for the reasons she has given me. Frankly, she has made a mountain out of a molehill, by refusing first to appear before the [Womens] Student Government and refusing now to write her reasons so they can be analyzed by people responsible for discipline; she has given a turn to her college career which I think is unfortunate. Either she should be willing to abide by the rules and regulations here or she should transfer to another institution. I feel that perhaps the best thing for her to do is ask for her credits, enter another University for her senior year.\(^{278}\)

Dean Tate was not hesitant in informing students that their best possibilities for success were on other campuses.

> The University’s sanctioning approach was punitive, but had educational undertones. In another incident, Tate shared words of wisdom with a student who was suspended after aiding a female student in slipping out of her residence hall at night.

> Mistakes are a common heritage of the human race; and they are generally bad only when we fail to profit fully by our error. If the unfortunate and complicated incident of this spring is the final one of such nature in your life, you will have profited fully by this unpleasant experience. The responsibility of preventing such a repetition is primarily yours, and I am expecting full cooperation for us from you in that respect.\(^{279}\)

---


Tate’s educational and developmental approach with the students reflected the recommendations of the faculty’s Committee on Student Conduct. 

We urge that more emphasis be placed upon the rehabilitation and re-education of the student when infractions of the rules occur. The conception that wrong behavior is merely to be punished fails to recognize the fact that such behavior may be a symptom of maladjustment, an indication that the student needs to be given help toward self-insight and developing more acceptable reactions.  

Tate was quick to reserve disciplinary action for his staff to dispense, but also understood the role faculty had in developing students. He outlined his philosophy on this topic in a report to the Faculty Committee on Student Conduct. 

In a broader and more intelligent sense, discipline is as wide as college education itself; and every teacher and every staff member should be concerned with discipline in this broad sense. Tactfulness on the part of a teacher, firmness in decisions, and such good qualities of citizenship on the part of the teachers and staff members in turn are effective guides to students who need help in self control and coordination; and such influence is in a subtle way more effective than more rigorous action on the part of officials. 

The overt and specific acts of disorder on the part of students should be the responsibility of every teacher and every staff member, not the responsibility simply of those who concern themselves with student morale or discipline. Those of us who counsel or discipline students therefore urgently request the continued cooperation and increased interest of the faculty in this field- in reporting cases for advice, counseling or disciplinary action, in warning the proper officials of certain problems arising on the campus even when specific names cannot be given; and in realizing that as a general policy the morale an conduct of students is a joint responsibility of all concerned with the University.  

Today’s administrators face many of the same conduct challenges as William Tate and his colleagues. Students in that era knew that times had changed for them and were sure that

280 Faculty Minutes of the University of Georgia, October 17, 1947. 

281 William Tate to Faculty Committee on Student Conduct, November 6, 1947, Student Conduct Records.
changes would continue to occur. In reflecting on a conversation with longtime registrar Thomas Reed about conduct, a student had the following thoughts.

Every University student regards it as his (or her) God-given right to rain profane invectives upon each other or the administration, to spend the whole week-end out of town, and to attend religious services only when he feels in the mood. Time was, about 100 years ago, when such behavior was sufficient cause for a fine or even rustication. "Rustication," according to "Uncle Tom" Reed, registrar emeritus, was nineteenth century vernacular for "suspension." . . . All of which goes to show that rules change even though people don’t. Who knows 100 years from now co-eds may be taking in washing every Sunday and staying up till midnight every night.282

The administration dealt with conduct matters while providing attentions to an increasingly complex housing crisis on the campus. The crisis was complicated by the oversight Dean Tate and other administrators felt was needed for students.

282 “Students of the Past Century Had Strict Rules—Uncle Tom',” The Red and Black, 1 August 1947, p. 5.
Chapter 10

Student Housing

Student housing was a controversial topic for both students and the administration during the era covered by this case study. In the summer of 1944, campus leaders presented President Caldwell with a petition asking to turn the pre-flight barracks into student housing for males when they were no longer needed by the Navy.\textsuperscript{283} This request came shortly after the administration had designated the coordinate campus for female housing. During the war effort, freshmen women had been allowed to live in sorority houses, a practice that was ended with the addition of the coordinate campus for freshmen and sophomore women.\textsuperscript{284} The addition of the coordinate campus did little to help with the housing shortage on campus.

