

The Tar Heel.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

BOARD OF EDITORS.

RALPH H. GRAVES, - - Editor-in-Chief.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

T. L. WRIGHT, - - - P. W. McMULLAN,

BURTON CRAIG, - - - W. S. MYERS,

S. S. LAMB, - - - S. W. KENNEY,

F. O. ROGERS, - - - Business Manager.

Published every Saturday by the General Athletic Association.

Subscription Price, \$1.50 per Year.
Payable IN ADVANCE or during first term.
SINGLE COPIES, 5 CENTS.

All matter intended for publication should be addressed to the Editor-in-chief and accompanied by name of writer.

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

It has reached our ears that some person, or persons, have ventured an assertion, the purport of which was that the TAR HEEL has become too much of a "kicker," and that the said "kicking" has often been unwarranted and inexcusable.

In defence of ourselves against this charge, we desire to call attention to the fact that, if we have printed any articles of an abusive nature, they have been communications and have not come from any member of the staff. This paper is supposed to represent the opinions and sentiments of its supporters, viz., the students of this University. If we receive a communication purporting to express the ideas of any considerable number of students, whether these ideas be favorable or unfavorable to the object of discussion, we are not justified in preventing its publication, nor do we intend to do so.

Some one may say that these communications are almost invariably in the shape of objections to some existing state of affairs. This is exactly true. But we claim that, in every case, there have been expressed the sentiments of a large percentage, if not a majority of the students. They have the right and they ought to express themselves on any subject that affects them, nor do we believe that the faculty is averse to such expositions of our opinions, provided they represent an appreciable part of the whole body politic.

Further, we desire to state that, if any editorial has appeared, or ever does appear, in which is embodied any element of objection or any form of abuse, it has been, and will be, because we believe it to voice the sentiments of some considerable portion of the student body.

Let our critic, or critics, take into consideration, that his approval, does not necessarily represent or influence that of others, and that, even if he is displeased by some of the TAR HEEL's statements, it does not always follow that they are incompatible with the majority's ideas or unexpressive of the majority's opinions. And yet, even if some communications express the sentiments of a large minority, no reasonable person can object to it or hold the editors responsible, for it is our duty to conform to the wishes of our supporters, and, within the bounds of reason, to publish such articles as they may submit to us.

Some people are so prone to to "kick," that they oppose whatever does not emanate from their own brains. Such seem to be the Di Society "muck-a-mucks", who have displayed their brilliant genius by defeating the establishment of a magazine.

The Phi Society took the lead in passing the magazine report by a large majority, but all their good work is now nullified by some manoeuvring syndicate in the other society. It seems that we are doomed not to have our literary publication, nor are we likely to carry out any progressive measure as long as our controlling society politicians make it their chief aim to oppose every thing which they do not happen to have originated.

For several years there have been efforts made to arrange for inter-collegiate debates with some of our neighboring Universities, but until this spring no definite plan could be formulated.

At present, however, our literary societies are negotiating the matter with the University of Georgia. Articles have already been drawn up, according to which there will be one debate each year, and they only await ratification to become a perpetual agreement.

We should by no means neglect this opportunity to promote the phase of our college life, which has been so long neglected, nor must we remain longer behind our Northern friends, by whom the debating contests are held with as much regularity as the annual athletic meets. Base ball, foot ball and all kinds of physical sports are of immeasurable importance, but they must not be allowed to overwhelm and drive out all mental exercises. Let us hope that, when the first debate comes off, we shall prove ourselves as expert in oratorical lines as we have been in "twirling" the baseball or bucking the centre.

Our post-graduate courses are now open to women, which we hope, means that they will eventually be admitted into all departments. The principal objection to Chapel Hill at present is the lack of social training and experience. After staying here for four years, a boy is almost afraid of a dress. The advent of women into our midst will stimulate a desire for outward polish as well as mental culture, and will be a benefit to the University in every way.

If any one desires local notices inserted in any issue of the TAR HEEL, they will do well to hand in the same before Thursday. Otherwise all space will probably be filled and the notices cannot be printed.

We ought to have a new grandstand. It will be a disgrace for us to exhibit our present roost to any visiting team. Let some one start the ball and the boys will contribute enough to fix it.

A good part of the *Hellenian* matter has gone to the press. The editors this year seem to be unusually alert in attending to their work and we have every reason to expect a splendid edition.

Psychology.

Under the above caption, there appeared in the last issue, bar one of the TAR HEEL, a severe criticism upon the method employed at this University in teaching psychology.

