

The Tar Heel

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Published Every Thursday by the General Athletic Association.

EDWARD W. MYERS, Editor-in-Chief.
GEORGE S. WILLS, A. B. KIMBALL,
ELISHA B. LEWIS, J. O. CARR,
M. H. YOUNT, J. C. ELLER.

DARIUS EATMAN,

Business Managers.

HARRY HOWELL, JNO. A. MOORE,
JAS. A. GWYN.

Entered at the post-office in Chapel Hill, N. C., as second-class mail-matter.

Read what "One of the Students" has to say in this issue and see if he does not talk about some things that could be considered by a University Senate?

The *White and Blue* and THE TAR HEEL have both been discussing the question of a Senate for some time. Can not some action be taken?

WE WERE very much pleased with our visiting Legislative Committee this year, and from their talks in the Chapel the pleasure was mutual. But we are made somewhat jealous by the story which comes from the Normal and Industrial School. It is said that our Committee, after being shown over the institution, were viewing the daily gymnasium drill, when Rep. White remarked; "Boys, this suits me; lets camp right here."

THE TAR HEEL greets its patrons this week with an increased editorial staff, and the largest subscription list in its history. An attempt was made by the Athletic Association last Fall to combine the two college weeklies, but for reasons that then seemed good to the *White and Blue*, no combination was made. At present, we are glad to say, there is nothing in the way of such a union. The editors of the *White and Blue* have agreed to give up their paper and help make the TAR HEEL even better than heretofore, provided that the assets and liabilities of the *White and Blue* shall be transferred to the TAR HEEL and Athletic Association. This proposition has been accepted by the Athletic Association, and we are prepared to say to the subscribers of both papers that they are now to get a better paper; and to our advertising patrons that the circulation is considerably larger than heretofore.

The editors of the *White and Blue* wish to thank the public for its patronage and kind words concerning their paper, and hope that the same public spirit will be extended to the TAR HEEL, which surely will make it the best college weekly in the South. With increased strength and enthusiasm, and a united college sentiment, we feel safe in saying to the public that our paper will be better and more readable than ever before.

SINCE our last issue the fortunes of the TAR HEEL have advanced far forward on the path of success in college journalism. By a happy arrangement with the WHITE AND BLUE, our formidable rival, the two papers have cast their fortunes together, and the friendly struggle for superiority between the two old papers is to be succeeded in this new one by the concerted effort to give to our readers a better paper than either could be before, both as to

its general readability and as an exponent of the life and happenings of the University. From the editorial staff of the WHITE AND BLUE the brightest and best men have been added to the staff of the TAR HEEL, and from this infusion of new blood much is to be hoped, and if the new paper is to succeed much of its success will be due to them.

Now have we made patent to the world at large that the internal dissensions of the University are forever buried with the things of the past and her son united standing shoulder to shoulder against those enemies who seek to drag her down from her pinnacle and cover her with calumny and insult. Together we will strive for victory, and should it be written in the book of fate that she must fall from her high estate and be made the reproach of the citizens of North Carolina, then, together will we mourn her fall and await those happier times when like the phoenix of fable, she shall arise again with a fresh lease of life for another hundred years, purged by the fire of all the slanders which have been heaped upon her, and she shall again take her deserved rank among the institutions of higher learning in the country.

Annual Inter-Society Debate.

Saturday Evening, March 2nd.

Of the many manifestations of continued healthy and vigorous activity in the Literary Societies, none is more positive than the increased interest shown by members of the Societies in the annually recurring Inter-Society debates. To say the least, the interest now taken in literary society work in the University, is somewhat different in kind, yet it is nevertheless real, strong and active. The absorbing, exacting character of argumentative discussion has engaging interest for men for whom the more volatile and evanescent qualities of oratory *per se* have no attraction. It was something of this kind of interest which made the exercises of Saturday evening's Inter-Society contest of perhaps a higher order than those of any preceding similar occasion.

The query, "Resolved, that the Good of the American People Demands Rigidly Organized Political Parties," was ably and skillfully argued by both sides; Messrs. J. O. Carr and V. A. Bachelor, of the Philanthropic Society, having the affirmative, Messrs. J. C. Eller and J. E. Little, of the Dialectic Society, the negative.

Sweeping generalizations of the arguments *pro* and *con* may be given.