Students enrolling at the University of Georgia in the fall of 1945 found very few options for housing. The University was forced to turn away potential students due to a lack of housing space. The Campus Leader voiced the frustration of the entire student body when he said, “Nearly 1,000 hopeful students will be refused admission to the University this fall due to a lack of housing facilities, and even though Georgia is a tax supported institution, the children of these same tax payers will be forced to attend another school unless an answer is found.”\textsuperscript{285} To an institution still recovering from a dramatic drop in enrollment, this shortage was frustrating to the administration.


\textsuperscript{284} “Use of Coordinate College to House Freshman, Sophomore Girls to be Resumed in Fall,” \textit{Athens Banner Herald}, 4 May 1944, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{285} “Student Rally To Be Held at Chapel Tuesday Night,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 27 July 1945, p. 1.
Canvas of Athens

The situation was so bleak that Dean Tate asked campus service organizations to conduct a survey of the Athens community to see what potential additional housing facilities existed. Members of the Mangleburg-Elrod Legion Post, Blue Key, Biftad, and Alpha Phi Omega canvassed Athens to identify spaces for students. Tate assisted with the literature to be handed out to residents and focused on the contribution the institution had made to the area. The Dean asked citizens to assist University students in their time of need by opening up extra rooms in their homes.286

The citizens of Athens supported this initiative, as they realized the positive role the University played in the community.

We should do all we can to help the University out with its wartime problem. The businessmen realize what the University has meant to Athens financially. A large part of their trade is by students. Many of our leading citizens are graduates of the University. The churches certainly realize the usefulness of the students. The University has made Athens one of the culture spots of Georgia. It is almost impossible to find any phase of our city life that has not profited by the University. For these reasons, if none other, we should give them our full cooperation. Let us urge that every housewife see if there isn’t a possibility of her housing one or more students. If we fail the University now, we will feel it in the future. Every student that is turned down means a loss for us. Now the University has a chance to start building up its enrollment for post-war days. If they have to start turning them away now, it may cause other future students to start looking elsewhere for their education.287

Residents were aware of the financial contribution students made to local businesses. Since many Athens’ residents were alumni of the institution, they viewed the housing shortage as an opportunity to give back to the institution.


287 “Students Urge Cooperation with Housing Canvass Committee Here,” Athens Banner Herald, 5 August 1945, p. 1
In 1946, the Student Veterans Organization organized another housing survey of Athens, and sent letters to homeowners. These letters contained pleas for citizens to open their homes to returning soldiers and appealed to patriotism. The letter contained the following paragraph:

The University of Georgia has found by record that the veteran student is a great success—both scholastically and socially. He is eager to make the most of his stay at the University. He is a more serious and a more reserved student than the college lad of normal time, it is certain then that you, the citizens of Athens, will derive great satisfaction and pleasure from aiding the veteran student. He will not in any way fail to show you his deep appreciation. Uncle Sam has given him the means, won’t you let him have a room, any room, with you.288

With a shortage of housing, the University was turning students away in large numbers. The Student Veterans Organization attempted to assist veterans in finding educational opportunities outside Athens.289 They hoped colleges and universities would be willing to turn empty classroom and storage space into temporary for incoming students.

While service organizations were surveying and sending letters to Athens residents, a group of students joined President Caldwell and Chancellor Sanford in making a direct appeal to the State Board of Regents. The language of the appeal was approved by a gathering of over 500 students and requested temporary housing facilities be erected on campus.290 The housing shortage had focused the attention of students on campus. While the student body had a reputation of apathy towards student government, they could muster their voices when needed. An editorial in the Red and Black captured this attitude. A student wrote,

288 Housing Committee of the Student Veterans Organization to Citizens of Athens, August 5, 1946, Box 35, William Tate Papers.


290 “Students Vote to Present Housing Lack to Regents,” The Red and Black, 3 August 1945, p. 1.
This, to put it mildly, is just too much for even the generally indifferent Georgia student to stomach. It has been called to the attention of school authorities and the Board of regents, and no definite action has been taken. The truth of the matter is that only vague promises have been made, and some think these were made solely for the purpose of getting some interested student out of the office.