It is not the purpose of this article to perpetuate a discussion, which we think should never have originated, nor is said article intended as a direct reply to the aforesaid criticism; but it proceeds only from a desire for justice, attendant upon the belief that should one side of this question, alone, be presented, misconceptions of the method employed in our "Psychology room" would mots probably result.

We readily admit that Psychology is the "bugbear of undergraduate students and the Jonah of the college curriculum," but we still fail most woefully in seeing that this fact indicates an incorrect method of teaching.

Indeed, one who carefully reads the criticism, to which we have referred must necessarily wonder how such an idea was evolved by the writer himself, for speaking of the professor he says—"He is an excellent psychologist, so far as we are able to judge. He is always logical and concise, goes to the root of every problem and his lines of argument are always clear and impregnable." The question naturally arises how the gentleman became aware of the prof's. knowledge of psychology?

It is certainly a well known fact that knowledge radiates from the individual to individuals through the medium of objectivity. Furthermore the "objective form" in this case must have been language and the mode of expression necessarily clear and simple, since the "psychologist" is termed "excellent."

Again, what is meant by "lines of argument?" In the discussion of class room method, it can mean nothing, we contend, except the means, by which the instructor demonstrates the truth of his explanation of the point in hand. There is no other possible deduction, so far as we are able to see: hence, having granted that they "are clear and impregnable," the idea contended in the following statement of the criticism that "He jumps or steps upon what we can't see" is entirely precluded. The two statements are wholly irreconcilable, and the truth of the former renders the state of affairs implied by the latter entirely impossible.

But admitting for the sake of argument that the latter is true, it proves absolutely nothing. For the later admission of the "Criticism" viz., "He" (the prof,) often asks if the point is clear to all and invites discussion," proves conclusively that, in the opinion of the professor, the key to the problem has been given; and for any man in the class who does not understand said problem, to fail to ask for a more complete explanation and then attempt to exculpate himself by the plea of modesty, is puerile in the extreme and reflects not the slightest discredit upon the instructor.

In brief, the gist of the "kritik's" argument is that "Marks on psychology are just indicators neither of brain" nor studiousness. To prove this he cites two men—one with

ability accompanied by application, the other with neither—both of whom obtained the same grade on examination. Now it is a thing of common knowledge that a grade on any examination is not necessarily a true exponent of one's knowledge of a subject but is indicative only of the *value of his examination paper*. A man, who knows a subject very well may be "blinded on exam.," and this is the logical explanation of the "brainy man's" failure to obtain a higher grade; for (as again confessed by the kritik), when at a later day he proved by his examination paper, that he did possess the "subjective individuality" necessary for a comprehension of psychology, he received the grade which his worth merited. What became of the man without brain or application? Did he perform a like ascent? We venture to say—not so.

The illustrations cited, then, prove nothing. A scrupulous examination of the "College Record" will disclose parallel cases in almost every department. Why then this bitter protest against psychology? Why the complaint that "good men" get poor marks while, with men of less than average ability, the reverse is true. View the matter in another light and the question naturally presents itself—what constitutes a "good man;" what a poor one?

We think that it will be readily conceded that, in the limited sphere of college life, one is reputed to be "good" or "poor" according as he receives a low or high grade on examinations. Then, what process of reason warrants the conclusion that, of two men who obtain the *same grade*, tho' it may be on different studies—say Latin and psychology—one should be held good, the other poor? They have, both, displayed ability, tho' in different spheres; they have done equally well, tho' their respective aptitudes have been exhibited along different lines. Whence the distinction? In other words, we contend that it is both unfair and unjust to brand "poor" upon a man simply because he fails to receive a high grade on any of his Freshman or Sophomore studies. Withhold your judgement awhile, for "many men many minds" might be interpreted many men many aptitudes.

It is too commonly known that a man may excel in languages and fail most ignominiously in mathematics, and reversely. Is this problem "unfathomable?" We think not. The explanation is to be found in the diversity of individual tastes and aptitudes. If this is true of German and mathematics, why not equally true of either (or both) and psychology? For psychology is

mentally different from both. The studies which one contends with in the first two years of college work, are largely "memory studies." Not only is this true, but they are also a direct continuation in the branches which the student has been pursuing in the preparatory school. He is at home, on familiar ground, and the man, who with a natural aptitude for such studies combines the additional advantage of thorough preparation finds no difficulty in achieving the highest distinction.