

# 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.

## McGuire Slings More Mud.

From the editorial silence on the part of *College Topics*, and from McGuire's own statements, we infer that the athletic authorities at the University of Virginia do not hold themselves responsible for the charges made against the University of North Carolina. They emanate from McGuire alone, and are to be so treated. We can only attribute these articles of McGuire's to some personal enmity or spite. He rakes up the past of the University of North Carolina while explicitly stating that his own *alma mater* has not a clean record and so attempting to forestall any reply by the method of recrimination.

Had McGuire simply desired to protect his former college-mates from wrong, he could easily have warned them and given his proofs. Exactly how he justifies this attack is quite beyond our comprehension. On one account we are glad of it, however, as it gives us opportunity to state clearly and for all men the position of the University. She conceals nothing and has but the one unfortunate incident mentioned in our last editorial of which she need feel ashamed. Let us re-state our position. We have always set our faces against any remuneration of the players, by gift of board or money for their services. Secondly, the scholarships in the gift of the University are bestowed upon all needy boys who apply, as long as they hold out. They are not to be looked upon as rewards for athletic services. Thirdly, the University has not looked upon the playing for money during the months of vacation as a bar to her students playing upon her own teams during the session. In this she had the support of the example of the University of Virginia, Johns Hopkins, Vanderbilt, Georgetown, University of Pennsylvania and many other colleges North and South. Now that a majority of Southern institutions have expressed themselves as opposed to this, the University of North Carolina has cheerfully acquiesced in the agreement and will abide honestly by it.

Now let us take up McGuire's charges. First, he mentions Lanier. When Lanier entered the University in 1892 he gave the authorities the assurance that he had never played ball for money. His connection with the Winston team was after leaving the University that summer. Lanier completed his law course at the University, passed his examination successfully and was one of the best students in the class. In 1894 he was in regular attendance upon his work as a student for nearly three months before the games with Virginia. How long was Smith with the University of

Virginia and how regular was his attendance on class.

How can a fair-minded man excuse such language as McGuire uses concerning Floyd—"a pitcher named Floyd, whose presence with them was said to be not on the proper conditions—in regard to this I can only say that the charge was made." What is the charge? Where are the proofs? We can only say that any assertion that Floyd was remunerated in any way for his playing or presence with us is absolutely false.

As to Floyd's brother; that incident can only show the straight-forward manner of our entire course. One of our players, L. O'B. Jones, whose sad death shortly afterwards from heart disease is so well remembered, could not go with the team, we telegraphed Virginia that we could not keep the engagement in Richmond as we had no substitute unless they allowed the brother of one of the players to take part in the game. We told them he was an outsider and that we knew nothing of him. Virginia replied that it was all right and that they *might have to do the same thing*. We have been told that Benner, who played for them in that game was remunerated for his services. It would be in accord with McGuire's methods to make this the basis of a charge, but we do not. We only know of Benner that he played rattling good ball and we will let it rest at that.

The charge as to the correspondence over George Stephen's eligibility in 1893 dwindles down to an assertion that the Virginia official thought afterwards that he was technically clear but "barred by the spirit of the law" and to a more serious imputation upon the honor of the gentleman who represented Johns Hopkins in the Association. The entire correspondence is kept filed away with our Association's records and is open to any honest inquirer after truth.

Then follow charges by wholesale against our players on the ground of their receiving money for playing during the summer. McGuire adds, however, "but all this may be unnecessary, as THE TAR HEEL acknowledges that they have always encouraged their players to make what they could during the summer months." If unnecessary, why is it done.

As to the charges against Mr. Collier, a few explicit statements will make that matter clear. 1st. Mr. Collier freely and repeatedly expressed his desire of becoming a student in the University of North Carolina after his visit here in the fall of 1893. No first suggestion of the kind came from any one at this University nor from any outside friend. Mr. Collier took the initiative and therefore he is not an "induced" student. It would be an unpleasant thought that the University authorities or friends tried to lead off students in other institutions and induce them to come here and it would be something to be heartily ashamed of.

2nd. For two very good reasons Mr. Collier could not receive a scholarship from the University authorities. He is not a citizen of this State and he is able to pay his way. But Mr. Collier was receive-free tuition at the University of Tennessee and his family would naturally be unwilling to pay tuition

elsewhere. A private scholarship was secured for him through the influence of a friend, one of those who had played with him at Asheville and to whom he had freely expressed his desire of coming here.

