POPULAR GOVERNMENT
presents as its July, 1944 issue (Volume 10, Number 4), this reprint from

The National University Extension Association
Studies in University Extension Education

NO. 2 JULY 1, 1944

The Story of the Institute of Government

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL

By
ALBERT COATES

Published by the Association, W. S. Bittner, Secretary,
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT is published monthly by the Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Editorial, business and advertising address: Box 990, Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscriptions, per year: $2.00. Single copies, 25 cents each. Advertising rates will be furnished on request. Address all communications to Box 990, Chapel Hill, N. C. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Chapel Hill, N. C.

The National University Extension Association
Studies in University Extension Education

NO. 2 JULY 1, 1944

The Story of the Institute of Government

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHAPEL HILL

By

ALBERT COATES

Published by the Association, W. S. Bittner, Secretary,
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. Price 25c.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

By RUSSELL M. GRUMMAN, *Director, University Extension Division*
The University of North Carolina

In 1939, while visiting a number of colleges, universities, and adult education centers in fifteen eastern and mid-western states, I was frequently asked for information about the Institute of Government. I found that it was being recognized as doing the most unique and distinctive extension work in the field of government in any American university.

The founder and director of the Institute of Government, Albert Coates, is also professor of law at the University of North Carolina. The idea of the Institute literally grew out of his law school classroom. Now it may be said that the entire state is his classroom. Recently, the Institute became officially a part of the University and thus gained recognition as the University, as well as the state, agency for in-service training of governmental officials.

My colleagues and associates in the field of college and university extension will be interested in the relationship of the Institute of Government and the University Extension Division. Administratively, they are independent of each other, but actually, through the co-operation of the directors and through representation on the Institute's board of governors, their activities are co-ordinated in order that the University may render maximum service to the state. As this story reveals, the program and work of the Institute constitute in a very real sense an important form of university extension.

The story of the Institute of Government adds another chapter to the history of society's struggle to achieve the social and political objective, namely, better government of, by, and for the people. In one respect it is a record of personal courage, sacrifice, and accomplishment. But more than that it is a vivid presentation of the experience of county, city, state, and university officials working together with the people to improve the democratic processes of American life.

In 1943 the National Extension Association invited Mr. Coates to write the story of the Institute of Government, in the form of a personal narrative, for its bulletin of Studies in University Extension Education. He was asked to retrace his steps in building the Institute, outline his successive trials and errors, and point out pitfalls which might be avoided by men in other institutions

throughout the country who may be interested in initiating or expanding similar experiments in governmental extension.

I have selected the following letters from the Institute files to indicate what federal, state, city and county officials, and educational leaders think and say about the Institute of Government.

Federal Officials

The President of the United States:

"The Institute of Government, its purposes and its organization, as conceived and established in North Carolina, has rendered and will continue to render fine service to the State and the Nation. It is my hope that other states will recognize the leadership of North Carolina in what it is doing through this Institute and that states having no comparable agency will accept and follow your leadership."

The Speaker of the National House of Representatives:

"If the program of the Institute of Government is pursued, a startling recompense will come to your people in economy and efficiency in every branch of your government and practically an awakening of the consciousness of the individual citizen of his responsibilities to his community.

"This is in my opinion a civic agency which in the long reach of coming years will not only prove of incalculable value to every citizen of North Carolina, but will also prove to be the pattern and likewise the inspiration for the establishment of other similar activities in many states of our Union."

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"I have been happy in watching the great work which you and your associates in North Carolina are accomplishing. I have always felt that what we have tried to do in a National way in regard to Federal agencies could be accomplished in a local way with local agencies. You have actually done this. The Institute of Government will be at the top of that list of names which in years to come will be viewed as pioneers in the advanced field of scientific crime detection and law enforcement training. As I go about the country I have a great sense of satisfaction in being able to point to North Carolina and the fine work that you are doing in that State. I know that this great work will spread to all sections of the country."

State Officials

The Governor of North Carolina:

"The Institute of Government has already rendered the State of North Carolina great service. Its usefulness has been demonstrated in a hundred different ways, and the State at large has acclaimed its constructive achievements in the public interest. At this crucial time in our State and National life the work of the Institute is even more important than ever before. The State looks to the Institute of Government to give leadership in these essential undertakings."

The Attorney General of North Carolina:

"I think it is pretty generally understood throughout the State that the Institute of Government has, during its existence, rendered a service of incalculable value to our counties, cities and towns in carrying on the functions and duties which, under the law, they are required to perform. To mention only one service with which I have been thoroughly acquainted, the listing, assessing and collection of taxes, I will say that the aid given by the Institute of Government to the taxing authorities in our local units of government has been of tremendous value."

The General Assembly of North Carolina—Joint Resolution, 1943:

"Whereas the services rendered by the legislative staff of the Institute of Government of the University of North Carolina in analysis of bills, preparation of pending calendars, daily reports of calendar action and other assistance to legislators has been of great value to members of the General Assembly and to interested citizens throughout the State;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

"That the General Assembly of North Carolina expresses its sincere appreciation to the Institute of Government of the University of North Carolina and to members of its legislative staff for the valuable assistance rendered by them to members of the General Assembly in the conduct of its business."

City and County Officials

(1) "The Institute's guidebook relating to the collection of taxes and the supplement thereto have been loaned by me temporarily to our Tax Collector, who is now studying them. After he has completed the study, it is his purpose to loan them to various employees in his office in order that all of them may be acquainted with these books."

(2) "On next Monday after serving sixteen years, I will retire from the board of commissioners, and feel my work would not be complete until I wrote and thanked you and the staff of the Institute of Government for the many courtesies shown me, personally as well as officially. I want to compliment the work the Institute is doing for the cities and counties of our State."

(3) "A certified public accountant has just completed his audit of our books and has advised our governing board that in all his experience of more than 20 years he has never seen a better report. Naturally this makes all of us feel good. The Institute of Government has been of such great assistance in handling our affairs that we are sending you a copy of this audit report."

(4) "I have carefully read the Guidebook. I think this one of the most valuable pieces of information on the conduct of elections that I have ever seen. I have suggested to the Chairman of the board of elections of my county that he urge every election official to study this book thoroughly between now and the date of the elections."

American Educator

Statement in 1935 from Roscoe Pound, Dean of the Harvard Law School:

"I doubt whether anything which has taken place in connection with American Government in the present century is as significant as the movement for planned, intelligent official and administrative co-operation which began some years ago in North Carolina, and has now taken on enduring form in the Institute of Government.

"If we are to avoid centralization under the conditions of today WE MUST LEARN CO-OPERATION.

"One might justly compare our policy in respect of co-operation to Artemus Ward's military company in which every member was an officer and the superior of every other.

"North Carolina has taken the lead in organizing this spirit of co-operation. . . . What seems to me particularly significant in the North Carolina movement is that it is a voluntary movement. . . .

"To rely on the enlightened free action of officials, rather than a system of command from above in a centralized administrative system, is in accord with the characteristic policy of English-speaking peoples.

"It is in accord with the spirit in which our political institutions were conceived. It is evolutionary, not revolutionary, and does not involve the institutional waste which too often accompanies significant changes in government."

INTRODUCTION

Don't Shoot Your Sheriff: Teach Him!

By J. P. McEvoy
Roving Editor, Reader's Digest

Reprinted from *The Reader's Digest*, October 1943

Is your County Sheriff in jail? Mine is. Does your county know how to collect its taxes? Mine doesn't—it is $800,000 behind. Did the Justice of the Peace in your neighborhood ever halt a trial midway and cry out to the amazed attorneys: "For God's sake, will somebody stop and tell me what the law is supposed to be?" That has happened in my county. Legend has it the dance-hall proprietor out West used to put up a sign: "Don't shoot the Piano Player. The Poor Devil is doing his best." Today, all over the land we taxpayers might well put up such signs over the desks of our officials in City Halls, County Court Houses and State Capitols.

Or, if we feel we can no longer afford the luxury of wasteful government—when it isn't downright stupid and corrupt—we might do what the citizens of North Carolina are doing: invest one half cent per person annually and support a central laboratory where the techniques of clean, efficient local government can be collected, studied, and passed on to every officeholder.

Fifteen years ago Albert Coates, Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill, began to analyze his job of teaching criminal law to young lawyers. He was giving the course—out of a casebook of Supreme Court decisions. He asked himself how many cases ever got up to the Supreme Court, discovered that the answer, over 30 years' time, was only four in every thousand.

Coates called his class together and said, in effect: "Hold everything, boys. We can't go on like this. I have been trying to teach 100 percent of a course out of four tenths of one percent of the knowledge. That difference represents the law as taught in my classroom and government as practiced in the City Halls and County Court Houses in North Carolina."

Coates found that most other colleges of the state were also teaching generalities out of sterile textbooks, and that the high school civics courses were even further removed from reality. "North Carolina was graduating every year 30,000 boys and girls who could track Caesar and Cicero around ancient Rome but

couldn't find their way around their own City Hall, County Court House or State Capitol," he said. "As a result, thousands of officials and hundreds of thousands of citizens were without adequate understanding of the workings of governmental institutions."

Coates laid aside his professorial gown and joined the first police force that would take him. He listened to complaints, went along with the cops when they made arrests, followed individual cases through the trials, and when he had thoroughly digested the procedure in that locality moved on to another.

He learned that government was practiced differently in every county, differently even in sections of the same county. He learned how inaccessible were the laws which governed procedures—hidden in constitutional provisions and legislative enactments, tucked away in County Commissioner's regulations and municipal ordinances, smothered under decisions of the Courts and rulings of Departments.

He ferreted out some of the accumulated experiences stored in the brains of hundreds of officials and employes—unwritten practices and techniques. "We teachers of government had been laying books end to end—but they had been laying experiences end to end," says Coates.

Then he went back to his criminal-law class, shoved the casebook into the background and called in the local law-enforcement officials to help him instruct his students and incidentally each other. More, he invited law-enforcement officers from all over the state, down to the lowliest constable, for a three-day get-together at Chapel Hill. He invited experts on scientific crime detection from the FBI and the National Police Academy. He led panel discussions in which officers on every level from township to federal swapped their hard-earned tricks of the trade.

It was the first time in the state's history that these law-enforcement officers working on the same problems with the same people in the same territory ventured out of their individual air-tight compartments of authority to come together for systematic co-operation.

This three-day Institute is now a ten-day intensive training school. The FBI says that as a direct result North Carolina is the nation's outstanding example of improvement in law-enforcement processes through co-operative effort.

Coates sent out similar invitations to Clerks of the Superior Courts, to firemen, to city and county accountants. In 1931, other groups organized judges, election officials, prosecuting attorneys,

city attorneys, coroners, tax officials. The following year—May 6, 1932—300 representatives of all groups of city, county, state and federal officials came together at Chapel Hill to form the Institute of Government.

Out of these meetings grew a series of guidebooks for the officials. The books set down on paper the hitherto-unwritten lore of officialdom. As Coates puts it: "I had a mental picture of thousands of North Carolina officials, town, county and state, rotating into office every two or four years to learn the job of governing by the wasteful method of making the same mistakes at the public's expense. The outgoing officers took their experiences with them and the incoming officers in many cases were lucky to get the keys from their predecessors, much less the benefit of such education as the taxpayers had provided. Like the frog in the well, local government was continually going forward three feet and falling back two."

The first guidebook, for law-enforcement officers, included scientific aids in crime detection, a complete manual of techniques and practices, and all the relevant laws, so organized that the simplest non-legally trained official need have no further trouble. Then came books on the Sheriff's office, a similar guide for Clerks of the Superior Court, for county and city tax collectors, for election officials, and many more.

These textbooks are distributed to every official in the state—including the 6000 who participated in these training schools—and through the mails and over long-distance telephone comes a continuous stream of practical down-to-earth questions.

A police chief wants to know whether he may lawfully sell confiscated tax-paid liquor and turn the proceeds over to the Town. A county commissioner asks to what extent he may financially aid local boards of such federal agencies as the Selective Service and OPA. Or a Board of County Commissioners wants an analysis of the tax systems and experience of several similar counties. Such an intelligent interest in other counties was unheard-of in the old days.

Once established, the laboratory proved its value. One tax supervisor in one year added 4000 new taxpayers and $5,000,000 in newly discovered property to the tax books. The Institute taught his improved methods to other supervisors, who likewise added millions to the tax rolls. One city reorganized its tax collections and saved $6500 annually. One county worked out methods by which 98 percent of its taxes were collected in the current year, as against the state-wide collection record of less than 85 percent.

How have citizens reacted? In one small community Coates invited local officials and heads of civic organizations to a joint meeting. He asked local officials if they worked together on their problems. They said: "Certainly not—it just isn't done."

The civic group representatives nodded "We told you so," and gloated out loud. Whereupon Coates asked them if they had ever worked together on the same civic problems, or whether the Rotary, the YMCA, the Women's Club, the Boy Scouts and the American Legion all walked by their wild lones, like Kipling's cat. With red faces they confessed: they didn't co-ordinate their efforts either.

And so developed the next step in the Institute's program—joint sessions of citizens and officials, to promote co-operation. It was impressed upon all that the Institute was nonpartisan and nonpolitical—that never would it lobby for or against anything or anybody no matter how good or how bad, either in the legislature or out of it. Its function was to find facts, distribute them, and co-ordinate officials, citizens and the schools in a united program for good government. Local chairmen of both parties began to appear together at district meetings, and when the $50,000 building of the Institute of Government was dedicated, they competed in tossing oratorical bouquets at the Institute and Coates.

One speaker brought out the fact that in the early years Coates had financed the Institute entirely out of his pocket—in 15 years he put $30,000, or half his total salary as a professor, into his project; that he and his wife worked on it days, nights, week-ends and summer vacations; that when the depression struck hardest they gave up their home and lived for three years in a rented room without the luxury of a private bath, and when they didn't have money to buy food a friend who ran a restaurant allowed them to run up $700 in food bills.

Then a handful of North Carolina businessmen came to Coates' aid and advanced $10,000 a year over a five-year period. This permitted a small staff, and by the time these funds had run out—around 1936—the value of the Institute's work was demonstrated to a point where counties, cities, and towns all over North Carolina were subscribing to its service—at the rate of one half of one cent per inhabitant, bringing in between $13,000 and $15,000 annually. (This year the state helped by matching this sum.)

Coates got up and told them he had never been a martyr and no one was going to make him one; that no man present could have taken the same amount of money he had put in the Institute and

bought more fun and satisfaction with it; that his wife felt the same way—especially after one co-ed who had seen her working for the Institute in the library day in and day out came up to her with this priceless tribute: "For a long time I thought you were Mr. Coates' secretary. And I felt so sorry for his wife."

When I asked Coates who could launch similar programs in other states, he replied: "Any group, any institution, any public spirited individual. The editor of a county newspaper, or the County Judge. Or the Rotary, or Lions. Or a country doctor, a banker, a writer, or a little businessman. It doesn't matter who starts it as long as the basic idea is education rather than reform. People dislike being reformed. In fact, few reform governments get re-elected more than once. But most people like to learn—officials, voters, children, teachers—and once they learn the right way of doing something, it's no longer so easy to get away with the wrong way."

Coates added that some of the things they must learn are that our form of government, which we are fighting a war to preserve, is forever being administered by beginners who do not always have beginners' luck; that private business, operating in this fashion, would go broke before beginners learned the business, and public business likewise may go broke before beginners learn their government.

"More than common honesty and common sense is required in public office. $100,000 lost through honest inefficiency is as great a burden to taxpayers as $100,000 lost through conscious fraud. Knowledge is no guarantee of character, we are told—but neither is ignorance—and the best of governmental systems may be wrecked by men who do not understand it. And finally, as Dean Pound has warned us, we can avoid federal centralization under the conditions of today only by learning and practicing local co-operation."

The Story of the Institute of Government

By ALBERT COATES
Director of the Institute of Government
The University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

"No people can ever become a great people by exchanging its individuality, but only by encouraging and developing it. We must seek out and appreciate our own distinctive traits, our own traditions, our own deep-rooted tendencies, and read our destiny in their interpretation."
—CHARLES B. AYCOCK, Governor of North Carolina (1901-05)

I

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT OBJECTIVES

A

The Gap between Government as Taught and Practiced

Some years ago I undertook to teach a course in criminal law in the law school of the University of North Carolina. I taught the course, as most teachers teach it, out of a casebook of Supreme Court decisions. I woke up one morning to learn that of all the cases tried in the criminal courts of North Carolina for the past thirty years, only four-tenths of one per cent ever got to the Supreme Court on appeal.

Does this mean, I thought to myself, that I am trying to teach one hundred per cent of a course out of four-tenths of one per cent of the knowledge? Does that difference represent the gap between law and government as it is taught in my classroom and as it is practiced in the city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies in North Carolina? I could not sleep that night for thinking of forty boys who were coming to my classroom each morning to learn enough to go back home and make a living, build a home, support a family, and work out a career. I knew I was giving them an all too slender underpinning, and I knew I had to do something about it.

I looked around to see how government was being taught in the colleges of the state and, with rare exceptions, found teachers of government one step farther removed from reality than teachers

of law. For most law school teachers were dealing at least with source materials—constitutional provisions, legislative enactments, court decisions and departmental rulings; whereas most political science teachers were often dealing largely with platitudes and generalities in textbooks derived at second hand from source materials. I looked further to see how civics and government were being taught in the high schools of the state and, with rare exceptions, found high school civics courses even farther removed from reality than college or law school courses. In stepping down the raw materials of knowledge to high school levels, the life of government had too often been stepped out, and the product reaching the students was cut and dried and dead.

From these investigations I concluded that the high schools, colleges and professional schools of North Carolina were every year graduating thirty thousand boys and girls who might be able to read a page of foreign text, but could not read their own municipal balance sheet; able to track Caesar and Cicero around Rome, and yet unable to find their way around their own city hall, county courthouse, and state capitol; with the result that thousands of officials were periodically going into office knowing nothing of their powers and duties, and hundreds of thousands of citizens were periodically going to the ballot box with little understanding of the structure and the workings of their governmental institutions.

I realized I could not keep my self-respect as a school teacher without trying to bridge the gap between government as it was taught in my own classroom and as it was practiced in the city halls, county courthouses and state departments of North Carolina—and this became the first objective of the Institute of Government.

If I had to put my finger on some one point in time when the Institute of Government was conceived, it would be that moment. Many years of hard labor were needed to bring it forth. This story of that labor is written at the request of the National University Extension Association as a guide to institutions and individuals interested in initiating similar programs and in furthering programs already under way. In the effort to achieve this purpose it is written in the informal terms of a personal narrative tracing the steps in the growth of the Institute's program, the pitfalls and difficulties confronted on the way, the efforts made to avoid these pitfalls and overcome these difficulties, and the successes and failures of these efforts.