It is getting rather sickening to us to get nothing but vague promises. It is likewise sickening for us to hear "We've gotta win the war first!" This old excuse has long since been worn thin through constant use by politicians. It is simply an indication of the inability of the one in authority to handle a hot potato.\textsuperscript{291}

Boo\textsuperscript{m} Town

In December of 1945, the administration announced that 100 trailers would be used to establish a “Trailer Town” on campus in the area known as “Ag Hill”.\textsuperscript{292} These buildings were the temporary barracks used by the armed forces at training sites and could house one or two families.\textsuperscript{293} Prior to the arrival of the trailers, the administrations had sewage and drainage systems installed on south campus.\textsuperscript{294} The temporary buildings did not arrive as soon as anticipated; only three trailers arrived in the first shipment in January of 1946.\textsuperscript{295} The administration was forced to use dormitory storage space as rooms for veterans. The delay in the additional buildings led to charges of “inefficiency and neglect on the part of certain top University officials” by some students.\textsuperscript{296}

\textsuperscript{291} “Students Want Action,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 27 July 1945, p. 2.

\textsuperscript{292} “Trailers Obtained to Ease Shortage of Veteran Housing,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 7 December 1945, p. 1; Dyer.

\textsuperscript{293} “Government Units To Help Shortage,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 25 January 1946, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{294} “Trailers Arrive on South Campus,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 1 February 1946, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{295} “University Gets First of Trailers for GI Families,” \textit{Athens Banner Herald}, 13 January 1946, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{296} “Student Vets Charge Inefficiency,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 5 April 1946, p. 1.
One hundred families moved into trailers in “Trailer Town”, or “Boom Town”, by the end of the spring semester in 1946. The trailers were designed for families of three and came with electricity, running water, oil heat, and an oil stove. Residents used separate trailers for toilets and showers. The trailer town also offered a laundry building with washtubs and ironing boards. The University latter supplied the veterans with lounge trailer which contained a study area and room for small parties. Some veterans brought their own trailers to Athens and were able to hook these structures to the utilities provided on “Ag Hill”.

The 1946-1947 Annual Report provided a stark description of Student Housing at the University of Georgia. President Caldwell wrote,

The increasing size of the student body has placed a very heavy burden on the physical facilities of the University. The highest pre-war enrollment in any one quarter was 3378. In the fall quarter of 1946 the enrollment was 6241-or 2832 in excess of the largest enrollment prior to the war. Our facilities were sufficient to enable us to provide comfortably for more than 4,000 students. Naturally, there has been a crowding of students in both classrooms and dormitories. Many students have lived in undesirable quarters off the campus of the university.

The housing shortage also made it difficult to recruit additional faculty to the University. New professors were unable to find homes for their families.

In a letter to the President of the University of Missouri, President Caldwell acknowledged that he was anticipating postwar building projects. He felt that the majority of the money would come from the state and additional funds would come from private donors or trusts.

---


299 The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947, p. 22.
with the authorization to be used on self-liquidating projects.\textsuperscript{300} These government funds were slow to arrive on campus as the administration had to navigate a dense bureaucracy of \textit{Justification of Need} forms that were required by the Veteran’s Educational Facilities Program under the United States Office of Education. As the classroom and housing shortages became dire, President Caldwell turned to the Senate for assistance. In a letter to Senator Walter George, Caldwell wrote,

May we ask that you take whatever actions you deem advisable to procure the projects which were deleted from our list of needs. May I point out that a critical shortage in educational facilities exists at the University of Georgia as a direct result of veteran enrollments and that no other institution in this region has made a greater effort to provide accommodations for veterans. You would be rendering a tremendous service to the State if you could help us get an affirmative decision from the FWA on the facilities which were deleted, all of which the agent of the U.S. Commissioner of Education has determined are sorely needed.\textsuperscript{301}

When faced with the need for additional student housing and influx of new students, Dean Tate felt the need to remind President Caldwell of his philosophy on students and his concerns about staffing patterns. He wrote, “Our clientele demands supervision and if we strengthen our social and educational supervision of the dormitories we will demand so much from our house mothers that 100 girls will be a full load. I certainly hope that we will never forget the fact that our house mothers are the chief counselors for our girls and that their work can remedy many disciplinary problems.”\textsuperscript{302} Conditions continued to worsen in the women’s