3rd. In spite of this, Mr. Collier's expenses have been higher here than at Knoxville, but he has been willing to make it a matter of personal sacrifice. Any assertion that Mr. Collier has received remission of other fees, payment of other expenses, or any thing else which can be regarded as remuneration is false. Mr. Collier has given into the hands of the Association all correspondence received by him, connected with this affair, and it is open to examination. It is well to state that the correspondence mentioned was not with any representative of this Association but with a personal friend and pledged club-mate. McGuire is anxious lest his three informants be "dragged into" this controversy. He would protect them however regardless he may be of injustice done to Mr. Collier and however recklessly he hurls rumors and baseless slanders at our University. You will have to produce your witnesses, sir, if we can force you to it, or own up to your lack of information and of common justice.

As to the rest of Mr. McGuire's charges we can only say that they are surprisingly puerile for one who came near getting his degree at the University of Virginia, and who has had two years of the training of a teacher's life to lift him above childishness.

He lays upon our shoulders the heavy charge of having Honeycut here. If that it so, he is certainly keeping himself remarkably well hidden. He speaks of Stephens having played upon the foot-ball team last fall, knowing well that it is only with this year of 1895, since the December meeting of the Southern Colleges, that the new agreement has come into force. He speaks knowingly of the make-up of this season's team when they are unknown to us here. Rest assured, Virginia, the list will be sent in ample time for all needed criticism. He says he "might add the name of Stanley" to the list of departed players but he is not positive of the fact." Had he waited for positive information in all these matters he would have been saved from doing needless harm and from much loss of reputation on his own part.

We do not bandy epithets with the author of these articles, but we would extend to him the advice once given by a good old bishop to an ambitious young clergyman. "My son always verify your references before you preach your sermon."

The nature of McGuire's "proofs" is well exemplified by his reference to the Chicago Tournament. He justifies the standing of his own team by speaking of Stagg's team from the University of Chicago as being in the same sort of a box, though he well knows that Stagg, famous as an athlete and a Christian, would not enter his team for any of the honors of the tournament because he himself was playing upon it.

What strange twist is it in McGuire's mind that makes him prefer this misleading statement about Stagg's team to the simple truth. The facts are that Stephens was challenged in Chicago and went to Stagg, who was manager, and gave him a full and unreserved statement of the case. Stagg exonerated him and decided that all was within the rules.

We did not charge the University of Virginia with unfairness in her Chicago games. We were, as Southerners, proud of her brilliant record, and as North Carolinians doubly proud because it was "our George" who was doing yeoman's service for her.

A word now as to free tuition at

the University of North Carolina. Did McGuire pay his tuition at the University of Virginia? Does any Virginian? Do they pay at the University of Tennessee, of Mississippi, etc.? Because these men get free tuition should they be debarred as athletes.

This University cannot give free tuition to all who are North Carolinians. There are seventy or eighty scholarships, however, and these are bestowed freely on all applicants, the most needy coming first, and athlete or cripple, all are welcome.

THE EDUCATIONAL war which has been so actively and vigorously waged in our state by those who would seemingly blot out of existence the highest organ of its intellectual life, has had an educational value whose effect the originators perhaps never reckoned. Partial lack of conditions which the agitation has tended to develop, furnished a basis for grave apprehensions on our part as to what might be the immediate issue of the future.

Yet when we see the University commanding the unreserved support of many who had first to be aroused from a state of somnolence on matters educational; even of many who, without fuller knowledge of its work, were disposed to undervalue its claims, with boundless faith in free inquiry and full discussion, we are willing for the light to be turned on through these channels. By this means the commonwealth may be brought to a proper appreciation of its great deficiency in respect to education, and the entire populace rendered more fitted to select the means for the end.

That the interests of church should at this advanced era clash with those of state in matters so vitally related to the latter's welfare, would seem to indicate that the church is assuming a debatable prerogative and transcending the grounds which a long and eventful history has marked out for it with tolerable clearness. It is axiomatic that a fiery enthusiasm for any restricted interest is fatal to the equilibrium of mind and feeling necessary for directing and fostering the interests of a great commonwealth. Our opponents profess friendship for the University, but we feel it to be something of the same kind which the Roman felt for the Carthaginian or the Norman for the Saxon!

THE MEMBER of the Advisory Committee who some weeks ago published a card of information concerning the Athletic Association ought to have read the Constitution before speaking so positively. He said "the Association includes two departments only, baseball and football." Now as a matter of fact, there is a whole article in the constitution devoted to Track Athletics. This has at last been discovered and the meeting on Saturday was the result. Better late than never, but two months ago was the time to start a Track team. We are curious to know the attitude of the said member of the advisory committee on Track Athletics, and whether he had ever read the constitution and by-laws of the General Association. If he had, how could he write such a card? And if he had not, what kind of an advisor would he call himself?