Part of the knowledge of government, I knew, was recorded in the books: in constitutional provisions giving the main outlines of

our governmental structure; in federal and state legislative enactments—including public and local laws and private and special acts, passed within state and federal constitutional limits; in the regulations and ordinances passed by county commissioners and city councilmen within state and federal legislative limits; in the decisions of courts construing constitutions and statutes and setting forth the common law; in the administrative rulings and regulations of departments and agencies at federal, state and local levels; in the secondary materials such as surveys, special studies and texts derived from original sources. But where were the sources of knowledge beyond the lids of the law books?

Studies in a particular county had revealed a series of special acts passed by successive legislatures to correct an evil practice in the sheriff's office, while the evil practice kept on rolling along without let or hindrance from the majesty of the written word. It did not take me long to find that though successive sheriffs in that particular county may have been philosophers, they were not given to much reading of the books. Each one had come by way of election into office, inquired of the office helpers how they had been doing things, and kept on doing them that way. Thus law in books and law in action ran in parallel lines that never met.

To the study of government in books I therefore added the study of government in action: in the accumulated experience stored in the brains of hundreds of officials and employees; in the methods, practices and techniques rising out of the initiative and resourcefulness of unnumbered persons in city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies—knowledge not to be found in printed pages, but no less representing the habitual processes of the law. In addition to looking for the law as it was written in the books on library shelves, I turned to looking for the law as it was written in the heads of public officials and employees in the routine operations of their offices and in their habits on the job.

B

The Gap between Overlapping Governmental Units

I started with the administration of the criminal law. There I ran into the fact that North Carolina was one piece of land; that in the last fifty years people had built on this piece of land a pyramid of overlapping governmental units—federal, state, county, township, town and special district; that many of these overlapping units were making criminal laws; that most of these units had their own

law enforcing officers. I found that a person committing a crime within a city's limits might be subject to arrest by a town policeman, township constable, county sheriff, state patrolman, or one of a number of federal agents; that he might be tried by a city, county, state or federal court and sentenced to a city, county, state or federal prison; that never in the course of a hundred and fifty years had these town, township, county, state and federal law enforcing officers, working on the same problems for the same people in the same territory, come together for the systematic practice of co-operative effort. *Thus I stumbled on the second objective of the Institute of Government: to co-ordinate the activities of officials in interlocking, overlapping, and sometimes conflicting governmental units, in the effort to cut down duplication, friction and strife.*

C

The Gap between Outgoing and Incoming Officials

As I worked my way into the field of criminal law administration I began to see face to face what I had long seen through a glass darkly: that we are committed by centuries of history to the theory and practice of elective offices, short terms of office, and rotation of officers; that every two or four years, hundreds of newly-elected officers come into the administration of public affairs knowing all too little about the powers and duties of their offices at the start, learning as they go along, going out of office at the end of their respective terms to be followed by successors who pick up the threads of office, not at the point where their predecessors left off, but almost, if not quite, at the point where they began; with the result that popular government in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina was in the fix of the frog in the well—jumping up three feet and falling back two.

As I worked my way still further into the thick of things, I found that throughout the 1920's and the early 1930's city after city and county after county in North Carolina had been forced to call for assistance from governmental experts beyond the borders of the state in dealing with their governmental problems; that the governor of North Carolina had to call in outside experts to assist him with his plans for the reorganization of various departments of state and county government, and felt he had to go beyond the borders of the state to get a group of men sufficiently equipped with knowledge and experience to make a competent survey of the structure of state and local government.

It is no discounting of the value of these governmental experts, called in by our leaders to do for us that which we had not yet developed agencies to do for ourselves, to point out the weakness in the practice of relying on them: (1) that through no fault of theirs they come to us ignorant of our local governmental institutions, the conditions out of which they have grown, the people of which they are a part and among whom they must operate; (2) they write their conclusions into a report which too soon goes upon the shelf to be read by all too few, and have no part in or responsibility for the practical operation of their recommended changes; (3) and as soon as their report is written they leave and carry away with them the most valuable results of all their work—the personal knowledge and experience gained in doing it.

Thus I stumbled on a third objective of the Institute of Government: to bridge the gap in knowledge and experience between outgoing and incoming public officials so as to provide continuity of governmental experience and cut down the lost time, lost motion, and lost money involved in a rotating governmental personnel.

D

The Gap between the People and Their Government

As I went further into the field I ran into the fact that the rank and file of the people had learned little about the operation of their government; that many of them had forgotten the little learning they had acquired; that in times of stress and strain the very people who had called for added governmental services would strike out all too blindly at the rising costs of government and slap their own officials in the face; that popular suspicions were being met with official resentments as criminations led to recriminations and the fighting line was drawn between "taxpayers" and "taxspenders", between "voters" and "officials", between "the people" and their "government". *Thus I stumbled on a fourth objective of the Institute of Government: to bridge the gap between citizens and officials by building the machinery to put the people in touch with their government and keep them in touch with it.*

How could these objectives be achieved?

II

CUTTING PATHS TO INSTITUTE OBJECTIVES

A

The Problem of Co-ordinating the Activities of Officials in Interlocking, Overlapping and Conflicting Governmental Units, in the Effort to Cut Down Duplication, Friction and Strife

The Stage Is Set for Conflict. Our structure of interlocking, overlapping and conflicting governmental units was not planned that way; like Topsy, it just growed that way. In 1663 the charter from the crown called Carolina into being as a single governmental unit. From 1663 to 1911 the state of North Carolina was divided into one hundred counties. This far-flung framework of one hundred counties was subdivided into near two thousand townships. On this subdividing framework of the township was laid the overlapping framework of three hundred cities and towns. Across this framework of town, township, county and state was thrown a crazy-quilt of special districts in numbers yet unknown. Into this complicated governmental structure came the federal government —with cautious steps in the Continental Congress in the eighteenth century, with firm strides in the federal Constitution near the start of the nineteenth century, and with dizzy speed since the turn of the twentieth century, as it has successively moved across state lines, county lines, township lines, town and city limits, onto the doorsteps and into the homes of the people.

This meant that city councilmen, county commissioners, state legislators and federal congressmen were making *criminal laws* for the government of the same people in the same territory, to be administered by city, county, state and federal court officials; *road laws* to be administered by city, county, state and federal street and highway officials; *health and welfare laws* to be administered by city, county, state and federal health and welfare officials; *tax laws* to be similarly administered, calling for taxes to be collected from the same people by city, county, state and federal tax collectors. It meant, as already indicated in this story, that most of these agencies had for one hundred and fifty years been working on the same problems, for the same people, in the same territory, without coming together in the systematic practice of co-operative effort.

Many of these groups had long been organized into associations. For two years I attended their conventions, getting acquainted with their officials, analyzing their problems as they were aired on con-

vention floors and in committee meetings, studying their organizations and activities, finding the places in their programs where they needed help, catching a vision of the possibilities involved in a federation of all groups of public officials representing all types of governmental units operating within the territorial limits of North Carolina.

Conflict Yields to Co-operation among Law Enforcing Officers. I started out to persuade city policemen, county sheriffs, state patrolmen, and federal agents to come together and talk about problems of law enforcement which concerned them all. Policemen told me they would come but sheriffs wouldn't. Sheriffs told me they would come but policemen wouldn't. Some officers in all groups promised me they would take a chance and come whether others came or not. To the astonishment of all, everybody came. A state highway patrolman actually picked up a county sheriff and a city police chief in his territory, and all three rode to the meeting in the same car! And there they were, all dressed up and asking—Where do we go from here?

Having brought them together, my next task was to persuade them to face the facts together. Have you ever heard of friction, jealousy or strife between different groups of law enforcing officers, I asked. Individual expressions before me instantly froze into expressionless masks. This was a matter to be discussed privately on the back stairs, not publicly in open meeting! When I got no response from the group, I turned to individuals with the same question. One after another denied in open meeting the very things he had told me in private conversation. As long as we deny the existence of these official jealousies, I pleaded, we can't afford to do anything about them, because the very steps we take to overcome them will be an open confession of the very things we have denied. When I saw I was getting no further fast, I turned to relating specific incidents individual officers had told me, and asked them if they had ever heard such things. Finally one of them cut his eye at the man next to him, another snickered, and then, as if on signal, the silence was broken; they broke out in spontaneous laughter; individuals came out from behind their masks, and we were ready to proceed.

Now that we are ready to admit these jealousies exist, I continued, let's see how they started, and if we can remove them. I suspect the jealousies between policemen and sheriffs in North Carolina began on the morning after the first town in North Carolina was incorporated, when the high sheriff walked down the street,

saw a man in blue coat with brass buttons standing on the street corner and asked, "Who are you?" The man replied, "I am the policeman." "I never heard of such a thing," said the sheriff. "There never was such a thing," replied the policeman, "until the legislature incorporated this town and the board of aldermen named me the first policeman." "What do you do?" inquired the sheriff. "I arrest folks when they violate the law," said the policeman. "What's that you say," exclaimed the sheriff in astonishment. "I am the sheriff—the high sheriff; and nobody has been arresting folks around here but me." "Well, you are going to have help from now on," replied the policeman. To which the sheriff replied, "I don't want any help, and I'm not going to have any help if I can help it." As the sheriff walked off muttering to himself, institutional jealousies between sheriff and policeman officially began.

I suspect that jealousies between local officers and the state highway patrol began one morning while the county sheriff and the city police chief were talking on the street corner. A newly created and finely appareled patrolman rode by on his shining motorcycle with his cut-out on, drowned out their conversation, threw dust on these local majesties of the law as his wheels cut around the corner, and added insult to injury as he waved a hand by way of greeting, which was no less friendly because it was a little condescending. At that point the sheriff looked at the policeman and the policeman looked at the sheriff. The sheriff swallowed a little of the tobacco juice which had accumulated while he stopped chewing tobacco to watch the new highway wonder go by, and then spat out the rest along with the quid. The policeman cordially ignored this obvious violation of the city ordinance, and, as he brushed off the dust, ominously inquired, "What is that thing?" He got his answer in a flash from the sheriff's eyes. Instinctively and intuitively they reached an understanding too deep for words to express, and as they shook hands in one convulsive spasm the banner of local self government was raised against outside encroachment from the "State Octopus," the "Capitol Crowd," and the "Raleigh Gang."

I suspect that jealousies began in similar fashion between state and local officers on the one hand and federal officers on the other. North Carolina was not so warm toward the federal Constitution to start with; she turned it down in the beginning; she was next to the last state to ratify it in the end, and only in later years began to thank God for Rhode Island which kept her from being the last to sign on the dotted line. Civil war and reconstruction intensified the original distrust of central power, and forever blowing breezes

kept the "state's rights" banner whipping in the winds. Older law enforcing officers can still remember the day when local police would close up like clams as a United States marshall or other federal officer walked into the courthouse in quest of information on some of the local talent. This talent might be criminal but it was our own; and at its worst it was worthy of protection against foreign emissaries.

These jealousies are the most natural things in the world. A friend of mine told me not long ago that his three-year-old son was as jealous as he could be of the new-born baby in the family. "I used to come home in the evening," he said, "toss the three-year-old in the air and play with him till supper time. Now I come home, toss him in the air, put him down and bend over the cradle till supper time. Yesterday my neglected three-year-old became a delinquent three-year-old as, in pure exasperation and resentment at the new baby's encroachment on his traditional rights and privileges, he took an expensive vase and crashed it to pieces on the floor." Human jealousies are thus as natural as brothers and sisters, and call for understanding rather than resentment. If brothers and sisters must outgrow them in the name of family affection, law enforcing officers must outgrow them in the name of law and order.

Is there any doubt in the minds of anyone of you, I asked, that a city policeman can "gum" the county sheriff's game; that police or sheriff can cripple the efforts of the state highway patrolman; or that any one of these can throw a monkey wrench into the federal agent's machinery? Is there any doubt that an ineffective police chief can nullify the efforts of the most effective prosecuting attorney, or that an ineffective prosecuting attorney can short-circuit the efforts of the most effective police department? Is there any doubt that a futile judge can cramp the style of both police and prosecution through misguided policies of punishment and probation; or that an indifferent governor can jam all the foregoing links in the chain of law enforcing machinery through arbitrary policies of pardon and parole; or that the finest efforts of police, prosecution, judiciary and governor are of little avail without the understanding support of an informed public opinion? All of you have everything to gain and none of you have anything to lose by pulling together instead of pulling apart.

The seeds of co-operative effort planted in meetings such as this in all sections of the state and continued year after year have sprouted and grown. Today they are bearing fruit all over North

Carolina, as law enforcing officers who had been working separately are coming together, studying together, and going home and working together. Hardly a week passes that newspapers do not carry stories of police, sheriffs and highway patrol going together on raids, helping each other on investigations, and co-operating with federal agencies to the point that the Federal Bureau of Investigation cites North Carolina as perhaps the outstanding example of federal, state and local co-operation in the United States. Thus the Law Enforcing Officers Division of the Institute of Government came into existence and blazed a trail which has since been followed by city-county-state-federal prosecuting attorneys, judges, probation, pardon and parole officers.

Conflict Yields to Co-operation among Legislative Groups. History repeated itself with legislative groups. City councilmen had met separately in annual conventions. County commissioners had met separately in annual conventions. State legislators had met separately in the General Assembly. Federal representatives from North Carolina had caucussed separately in the federal Congress.

"These groups will not work together," I was told in no uncertain terms. "Cities and counties have antagonistic interests," some municipal officials exclaimed. "Legislators are rural minded, looking out for the interests of the counties, knowing nothing about city problems and caring less," said others. "You'd better watch the 'county courthouse ring'," said the city group. "You'd better keep your eyes on the 'city hall group'," replied the county group. "State legislators treat cities and counties like red-headed stepchildren," city and county officials both agreed. "The federal Congress is trampling the life out of the states," cried state leaders in one breath and in the next breath they called on the Congress for grants-in-aid to keep state and local governments alive.

"If you can bring these groups together in a working relationship," said the accredited representative of a national foundation subsidizing governmental organizations in all sections of the country, "you will do something in North Carolina that has not been done in any other state in the union."

As I went from one of these groups to another I was met with the question, "Will you look out for the interests of our particular group in the General Assembly, or in the national Congress, or before state and federal administrative tribunals?" To this question I could give only one answer: the Institute of Government will not lift a finger to lobby for or against anything or anybody, no matter how good or how bad, either in the legislature or out of it.

These are the things that separate groups must handle separately through separate organizations. But, I countered, in proclaiming to the world the conflicting interests which make you square off for a fight, you might seek out and find a common ground on which you can unite. In seeking for this common ground, you might start with the fact that people living within the limits of every one of three hundred or more cities and towns in North Carolina are also citizens of the counties, the state and the nation. They created these governmental units at their will, and they can remake them or dissolve them at their pleasure. They put all of you in office in the beginning and they can put you out in the end. They are footing all the bills of all these units all the time. You can not afford to give them the idea that city, county, state and federal governmental units in North Carolina are operating in the fashion of the freak turtle with several heads fighting each other for food going to the same stomach.

Within your city limits you have many problems which can be solved more effectively and less expensively by co-operative effort than by conflict. You have the common problem of criminal law enforcement with city, county, state and federal police, prosecutors, judges, prison, probation and parole officials working on it all the time. City police, county sheriffs and state patrolmen operate under similar laws of arrests, search and seizure, criminal investigations, criminal law and procedure. Research for one group may be research for all; guidebooks for one may be guidebooks for all; training schools and instruction staff for one may be training schools and instruction staff for all; laboratory and clearing house of information for one may be laboratory and clearing house for all. You have the common problem of financing public services within the limits of revenues allocated by the General Assembly. City and county tax collectors, attorneys and finance officers likewise operate under similar laws and employ similar procedures and techniques. Research for one group may be research for all groups; guidebooks on tax collection and foreclosure may be used in city halls, county courthouses and state tax departments alike; the same instruction staff, laboratory and clearing house may service all.

The Institute also can work with conflicting groups even on controversial propositions. A tug of war is now going on between the cities, the counties and the state over the division of the proceeds of the gasoline tax. The studies and the findings of each special interest group are suspected of a bias by the others: the

counties suspect the cities, the cities suspect the counties, the state suspects both cities and counties, and a resulting stalemate paralyzes all. The Institute staff can analyze this problem from an impartial standpoint, set out in detail all conflicting claims—giving each group the privilege of adding supporting arguments if it wishes—and put the resulting study approved by those groups into the hands of their legislative committees for such legislative action as they care to take to further their respective interests.

When the General Assembly convenes, Institute staff members can attend every session of the house and senate, analyze all bills as they are introduced, and on each succeeding morning of the General Assembly put on the desks of city, county, state and federal legislators and department heads a digest of all legislative action taken on the day before. After the legislature adjourns, the Institute staff can summarize all bills that passed affecting city, county, state and federal units and officials, put copies of this summary in the hands of every unit and official affected, and keep them in touch from month to month thereafter with constructions of these laws as they are handed down by the attorney general and the Supreme Court.

On these co-operative levels city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies can unite in building the Institute of Government into a joint fact-finding and research agency for all groups, a joint laboratory and clearing house of governmental information for all groups. One co-operative agency can carry on a continuous study of these interlocking relationships and keep the respective governmental units and officials adequately informed of their respective rights, powers and privileges under the law, at one-third the cost that would accrue to these groups from operating separate, competitive and duplicating programs.

These arguments won a hearing and a trial. City councilmen, county commissioners, state legislators and federal congressmen came together in the Legislator's Division of the Institute of Government. They promoted the systematic practice of sitting down together in local communities to confer on needed legislation before the General Assembly convened and while it was in session. At the close of the General Assembly in 1933 they began the practice of coming together for explanations and discussions of state and federal legislation affecting their respective governmental units. When these state-wide meetings drew an attendance of twelve hundred, they were split into district meetings better suited to teaching purposes.

Through the Institute of Government these city, county, state and federal legislators are taking thought for the morrow in a growing program of investigation and research as a basis of legislative action. The Institute's daily and weekly summaries of legislative actions are received and relied on by co-operating and competing groups alike. Institute analyses of highly controversial issues have won the respect of conflicting groups for their thoroughness and fairness to competing claims. On more than one occasion representatives of some of these competing groups have done us the honor of adopting and presenting Institute researches as their own.

Co-operation Spreads to Other Groups. Similar arguments carried this co-operative program to other official groups: in the field of taxation and finance; in the field of fire prevention and fire fighting; in the field of street and highway maintenance, traffic safety and public works; in the field of health, welfare, sanitation, water supply and sewage treatment; in the administration of justice in the courts—through sheriffs, clerks of court, registers of deeds, etc.; and so on throughout the field of government and its administration in North Carolina—civil and criminal. Existing organizations joined in a federated structure, and other groups were organized and brought into the federation. When the President of the United States called for the co-ordination of federal, state and local agencies in the national defense, North Carolina was already on the mark.