\textsuperscript{300} Harmon Caldwell to F.A. Middlebrush, July 1945, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

\textsuperscript{301} Harmon Caldwell to Senator Walter F. George, January 1947, Jonathan Clark Rogers Papers. Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library, The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

\textsuperscript{302} William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, November 1945, Harmon Caldwell Papers. This burden on the House Mothers may have been the impetus for the conduct responsibilities later given to the Women’s Student Government.
dormitories with three or four female students packed into double rooms and two students in rooms intended for one individual.\footnote{Report of the Office of the Dean of Women 1947-1948, Student Affairs Papers.}

Some students believed the administration was working hard to meet the housing needs, as evidenced by an editorial in the \textit{Red and Black}.

The staff of the Red and Black views with satisfaction the excellent progress that has been made in the recent housing problem. Through the efficient work of Mr. B. C. Kinney, of plant operations, an almost insurmountable problem has been alleviated, although it has not been completely solved. We are aware that the progress made consumed much time and over-time on the part of Mr. Kinney and his capable assistant Mr. E. B. Cook.\footnote{“Housing Students Takes Brighter Forecast,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 1 May 1946, p. 2.}

Other members of the student body continued to be frustrated by what they perceived to be “continuous run arounds, misleading statements, and a violently over emphasized ‘pass the buck’ program which has been employed by University officials.”\footnote{“An Editorial,” \textit{The Red and Black}, 5 April 1946, p. 1.}

Even with the incoming new units and additional dormitories, Dean Tate was confident that they would continue to face an uphill battle in housing all students as they headed into the fall semester of 1947.

Although a letter of mine to Mr. Blair mentioning our inability to house all the couples coming here was quoted by the students, I have carefully avoided any publicity saying we would be crowded this fall. Mr. Bailey reports that his applications for rooms are about one-third ahead of last year, that we have 450 couples without children and 130 with children that we have been unable to accommodate, despite the fact that in the last month we have placed quite a few in town against September’s moving date. For instance, in the last ten days we have placed seven faculty members, in addition to many students. Last year Mr. Thaxton had four drawers of applications when we had enrollment of 6220, and this year we have already filled two and a half drawers so far. We have more applications from women now than we can accommodate. I believe this information has been given to no one, but I see just now a heavier jam than last year. I do not like to stick my neck out...
on prophecies, but the last six bets of mine on enrollment have been paid by other administrative officers.\footnote{William Tate to Harmon Caldwell, July 7, 1947, Harmon Caldwell Papers.}

The administration knew the housing shortage provided bad publicity for the University and attempted to focus on the gains they had made in finding beds for students and divert attention from the “two and a half drawers” of applications and wait lists. President Caldwell provided an accurate snapshot of the housing situation to the Chancellor and Board of Regents in his 1946-1947 Annual Report.

As was pointed out in my report for 1945-46, temporary housing accommodations were given to us under three separate contracts. First we secured 100 trailers. Later we were given 76 apartments for married students. These apartments were in one story wooden buildings that were moved to campus. Finally, we were given 355 housing units in wooden structures that were erected on campus. We asked that 177 units of the last allocation be designed so that they could be used by married veterans and their families. All of these housing projects have been completed and units have been allocated to students, with the exception of 30 units which were assigned to faculty members who were veterans. Although all apartments for married students have been assigned, we still have more than 600 applications from married couples, one or both of whom wish to enter the University.\footnote{The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1946-1947, p. 25.}

The 1947 Pandora contained a special feature on “Boom Town”, the affectionate name given to the housing area on south campus for married students.\footnote{1947 Pandora} The majority of the husbands in “Boom Town” were veterans. The area consisted of 100 trailers, 260 prefabricated units, and 42 privately owned trailers. The buildings housed 402 married couples, who also took advantage of the three laundry units, nurseries, recreational hall, and post office. Some married couples were able to find living quarters in the homes of Athens residents.\footnote{“Officials Predict Some Improvement Housing Situation,” The Red and Black, 10 January 1947, p. 1.}
The veterans in the trailer town quickly set up their own community. The residents elected a mayor and aldermen for five wards within the area.\(^{310}\) The mayor and other elected officials worked hard to draw attention to needs in their community. They lobbied the University administration to improve living conditions, including the quality of the rods in and out of “Trailer Town”.\(^{311}\) The mayor and aldermen set rules and regulations for the laundry and community gardens. They later worked with Dean Tate and other administrators to require all dogs to be placed on leashes to protect children and gardens.

