

The Daily Tar Heel

Published daily during the college year except Mondays and except Thanksgiving, Christmas and Spring Holidays.

The official newspaper of the Publications Union of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription price, \$2.00 local and \$4.00 out of town, for the college year.

Offices in the basement of Alumni Building.

W. H. YARBOROUGH, JR., Editor; JACK DUNGAN, Mgr. Editor; MARION ALEXANDER, Bus. Mgr.; HAL V. WORTH, Circulation Mgr.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

B. C. MOORE, J. C. WILLIAMS, K. C. RAMSAY

CITY EDITORS

G. E. FRENCH, E. C. DANIEL, JR., J. M. LITTLE, HENRY WOOD, ELBERT DENNING, SHERMAN SHORE, W. A. SHULENBERGER, J. G. HAMILTON

EDITORIAL BOARD

J. HOLMES DAVIS, JR., MOORE BRYSON, JOE JONES, ALAN LOWENSTEIN, E. F. YARBOROUGH, HENRY ANDERSON

SPORTS EDITOR

BROWNING ROACH

ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITORS

JACK BESSON, HUGH WILSON

REPORTERS

Jack Riley, B. H. Whitton, Charles Rose, Dan Kelly, J. P. Tyson, Nathan Volkman, Harold Cone, William Roberts, Willard Hayes, C. W. Allison, Howard M. Lee, Phil Liskin, R. W. Poole, Billy McKie, Glenn V. Willins, Aaron Bloom, Sam Silverstein, C. A. Renn, George Wilson, Dan McDuffie, Tommy Thomas, C. C. Jackson, Everard Shemwell, Vass Shephard

ASSISTANT MANAGERS

Ashley Seawell, Tom Badger

COLLECTION MANAGERS

J. C. Harris, T. R. Karriker, B. C. Prince, Jr., Stuart Carr, Donald Seawell

Saturday, May 24, 1930

A THOUGHT FOR TODAY

The only advantage I can see in writing plays, is getting to see one's own play for nothing. —Ed Wynn.

A Question of Thirty-Three Cents

Is the Tar Heel to remain a daily? If the maintenance of the present status of the paper depends on the additional thirty-three cent contribution per quarter, the "ayes" should be in the majority. It is nothing short of amusing to argue against this additional fee on the grounds that "financial conditions in the state are prohibitive." The state of North Carolina will never feel the stress of the campaign of raising enough money to uphold the Daily Tar Heel, so quiet will the campaign be. If, on the other hand, it be suggested that the paper again become a tri-weekly due to a shortage of news material for the running of a daily, the argument would be irrefutable. But such has not been the case. The editors have made the paper a readable one. Smaller and less advanced universities than Carolina boast commendable dailies.

The fate of the Daily Tar Heel is incidental to the current problem of the reorganization of the University. Carolina will be viewed with a critical eye in all of her activities and endeavors from now on until her new machinery is well oiled. Any regression in University or student activity will be food for unwelcome thought and erroneous conjecture. Hence all steps should be forward and none backward. —P. S. L.

Education In The Honor System

At the recent convention of the North Carolina Federation of Students and again at the meeting last Tuesday of the University student activities committee the disciples of a new system of education in the honor system propounded their ideas, as yet indefinite in form.

Basically, their proposition is this: In order to instill in the students a proper respect for the

system and thus to insure that it may be more generally observed, instruction in the ideals and principles of honorable conduct should be begun in the high schools and preparatory schools of the state.

It is popularly agreed that a major portion of the infractions against the University honor system occurs among the members of the first-year class, and so during the freshman orientation period a concentrated effort is made to instruct the newcomers in the traditions of the institution.

But, this system is found to be inadequate in that there is difficulty in teaching the new students something about which they have never been given any previous inking.

And so, it has been concluded that a solution to the problem may be found in beginning education in the honor system among students of pre-college age, especially prospective University entrants.

Then there is the question as to what agency is to be created or what present means are to be employed in spreading such propaganda.

The first and best of all suggestions that have been offered is that the University Extension division through its bureau of high school debating and athletics carry on this work. This department is in an excellent position for activity of this type, having already established a direct and intimate contact with students all over the state.

For this reason, we suggest if any action is ever taken in this most important matter, that Messrs. Grumman, Rankin and Company be given the responsibility.

—E. C. D., Jr.

Readers' Opinions

EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE DID NOT FAIL

Editor's Note: Misleading press despatches upon which the Daily Tar Heel editors have commented are corrected below by the dean of the liberal arts college.