In the beginning some groups feared they might lose their separate identities in the federation and be swallowed up in the mass. I tried to calm these fears by using the analogy of the family group. There are nine children in the family I was born in, I said to these skeptical friends. Their first names are all different, but the last name of all these different children is the same. The fact that all these children belong to one family does not mean that anyone of them has lost his individuality. The fact that my last name is "Coates" in common with my brothers and sisters does not do away with the fact that my first name is "Albert" to differentiate me from other members of the group.

As years went by we showed them in actions which spoke even louder than our words that the integrity of individuals must be preserved as the basis of group action, and that the integrity of individual groups must be preserved as the basis of co-operation among groups. In order to build the Law Enforcing Officers Division of the Institute of Government we did not need to blot out

the different enumerating labels of "Policeman," "Constable," "Sheriff," "State Highway Patrol," "Federal Agent"; we needed to find the common denominating label which would include them all. We found that common denominator in the label "Law Enforcing Officers"; and thus the Law Enforcing Officers Division of the Institute of Government came into existence. It is not stepping on the toes of all these differing groups; it is standing on their shoulders.

In order to build the Legislators' Division of the Institute of Government, we did not need to blot out the different enumerating labels of "City Councilman," "County Commissioner," "State Representative," "Federal Congressman"; we needed to find the common denominating label which would include them all. We found that common denominator in the label "Legislator"; and thus the Legislators' Division of the Institute of Government came into existence. It is not stepping on the toes of all these differing groups; it is standing on their shoulders.

And so of all the Institute divisions. The Institute of Government is not stepping on the toes of city, county, state or federal governmental units and officials; it is standing on their shoulders. Their own elected leaders are on the Institute's governing board. Every Institute proposal is sifted in their councils and every Institute program is carried out with their co-operation.

In Union There Is Strength. All groups are now seeing that the end in view is not absorption, nor merger, but union—a working collaboration of all groups in an association and a fellowship which is greater than the sum of all its parts. They are finding in union a strength they do not separately possess. Their separate powers run in rivulets too small to float their independent enterprises; but these same rivulets running together could float a program able to sustain them all. In this spirit city, county, state and federal officials in North Carolina are coming together, through the Institute of Government of their own building, in a great co-operative enterprise—as vast as government of the people but no vaster, and with as good a chance of success but no better. For the first time in American political history the leaders of both political parties joined with officials in building the Institute of Government into a non-partisan, non-political and non-profit agency for the service of officials of whatever parties are elected to public office in the cities, the counties and the state.

B

The Problem of Bridging the Gap between Outgoing and Incoming Public Officials, so as to Provide Continuity of Governmental Experience and Cut Down the Lost Time, Lost Motion, and Lost Money involved in a Rotating Governmental Personnel

The Beginning of the Gap. Every two or four years hosts of newly elected officials come into the administration of public affairs in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina. These officials are not born with a knowledge of the powers and duties of the offices to which they are elected—the office of sheriff or chief of police, clerk of court or register of deeds, city alderman or county commissioner. Their private occupations and professions do not teach them the powers and duties of public officials. The uncertainties of political life do not offer them incentives to study the responsibilities of a public office before they seek it. The democracy which clothes them with the public trust does not provide them with the training which fits them to discharge it.

They go into office to learn by mistakes which might have been avoided, in the school of hard knocks which sometimes knock harder on the public than on the public officer. The learning they acquire in this rough, ready and expensive fashion too often goes out of office with them at the end of their official terms. The mental attitude of a defeated official does not beget a tender solicitude for his victorious opponent. The successor who will gladly learn does not often find a predecessor who will so gladly teach. Retiring officers have been known to walk out of their office doors as the clock struck the end of their official terms without going to the trouble of a greeting to incoming officers waiting on the threshold. The only tie binding successive governmental administrations together today is in most places the clerical and stenographic helpers familiar with the office routine. Sometimes this tie is broken. There have been instances where outgoing officers have secured as good or better jobs elsewhere for their clerical and stenographic help—primarily to guarantee a start *de novo* to their successors, and incidentally to punish the people for daring to exercise their constitutional rights by turning out of office men who were old hands at the game.

Consequences of the Gap. Within the limits of our governmental experience we have seen the political pendulum swing the balance of power from the king to the subject; from officers appointed by the crown to officers elected by the people; from the

continuity of long-term tenure to the rotation of short-term officers; from the belief that the common man could do nothing to the belief that he can do anything; from the naïve notion of birth as the entitlement to office to the equally naive notion of birth as a qualification for it; from the aristocratic notion that some men are born to fill an office to the democratic notion that all men are born knowing how to fill it; from the antiquated notion that some men are not as good as other men to the current notion that every man is as good as every other man and "a whole sight better."

Within that span of time we have lived to learn that the commonwealth may be plundered by favorites of the people as well as by favorites of the king; that "to the victors belong the spoils" may be alike the doctrine of hereditary rulers and elected office-holders; that shades of ancient spoilsmen may still gather in a modern sheriff's eyes; that remnants of the divine right of kings may still crack down in a policeman's billy; that the constitutions of the state and the United States do not change the constitution of human nature; that mere forms of government guarantee neither the character nor the competence of the men in office; that the hope of popular government is not so much wrapped up in theories of government, centralized or localized, as in the effective and efficient handling of governmental affairs by effective and efficient governmental officers, responsible and responsive to the people.

Methods of Bridging the Gap. I decided we could go a long way towards bridging the gap between outgoing and incoming officials if we could (1) make comparative studies of the structure and workings of government in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina; (2) set forth the results of these studies in guide-books which would bring to each incoming official a clear and concise outline of the powers and duties of his office together with the methods and practices of his predecessor in office and of other officers in similar offices in this and other states; (3) teach these methods and practices in state-wide, district and local training schools which could bring to every incoming official a better understanding of the governmental machinery of which he is a part as well as of his part in it; (4) demonstrate them in a governmental laboratory to which incoming officials might come to see in one place the governmental methods, practices and techniques growing out of the initiative and resourcefulness of officers in city halls, county courthouses and state departments throughout North Carolina; (5) keep them up to date through a clearing house of govern-

mental information which would be forever collecting and comparing new methods, practices and techniques as they develop in each office and disseminating them to every other office; (6) build in our own ranks a staff of men experienced to the point of expertness in the problems and practices of the cities, the counties and the state, and able to assist and guide incoming officials as they move from private business into public office.

Comparative Studies

Government in Books and Government in Action. The first task was to track down and bring together, for the guidance of different groups of officials, the pertinent laws scattered through the books to the point of practical inaccessibility—in constitutional provisions, public laws and special acts, county regulations, city ordinances, court decisions and departmental rulings. The next task was to supplement these laws with the methods, practices and techniques of doing similar things in different offices.

I started in the field of criminal law administration by joining a city police force; by working at the desk blotter in the police station to see the variety and volume of local crimes and criminals; by going on trips with officers investigating specific crimes reported, and on raiding parties on the heels of these investigations; by working with patrolmen on their beats; by following through the administration of the police department in all of its divisions, in the effort to understand the problems arising, the ways in which officers' minds were working on these problems, the different methods, practices and techniques they were using, and their relative effectiveness. When I finished in the city hall I went to the county courthouse, joined the sheriff's force, and repeated the former process; then to the state highway patrol; then to federal agencies with local headquarters. I followed these officers into the courts and worked with city, county, state and federal prosecuting attorneys, judges, and probation officers; with prison officials and the agencies of pardon and parole. From one locality I went to another until I had worked my way through the successive links in the chain of law enforcing machinery, in a fair sampling of the larger, middle-sized and smaller cities in the eastern, piedmont and western sections of the state.

Before I had finished with this process, another member of the Institute staff went to work as an apprentice in the field of tax administration—studying the methods of tax listing, tax assessing, tax levying, tax collecting, and safeguarding public funds on hand.

Another followed as an apprentice in the field of accounting and finance—studying under local officials the methods of budget making, budget administration, public purchasing, governmental financing. Another followed as an apprentice to officials engaged in the administration of justice in the courts. Others followed as apprentices to officials in public health, public welfare, public works, federal-state-local relationships, and so on. All of these men went from one city hall, county courthouse and state department to another in the now familiar process of collecting, comparing and classifying the methods, practices and techniques in use.

I was told in the beginning that officials would be suspicious of my motives, that they would shut up like clams when I began to ask them questions about their offices, and that they would throw me out on my head when I asked them to show me their books. But with what some of my friends called "more nerve than sense," I started out and kept on going. I did not start out on a "snooping" expedition, nor on a "muckraking" expedition, nor on a "reforming" expedition, nor even on an "economizing" expedition. I started out on a "learning" expedition with the resolve of hewing to that line—let the chips fall where they might.

When official eyebrows lifted and official voices asked me what I wanted, I told them the truth: that I was teaching law and government out of the books; that the books told only a small part of the story; that the rest of it was stored in their heads and wrapped up in their experience; that I wanted them to teach me what they had learned from experience so that I could add it to what I had learned from books, and go back to my students with the knowledge I should have been required to have before I was ever trusted with a classroom. My earnestness could not be doubted. My objectives seemed reasonable. My ignorance of the practical workings of government was transparent enough to remove any question of my motives. And so they took me in as one of themselves and taught me what they knew.

Help to the Helpless. My helplessness without their help may be illustrated by the comment of an official, relayed to me by a friend: "Not long ago some little 'whippersnapper' came down here, walked into my office as if he owned it, told me there were a lot of things wrong with local government and that he had come to my place of business to find out what they were. I saw right off what sort of fellow I was dealing with; any official can spot his sort almost by instinct. I told him that all our records were public records, that he or any other citizen was welcome to help himself to everything

he could find, that I knew he did not want me or others in the office to make bad matters worse by interrupting the discharge of our official duties in order to talk to a stranger; and then I went back to work. He was the most helpless fellow you ever saw. He just fiddled around until he petered out. Now this fellow Coates came in with a different attitude. He told me he was trying to teach his students in the law school what they needed to know to make a living, that there were a lot of things about the practical workings of the government that he didn't know and that we did, and he wanted us to tell him what we knew about it so he could go back and do a better job of teaching school. We took off our coats and went to work with him. Some of us have gone back to the office every night for about ten days now and worked with him till after midnight. The curious thing about the business is we are learning about as much from him as he is learning from us. When we tell him we are doing certain things, he asks us why we are doing them that way and if there is a better way of doing them. That starts us to thinking, and now and then we wind up with something better than we started with. Sometimes he tells us how other folks are doing the same things. Part of the time we think we've got the other folks beat; but part of the time we figure the other folks have got us beat; and so we profit by their experience."

Thus, all members of the Institute staff—men who had graduated from high schools, colleges and professional schools—went, and are still going to school as apprentices to officials all over North Carolina. From one end of the state to the other these officials have been our teachers. Most of them have never seen inside of college walls. Many of them have never finished high school. Some of them have never finished grammar school. But they have taught us more about the actual operations of government than we had learned from any high school, college or professional school classroom we had ever entered. They taught us much more than they knew they were teaching us—the difference between literacy and intelligence. Some men whose formal schooling was next to nothing had more common sense, quicker wits and deeper insights than many Ph.D.'s we knew. Many men, who for one reason or another had left off schooling early, had laid moments of experience end to end, had grown in wisdom and in stature quite as rapidly as other men who had laid books end to end in cloistered halls. Not that these men did not see the value of book learning; their very lack of it gave them an exaggerated notion of its value. They readily agreed to trade the knowledge they had learned from experience for the

knowledge we had learned from books. Thus these comparative studies of government in books and government in action began and kept on going until they became the foundation of the whole program of the Institute of Government.

Set Forth in Guidebooks

The next problem was to set forth the results of these comparative studies in guidebooks for incoming officials as well as those already in office; for, as indicated earlier in this story, one hundred and fifty years of history had failed to produce a single adequate guidebook for any substantial group of public officials.

We undertook to bring together in these guidebooks (1) the constitutional provisions; (2) legislative enactments; (3) judicial decisions; and (4) the attorney general's rulings applying to particular groups of officers; together with (5) methods, practices and techniques in use in similar offices. We undertook to write these guidebooks simply and concretely enough for any person with common sense to read and understand. We put practical questions at the ends of chapters so that officials might test the thoroughness of their reading.

Many of these guidebooks are completed and in use in city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies throughout North Carolina. Others are now in preparation. The following are illustrations.

Guidebooks for Law Enforcing Officers—including town and city police, township constables, county sheriffs, state highway patrolmen, prosecuting attorneys, federal officers—on such topics as Scientific Aids in Crime Detection; Law Enforcing Agencies in North Carolina; Territorial Limits of Law Enforcing Agencies; The Laws of Arrest, Search and Seizure—with and without Warrants—for Felonies and Misdemeanors; Methods and Practices in Making Arrests; Accident Prevention and Motor Vehicle Law Enforcement.

Guidebooks for Taxation and Finance Officials—including tax supervisors, tax listers, tax assessors, city and county tax collectors, accountants, treasurers, purchasing agents, managers and attorneys—on such topics as Tax Listing; Tax Assessing; Tax Collecting; Tax Foreclosure; Levy and Collection of City and County Privilege-License Taxes; Levy and Collection of Special Benefit Assessments; Refinancing of Bonded Debt of Counties, Cities and Towns in North Carolina; Public Purchasing in Cities, Counties and the State of North Carolina.

Guidebooks for Court Officials—including registers of deeds, clerks of court, sheriffs, judicial officers and bar officials—on such topics as Powers and Duties of Registers of Deeds; Powers and Duties of Clerks of Court; Powers and Duties of Sheriffs; Powers and Duties of Notaries; Organization, Structure and Jurisdiction of Courts in North Carolina.

Guidebooks for Health and Welfare Officials—including city, county and state health officers and boards; city, county and state welfare officers and boards—on such topics as the Organization and Structure of State and Local Welfare Departments; Organization and Structure of State and Local Health Departments; Status of Recreation as a Governmental Activity in State and Local Units; Juvenile Courts in North Carolina; Woman and the Law in North Carolina.

Guidebooks for Public Works Officials—including water works officials, sewage plant officials, building inspectors, street and highway superintendents and engineers—on such topics as Legal Aspects of (1) Street and Sidewalk Construction and Maintenance; (2) Construction, Maintenance and Inspection of Public Buildings; (3) Sewers, Drains and Water Courses; (4) Liability of City for Injuries Caused by the Condition of Streets, Public Buildings, Parks and Playgrounds; (5) Liability of Municipal Corporations for Damage to or Loss in Value of Property Caused by Grading or Improving Streets; (6) Tort Liability of Municipality in Connection with the Operation of an Electric Light System; (7) Tort Liability of City for Injuries Suffered by Prisoners as Result of Failure of City Properly to Maintain and Supervise Jails; (8) Fire Prevention and Fire Fighting in Rural and Urban Areas in North Carolina.

Guidebooks for Election Officials—including the state board of elections, county boards of elections, city election officials, state and local political party chairmen and committees—on such topics as the Evolution of Election Laws and Machinery in North Carolina; Registration of Voters; Conducting the Election; Absentee Voting; Rules and Procedures of the State Board of Elections.

Guidebooks for Civilian Defense Officials—including members of state and local defense councils, citizens defense corps, citizens service corps, and related war agencies—on such topics as the Victory Speakers Corps; Office of Civilian Defense—National, Regional, State, Local; Citizens Volunteer Office and War Information Center; Internal Security; The Enemy Within Our Gates;

Citizens Defense Corps in North Carolina; Citizens Service Corps in North Carolina.

Guidebooks on Federal-State-Local-Relationships in North Carolina, on such topics as Federal Services to the State, the Counties, Cities and Towns; State Services to Counties, Cities and Towns.

Guidebook on Postwar Planning for all groups of city, county and state officials in North Carolina.

Some of our early guidebooks were too long for men not accustomed to much reading; but we found that men who gagged at the sight of a hundred page guide coming to them under one cover, did not hesitate to swallow the same amount of reading material coming to them in broken doses of five to ten pages. Other guidebooks were too general for men faced with specific practical problems in the thick of things; but we found that by building the guidebooks around specific problems of immediate practical importance we could lead officials into the consideration of underlying principles with no less concrete value.

There were some officials who never even opened guidebooks sent to them. Perhaps they help to give an explanation of that well-known couplet:

"Alas for the South! Her books have grown fewer,
She was never much given to literature."

They were like a friend of mine who replied to complaints that he did not answer letters with the statement: "This office practices law by ear and not by note." And so we went up to the ears in training schools.

Taught in Training Schools

What's in a Name? I was told by friends at the outset that officials would not fool with "training schools"; that "schools" were for boys only and beneath the dignity of grown men; that many grown men in official positions would not be caught attending them, and would laugh at those who did. I soon found out there was more truth than poetry in what my friends had told me; and, in the beginning, at any rate, the ridicule of some of the "old timers" was more likely to be directed at me than at their fellows.

There were those who looked at me with the expression the mayor of my home town is said to have worn when he met the editor of a hostile local paper and said: "Look here, boy! I knew you when you won't, and you still ain't." Some of them went beyond quizzical glances into quizzical words. There was the "old timer" with an extended front who started out to bait me in a group of

officials with the question: "What are your qualifications for instructing police officers, young fellow?" I felt his hostility and with utter truthfulness I answered: "Absolutely none; not even a pot belly or a flat foot." This was treason and I knew it. But there was no way out of it; for if he had got the upper hand in this exchange that group would have laughed me out of school. Had not ridicule recently helped to kill an anti-evolution bill introduced into the General Assembly of North Carolina by the representative from Hoke County, when a fellow legislator sent up a bill entitled: "An act to prevent any tadpole from shedding its tail within two miles of a Hoke County schoolhouse?"

A School by Any Other Name Doth Smell as Sweet. Our first training schools were in the field of criminal law administration and with law enforcing officers. We made concessions to the understandable prejudice against "schools" and started by asking police association officials to let us work out a two-day instruction program under the old "convention" label. From the "convention" we went by slow and almost imperceptible degrees to the "meeting," to the "conference," to the "institute," to the "school"; from two-day to three-day, to five-day, to ten-day sessions. In the beginning these schools were held annually, later semi-annually; they will be held quarterly as soon as facilities permit.

We supplemented the statewide schools with district schools, so placed that officers could leave home in the morning, arrive at the designated meeting place in time for six hours of instruction, and get back home before dark, with no expense except the price of a mid-day meal and the cost of transportation. We supplemented the state and district schools with local schools in many places. During the coming year we expect to extend these local schools to every section of the state.