\[^{310}\] “Veterans on “Ag Hill” to Select New Mayor; To Elect Aldermen,” The Red and Black, 25 April 1947, p. 1.

\[^{311}\] Dyer.
Chapter 11

Conclusion

Returning veterans at the University of Georgia helped shape the institution in the late 1940s through their leadership and involvement. They were serious about their studies, but did get involved in campus activities and politics. Their presence helped shape the experience of their traditional age peers in both positive and negative ways. Some facets of campus never accepted the veterans.

The bitter boys are fading out. The grim and worldly-wise veteran is rapidly being replaced by the smooth-cheeked successor, the freshly-hatched high school graduate.

Dungarees and khakis, familiar on campus for such a long time, will soon be as extinct as the short skirt. The newcomers in rat caps are the first indication of return to the traditional UGA life—less callousness toward tradition, youthful enthusiasm in all activities, reserve in fraternity rushing.

Veterans must see the handwriting on the wall. The power they have wielded, and wielded so well, is on the wane. They must realize that the character of the campus during the last two years has been a reflection of their purposeful philosophy, rather than an example of the typical college atmosphere.

The older element should not be dismayed by the youthful behavior of these invaders—these ‘greenhorns.’ Despite their lack of worldliness, they are the true collegians; students whose ideas and attitudes will be shaped here rather than in the sophistication of Paris, the privation of Italy, or the desolation of the Pacific Islands.

We, the old guard, should not resent this naiveté, but recognize it as a healthy sign of a return to campus normalcy. Let us extend a welcome hand to newcomers. 312

The influx of veterans began to slow in the spring of 1947, and took a sharp downturn in the fall of 1948. 313 Veterans at colleges and universities across the nation were completing degrees and moving into the next phases of their lives. When they left an institution, that college or university lost federal funds. The University of Georgia was hit especially hard by these losses. The institution had made mission-crucial budgetary decisions based on federal money.


313 “Enrollment Figures Break All Records with 7,087 Total,” The Red and Black, 29 October 1948, p. 3.
When veterans began to graduate and those monies began to slow, the administration faced a deficit. In describing the situation to a colleague, Dean Tate wrote, “I do not know that we face a falling off in enrollment any more than any other college, but I do feel that we are more dependent on our increased veterans’ fees than other schools seem to be and consequently will be hit between the eyes quicker than others.”\textsuperscript{314} This decrease placed great stress on the administration of the University.

The institution had to manage a 14 percent budget cut in 1948 due to the decrease in federal funds for veterans’ tuitions and fees.\textsuperscript{315} This budget cut came at a time when the overall enrollment continued to grow, requiring the same if not additional personnel. In order to maintain the services provided, the state would have to increase it annual appropriation.\textsuperscript{316} The 1948-1949 Annual Report painted a bleak picture of the financial realities in Athens.

Veteran enrollment is so rapidly declining; it will be negligible within two years. This does not mean that total enrollment will be smaller; the exact opposite is predicted. On the basis of Government forecasts ad a nation-wide survey by the National Education Association, university attendance will soon begin rapidly to increase. If, therefore, the University of Georgia is to meet future student demands, facilities must be immediately expanded to care for 9,000 or 10,000 Georgia boys and girls.

The loss of Government tuition payments or veteran students will also call for larger state allocations. The University of Georgia is truly a ‘state’ school; it does not cater to out-of-state students in order to collect their out-of-state fees. Its students are 89% Georgians, and on behalf of these Georgia boys and girls, the President pleads. Matriculation fees should be lower so that every Georgia boy and girl can secure, with least difficulty and embarrassment, the University training to which they are entitled.

Through the preceding pages of this report a certain spirit of pessimism is reflected. This stems from a sense of frustration on the part of faculty and students alike. Present salary schedules are insufficient; plant facilities are entirely outgrown; housing

\textsuperscript{314} William Tate to Robert Strozier, January 4, 1949, Harmon Caldwell Papers.