The debaters of the affirmative maintained that political parties are fundamental in our political life, that they are the exponents of great principles which are a part of the American people, and thus deeply rooted into our political character, have legitimate places. It was held that the most effectual means of giving to these principles real and living expression, is in turning to account the strength of unity, of rigid unity—of rigid party organization.

The representatives of the negative, in turn, forcibly maintained, that instead of rigid party organization being conducive to American

interests, it is precisely the rigidity of party organizations which has rendered our public functionaries mere tools of monied interests, driven superior talent and character out of politics, made possible bossism, enabled a few men to thwart popular will and dictate the nation's governmental policy. Tammany, it was urged, is an example of the excesses to which the principle may be carried.

After listening to an animated discussion for two hours, the committee rendered their decision in favor of the affirmative.

The order of the entire discussion was of so high a degree of excellence, that special mention is hardly in place. It is sufficient to add that so long as the work of the Literary Societies is typified by such productions as these, their relation as a permanent factor in the intellectual life of the University will remain as fundamental and vital as of yore.

"One of the Students" Talks and Asks Some Questions.

A dozen years ago, it is said, there was a student at the University whose "bump of destructiveness" was abnormally developed. At times, the only thing that would satisfy him was to destroy a lot of college property—*e. g.*, the breaking of a score or two of window-panes. Tradition has it that he would always end by going to the bursar, telling him how much damage had been done, and settling the bill on the spot.

I do not bring up this case as an example in every particular. Most assuredly the deliberate destruction of college property is pure wantonness, and vandalism, and cannot be condemned too strongly. What can be commended, however, is that spirit which, when such damage has been done—voluntarily or accidentally—makes the offender walk up like a man, and pay for it in full.

A dozen window-panes here, a lock there, a door yonder, a coal-bin in another place, will in the course of a year, run the damage account up to several hundred dollars—and this, too, for damage that is absolutely unnecessary.

The studious, quiet men in the institution may think that this is a matter that concerns only the faculty and the offenders. Is this true?

Whoever knows anything about the University knows that its work is seriously hampered through the lack of money.

Several of the departments are crowded, and the professors in charge, although overworked, are still unable to do all that they would like to do. The money spent in repairing inexcusable damages would go a long way towards providing assistants for these departments, and the whole student-body would thereby gain.

Any one who helps to throw such an expense on the University is—unintentionally and thoughtlessly it may be—robbing himself and all of his fellow-students.

I should be loath to say that this carelessness of students in their treatment of college property is due to a low moral standard; on the

contrary, I believe it is not. There is enough in our life here to show that a North Carolina University student places a very high value upon his honor. The trouble is due partly to thoughtlessness and partly to a failure to recognize the difference between "mine and thine."

The average American citizen looks upon public property as that with which the public can do what it please—even to destroy it. It is the same spirit—or lack of spirit—that allowed a congressman at the at a White House reception, not long ago, to climb onto a plush upholstered chair with his feet, and utterly ruin the chair—an expensive one.

A few years ago, a certain baseball team had arranged to play a game with the University on the latter's grounds. There was no fence then, and the visiting team was naturally solicitous about the receipts. The reply of the manager of the home team was: "You need not be uneasy; if a University student is caught looking at this game without having paid his fifty cents, we'll make it so hot for him that he can't stay here."

During this year we have seen men in the windows of the South Building, in the Library, on top of the Physical Laboratory, on the park fence, and in the trees, watching games without having paid for privilege. The Chapel windows have been painted and nailed down because men would stand at them and appropriate what every body is expected to pay for.

If this article were left in this shape it would do a great injustice to the students of this University, the great majority of whom would scorn to do anything mean or dishonorable. But there are a few among us governing principles seem to be utterly unworthy. Although the number is so small, the entire body of students is blamed for their actions, and shall we say that this blame is altogether unjust? Could not the majority make it "so warm" for these few that, whether they wanted to or not, they would be obliged to act honorably in all their relations to the University or its students?

The trouble with this majority is, I think, not indifference or unwillingness to act; but the lack of a channel through which they can act.

The TAR HEEL and the *White and Blue* have, for some weeks, been discussing the question of a University Senate. It seems to me that this is worth serious consideration as a possible solution of the difficulty.

Fellow-students, there are many things in our life that we are proud of; but such things as we have referred to above, we blush to own, and they are the things that we would remedy. How can we do it?

ONE OF THE STUDENTS.

Ye editor heard the debate on the University yesterday evening. He is now sure that the University and all the colleges ought to be sustained, and they ought to take steps, at once, to teach logic in every one of them.—*Caucasian*.