We followed the schools for law enforcing officers with schools for tax supervisors, tax listers, tax assessors, tax collectors, accountants, purchasing agents and finance officers generally; schools for officials engaged in the administration of justice in the courts; for health, welfare and public works officials; for election officials; for civilian defense officials; and so on.

The timing of these schools is immaterial with some of these groups, but not with others. We have found it advisable to hold schools for tax supervisors, tax listers and tax assessors, just before the tax listing period begins; for tax collectors, around the time the tax books are turned over to them; for tax attorneys, just before they start foreclosure proceedings; for accountants and

finance officers, just before budget-making time begins; for election officials, just before the primaries and general elections; for many other groups of officials, between the day of election and the day of taking office.

The basic teaching materials are the guidebooks described in the foregoing section. Many an officer who did not have the heart to tackle a guidebook by himself would use it as his Bible after he had pored over every word of it in training schools and lost his fear of mimeographed and printed pages. At the end of training schools I would sometimes tell attending officials that the substance of all I had said was in the guidebooks being put into their hands; that they would find in the text most of the answers to the questions at the end of each chapter; and that in answering the rest they might seek the help of fellow officers, friendly lawyers, prosecuting attorneys, judges and anybody else who could give them any light.

Our teaching methods changed for the better as we went along. In the beginning, legal training and terminology threatened to be a drawback. In a recess between lectures at the first training school I ever held for law enforcing officers, I overheard one police chief ask another, "What do you think of Coates's lectures?" The other chief replied, "They are the finest things I ever listened to. That man is deep." I am thankful I had sense enough to know what that exchange meant: that my lectures might have been all right for lawyers, but they were all wrong for officers; that what I was saying was going over their heads and they were too proud to admit it. Before I held another school I had worked as an apprentice to law enforcing officers in many police departments, stood in their shoes and studied their problems from their angles to the point that most of them are willing to admit today that I can "speak their language."

The self-conscious stage is now over. Most officials have lost the feeling that they are supposed to start out knowing everything there is to be known about a given office. While holding fast to that which they do know, they are increasingly inclined to learn new things, and are no longer embarrassed at being caught in "school" studying their lessons. Now and then we run across one who honestly thinks he knows it all and is almost sorry he learned it; we ask him to help us teach the others. Six thousand officials have participated in our training schools in the past few years. Presently developing plans will bring the training program of this in-service University of public officials within the reach of every official in

every city hall, county courthouse, state department and federal agency in North Carolina who thinks it worth his while.

Demonstrated in a Governmental Laboratory

The Notion of a Laboratory. It did not take me long to find out that it was not enough to turn our comparative studies into guidebooks; that it was not enough to teach them in training schools; that we had to go further and demonstrate them in governmental laboratories. The first notion of a governmental demonstration laboratory came when a college mate was showing me through the laboratory in his textile mill in a North Carolina city years ago. Workers in this laboratory were continually analyzing their own manufacturing processes, comparing them with the processes of other textile plants throughout the nation, keeping them up to the level of the best.

You are in competition with a man operating in another city and county in the state, I said. If he should keep improving his manufacturing and marketing processes from year to year, and you should stand pat where you are, how long would it take him to put you out of business?

"Things are moving pretty fast," he answered. "I suppose I would begin slipping in two or three years and in four or five years I would be on the way out."

Has it ever occurred to you, I asked, that the city and county units in which your plant is located could stand pat on existing official methods and practices and never be put out of business by officials constantly improving their governmental processes in the city and county of your competitor? The competitive spirit which keeps American business on its toes is well nigh non-existent between adjoining governmental units and officials. Would it not be a fine thing if we could build a governmental laboratory to which successive generations of public officials might come to see demonstrated in one place the governmental methods and practices they would now have to go to one hundred county courthouses, three hundred city halls, and scores of state departments and federal agencies to find, and would not find readily available for demonstration purposes when they got there; a governmental center to which newly elected or appointed officials, as well as those in office all over North Carolina, might come to meet, swap ideas and experiences, and go back home with new knowledge, new information and new insight?

My friend replied, "It sounds good; but how are you going to work it out?" If there are any precedents to go by, I don't know

where they are, I answered. But if it is worth doing, there ought to be some way to do it. Thereupon I began to fumble around to see what could be done, and finally hit on the germ of a notion which has grown into the governmental laboratory and clearing house we are still in the process of building.

The Laboratory Takes Form. In the course of our comparative studies members of the Institute staff discovered that one county took one hundred and forty successive steps in the process of tax listing, tax assessing, tax collection and tax foreclosure; that each one of these successive steps was represented by some book entry, form, blank, or other record. We took copies of these records representing each successive step, filled out the blanks in the accepted fashion, attached to each a typewritten explanation of its place and purpose in the system, and finally pieced together the concrete exhibits of each governmental move in chronological sequence. We have repeated this process in ten or more counties, of different sorts and sizes, in different sections of the state, and in the cities and towns within these county limits. We have extended it to include accounting, purchasing, budget making and other processes of finance administration, law enforcing procedures, the processes of the administration of justice in the courts. It is to be extended to every phase of government and its administration which lends itself to this technique. When we have extended it to every office in every county, city, town and state department, we shall have laid the foundations on which officials in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina can work toward increasingly higher levels of governmental performance by lifting the poorest practices to the level of the best. We have hardly scratched the surface of this job; but we know now where we're going and we're on our way.

In no case are we setting up "model" offices in our governmental laboratory. What may be a "model" office in one city or county may not be a "model" office in another city or county with differing conditions. We are not even setting up an "ideal" office for any group; for at this stage of my learning processes I confess I do not know just what an "ideal" office is. We are staying out of the clouds and keeping our feet on the ground—even digging in a bit—by way of answer to certain sorts of minds that think all college professors are starry-eyed dreamers and impractical theorists, but not by way of admission that we do not believe in theories and dreams, or that we would not now and then like to have the chance to shake a bit of stardust from our hair.

Transmitted through a Clearing House of Governmental Information

Developments in the General Assembly of North Carolina. Members of the Institute staff sit in on every day's proceedings of the General Assembly of North Carolina, from the preliminary caucus on the night before the opening to the fall of the gavel on the concluding day. After each day's session they digest each bill introduced; record the calendar and committee action on all others in the legislative hopper; mimeograph the results and put them in the mails around midnight. The next morning these digests are on the desks of members of the General Assembly, the governor, all state department and federal agency heads, and in the hands of officials in the one hundred county courthouses and three hundred city halls in North Carolina.

At the end of each legislative session we summarize the laws relating to all state departments and institutions; to all counties, cities and towns in general; and to each county, city and town in particular. We send these summaries to every city, county and state official in North Carolina, as well as to federal officials affected by them. From month to month throughout the year we collect, digest and, through the Institute magazine, *Popular Government*, send to these officials Supreme Court decisions, attorney general's rulings and departmental interpretations construing the meaning of these laws and defining the powers, duties and responsibilities of governmental units and officials. All this material on the laws of every legislative session since 1933 is assembled in the clearing house, classified and made conveniently available for practical use at a moment's notice, and is growing in volume and in value every year.

Developments in City Halls and County Courthouses in North Carolina. We should like to sit in on meetings of city councils and county commissioners as we do on sessions of the General Assembly. Since we cannot multiply our staff to this extent we are urging these governing boards to make carbon copies of their minutes as they type them for their minute books and send them to us each month to be digested and interchanged through periodic bulletins, acquainting officials of each unit with the problems arising in other units and their methods of meeting them. We are supplementing these sources of information with clippings from daily and weekly newspapers coming to us in exchange for our publications from every city, town and county in the state, on the theory that newspaper reporters will record the principal developments and give their background and local color.

Developments in Local, State and Federal Units throughout the

Country. In similar fashion we try to keep in touch with governmental developments in the national capital and in other sections of the country through magazines, special studies, bulletins and reports issued by a variety of organizations of public officials, taxpayers' leagues and citizens' committees, municipal research bureaus, university departments of governmental research, national clearing houses of governmental information, and every other source we can think of or stumble on.

The Clearing House and Laboratory Building. This governmental laboratory and clearing house of information is housed in the Institute of Government building along with offices of the Institute staff, bedrooms for officials coming for consultations with members of the staff, rooms for official committee meetings and informal gatherings, and classrooms for training schools. We are opening avenues from this building to every local, state and federal governmental unit in North Carolina, with the hope that everything we can find out about government will go out from this building to officials at the other ends of these avenues, and that every new development in government arising out of the initiative and resourcefulness of governmental units and officials throughout the commonwealth will flow back into this vitalizing center of them all.

To the extent that city, county and state officials continue and increase their working with us, we can turn this governmental laboratory building into a common treasure house of knowledge worth its weight in gold to those who come here and learn for their own use: the methods by which one tax supervisor added four thousand new taxpayers and five million dollars worth of new property to the tax books in a single year to lighten the tax load on those already there; methods by which one tax collector collects around ninety-five per cent of the local taxes in the year in which they fall due, thereby saving some citizens the penalties of delinquency, and all taxpayers the added burden falling from the shoulders of those who never pay; methods by which the initiative and resourcefulness of local officials scattered here and there throughout the state are improving the processes of government and cutting down the costs of its administration.

Inquiries and Answers. Through the mail and over long distance telephone comes a continuous stream of questions from local officials which point up the many perplexities that daily confront seasoned officials as well as those undertaking to discharge the duties of office for the first time. Nor are these questions hypothetical, theoretical or fanciful. They are down-to-earth, concrete and practical. "What can I do in this situation?" The questioners

want specific answers to specific, existing problems. A mayor of one town writes in and asks what steps should be taken toward holding municipal elections at the next regular time for such elections, explaining that for the past several years the citizens had "neglected" to hold an election. A newly appointed county attorney asks for an outline of the steps to be taken in foreclosing delinquent taxes, together with forms of notices, pleadings, judgments, and orders. A police chief of a town wants to know if it is lawful for him to sell confiscated tax-paid liquor and turn the proceeds over to the town instead of having to turn the liquor over to the county commissioners. A county accountant wants to know if there is any way to get around the constitutional limitation on the rate of the tax levy for general county purposes, explaining that it has become impossible to carry on the expanded county activities within the limitation. A clerk of a recorder's court sends in a copy of a schedule of court costs that has been in use in his court for a number of years, and asks that it be corrected and brought up to date. A county commissioner asks to what extent it is lawful for the county to give financial aid to local boards of such federal agencies as the Selective Service, Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Civilian Defense. A city attorney sends in a long list of proposed appropriations and asks whether the city may lawfully make them. A clerk of the Superior Court wants to know whether he can compel the production of a letter referred to in a will as containing instructions for the disposition of trust funds. And a town clerk wants to know what his duties are in regard to the approaching town elections, in view of the fact that none of the incumbents will file for re-election and no other candidate for any office has come forward.

The foregoing inquiries indicate the extent to which Institute staff members are being called on daily for information and guidance by officials in city halls and county courthouses in all sections of North Carolina. Institute staff members have also been called on by commissions and departments of the state government to conduct surveys and carry on researches and investigations as a basis of constitutional revision and legislative action, such as (1) the analysis of the new constitution for North Carolina proposed in 1933, (2) the analysis of constitutional amendments proposed in 1935, (3) the studies and investigations for the tax classification commission in 1937, (4) the studies and investigations for the state department of justice commission in 1939, and (5) the studies and investigations for the state board of elections in 1939.

Institute staff members have been called on for further ser-

vices: (1) to assist in laying the foundations of a tax research division in the state department of revenue; (2) to serve as chief deputy in the state auditor's office for the audit of state departments and institutions; (3) to organize and direct the work of marshal and librarian of the Supreme Court of North Carolina; (4) to serve as assistants to the attorney general of North Carolina; (5) to serve on the instruction staff of the National Police Academy conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; (6) to serve as consultant to the governmental requirements branch of the War Production Board, and to act as liaison agent between this federal agency and counties, cities and towns in North Carolina; (7) to serve as consultant to the regional director of Civilian Defense in the Fourth Corps Area; (8) to serve as director of training for the North Carolina Office of Civilian Defense.

Through the foregoing comparative studies set forth in guidebooks, taught in training schools, demonstrated in laboratories, and transmitted through a clearing house of governmental information, the Institute of Government is striving to bridge the gap between outgoing and incoming public officials; to provide continuity of governmental experience; to cut down the lost time, lost motion, and lost money involved in a rotating governmental personnel, and to raise the standards of governmental performance by lifting the poorest practices to the level of the best.

C

The Problem of Bridging the Gap between Citizens and Officials by Building the Machinery to Put the People in Touch with Their Government and Keep Them in Touch with It

Citizens Slap Officials. I invited thirty civic leaders to come together in Chapel Hill in the closing days of 1931 to consider plans for bridging the gap between citizens and officials. Six were called out of the sessions and back to their homes by the news of failing banks. The depression was swinging into high. Taxpayers' leagues were forming thick and fast. Citizens committees were moistening their tongues for caustic comments. The knifing stage was in the offing. Open season was soon to be declared on all officials.

Visiting committees began calling on officials in city halls, county courthouses, and state departments. Their tone of voice carried an open advertisement of the suspicion that something was rotten in other places than Denmark. This suspicion was met with resentment, sometimes thinly veiled and sometimes clothed in a Chesterfieldian affability, which would welcome the visiting committee with

a flourish, if not a grasp of the hand, saying, "Come right in, gentlemen. The city hall is yours. The county courthouse is yours. The state department is yours. Examine the records and find out all you want to know about your government." At that point the citizens of North Carolina found not only that they knew next to nothing about their government, but that they didn't even know how to start finding out about it. Frustration drove them to resolutions. These resolutions stuck in official throats and would not go down. And when three hundred representative officials came together to lay the foundations of the Institute of Government on May 6, 1932, they were ready, willing and anxious to resolve in return.

Officials Turn the Other Cheek. At this turn in the proceedings I pointed out that it was hardly becoming in officials to object to a citizen's interest in his government; that their real kick lay in the fact that citizens had taken little interest in their government in the forerunning days of prosperity, were likely to lose their present interest as soon as the depression was over, and might be expected to come at them hammer and tongs with the dawn of another depression.

I further pointed out that many of the very citizens who were complaining at official expenditures had urged the official expenditures at which they were now complaining, and had themselves overspent in houses, churches, automobiles and other good things of life; that this was illustrated by the fact that in many places building and loan payments had to be cut down and extended to avoid foreclosure of the homes of the people; that insurance companies holding mortgages on churches were left to worry over the temporal and spiritual problems involved in foreclosure on the houses of the Lord; that instead of driving critical citizens to hostile camps by resentful resolutions, they should invite them to turn their critical interest into constructive channels by joining with their officials in building the Institute of Government to put the people in touch with their government and keep them in touch with it through prosperity and depression alike. This the officials unanimously agreed to do.

This moment of agreement was a historic moment. It meant that official groups and citizen groups did not intend to dwell in hostile camps, or draw the line to fight, but to work together for the common good. It tested the good faith of the rank and file of officials in declaring they had nothing they cared to hide. It tested the good faith of citizens in declaring they really wanted to study their government to the understanding point.

Avenues to Citizens. At this point I faced a choice of avenues

for reaching citizens with a continuous program of governmental education without grinding the personal axes of particular groups. I discarded the idea of a new organization of citizens on the theory that citizens were already over-organized if not over-worked. I discarded the notion of working through special interest groups, on the theory that their study of government might be limited to its impacts on their own group interests.

I discovered that a growing civic consciousness had brought representatives of many of these groups together in civic clubs which might be expected to look at governmental problems from the civic standpoint. Through these civic clubs we could reach most groups of men in most communities. Starting with this civic club nucleus we could reach out to other citizens' groups not represented adequately or at all in civic clubs; women's organizations, farm organizations, labor organizations, and so on till we included every group of men and women with enough interest in their government to study it.

This plan looked good on paper. When I put it to the test of practice I found that citizens had fully as much human nature as officials; that the competitive activities of citizens' organizations flowered into fully as many rivalries, jealousies and sharp practices as I had ever noted in official groups. Even ministers, who were all steamed up over economic savings which might result from merging overlapping governmental units, swallowed their enthusiasm for such a venture at the irreverent suggestion of local officials that corresponding economic savings might be achieved through the merger of religious denominations and the replacement of many local pastors with one high-powered pulpiteer.

Argument to Citizens. I pointed out to civic leaders that there was little if any gap between the people and their government in the early days of North Carolina's history when every pioneer was a law unto himself, and had to rely upon himself to keep the peace, cut his own path, find his own water supply, build his own house, fight his own fires, provide his own lights, dispose of his own garbage, and look out for his own health and sanitation. Even after the turn of the nineteenth century citizens were called to serve as policemen on the night watch, dig their own wells, keep two buckets of water and a ladder for use in case of fire, keep up the roads in their own neighborhood, and so on throughout a long list of civic duties.

The gap between the people and their government began and grew as people decided they would rather pay taxes to have these things done for them than do them for themselves. It was a long

time before the heirs of pioneers began to realize they could not wash their hands of elemental civic responsibilities by the convenient device of delegating them to officials and employees; that people could not stop with paying their taxes but had to follow their dollars home.

When citizens saw this gap between themselves and their government they sought to bridge it by surface measures. They found it easy to give their government a lick and a promise; to set up taxpayers' leagues as the watch-dogs of the treasury when depressions come and then sit by and watch the watch-dogs die as soon as depressions go; to go down to the city hall or county courthouse once a year and look at the budget when it is thrown open for inspection; to put off all visits to officials until they have axes to grind which officials may reasonably suppose to be private axes; to bring down the fist in condemnation of official slips and never lift a finger to prevent them; to fall into the fashionable assumption of antagonistic interests between taxpayers and taxspenders, between citizens and the officials they vote for, between the people and the government they support—forgetful that in cultivating these antagonisms they were simply cutting off their noses to spite their faces and sowing the winds of discord to reap the whirlwinds of disaster. These devices come and go with feverish haste in the wake of sudden scandals and long drawn out depressions. They may sometimes fly across the gap; they never bridge it.

Civic organizations have gone much farther and cut much deeper than these stop-gap devices. They devote many of their meetings through the year to lectures and discussions on governmental topics. They have standing committees dealing with different aspects of public affairs—ranging all the way from public libraries to parking lots, from underprivileged and delinquent children to underpaid and defaulting officials. These committees are too often ill-equipped to find needed governmental facts, and even when they find the needed facts in local units they are crippled by the lack of machinery for getting comparative information from other civic and official groups in other places.

Why not merge these scattered, sporadic and sometimes superficial governmental studies into a systematic, thoroughgoing and continuous study of the structure and the workings of government in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina? Why not invite Institute staff members to turn their comparative governmental studies into popular guidebooks for citizens as well as into technical guidebooks for officials; teach these studies in training schools for public affairs committees of citizens organizations as

well as in training schools of public officials and employees; demonstrate them in a governmental laboratory serving successive generations of citizens as well as officials; transmit and interchange them through a clearing house of governmental information for citizens and officials alike?