\textsuperscript{315} The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1948-1949.

for students and faculty is either too poor or unacceptable or too scarce and too high from the standpoint of rentals.\textsuperscript{317}

The pessimism of the President’s report is accurate but seems not as dismal when considered in the context of five years of the history of the University. While the snapshot seems dark, the relationship that existed between the institution and the students was vibrant. For example, the administrators and the student body were not able to completely resolve the housing crisis, they worked together to improve the situation in a variety of ways. They were aware of the patriotism of the era and used it to their advantage in recruiting Athens residents to house veterans.

Research identified at least three initiatives during the era that never came to completion. Student apathy appeared to be the cause of failure for the honor code and student government movements. Faculty reluctance never allowed the class week to be shortened to five days. While there were some examples of apathy, students were passionate in their arguments. What appeared to be apathy may have been two immovable forces meeting with no resolution. The G.O.P and the IFC were both very strong and had considerable power on campus at a time fraternities at other institutions during this era were decreasing in power in influence.\textsuperscript{318}

The interaction between Greek and non-Greek students was a deterrent to at least two of the major initiatives during the era, the honor code and the creation of a student government. While this study was focused on the relationship between the institution and the entire student body, future research could examine the historical nature of relationships between student populations within the greater body. Research of this type may reveal information to assist administrators as they attempt to build student support for new policies.

\textsuperscript{317} The University of Georgia Annual Reports 1948-1949, p. 60.

\textsuperscript{318} Altbach, Student Politics in America.
The swinging pendulum that illustrates the relationship and the shifting power between students and the institution was active between 1944 and 1949. The arc was apparent in the student government movement. Administrators offered students more power as veterans arrived on campus. When students repeatedly failed to reach a consensus on the matter, the administration began to take back power they had originally offered. This reversal was evident in the refusal to give students a voice in the allocation of student organization fees. In contrast, the faculty never offered the student body its reasoning for not supporting the five-day week initiative.

Administrators today face many similar challenges as those managed by President Caldwell and Deans Tate and Stallings. The conduct issues outlined in the study could easily be handled in modern student conduct offices. While regulations for moral behavior may be strikingly different, the educational conversations with students are similar. Students face similar challenges today, just their context is different. Alcohol is still prevalent on campuses and administrators still navigate relationships with businesses in college towns with purposes that sometimes differ from institutional goals. While the Chicken Shanty may no longer exist in Athens, numerous bars have now taken its place.

Today’s student affairs practitioners sometimes feel they deal with over-involved parents. This research provided records of a surprising number of parental interactions with administrators. Parents were protective of their sons and daughters and often pleaded with Dean Tate and his staff for second chances for their children.

The Student Conduct records contained several administrative referrals to counseling services. Many of these referrals were accompanied by suspensions from the University. The modern University has a larger infrastructure with more personnel to provide attention to
troubled students. Administrators in this earlier era took steps to protect the larger community since they were stretched too thin in areas of responsibilities to provide individual attention to students presenting special problems. A semester suspension was utilized to provide students with the opportunity to get help for whatever problems they were struggling with that had manifested in a behavioral issue.

It is impossible to completely capture the essence of the relationship between a college student and his or her college or university. This study has provided only glimpses of the relationship, which can best be understood as two entities working toward a common goal. The context of the era and the developmental differences between the groups complicate the goal and enrich the learning experience for the student and administrators. Researchers examining the pendulum swings of the relationship must be careful to remove their modern lens when attempting to compare eras. Each time period has a very unique context. While challenges are similar, they are displayed in very different ways. The editorials in past eras have been replaced by blogs and social networking applications utilized by current college students. Biases or presumptions must be put aside in order to identify similar themes that exist over different eras.

As stated in the introduction, “much of current American culture and society is based on actions and events in the past.” Students on college campuses in the late 1940s would go on to serve as faculty and administrators over the next 50 years. Their experiences in the time after the implementation of the G.I. Bill would help shape the decisions they made. An examination of the relationship between students and intuitions provides a richer and fuller understanding of later policy decisions and can also provide guidance to those administrators making decisions.

---

This manuscript began with the premise that each college generation is a product of its era. The behavior and challenges of the students and administrators in this case study were certainly shaped by the unique changes taking place on campuses at the end of World War II. An older, more mature student entered the classroom and the student organization meeting room. The study revealed a vibrant campus life and an involved student body that is not all that different from the population on today’s colleges and universities.
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