Through these processes the Institute of Government can equip local civic leaders to carry the story of local, state and federal governments in action to their respective groups in weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual meetings devoted to the discussion of public affairs. We can extend these processes through the accredited leaders of all citizens' organizations of men and women to the rank and file of the people. And through these processes we can build the Institute of Government into an agency for putting the people in touch with their government and keeping them in touch with it.

Private citizens of North Carolina have reason for uniting with their officials in building the Institute of Government for official uses; and they have added reason for joining them in extending Institute services to citizens as well. For citizens are the beneficiaries of all improvements in governmental processes and administrative skills. One hundred thousand dollars lost through honest inefficiency is as great a burden to the taxpayer as a hundred thousand dollars lost through conscious fraud. Absconding officials are more than thieves or embezzlers of public funds; they are thieves and embezzlers of the public trust of public office. Incompetent officials are more than wastrels of the people's money; they are wastrels of popular confidence in popular government. Indifferent and by-standing citizens are more than silent witnesses of specific breaches of the public trust; they are accomplices in the forfeiture of liberties won through the suffering and blood of successive generations of their predecessors. They are running into the ground at home the traditions their brothers on a hundred battlefields of this and other generations have lifted to the stars.

Officials in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina are leading the officials of cities, counties and states throughout the nation in a great co-operative enterprise in the effort to cut down existing duplication, friction and strife between interlocking overlapping and conflicting govermental units; in the effort to cut down the lost time, lost motion and lost money involved in a rotating governmental personnel. Why should not the civic organizations of North Carolina lead the civic organizations of the nation by joining with their own officials in this constructive and far reaching governmental program; by cutting in half the costs a separate organization with a similar program would require—thus prac-

ticing for themselves the economies they preach to their officials; by avoiding the hostility and bitterness which always come when citizens and officials array themselves against each other in opposing camps?

Plan of Action. Civic leaders accepted this invitation with an inspiring degree of unanimity, and Institute staff members went to work on these expanding functions. Illustrations of their activities may be found in a 75-page analysis of guides to highway safety; in a 126-page analysis of the proposed new constitution for North Carolina and subsequent amendments; in a 198-page guidebook for members of the Citizens Defense Corps, Citizens Service Corps, Citizens Volunteer Offices, Internal Security agencies and related civilian war activities; in a 100-page guide to postwar planning.

These guidebook studies were carried to open meetings and discussion groups in ten statewide training schools, lasting for three days each and attended by an average of fifty people; followed by twenty one-day district schools with attendance ranging from fifty to one hundred; followed by local schools conducted by local leaders trained in the state and district schools. We have conducted a statewide training school for civic leaders concerned with postwar planning, to be followed in the near future by district schools in all sections of the state, to be followed by local schools in all communities. We have conducted public installations of local officials, with instructional ceremonies attended at the start by thirty thousand citizens, in the one hundred county seats connected in a statewide radio broadcast by the incoming governor and other officials from the state capitol. These instructional activities have been carried forward by demonstrations in the governmental laboratory and supplemented by the clearing house of governmental information.

We expect to expand this civic program to all basic governmental functions. To illustrate. Keeping the peace is one of the oldest governmental functions. Here in North Carolina this function has been discharged successively within the last century by citizens on the night watch, by part-time law enforcing officers with the aid of citizens, by full-time officers all too often without the aid of citizens. But citizens still have definite rights and duties in the administration of the criminal law—in preventing and investigating crime, in testifying as witnesses in open court, in serving on grand and petit juries, in supporting the civic forces of law and order.

We expect to build on these responsibilities by preparing guidebooks for the use of citizens, by bringing together selected civic leaders in statewide training schools for systematic instruction in

these civic responsibilities—to be followed by district and local schools under the direction and supervision of local law enforcing authorities. We expect to extend this educating process to such governmental functions as fire prevention and fire fighting in rural and urban districts; water supply and sewage disposal; street and highway maintenance and construction; public health and welfare; to taxation and other sources of revenues, and the participation of local, state and federal units in financing these and other governmental functions.

We expect local citizens' organizations to supply at least a corporal's guard for the study of these governmental functions in every community—the Lord asked for only ten good men as the price of saving Sodom and Gomorrah, and Sodom and Gomorrah fell because these men could not be found. We expect each corporal's guard to grow into a platoon within a year, and to keep on growing through the years till every city block and rural neighborhood has citizens who understand the organization and operations of one or more of these governmental functions, and until this practice has lengthened into a tradition which is handed down from one generation to another.

If the Spirit Is Willing, Is the Flesh too Weak? Many of my trusted friends feel the Institute of Government is foredoomed to failure on this civic portion of its program. They point out that citizens take little interest in their government in ordinary times; that only in the extraordinary moments of scandal, depression or war do they "stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood, disguise fair nature with hard favored rage" and rush out to lock the stable door after the horse is gone; that for a thousand years they have heard the wisdom of the adages—foresight costs less than hindsight—a stitch in time saves nine—an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure—and the ancient wisdom goes in one ear and out the other, leaving no impression; that this civic trait found eloquent expression in citizen reaction to the scandal of Teapot Dome, to the depression problems of the 1930's, to the call for auxiliary firemen, policemen, public works operators, and the like—in all of which their interest flared with sudden brilliance and then began to wane until hardly a handful stayed to hold the torch.

I am familiar with such arguments as these. They were my starting points for stirring citizens to action in 1933. They are the very traits and tendencies which create the problem to be solved. "We are fighting Germany," said Edward Kidder Graham to the students of the University of North Carolina in 1917, "for the privilege of sleeping through an early morning class if we want to. But

the victory of democracy will not be ours unless after winning the right to stay in bed we choose to get up." "It is easier," he continued, "for some men to charge through barbed wire on the cold steel of German bayonets than to crawl out of a warm bed on a February morning to attend a first hour math class." And so today it is easier for some men to "storm at all the thousand doors that lead to death" along the roads to Berlin, Rome and Tokyo, than it is for others to give up a second cup of coffee, turn in a spare tire, give up pleasure driving, or start on one of several civilian war and protective services and stick to it with the faithfulness of men on the firing line. But we also know that the hope of popular government lies in the overcoming of that difficulty.

The gap between the people and their government never will be bridged by citizens who never go to the ballot box except at the prodding of political candidates and of party workers running around to get out the vote; who never go there unless they are hauled to the polls by somebody more interested in getting them there than they are in going; and who thereafter let their governmental interest go into eclipse until the next election rolls around and some one takes them for another ride. It never will be bridged by citizens who pass laws against the sale of liquor; employ officials to enforce these laws; hire bootleggers to trample these laws under foot; and damn the officials who do not catch the bootlegger in the act, as well as those who do. It never will be bridged by citizens who pass laws against drunken driving; violate those laws by driving drunk; and then put pressure on policemen not to report the violation, on the solicitor not to prosecute, on the jury not to convict, on the judge not to sentence, and on the governor to pardon.

The gap between the people and their government will be bridged when citizens stop to think that no law is stronger than the police desk, the prosecutor's office, the jury box, the judge's bench, the governor's chair, and the ballot box behind them; when they realize that it is not only to their officers but to themselves that they must look for remedies of their governmental ills; that in the study of our own governmental institutions, in the ascertainment and correction of their faults, in their gradual adaptation by evolution rather than by revolution to ever changing needs, we have the greatest guarantee of the preservation and development of American governmental institutions. Here is the surest reason for belief that when our sons shall rise to power, it will not be in a land where the restless energies of a once free people are harnessed by a dictator or harrassed by a demagogue, but in a land where people of all races,

colors and creeds are pulling together to build the democracy for which men and women throughout the ages have fought and dreamed and died but scarcely dared to hope.

D

The Problem of Bridging the Gap between Government as Taught in my Classroom and as Practiced in City Halls, County Courthouses, State Departments, and Federal Agencies in North Carolina

Within the University

I started working on this gap with the idea of helping myself and not with the idea of helping others. I knew I needed help; I didn't know whether others needed it or not; and for the time being I didn't have time to find out.

Within the Law School Framework. My first move within the law school framework was the effort to get in my hands the courses dealing with the legal aspects of government and its administration. I got hold of the traditional course in the common law of crimes; expanded it to include criminal procedure; and finally developed it into a course in criminal law and its administration in city, county, state and federal governmental units. I got hold of the traditional course in municipal corporations; found it dealt almost wholly with cities and towns; saw that the operation of cities and towns had become so closely linked with the operations of counties and the state that one needed to study them together in order to understand them separately; and expanded the course to include the constitutional limits within which the cities, the counties and the state live and move and have their being—going far enough into the federal structure to round out the state and local picture. I then got hold of the traditional course in domestic relations and reshaped it into a course on the family as a governmental unit, on the theory that neither city, county, nor state officials exercised as much influence over the citizens of their respective units as the law allowed parents to exercise over the members of the family unit during the most impressionable years of their lives, and that out of these homes and families came the officials and the citizens of the future.

With these courses as a starting point, I went out to open up the life lines between my classroom and every city hall, county courthouse, state department and federal agency in North Carolina. I wanted the results of my studies to flow out through these

life lines to officials in their offices, and the developments springing from their initiative and resourcefulness to flow back to my classroom at the classroom hour. I fought for the extension of this concept to every law school classroom. In fact, I had no notion of building an Institute of Government or any other sort of organization, because I conceived of the law school itself as the organization through which my purposes could be achieved. To make a long, eventful and dramatic story short, I lost the fight for law school sponsorship. I lost the fight for my own classroom sponsorship. More than once I all but lost my classroom; and the only thing that saved me was a presidential ruling that so long as I protected the integrity of my teaching my professional "chair" would not be pulled out from under me.

On the heels of this ruling came the charge that I was neglecting my teaching duties; and but for the backing of my students I would have lost my "chair," and found no flooring underneath it. To remove even the appearance of a conflict of interests I cavalierly requested, and was nonchalantly granted, a part time leave of absence from my teaching duties on the same terms that Pickwick got his trip around the world—at my own expense. But this technique, repeated again and again, did not achieve its purpose. I must have been stepping high; going like a young man in a hurry; advertising the sort of stride Winged Victory was putting on when she got her head knocked off. It began to dawn on me that far from being the law school's hope I was fast becoming the law school's despair; and I reluctantly became receptive to official effort to find an operating base outside the law school but still within the limits of the University.

Within the University Framework. By this time the hue and cry had brought the lords and men of the adjoining lands to the borders of their several jurisdictions—ready to do battle over their respective cubic feet of learning. The very name "Institute of Government" took on ominous implications. Did I mean to trespass on the territory of "public administration"? of "political science"? of "university extension"? These properties had been listed in the catalogue for years and the boundaries posted according to the law in such cases made and provided. Then why did I use the word "government" in my title? Why didn't I call it the "Institute of Law"? When I stopped to consider that question I could not think of why I had not called it the "Institute of Law" to start with, unless it was a touch of the "mystical lore" that "coming events cast their shadows before." I agreed with them

that any one of several departments might register a valid claim to the sort of work that I was doing under the particular label I had chosen; that all of them ought to have been doing it for a hundred years; that in the eyes of the law constructive possession yields to actual possession and the statute of limitations eventually runs in favor of persons holding under color of title; that I ought to be accorded at least the dignity of a "squatter's rights" in territory I had already occupied; that I was perfectly willing to take another name if they could help me find one equally suited to my purposes without an academic patent on it. But that was my lookout and not theirs.

"Where did Coates get the idea that he represents the universe when he doesn't even represent the University?" wondering critics asked. Any wedding of the Institute with any other department at that time would have been a shotgun wedding—from the viewpoint of all parties. I found myself repeating the despairing wail of the early Britons: "The barbarians drive us to the sea. The sea throws us back on the barbarians. Thus, two modes of death await us: we are either slain or drowned." And I, a timid country boy who had never heard a harsher tone than the morning song of a field lark or the evening call of a turtledove, was forced to "drink delight of battle with my peers, far on the ringing plains of windy Troy."

And what a battle! No man's political education is complete until he has fought through academic battles. The "party battles of the Jackson era" cannot match the academic battles of any era. The practical politician cannot hold a candle to the academic politician. To make another long, eventful and dramatic story short, they beat me to the draw, they outsmarted me, they outfought me, and gave me the worst licking I ever took in my life. I am glad I didn't find how completely I was licked until I was back in the running again; and it was then too late for me to give outward and visible evidence of what had been supposed to be an inward and spiritual truth.

As the issues of the battle clarified, the status of the Institute improved. One day the dean of administration encouraged me with the comment: "Everyone admits a baby has been born. Everyone is swearing it's a bastard. But everyone is secretly hoping its paternity will be ascribed to him." From an academic nonentity, the Institute had come far enough to be whispered as the stillborn child of academic hope, and now the hope was made flesh with a local habitation and a name. This spelled progress!

But I could not help crying out in the words of Edmund in King Lear:

> "Why bastard? Wherefore base?
> When my dimensions are as well compact,
> My mind as generous, and my shape as true,
> As honest madam's issue? . . .
> Now, gods, stand up for bastards!"

And they did. A committee which had been handpicked to furnish free skids for the Institute violated its instructions and passed a resolution to the following effect: "It is the sense of this Committee that the Institute of Government should be invited to become an integral part of the University of North Carolina and it therefore recommends that the President of the University make all possible efforts to this end, and that this Committee disband with the understanding that it is not to reassemble unless and until such efforts fail." The president moved as fast as circumstances would permit in the direction of legitimatizing the Institute. Fifteen years of effort came to fruition in January 1942, when the Institute of Government became an integral part of the University of North Carolina through formal action of the board of trustees, and the belated birth certificate was duly authorized and issued.

The president followed the trustee action with a statement to the effect that: "Joseph Caldwell and Elisha Mitchell went out from the University in the 1820's to work with local officials in surveying and locating town sites and county seats. Edwin A. Alderman and Charles D. McIver went out from the University in the 1890's to hold institutes for the training of teachers in the public schools throughout the state. Edward Kidder Graham and Louis R. Wilson went out from the University after the turn of the century to carry the limits of the campus to the boundaries of the state. In line with this historic tradition, the Institute of Government went out from the University in the 1920's and the 1930's to carry on a program of governmental education in a variety of forms to the officials, the citizens and the youth of the cities, the counties, and the state of North Carolina." On October 12, 1943, during the celebration of the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the laying of the cornerstone of Old East Building, the president remarked that the Institute of Government was one of the outstanding democratic achievements of the University of North Carolina.

Knowledge Comes but Wisdom Lingers. I had started with the realization of the gap between my classroom and the city halls, county courthouses and state departments of the commonwealth. I had steered my precarious course between scylla and charybdis to the bridging of that gap. But I had not realized the gap between classrooms and departments within the confines of academic institutions—between law school and political science departments, between criminal law and criminology, between municipal corporations and municipal administration, between the law of domestic relations and the sociology of the family. I was better acquainted with the outside universe than with the inside University, and I found myself stepping on academic toes instead of standing on academic shoulders.

I did not come into an understanding of this gap until I heard President Graham outline the evolution of the college curriculum through the swing of the centuries: how the classicists who had controlled it fought to keep the natural scientists from getting a toe hold; how the natural scientists, once in and settled down, had fought to keep the social scientists down if not out; how the social scientists, with one foot in the curriculum door, for a season curried favor with the classicists and the natural scientists by ridiculing the pretensions of extension divisions and schools of education.

The curricular history of my own Alma Mater illustrated these successive clashes. Had she not lost the disciplines of agriculture and mechanical arts by tucking federal aid to agriculture under a classical wing and keeping it out of sight and out of mind? Had I not seen University "extension" damned with the faintest of praise and all too slowly make the academic grade, aided and abetted by the questionable but effective device of supplemental pay for outside work? Then why should I wonder at the lifted eyebrows, distended nostrils, pawing hoofs, and wild alarums, as I led into "these classic shades, these noble oaks, this quiet spot," policemen, constables, sheriffs, and their fellow officers from the farthest creek banks in the commonwealth.

Brothers under the Skin. I was beginning to understand at least a part of what I knew. The feeling of each vested academic interest for any new claimant was not very different from the feeling of the ancient sheriff toward the first policeman who came into his county to help him enforce the law when he hadn't asked for any help; from the early feeling of both sheriff and policemen towards the state patrolman; and of all these for the federal officers. It was not very different from the feeling of early indus-

trialists for labor unions, and the feeling of both of these groups for the Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Each newcomer was saying to the old timers: move over, reshuffle the decks, give us a new deal. A campaign to share the curriculum was the academic equivalent of a campaign to share the wealth. A vote in a faculty meeting to take Latin and Greek off the list of required courses and put them on the list of electives excites in the breast of a classicist the same sort of feeling excited in the breast of an industrialist by a vote in Congress to take his product out from under the protective tariff and into the competition of the open market. Both of them have a vested interest in preserving the ways of the fathers—a bread and butter interest in maintaining the status quo.

With this hard won insight I went out to open up the life lines between my own and neighboring classrooms, between the Institute of Government and related University departments, in the effort to avoid the backwash of departmental imperialisms which had swept me into previous disasters. The results of these efforts find illustration in present day relationships through which members of the Institute staff are privileged to teach courses involving the legal aspects of city, county and state government and its administration, civil and criminal, in the law school; courses dealing with the administration of government in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina, in the department of political science; courses dealing with the laws of social work in the department of sociology and public welfare, the laws of public health in the school of public health, and governmental accounting in the school of commerce. The Institute library materials are fitting into the University library system, and Institute activities are fitting into the general pattern of University extension activities.

Through these avenues and relationships the full resources of the Institute of Government are flowing to students, faculty and administrative officers in all related schools, divisions and departments. Undergraduate students from many departments are coming to the Institute building in increasing numbers to utilize this field of studies, research reports and other source materials in our governmental laboratory and clearing house of information. Graduate students are using these source materials for theses to be submitted for graduate degrees and frequently consulting with members of the Institute staff on problems coming within the range of their school specialties. Plans are in the making through which Institute staff members, constantly working with public

officials, will supervise and direct a program of student apprenticeships to public officials in city, county, state and federal governmental units in North Carolina. The advantage of this arrangement to the University grows out of the fact that every Institute staff member is working throughout the year on the subject matter of the course he teaches for one quarter, and the department in which he is teaching gets the results of twelve months' work for less than three months' pay. The advantage to the Institute of Government grows out of the fact that every staff member's part-time teaching duties require him to organize and assimilate his research materials to the point that he can effectively interpret and transmit them, increase his expertness in the handling of them, and give him the deeper insights which teaching brings.

Through these same avenues and relationships the total library, research, teaching and administrative resources of the University of North Carolina are flowing into the Institute of Government and through it to the officials, the citizens and the youth of the commonwealth. Ph.D. theses, M.A. theses, and special reports in seminars are taking on increasing practicality and finding their way off of the library shelves on which they have been too frequently entombed, into the service of officials, citizens and teachers on the job, through Institute guidebooks, training schools, clearing house and laboratory. Teachers in University departments are giving special seminar courses of instruction for members of the Institute staff, all of whom are registered as graduate students. These teachers are going further and joining the Institute's instruction staff in its program of training schools. Related departments have become allied departments, and are collaborating with us as wholeheartedly as they fought us; greater collaboration than this no man could ask for. The possibilities of co-operative effort are unlimited, and we have only scratched the surface.

When I am asked how the collaboration of present days has outgrown the competitions and the fights of former days, I think of the boy who asked his father what had become of the dinosaurs and other frightful monsters of prehistoric days, and received the answer that the climate had changed and they had gradually disappeared. And so these catastrophic conflicts faded out like the Cheshire cat of *Alice in Wonderland* fame—disappearing by degrees: first its tail, then its body, then its head, until nothing was left but its grin, which remained for some moments after the cat itself had disappeared.

I do not mean to convey the impression that the "war

drums throb no longer and that all battle flags are furled." Too often I have seen Alice in Wonderland's Cheshire cat in reverse: first its grin, then its whiskers, head, body and tail; then the arched back followed by the gentle recoil shifting the weight to the hind legs while the fore paws rise and velvet foot pads take cover behind protruding claws. There is at least one of my colleagues who certainly, another who probably, and still another who possibly has no doubts about my relative position in the animal kingdom. In all fairness I must admit that I am impressed with the amount of solid proof they have at times brought forward in support of their contentions; and with proper deference to these proofs I no longer pose in garments of lily white, but only of battleship gray, on the darker side.

Within the High School

With avenues thus opened from my law school classroom to teachers and students in other classrooms in related departments in the University, I faced the task of extending these avenues to the two thousand or more teachers and the hundred thousand or more students in the civics and government classrooms in the eight hundred or more high schools of North Carolina.

At this point I took counsel with high school superintendents, principals, and teachers of civics and government in eight district meetings, and invited them to join with public officials and private citizens in extending the scope of Institute services to include the students and teachers of civics and government in the schools.

The Margin of Freedom. I found the starting point of my argument to high school teachers in the words of an English scholar to an English prince, four hundred years ago. The old scholar had written a series of lectures to acquaint the young prince with the laws and customs of his country. In the course of these lectures he asked the prince this question: "Who has the more power, the king of England or the king of France?"

The prince replied: "The king of France, of course. He has the power of life and death over all his subjects. He can put his heel on any man's neck. There are no limits to his power. But here in England my father, the king, is hedged in with all manner of restrictions. He has to ask permission of Parliament before he moves. His power cannot match the power of the king of France."

The old scholar came back with the answer that is the basis of my belief in popular government—the basis of my belief that popular governmental institutions will be here long after nazi and fascist

institutions have perished from the earth. "You are wrong," he said. "A king has no more power than is in the people behind him. In France, as you say, the people are serfs, slaves, under the heel of the king, with their initiative, energy and resourcefulness cramped and stifled. But in England every subject of the crown has a margin of freedom. Within that margin of freedom the initiative, energy and resourcefulness of men develop to the point that when the king of England speaks, he speaks with the combined power of a free people."

This margin of freedom has steadily widened for English speaking peoples. The Magna Carta in the year 1215, the Petition of Right in 1628, the Habeas Corpus Act in 1679, the Bill of Rights in 1689, the Reform Bill in 1832 are milestones in the long unbroken struggle through which men and women have climbed their way from serfdom to freedom. Here in the United States this tradition has steadily widened with the Declaration of Independence in 1776; the American Bill of Rights in 1791; the Emancipation Proclamation in 1862 followed by constitutional guarantees in 1865; the enfranchisement of women in 1919. Here in North Carolina, history repeated itself as the first part of the last century rubbed out the property line, which from colonial days had stood between the citizen and the ballot, and permitted men without property to vote; as the middle of the last century rubbed out the color line and permitted negroes to vote; as the early part of the present century rubbed out the sex line and permitted women to vote; until today practically everybody over twenty-one years old is entitled to a say-so in the running of city, county, state and nation.

These hundreds of years of struggle to transfer the power to govern from the king to the people bring on another and no less compelling struggle to bring the people who have won the power to govern into an active and understanding participation in public affairs. The schools of the people are the only institutions through which all or nearly all of the children of the people pass on the way to the ballot box. Many boys and girls drop out in the primary and grammar grades. Even those who reach the high schools do not find an adequate civics book and seldom find an adequate civics course; with the result that thousands of officials are going into public office, and hundreds of thousands of citizens are going to the ballot box, with little understanding of the structure and the workings of their governmental institutions.

The Gap between Teaching and Practice. This gap between civics and government as it is taught in local high schools and as it

is practiced in local government units cannot fairly be blamed upon the high school teacher. Most high school teachers are not blood kin to the candidate for county surveyor who appealed for votes on the platform that his grandfather was county surveyor, that his father was county surveyor, and that he himself had "inherited at birth" the qualifications of a county surveyor. Few of them acquire a teaching knowledge from their high school and college governmental courses, and fewer still acquire it from practical experience. When they are put into a high school classroom, few if any are given adequate text materials to enable them to discharge their civics teaching duties. From 1663 when Charles II issued the charter from the crown bringing Carolina into being as a governmental unit, nearly two hundred years went by before the first serious effort to prepare a book on North Carolina history for use in the schools. The first significant history of the state did not appear till 1857. The collection and publication of colonial and state records did not begin until 1886 to make early source material conveniently available for historical use. There have been a few scattered governmental studies but throughout the two hundred and fifty years of our history we have never undertaken a thorough and systematic study of governmental institutions and processes in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina.

Many high school teachers are making heroic efforts to bridge this gap. Some of them have been preparing their own course materials. Some of them are bringing local officials into their classrooms from time to time. Some of them are taking their students on occasional trips to city, county and state offices—a practice sometimes carried to the nuisance point. Some teachers are going into their local city halls and courthouses to learn for themselves and take their learning to the classroom.

Institute Co-operation. I pointed out the fact that Institute staff members had inaugurated the first systematic and thoroughgoing study of the structure and workings of government ever undertaken in this state's history; that they were setting forth the results of these studies in guidebooks; teaching them in training schools, demonstrating them in laboratories and transmitting them through a clearing house of governmental information for public officials and the public affairs committees of citizens' organizations; and that they might perform similar services for teachers and students of civics and government in the high schools of North Carolina.

If officials in the city halls, county courthouses and state departments of North Carolina are leading the officials of the nation in a

co-ordinated program of governmental education for officials; if the civic organizations of North Carolina are leading the civic organizations of the nation in a co-ordinated program of governmental education for citizens; why should not the schoolrooms of North Carolina lead the schoolrooms of the nation in a co-ordinated program of governmental education for the youth of today who will be the officials and the citizens of tomorrow?

The teachers assembled in these meetings accepted this invitation, and in their name, too, we went forward with our work. Since these meetings, specific studies have been prepared for the use of teachers and students in the schools paralleling the studies made for citizens' organizations and described earlier in this story: in a 75-page analysis of guides to highway safety; in a 126-page analysis of the proposed new constitution for North Carolina and subsequent amendments; in a 198-page guidebook for members of Citizens Defense Corps, Citizens Service Corps, Citizens Volunteer Offices, Internal Security agencies and related civilian war activities; in a 100-page guide to postwar planning.

Other chapters dealing with other topics are scheduled to come out in sequence, beginning in the fall of 1944. They will be geared to the study of similar topics by citizens and officials, as outlined in the earlier sections of this story—to the end that the officials, the citizens and the youth of a community will be studying the same functions of government at the same time. They will be timed so as to coincide with the actual performance of basic governmental functions, such as the listing and assessing of property for purposes of taxation, during the listing period beginning each year on January 1; the preparation of budgets, during the budget-making period beginning in April and May of each year and continuing through the fixing of the tax rates and the introduction of the budget resolution; the collection of taxes, during the period when the tax books are turned over to the tax collector and prepayments are rewarded with discounts; the operations of political party machinery and the conduct of primaries and general elections, during the seasons when campaigns for party nominations and final elections are going on. Chapters on law enforcement, fire fighting, water supplies, public works, health, welfare and other activities always going on will be interspersed between the seasonal activities of government.

We expect to follow up the foregoing steps by interpreting these materials and their uses in periodic statewide, district, and local training schools for teachers; by demonstrating them for teachers

in the governmental laboratory in Chapel Hill, and in local laboratories in every one of our eight hundred high schools; by keeping them up to date and transmitting them through the clearing house of governmental information to which every teacher of civics and government in the high schools of the state has the same access as any public official or private citizen. Already we are sending to high school officials weekly summaries of the daily actions of the General Assembly throughout its biennial sessions, to be fed into civics and social science courses. Next year we expect to send similar summaries of action taken by city councilmen and county commissioners in their monthly and weekly sessions. Already inquiries are coming in from students and teachers, growing out of classroom discussion of governmental matters.

We expect to carry this interlocking relationship still further. The courses offered by Institute staff members through existing University departments to students on the campus will during the coming year be offered through the channels of the extension division to teachers of civics and government in the eight hundred high schools of North Carolina—supplemented by field studies in the city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies located in the communities where these teachers live, and supervised and directed by Institute staff members with the cooperation of the local, state and federal officials concerned. Under this arrangement there is no more need for a modern civics teacher to be at the mercy of dull, dry and uninforming textbooks when there is a city hall or county courthouse at his door, than for the medieval schoolman to speculate on the number of teeth in a horse's head when there was a horse at the door with a full set of teeth to be counted.

Through activities such as these the Institute of Government expects to go a reasonable distance in correcting the conditions described at the beginning of this story—conditions which permit thirty thousand boys and girls to go out from our schools knowing how to read a page of Caesar's Gallic wars, but not knowing how to read their own municipal balance sheet; able to track Cicero around Rome, and yet unable to find their way around their own city hall, county courthouse, and state capitol.

Pitfalls in the Path. "Are the officials and the citizens of North Carolina willing to work with high school teachers on this program of governmental education?" Over and over again I have been asked this question, and over and over again I have replied that accredited leaders of all groups of officials and citizens working

through the Institute of Government have expressly authorized me to invite the teachers' participation in this program and urge their acceptance of the invitation. In many places officials have already suited action to the word, and certain phases of this cooperative program are under way.

"But is not this program beyond the function of the public schools," I am sometimes asked. If you define the function of the public school in terms of keeping out of life instead of getting into it, and as the teaching of platitudes which have been described as truths which have lost their truthfulness, then the program of governmental education outlined in this story of the Institute of Government is beyond the function of the public schools.

"Let's be practical about this matter," say some of my teacher friends who, from experience longer and more practical than any I have ever known, have learned the side their bread is buttered on. "Aren't you leading the public schools of North Carolina on a dangerous mission?"

Of course, it is a dangerous mission, I reply; the quest for truth has always been a dangerous and uncertain quest. But school teachers on the home front might do well to remember that around two hundred thousand of North Carolina's youth are today engaged on even more risky missions—on the seven seas, on the wings of the morning, and in the uttermost parts of the earth.

They might recall the words of Sir William Berkeley, colonial governor of Virginia: "Thank God, there are no free schools nor printing presses, and I hope there will be none for a hundred years; for learning has brought disobedience, and heresy, and sects into the world, and printing has divulged these and other libels." Hitler suited action to the words of this outgrown, outworn, and half-forgotten tune, as he stole into the schools, threw the nazi noose around the necks of students and teachers alike, closed the doors of the universities to the search of truth, and prostituted them to the spread of propaganda. It is not too much to say that the schools were opened and the freedom of the schools was bought with the blood of men and women who loved liberty more than life. It is not too much to believe that the students and teachers in the schools will make their schoolrooms worth the cost.

Within Student Governing Bodies

Within the limits of the state of North Carolina, the county of Orange, and the town of Chapel Hill, I discovered another branch of government in student government of thousands of students on

the University campus, with little help or interference from city, county, state, or federal authorities.

The minutes of the trustees, faculty, and student organizations from the opening of the University in 1795 to this day unfolded a fascinating chapter in political science. From the records it appeared that the plan of governing students from 1795 to 1871 required the trustees to make the laws, the faculty to enforce them, and the students to obey them. Within this ring of authority drawn by trustees and faculty, students in the Dialectic and Philanthropic Societies governed themselves so well—first within the society halls and later on the campus—that in 1875 the faculty recognized these student organizations as student governing bodies by a series of compacts which gradually extended to the regulation of all forms of student conduct.

Trustee recognition followed in 1885 when the trustees authorized the faculty to expel from the University any student whom the students expelled from the societies; and this recognition went still further in 1910 when the trustees authorized the student council to suspend students from the University without the intervention of the faculty. The principle of student self-government, thus established, has been steadily extended through the years until practically all phases of student affairs have come to be administered by the students themselves. Faculty and trustee recognition has been followed with recognition by the civil authorities, as officials in the town of Chapel Hill turn over cases involving students to the Student Council for trial.

In some high schools in North Carolina we found that students have as little to say in their own government today as students on the University campus in 1795. From this starting point we discovered varying degrees of student participation in the management of student affairs with varying degrees of success. How far this student participation can be carried in high schools is a debatable question; but the records show that many high school students are developing self-governing capacities to a high degree. In one high school in the state the students have taken a slot machine into a classroom, uncovered its operations, demonstrated its frauds, turned the sporting sense of the student body against these "one-armed bandits" which never give a decent sporting chance, and helped the police to stifle an illicit business which accredited law enforcing officers seemed powerless to stop. In one city school, child accidents were cut in half with the help of student safety patrols; in another city the annual property damage of several hun-

dred dollars in hallowe'en celebrations was cut to practically nothing with the help of the organized youth of the community. In another city the annual school property damage resulting from careless acts of students which teachers seemed unable to prevent was cut two-thirds by student participation in school affairs. These are indications of the practical possibilities flowing from the systematic and organized participation of youth in the daily administration of public affairs.

Student Government in the Institute of Government. Armed with this record of student achievement, I went to the Institute governing board with the recommendation that student government officers in colleges and high schools be invited to participate in the program of the Institute of Government on the same basis as public officials and private citizens.

I argued that from colonial days to the present the people of North Carolina had successively removed the property line, color line, and sex line as barriers between the citizens and the ballot box, until most persons over twenty-one years old were privileged to vote; that while we were unlikely to lower this voting age in general elections, the University trustees and faculty, under authority of the legislative charter issued in 1789, had extended to boys and girls under the age of twenty-one the power to vote, hold office and run their own affairs on the campus at Chapel Hill; that these students had accepted and lived up to their responsibilities as self-governing citizens on the campus fully as well as citizens of the town of Chapel Hill, the county of Orange, or the state of North Carolina; that this self-government movement was fast spreading to the high schools; and that it was entitled to public recognition as part and parcel of a growing democratic tradition.

The significance to North Carolina of student government on the campus of the University of North Carolina is apparent in the words of President Winston as early as 1894: "The University is a miniature state whose members represent every condition of poverty and wealth, every type of local character, every phase of religious and political belief . . .; the problems before it are problems that confront the state; problems of crime, of pauperism, of social unhappiness and disorder. It is training minds and training hearts and training bodies that will solve these problems." Likewise the significance to every community in North Carolina of student government in the high schools in that community is apparent from the fact that high school students bring to the high school every

element of local citizenship and make the high school campus an epitome of the community's problems and its possibilities.

The words of Francis Bradshaw, dean of students in the University of North Carolina, apply with equal force to student government in high schools and colleges alike: "It would seem to me justifiable to say that the ability which the campus has shown to meet its own problems of government, organization, and activity is an indication that the institutions and traditions of student life are feeding into the life of this state men who have more than a mere knowledge of how things should be done, men who have that rarer and more difficult knowledge which is based on experience in trying to put knowledge to work in meeting the problems of their own life."

The recommendation that student government officers be invited into the councils of public officials was unanimously accepted by the Institute's governing board, and public officials in North Carolina publicly recognized that student government had come of age.

Following this action, Institute staff members, with the backing of a student committee including the president of the student body of the University of North Carolina together with the president of the college and high school student federations, carried forward comparative studies of the structure and the workings of student government in the colleges and high schools of the state, recording its successses and failures, and trying to find their underlying causes. We are setting forth the results of these studies in guidebooks for college and high school student leaders; teaching them in training schools; demonstrating them in laboratories; and transmitting them through a clearing house of student governmental information to college and high school students throughout the state.

We are proceeding on the theory that college and high school faculties cannot *give* student government to their respective student bodies—that the most they can do is to give their student bodies *the opportunity to win it* for themselves. We are proceeding in the belief that by the extension of this self-governing principle of responsible citizenship to college and high school students step by step, as fast as they can win it on the merits and no faster, the school teachers of North Carolina have the opportunity to turn their classrooms into starting points of a practical program of citizenship training without parallel in America today. We are proceeding in the faith that students who organize their own parties, nominate

their own officers, run their own elections, initiate and finance their own activities in the light of their own intelligence, will be that much better fitted as citizens to participate in the precinct meetings and county and state conventions of political parties, to operate state and local election machinery, to initiate and finance governmental activities in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina. We are proceeding in the knowledge that the fascist youth were not independent and self-governing youth—they were the rubber stamps of Mussolini; that the nazi youth were not independent and self-governing youth—they were the rubber stamps of Hitler; that the Japanese youth were not independent and self-governing youth—they were the rubber stamps of a ruling military clique. And we are going forward with the conviction that human beings who grow into the habit of governing themselves while they are boys and girls in school are less likely as men and women to turn over the reins of the commonwealth to a dictator or demagogue forever hovering on the outskirts of democracy.

III

FINANCING INSTITUTE ACTIVITIES

A

The First Start

Some years ago my friend R. B. House remarked that "every North Carolinian worth his salt was born in a panic, bred in a depression, and buried on a debit balance." This remark almost plotted the course of the Institute of Government. Money for the beginnings of the Institute came out of my own pocket. This was right and proper, for the reason that it started with a personal problem—the bridging of the gap between law and government as it was taught by myself in my classroom and as it was practiced by officials outside. Bridging that gap was my business. This personal financing covered such items as my own time and labor in summers and vacations which I devoted to this purpose; traveling expenses to all sections of the state to see officials in their offices and to sit with them in their conventions; secretarial and clerical help; postage, printing, and office supplies.

After a while, a handful of business men thought my efforts showed sufficient promise of results to justify them in contributing enough money to give me the nucleus of a staff. The first gift, $500, came from a college mate who had watched the work with interest. A few months later this same man called me to his office and without a word of warning overwhelmed me with the statement that he was going to give me $5,000 a year for three years, and suited action to the word by handing me the first check. This man subsequently added $5,000 a year for two more years. Another college mate added $5,000 a year for three years, and thereafter added another $5,000. One former student added $2,500; another former student, $1,000. Some of the older business men of the state made separate gifts adding up to $5,000. This money financed a staff which multiplied my efforts. Funds for a building were not even in the offing at that time.

As soon as studies of the staff had gone far enough to be of service to officials, we invited them to subscribe to our publications, bulletins and other services. The response to this invitation was spotty at the start; in some places every local official would subscribe, while in others the proportion petered down to nothing. One day we received a letter from a city manager saying that he

had followed our training courses, publications, bulletins, and other informational services from the beginning, that he thought they would be as valuable to other city officials and department heads as they were to him, and asking that we submit a blanket rate for which we could furnish our services to all of his officials and department heads. This was the beginning of city and county memberships in the Institute of Government, figured on the basis of one-half of one cent per inhabitant, and so weighted as to bring in from the cities and counties amounts proportionate to the rural and urban populations of the state. One hundred per cent collections on this basis were calculated to bring in around $15,000 a year.

I had long seen the need for a building to house the working staff of the Institute, its comparative studies and exhibits, the training schools, the laboratory and clearing house of governmental information, and to serve as the headquarters of all Institute activities. The Federal Public Works Administration earmarked $45,000 for this building. One man agreed to put up $25,000, provided a total of $100,000 was raised—$50,000 to match the PWA grant, and $50,000 as a backlog for operations while we were building up our revenues to the sustaining point. Two men agreed to put up another $25,000 on the same conditions. One of the national foundations sent its representative to inspect us with a view to matching funds. He found local factions with cross purposes, but was so favorably impressed with our plan, our staff, and our work that he volunteered to hold back his report for the next thirty to sixty days to give me another chance to get the united front required before he could recommend a grant-in-aid. To make a long story short: I could not unite these factions behind the Institute; I lost the $45,000 grant; I lost the chance of matching the $50,000 in hand; I lost forever $25,000 of the $50,000 already pledged and saw the other $25,000 hanging in the balance. I had geared our operations to the building program; the bottom had dropped out from under both; and I was left with a staff of five men, four of whom were married, and two of whom had children. Salaries were already behind, and no money was in sight for bread and butter for either the present, the immediate past, or the immediate future.

In desperation I turned for further help to early friends and backers, but with scant success. For had I not outlined to my friends and backers an air-tight, water-tight, and fool-proof financing program, convincing to some of the "hardheadedest"

business men in the state? Was not this plan well known in circles where I might reasonably look for help—to the point that they had been congratulating me on a "great achievement"? And had I not accepted those congratulations with the "becoming modesty" of a man who realizes there is some merit in what his friends are saying?

As I look back at this situation, I can see that when I changed faces and walked back into those circles, even my very best friends could see a transformation had been wrought. The fact that I was wearing a second face was sufficient evidence that I had lost the first one. They smelled a rat, and some of my gentler critics even said they saw one! What in prospect had looked just good enough to be true, in retrospect looked too good to be true.

Having learned that nothing succeeds like success, I now proceeded to learn that nothing fails like failure; for after I had moved in every direction, butting my head in the dark against surrounding walls at every turn, I used the distressing imminence of death to the Institute as a final argument for its salvation. In that moment I had a dawning appreciation of the World War I story of the Negro soldier who threw down his bayonet in the face of a German bayonet charge, drew out a razor which was better assimilated to his personality, and flourished it with a speed reminiscent of the adage that the hand is quicker than the eye. "You missed me," said the German soldier. But the Negro smiled, wiped the blood off his razor, and answered: "You just shake your head." I did not shake my head; I couldn't afford to. There is a line in a recently familiar song, "Coming in on a wing and a prayer." That line cannot begin to describe the condition in which I found myself. I knew I had no wing; and friends who appeared to know what they were talking about told me I did not even have a prayer.

B

The Second Start

About this time a friend whose girl had "kicked" him wrote me that he had found one consolation in his predicament: any further falling was bound to be up hill. I understood what he was talking about. I had heard that drowning men would grasp at straws. Luckily for me several straws began to float in my direction. State departments began asking for services of the Institute staff in specific undertakings. The Supreme Court of North Carolina asked

for the services of the Institute staff member who had been working on the administration of justice in the courts. The state tax commission asked for the services of the Institute staff member who had been working with city, county, and state tax officials. The newly elected state auditor asked for the Institute staff member who had been working with city, county and state accountants. The newly incorporated state bar asked for the services of another Institute staff member to carry on its fast developing work with the lawyers of the state.

I had planned from the beginning that all Institute staff members working with city and county officials should serve their apprenticeships to state departments as soon as these local apprenticeships were over. Why not, I thought to myself, let them serve these state apprenticeships during the next year—at the state's request and at the state's expense! Particularly since there was nothing else I could do. Necessity was certainly the mother of that invention.

I believed that scattered revenues from city and county memberships would keep up the appearance of Institute headquarters and a minimum flow of services to subscribing members, and that I would fill the remaining gap with big talk about big plans for the future—this being the sort of thing which even my harshest critics admitted I was good at. I hoped that, while the PWA grant had lapsed, it was not dead but sleeping; that the national foundation might still come to my aid if the Institute could show a united front within the University, and if I could persuade the local pledgors to give me more time to match their conditional gifts. Here were a lot of "ifs"; but they were all I had to work with, and I went to work.

Things seemed to be going well. Scattered memberships continued coming in fast enough to keep buckle and tongue together on a skeletonized figure. I was doing all the big talk I had promised to do, and more; and I was finding that I could point out the significance of the Macedonian call of state departments for Institute staff services so effectively that for the time being it took the minds of most of my hearers off the fact that the staff was no longer with the Institute! The foundation representative was ready to listen to evidence of a reasonably united front at home. The newly nominated governor of North Carolina took off a day to go with me to see leaders of the North Carolina congressional delegation in the interest of reviving the PWA grant before the

deadline date. I could already see the staff back with the Institute, seasoned by a year of invaluable experience on state levels, and ready to carry the Institute forward with tremendous strides. And then explosions began.

I found that one of the $25,000 pledgors had received satisfying assurances from my critics that I had not lived up to the conditions of his gift, that the Institute was dead beyond the reaches of the pulmotor, and that even while it was alive it was so much the subject of factional dispute that money put in it would be put into a doubtful venture; and that was the end of that. But this loss did not mean that all was lost; and I moved in the direction of the foundations—gambling on the hope that the danger of losing building, staff, and Institute might be enough to bring all factions into a united front. I lost the gamble when I found that certain factions were not only not denying they were fighting me—they were bragging on it! I lost all hope of help from PWA when the deadline fell for final allocations and I was not there. I lost all hope of early help from the University when the appropriate faculty committee washed the institution's hands of me by withdrawing the invitation to join with a new department which I had suspected was organized to take over Institute assets without accepting Institute commitments.

The dream which had sustained me for the past twelve months had faded into air too thin to breathe. The staff—four years in training, four years in laying the foundations of the Institute, and fitted superbly to build a superstructure worthy of the foundations—this staff could not come back to nothing; it was gone! I thought of President Graham's pleas to depression legislatures: "It takes a generation to build a faculty and only a year to lose it." It would take three or four years to train another staff which could pick up at the point where these boys left off. There was no money for replacements, even if they could be found. There was no hiding either the fact that the staff was gone, or that we did not have the wherewithal to get another. It was not a problem of building back with worn-out tools; it was a problem of building back without any tools at all.

C
The Third Start

I caught a late bus from Raleigh to Chapel Hill one night and the only other passenger was an older man who had lost everything in the depression but his name. I had always admired this man and he had responded to my admiration by talking freely to me.

On that bus ride he described to me the scene in the director's room of a great bank on the evening the officers and directors first realized the doors of the bank could not be opened the following morning. Panic broke loose as those men realized that their lifetime's accumulations had been swept away and that the penalty clause of the banking law was likely to hang the millstone of deficiency judgments around their necks as long as they lived. Grown men wept and didn't try to hide their tears; others moaned with their heads in their hands; one talked of suicide; one started to jump out the window.

All of them were making bad matters worse when this man rose to his feet and told them all to listen to what he had to say: "We are slaves to *things.* Ghandi has freed himself from slavery to *things;* he gets along with a loincloth and a few grains of rice a day; he is about as happy as we are, and gets a lot more done. We start out that way, with life and health and strength; we begin to accumulate *things;* we keep on till we've got more *things* than we need, we keep on till *things* have got us, till we don't know what to do without them. Then we lose *things;* and when we lose them we think we've lost everything; life is not worth living without them; we lose our senses and turn this director's room into a madhouse. Look at me: I have lost all the *things* I had; but I started out with *no things* — nothing but the fundamental values of life, health, strength, brains, and a willingness to work; and with the help of these values I won the *things* I've lost. But I'm not going to lose my head. I have all the fundamental values of life, health, strength, brains and willingness to work I started out with. They are more valuable than they were at the start because they are seasoned with experience, tempered with judgment, labeled with a name I didn't have to start with, and galvanized for action by a love which I discovered on the way. With their help I am taking heart and getting off to a better start than I ever could have had before."

I do not know what else this idol of my youth said on that bus ride. I do not recall the form of words he used. But I do know that I touched the garment of a prophet, priest and king that night.

Who was I to weary of well doing? Had I not started out ten

years before with nothing but a hope and a dream, and with no precedent to guide me turned untrodden ways into a path which many men had walked along with me? Grant that the goal was farther away than it had seemed a year ago, or even the year before, it was no farther and maybe not so far as it had been in the beginning. And here I was with the native ability and training I had started with, seasoned with some experience, tempered with added judgment, and lifted by a love I had not known at the beginning. I knew I had more sense than I started out with; but had I lost my nerve? or the willingness to take on myself the same sort of risks others had been taking for me? Could I not start over again, aware of the pitfalls in the path; schooled by my critics in the sidesteps, dodges, stalls, squeeze plays, thrusts, and shut-outs that only academic adversaries know; possessed of an idea and a plan which had stood up under secret fighting and open fire to the point of reversing the affectionate criticism: "Coates is all right, but the Institute isn't worth a damn," with the less affectionate criticism: "The Institute is all right, but Coates isn't worth a damn?"

I thought of the men who had put up the money to help me get a staff to work with. Was I going to let them lose the money they had gambled on me and my venture? Grant that I had matched their money with my own and that no one could question either my faith or my efforts, could I walk into the future facing either those men or myself with the consciousness that though I had fought a good fight and though I had kept the faith, I had nevertheless finished my course? I did not need a dozen satisfactory explanations of an obvious failure; I needed a dozen impossible performances to explain an unbelievable success.

I thought of the many men in public life who had backed me with their names, their ideas, their judgments, and their time in private conference and in open meeting—from policemen in the smallest towns to chief executives of the commonwealth; of the private citizens who had backed me without stint or limit in civic and professional organizations of men and women; of the teachers of civics and government in the high schools who had given me the first glad hand held out from members of my own profession; of the students in my classes, careless of consequences to themselves, who had rallied almost to a man to my support when the hour of danger struck.

I thought of the boys, first my students and later my colleagues on the Institute staff—boys who had left the security of established positions for themselves and their families to follow with me the glimmer of a dream into an uncertain economic future—boys who

had shared each other's savings when Institute coffers more than once ran dry, and who more than once had borrowed money to live on so as to ease the strain on me—boys

> ". . . who have toiled and thought and wrought with me,
> Who ever with a frolic welcome took the thunder and
> the sunshine
> And opposed free hearts, free foreheads. . . ."

"The difficulty of the Institute is that there are no paths," one of them had said, "and the beauty of it is there are no fences."

And I thought of another who had walked by my side with a light that never failed.

"High Stakes and Hair Trigger." The end of that bus ride was the beginning of a new chapter in my life and the Institute's. One of the local $25,000 contributions earmarked for brick and mortar purposes had stuck—an island of hope in a sea of despair. A gift of $10,000 came in, and with it I bought a piece of land for a building site. I played that purchase for all and more than it was worth; I played it, in fact, until it was played out. Then I borrowed money to dig a hole on the land—the exact size and depth for the foundation and basement of the building to be, and big enough for me to crawl in and pull it in after me, if and when I had to. For the time being this seemed to satisfy the most cynical—for who could be fool enough to dig such a hole if he did not have the where-withall to fill it up? I was, in fact, so big a fool they could not conceive of how big a fool I was! Then the rains came and filled the hole with water. This gave me more time, but not enough, because the water began to stand, then to stagnate, and then to breed talk as well as mosquitoes. So I hired a man to pump the water out, and told him to pump as slowly as he could. He did.

The time had come for me to put up or shut up. I went to a man who knew me and the workings of the Institute, and showed him the following extract from the auditor's report on the Institute records from the beginning to date:

"The records indicate that Albert Coates has been meticulous in recording funds received by the Institute but prodigal to the same degree in the use of his own personal funds for the Institute. In the early years of its life, the Institute was financed entirely out of his pocket; later with the help of private sponsors. It seems reasonable to estimate that, over a 15-year period, from $25,000.00 to $30,000.00 of his own funds have gone into this undertaking."

When he had read it, I argued that I needed $25,000 more than I had to build the first unit of the Institute building; that I wanted

to borrow that $25,000 and repay it in ten annual instalments; that if Institute revenues did not come in to pay these instalments I was ready to pledge $2,500, or more than half my salary, each year for the next ten years as a guarantee; that the fact that I had put in that amount each year for the past ten years was some evidence that I could and would, to the last jot and tittle, live up to that pledge. He took the gamble, and on his personal responsibility put through the loan. The contract for the building was let. I switched from a policy of colossal stalling to cover up the fact that I had nothing to go on, to a policy of colossal speed to cover up how little I had. I borrowed seventy-five dollars to pay an architect for a drawing of the building from which we made two thousand reproductions and sent to every office in every city hall, county courthouse, state department and federal agency in North Carolina as well as to high schools and civic organizations. Thus the building as "idea" began working for me long before the building as "reality."

By this time even my critics were beginning to be sure of one thing—if the Institute of Government died at all it would die by violence, in open fight, with no holds barred. The issue was swiftly moving out of my hands and out of the hands of my critics, and resting in the well known laps of the unknown gods. Here I was on familiar ground and had a great advantage. For the gods were fast coming to the conclusion which one of the supporting governors of North Carolina had expressed to some friends of mine: "I know more than I understand about this Institute of Government, but I feel certain about one thing: that whenever anybody wants anything as bad as Albert wants this Institute he ought to have it; and I am not sure anybody can keep him from getting it."

No matter how fast the building went up, it went up all too slowly. I had often heard my grandfather say: "When you start out to build a rock chimney, haul twice as many rocks as you think you will need and you will wind up by having half enough." We set the day for dedication six weeks beyond the builder's completion date, and even that saving margin almost failed to save us. The rock wall in front of the building was completed and the brick path from the building to the street was laid by electric light on the eve of the dedication day. The building was cleared of debris during the morning; furniture installed during the afternoon; and at four o'clock my wife with broom in hand greeted, registered, and toured the building with the first official to arrive. Twelve hundred officials came for the dedication ceremonies—from city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies in every section of the state, together with representatives of citizens' or-

ganizations and the schools. One of our senators and seven of our congressmen were here from the national capitol, bringing with them the speaker of the national House of Representatives who spoke at the dedication ceremonies.

But the End Was Not Yet. "This building is your monument," said some of my friends on the day of dedication. It may turn out to be my tombstone, I replied. For Institute operations were suffering from malnutrition. Some of my more observant critics even noticed signs of scurvy. I went out to raise more money, and my heart still goes out in sympathetic understanding to the scores of men who listened to my story in and out of office hours. The telling would take me an hour at the least. If at the end the listener made the mistake of asking any questions, as he usually did, out of politeness if not of interest, those questions would bring on more talk. Some folks thought I was a fool for taking so much of a listener's time, but I knew I would be a fool for taking less. I had found from experience that if I talked to a man ten or fifteen minutes I would get ten or fifteen dollars when I needed ten or fifteen thousand. Most of these men took my talking in good spirit; some of them with resignation, as did the friend who sent this imploring message before a scheduled interview: "Tell Albert not to try to put every paling in the fence." And there was the one who, when asked how few people I would be willing to talk to on my one and only theme, replied that he had often seen me talking to myself, and I was the most interested audience I had ever had.

In the end I came to understand the predicament of the Confederate soldier who explained that he was eating green persimmons to draw up his stomach to fit his rations. My time had come to eat some green persimmons. When salaries were cut during the depression, my wife and I moved out of a house and lived for three years in a rented room. We sold the lot we had bought as a site for the home we had hoped to build. As Institute revenues ran lower, I pieced them out with my salary. As salary frazzled out, I resorted to credits. When credits ran low, a filling station friend allowed me to run up a bill of several hundred dollars for gasoline, oil and repairs. When traveling money ran low, I resorted to the long distance telephone as a substitute for travel. When I had gone beyond my own telephone credit limits on long distance calls, a friend loaned me the use of his telephone to help me beat the devil around the stump. When light bills reached beyond the limit and the lights were cut off, we resorted to tallow candles. When grocery bills ran up to shaky heights, two friends who ran a restaurant invited us

to eat for months on a credit which never ran out. For a long time I wondered whether we were priming the pump or filling the well.

The forty-hour week was a godsend to me—it enabled me to carry on two full-time jobs at the same time with a good conscience and a straight face. I studied my lessons—in my office, in my home, and in my absence on the road. My wife would drive the car while I studied my casebooks; I therefore lost little time from my studies on the way to and from my many destinations. When I arrived at the goal of my journeys—usually a city hall, county courthouse, state department, some federal agency in North Carolina, or a gathering of officials from these places—I would go into a conference with officials on problems and practices involved in the very subject matter I was teaching in the classroom.

I was going on, but the going was rough and growing rougher; until the new controller of the University dropped in one night while we were working at the Institute building. "I have been going over the University budget for the past several years, and do not find any record of financial aid extended by the University to the Institute of Government," he began. "I don't know what others think," he continued, "but in my opinion this Institute is one of the most unique, distinctive, and fruitful ideas that has come out of a University classroom, and I am going to do everything I can to bring it into the University."

Thus fresh efforts were begun to bring the Institute of Government into the University of North Carolina. Now and then I gave a push, but the controller carried the ball. The president welcomed the controller's efforts, wholeheartedly approved the plan of integration recommended, went with him to the governor of North Carolina who readily agreed to recommend to the next General Assembly an appropriation of $15,000 a year—matching the city and county contributors—provided we could find some one to put up the money needed to match city and county funds for the next year and a half. Next they went to one who if not a son was at least a grandson of the University and familiar with the Institute's work. Over night they received the gift of needed funds and carried it to the board of trustees who unanimously approved it. Finally they took the request for the appropriation to the budget commission for approval, and steered it through the General Assembly. Thus the Institute of Government was officially recognized as a department of the University of North Carolina, with the financial backing of the state.

IV

ORGANIZATION OF INSTITUTE—SELECTION OF STAFF —METHODS OF WORK AND RELATED MATTERS

The head of a municipal research bureau connected with a university in a distant state recently inquired if a stranger might come to Chapel Hill and "poke his nose" into everything concerning the Institute of Government. "It may be," he wrote, "that one part of the postwar plans for this University will be an Institute of Government, stolen without apology directly from the University of North Carolina. For, if I get your idea, the lesson you teach will not be thoroughly mastered until there is an Institute of Government in each of these forty-eight states."

I wrote in reply: "If you steal this Institute of Government you will not have a task of petty thievery but of grand larceny. Since I am opposed to all constituted authority for no other or better reason than that all constituted authority has always been opposed to me, I see no reason why I should not aid and abet you without stint or limit in achieving your criminal objectives. One of the things we are fighting Hitler for is the right of you and every other man to come to Chapel Hill at any time and 'poke your nose' into everything concerning the Institute."

This man sitting across my desk in Chapel Hill shot at me many inquiries: "What is your plan of organization and how does it fit into the University structure? If you were starting the Institute of Government over again, would you start it inside or outside the University? How do you select the Institute staff members? How did you arrive at the Institute methods of work? Why don't you quit your teaching and give all your time to the Institute?"

A

"What Is the Institute Plan of Organization and How Does It Fit into the University Structure?"

In the beginning we invited the accredited leaders of each co-operating organization of officials, citizens and teachers to form the governing board of the Institute of Government. As the members of co-operating organizations increased and the original governing board grew cumbersome, an executive committee of nine members was set up to guide Institute operations between annual sessions of the full board. When supporting memberships shifted from the individual official to the governmental unit basis, we kept

the representative character of the governing board and simplified its structure by selecting three mayors representing the governing bodies of cities and towns; three commissioners representing the governing bodies of counties; the governor, lieutenant governor and speaker of the house of representatives representing the governing body of the state.

These nine representatives, with five representatives from the three units of the University of North Carolina—at Chapel Hill, Raleigh and Greensboro—together with a justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, who has served as chairman of the Institute's executive committee since its organization, make up the fifteen-member governing board of the Institute of Government under the president and trustees of the Greater University of North Carolina.

This governing board serves as the co-ordinating body, working with accredited leaders of all specific groups of officials, citizens and the schools in outlining the programs affecting each group, and integrating the programs of all groups into a great co-operative undertaking. To illustrate. The official heads of the city police chiefs, county sheriffs, state highway patrol, state and federal bureaus of investigation work with the Institute's governing board on the program of studies to be made, guidebooks to be written, training schools to be conducted, governmental clearing house and laboratory demonstration services to be provided for the criminal law enforcing agencies. And so on through the catalogue of all official groups. The accredited leaders of the citizens' organizations, civics and government teachers, and student government officers follow similar patterns in working out Institute programs affecting their particular groups.

This plan of organization (1) recognizes and preserves the integrity of each official group; (2) permits city officials to study city problems, county officials to study county problems, state officials to study state problems, federal officials to study federal problems; (3) promotes their co-operative study of interlocking, overlapping and conflicting problems; (4) encourages all groups to work with similar groups in other states in national associations with similar purposes. It provides the same flexibility and freedom for citizens' organizations, teachers of civics and government in the schools, and student government officials.

There is poetic justice in this particular plan of giving two-thirds of the voting power of the Institute's administrative board to representatives of the official groups who had helped to build it;

it leaves the Institute in the hands of those who loved it. There is common sense in it, too; it guarantees that the practical problems of government in the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina will be the problems the Institute of Government is forever working on. It carries also the no less important guarantee that the Institute will have reasonable support and backing from related academic departments whose legitimate interests and jurisdictional claims have brought about frictions in the past, and might bring about frictions in the future if they are not represented on the Institute governing board and entitled to look upon its program as their own.

B

"If You Were Starting the Institute of Government Over Again, Would You Start It inside or outside the University?"

I started from my law school classroom in the University because that is where I was. I took it out of the University only when I had to take it out, and I brought it back into the University as an independent department the first time it was invited on agreeable terms.

The field of government and its administration has many facets. Every well-rounded state university has departments wich are or should be studying all these facets. The simple correlation of activities already going on in these departments will bring the interests of their varied personnel to a focus on the governmental problems about them, put them in touch with the surrounding officials working on these problems, and furnish a starting point for an Institute of Government in any state without a great additional outlay of funds. The officials can bring badly needed practical insight to students and teachers who in turn can bring just as badly needed theoretical backgrounds to practical officials. The book-men need the practice; the practice-men need the books; and the college campus needs the interlocking relationships of both in order to do its duty by the state in which it lives and moves and has its being.

It would be altogether practicable for teachers of governmental subjects in University departments of law, political science, commerce, psychology, sociology, public health and welfare and the like to spend from six weeks to two months of their summer vacations in conducting training schools and working with officials on the job in city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies operating within their particular states. Thus, a financial

outlay covering a maximum of three months' summer work would bring to officials the benefits of twelve months' study and teaching of particular governmental functions and activities, in addition to building up an incidental but no less mutually helpful advisory relationship lasting throughout the year. Through this sort of reciprocity, an Institute of Government in any state would also get the benefit of existing library facilities of all University departments running into thousands of volumes—facilities beyond the reach of an Institute operating independently of University relationships.

Within the University itself such an Institute might be logically rooted in the law school, political science department, or in any one of a number of existing departments. It might just as logically be rooted in a separate department with a staff nucleus co-ordinating existing departments having a stake in the venture; or as a unit of the extension division. The latter method might best utilize existing machinery so as to avoid the competing departmental imperialisms I encountered at the start. Different conditions in different universities will call for different starting points, but the university extension division is a proper avenue and outlet from any starting point. Perhaps my view is colored by the fact that I have been so signally blessed with the understanding, sympathetic and co-operative spirit of the director of the extension division of the University of North Carolina.

C

"How Do You Select Institute Staff Members?"

There are full-time staff members. There are also part-time staff members drawn from the ranks of officials, civic leaders, and high school teachers, and from the teaching staffs of related University departments.

In the beginning I selected the full-time staff members from the ranks of my own students—men who had high school, college and professional school training and the seasoning of two or three years of practical experience. Later I selected some men just out of law school and put them out to get their practical experience as apprentices on the job. I resorted to my own students in the beginning because three years of training in my classroom had taught them what I was driving at; because they knew and trusted me and showed a willingness to follow me on ventures which strangers would not risk; because other department heads often

warned their students not to line up with a movement which they honestly believed to be a "flash in the pan"; because I had observed that officials on the job were not so anxious for knowledge of government in general as for knowledge of government in particular, and the pointed classroom study of constitutions, statutes, decisions and administrative rulings involving the cities, counties and state of North Carolina gave my own students a head start on the job.

I found it was not so important to select men who had accumulated a "body of knowledge" in a particular field as to select men who had native ability, quick and resourceful intelligence—men who had a talent for getting knowledge out of the heads of experienced officials, as well as out of learned books on library shelves. I found that some men who were past masters at getting information out of books on a table were past hope in getting information out of heads across a desk; and that the type of man who made a well-nigh perfect tax collector or accountant might fall far short of perfection in the task of analyzing accounting or tax collecting processes and weaving existing systems into a pattern and a standard which might lift the poorest practices to the level of the best. It was not enough for a staff member to know the figures, he had to know the folks. I found that the man who put his heart and soul into the work could cut circles around another man with equal ability and equal training who did not bring equal devotion to the cause at hand. Our staff has numbered as high as five full-time members with two or more secretarial assistants. We expect to increase this number to ten or twelve as rapidly as finances will permit.

Around this full-time nucleus we are building a supporting staff of part-time instructors drawn from the ranks of experienced teachers and officials with governmental knowledge and experience. We are recruiting instructors and researchers from the ranks of teachers in the University departments of law, political science, public health and welfare, commerce and economics, psychology, engineering, agriculture and related subjects. We limit the teaching and research activities of these men in the Institute to their fields of teaching and research in their respective departments.

We are recruiting instructors from the ranks of experienced local officials who have been trained in statewide, district and local schools conducted by the Institute and who have shown special aptitudes for teaching. We are giving these new special courses both in subject matter and in teaching methods. It takes awhile

to single out these potential teachers from the mass; but when they are discovered and trained they make thoroughly reliable auxiliary teachers.

We are recruiting teachers from the ranks of state officials. Division heads of the state highway and public works commission, with fine engineering training and varied practical experience, furnished all the instruction at a recent school for city street superintendents, engineers and public works officials. The director of the state division of purchase and contract and his assistants have supplemented the Institute instruction staff in schools for city, county and state purchasing agents; so have officials from the state departments of revenue and auditing in our schools for taxation and finance officers; so have officials of the state board of health, the state insurance department, the state board of public welfare, and the local government commission. Solicitors and judges of federal, state and local courts have helped out in schools for law enforcing officers. Representatives of the state highway patrol and state bureau of investigation have followed their example. Governors, justices of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, judges of the United States District Court and of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, together with United States senators and congressmen have not felt it beneath their dignity to serve on our instruction staff.

At this point I want to single out for special recognition the director, assistant directors and the staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the part they have played in the Institute's training program for law enforcing officers in North Carolina. Year in and year out they have furnished instructors, materials and equipment without stint or limit. If the state of North Carolina is an outstanding example of federal, state and local collaboration in law enforcement and in the training of law enforcing officers, it is because these men of the FBI have helped to make it so.

D

"How Did You Arrive at the Institute Methods of Work?"

If one member of the staff took the unit of city government for his field, another county government, another state government, and still another all federal agencies operating in the state of North Carolina, each would find his interests scattered and his energies dispersed over a variety of matters to which he could give little more than a lick and a promise. But if he took a governmental function for his field—such as law enforcement, public health and welfare,

taxation and finance—and followed this function through city, county, state and federal governmental units in the same territory, he could achieve a concentration of interests and energies enabling him to reach a degree of expertness in far less time than the other working method would permit.

There is still another advantage in this study by governmental functions rather than by governmental units. Staff members taking different governmental units for their respective fields are likely to take on the limitations and prejudices of "the city point of view," "the county point of view," "the state point of view," or "the federal point of view." But staff members taking governmental functions for their respective fields are bound to cut across all governmental units and are likely to wind up with an understanding of all these differing points of view.

This procedure does not mean that Institute staff members do not get a picture of the integrated activities of these differing governmental units as a working whole. No staff member starts out to study a particular governmental function with blinders on to the exclusion of related governmental functions of the unit in which he works. He goes on the theory that in order to understand any governmental function in itself he must study it in its setting. Frequent conferences of staff members bring all these functions into focus and each staff member winds up with a far better understanding of cities, counties, or the state as separate units of government than if he had started out to achieve this result by his own unaided efforts.

As I pointed out in earlier stages of this story, any person, starting out to study city government only, will have to carry his studies over into county, state and federal relations before he completes his city studies; and so of persons starting out to study county government only; and so of state or federal governments. That is why all these levels of government can unite in a joint program of investigation, research, instruction, and education generally, at about one-third the cost of operating separate educational agencies. That is why citizens' organizations and schools can unite with officials in a program that will serve their common ends with corresponding savings to themselves.

E

"Why Don't You Quit Your Teaching and Give All Your Time to the Institute?"

Let me answer that question by telling you how I got into teaching. In my final year of law school I received the invitation to come back to teach in this University. One of the ablest lawyers in my home town had offered me an excellent opening for law and politics; and I like both law and politics. I went out on the banks of the Charles River to think it over; and I finally concluded that there would be no lack of lawyers to take care of litigants, no lack of politicians to run for and fill all offices, but there might be a lack of teachers with my particular conception of the classroom's place in the life of the commonwealth and with the willingness to go to the necessary lengths to put that conception into practice. I decided to give teaching a trial, and go into the practice later if I changed my mind.

When I began working with officials and organizing official groups into the Institute of Government, some of my friends began to nod their heads in understanding—they were morally certain I had all along been planning to go into politics on a statewide scale, using law school and Institute rather than law practice as the shortest route. They lost that notion as the years went by and the Institute of Government got under way; as the people built a governmental laboratory to shelter the activities of the Institute; as cities, counties and the state appropriated funds for its support; and as all factions and both political parties backed it. They began to see that I was not a martyr giving his life in sacrificial offering to a cause, but that I was getting more pure and selfish joy out of the work I was doing than I could possibly get out of doing anything else, and that I would not swap it for either the prestige or the opportunity of any office within or without the gift of the people. Today they nod their heads the other way as they say that after all the Constitution of the United States guarantees to every man the inalienable right to make a fool out of himself if he wants to; and a news man brings down a storm of approval and applause from a gathering of officials with the observation that the Institute of Government is living proof of the fact that fifteen years ago "Albert Coates got hold of an idea and went crazy."

During these years I have come to see the place of the schoolroom in a democracy. There are around three and a half million people in North Carolina, grouped in around six hundred thousand families

and homes. Around six hundred thousand children leave these separate homes in the fall of every year and group themselves in thirteen hundred elementary schools running from the first to the seventh grade. Nearly three hundred thousand move on to regroupings in eight hundred high schools. Fifteen thousand go on to regroupings in twenty-five colleges and universities throughout the state. These elementary schools, high schools, colleges and universities are the wellsprings of democracy in city, county, state and nation. In the lives of these nine hundred thousand boys and girls the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina are born again with every generation. The school teachers of the commonwealth are in the bloodstream of this evolving life.

I have felt the power of teachers in these schoolrooms. There was a teacher of my freshman year, colleague of my early teaching days and now the president of this University—who saw the idle contents of unconnected college courses lying on the surface of a student's consciousness like evaporating puddles in the sun; pulled them to a focus in his classroom as he showed how the forces of religion, philosophy, science, economics, law, politics and the rest united in making history; and thus gave fresh direction and significant purpose to his students' lives. There was a teacher of my later college years who touched hidden wellsprings in my life that have never yet run dry. In the life-testing struggles through which I have come on my way from his classroom, in moments of encircling gloom through which I could not see my way, and withdrew into my own inner temple to look for light I could not find outside myself, I have always found him in there with me. There was a University medical school teacher lying in a hospital at the point of death, attended by physicians he had taught. His wife inquired about the advisability of calling in distinguished medical consultants from distant centers, and he answered: "Leave it to my boys; they will know what to do." This man bet his life on his teaching and he won his bet. If I can bring into the lives of some of my students what men like these brought into mine, I shall feel I have begun to touch what O. Henry called "the hem of the garment of romance."

But this traditional academic process at its widest point is all too narrow and in its farthest reaches falls too short. One hundred thousand children start in the first grade of the public schools each year. Sixty thousand drop out of the procession before they reach the first year of high school. Eighty thousand drop out before they finish high school. Ninety-five thousand drop out be-

fore they reach the first year of college. And of the five thousand who go to college, over half drop out before their college graduation day. These men and women are the forgotten of the schools. Later on they show up as our rulers.

In a two-weeks school for federal, state and local law enforcing officers conducted by the Institute of Government not long ago, there were men *whose ages* ranged from nineteen to sixty; *whose schooling* ranged from the third grade in public school to one year in college; *whose experience* in law enforcement ranged from one month to thirty-two years; and *who had previously worked* as salesmen, bookkeepers, textile mill employees, plumbers, saw mill operators, soldiers, sailors, painters, merchants, newspapermen, construction engineers, steel mill employees, electricians and radio workers, baseball players, bankers, carpenters, machinists, truck drivers, stenographers.

Expand this class to the six thousand or more officials and citizens who have attended Institute training schools within the past ten years and you have a cross-section of the men and women of the cities, the counties and the state of North Carolina. Most of them do not have the sixteen units of book study listed as college entrance requirements, and college doors refuse to open at their knock. But while others have been laying books end to end in schools, these men and women have been laying moments of insight and experience end to end in working at their jobs. The Institute of Government accepts these credits for admission to its training schools; and the University of North Carolina thus finds its rootage extended beyond the public schools to include the city halls, county courthouses, state departments and federal agencies of North Carolina and the civic organizations of the men and women on whose shoulders these governmental units rest.

These men and women come into our classrooms in statewide, district and local schools, charged with interest in the subjects to be taught and with first-hand impressions of the problems to be discussed. Where the students with book-learning backgrounds draw on their imaginations for hypothetical questions, these men and women draw on their experience for questions filled with the realities of the life in which they live. Their interchanges in these classrooms lift the classroom hour above the level of supposititious considerations and infuse it with the "hum and shock" of life. The clashes of their minds in free and open discussion now and then strike off sparks already beginning to light up the face of the state

like matches struck in darkness. The schoolrooms of the people are becoming the crossroads of the commonwealth.

The results of these activities are already appearing. I have seen official leaders come into departments with a vision lifting their co-workers out of ruts and routines, releasing their frustrated energies, and bending their cross-purposes to a willing focus on the common task, in the spirit of all for one and one for all. This new spirit among departmental employees has turned the irritating trivialities of daily contacts into opportunities for collaboration giving dignity to their employment. It has translated the moral values of their own good fellowship into economic assets of their respective governmental units.

I have seen competing citizens' organizations of men and women turn to co-operating activities no less beneficial to each organization because they seek the common welfare. I have seen teachers in colleges and universities turn from the departmental imperialisms, which too often Balkanize educational institutions, to departmental collaboration on tasks beyond the power of any one department, beyond the power of all departments working separately, but within the present grasp of these same departments when they work as one.

These things happen often enough to give us a vision of the possibilities flowing to the people of North Carolina from the spread of this stimulating fellowship to all departments within each governmental unit; between all units in the governmental structure; between the officials, the citizens, and the youth in the schools of today who will become the officials and citizens of tomorrow. It would be foolish to ignore the rocks in the roads leading to these goals; it would be just as foolish to accept these rocks as immovable.

I would not give up my classroom vantage point for organizing these activities or for participating in this common enterprise. And as I press forward on this work I find myself repeating with all humility the prayer uttered by the old Roundhead before going into battle with the Cavaliers: "O Lord, I shall be very busy this day. I may forget thee, but do not thou forget me."

Miss Harriet L. Herring
University of North Carolina
4 Pratt Cottage
Chapel Hill, N. C.