Editor the Daily Tar Heel:

Twice within the past month I have noticed editorial comments in your columns regarding the failure of the Experimental College under Dr. Meiklejohn at the University of Wisconsin. In itself, a mis-statement of this kind is not, perhaps, very important, but since the college has not been closed and since it will continue next year, I feel justified in calling this to your attention. More important, however, than any misunderstanding regarding the continuance of this Experimental College is the impression that may have spread over the campus from your editorials to the effect that educational experimentation in college has received a setback. Since I believe that college education must move forward largely through one or another of the experiments now under way in America, I regret the spreading of false impression regarding one of these most widely advertised experiments. The Experimental College at Wisconsin will continue next year.

More important than the continuance of Meiklejohn's experiment is the fact that next year the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Wisconsin puts in several rather wide-reaching changes, changes which those who have watched the experiments of Dr. Meiklejohn must believe have come about through the work of his Experimental College.

The campus may not be interested in the details of these changes, but I should like to

itemize for you some of the things which are to be done within the College of Arts and Sciences next year:

1. Students are to be promoted on the basis of actual attainment and growth rather than on mere attendance at classes and the meeting of routine requirements.

2. Specially capable freshmen to the number of some five or six hundred entering next fall will be excused from certain routine freshman requirements and allowed to enter immediately upon more advanced work.

3. Routine language requirements will be changed to allow a student to complete a requirement at any time when he can show sufficient proficiency in a language. It will no longer be a question of how many hours are taken, but how far the student actually is able to use a language he has studied.

4. Students who at the end of two years in college show themselves unable to bear up under the pressure will be excluded from the junior-senior years. The college plans to exclude 25 per cent of the sophomore class in this way. Students who satisfactorily finish the first two years of study will be given certificates entitling them to the rank of Graduate in Liberal Studies. Not all who receive the certificate will necessarily be admitted to the junior year.

5. Correlation courses will be offered in several fields through the cooperation of different departments within the College. One such course, open to sophomores only and running throughout the year, will be administered jointly by the departments of economics, philosophy, and political science, the intention being to give the students a philosophic approach to individual, economic, and political life.

6. Comprehensive examinations will be required of all students before graduation.

7. It is expected that the new curriculum will permit exceptional students to speed up their work and secure both their bachelor's and master's degrees at the conclusion of four years. Under this new plan, high grade juniors and seniors will be allowed to select their own methods of preparation in their major subject.

8. Students who wish to enter the university without pointing towards a degree will be given the opportunity.

I think any one who scans the above will realize that experimentation, at the University of Wisconsin, instead of having received a death blow, has been invigorated. Since Liberal Arts Colleges throughout the country can expect continued life only through progress, and since progress can come only through experimentation and change, I have written this note of correction in the hope of off-setting the impression, created by your former editorials, that in at least one institution experimentation had failed.

Very sincerely yours, ADDISON HIBBARD.

TAR HEEL SERVES THE CAMPUS

It would be absolutely impossible to sum up in one article all the things that the Tar Heel has sponsored in the last two years, but in a brief way I am going to point out a few of the most outstanding things. The Tar Heel has always endorsed the Carolina Spirit and upheld the honor system.

The Tar Heel began the drive for student entertainments and with much work succeeded in getting them. The Daily Tar Heel has continually backed the Carolina Playmakers.

At the beginning of last year

the University band was very much in need of new uniforms. This was another thing to which the Tar Heel gave its full support. The paper soon started a drive to secure new uniforms for the band. During this same time the Tar Heel issued an appeal to the students to protect University property and in many other cases the Tar Heel has sponsored a drive for beautifying the campus.

The Tar Heel has also been back of a drive for a Fine Arts school. There are many North Carolinians who prefer to study art and they have to go to some school out of the state in order to do so. Therefore it is an entirely commendable thing to desire to create a Carolina Fine Arts center for Carolinians.

Years ago it was suggested to the Tar Heel that the University should adopt intramural athletics. The staff's aid was enlisted to bring this form of athletics here. Immediately after this drive was made the Tar Heel became interested in an Alumni Loyalty Fund.

The Tar Heel has always backed all University enterprises, the glee club, the different athletic teams on the campus, the literary societies and all other campus activities.

Two of the most important things which the Daily Tar Heel has been largely responsible for putting through in the last two years are the Dormitory Stores and the State Federation of Students. The students asked for dormitory stores three years ago and the Tar Heel had been working on the question up until it was put through this school year. The State Federation of Students movement was introduced by John A. Lang, a student here in the University. Lang soon had the Tar Heel behind him.

By the many things that the Tar Heel has sponsored for the benefit of the students, especially since it was made a daily publication, and because it is one of the college dailies in the south, we should strive to maintain it, and in doing this we should vote next Tuesday to keep it a daily rather than a tri-weekly.

D. C. McDuffie.

\$80,000 Subscribed For New Gymnasium By Deacon Alumni

A recent press dispatch from Wake Forest states that at a meeting of a joint committee of trustees, alumni and faculty it was reported that already \$80,000 had been subscribed in the campaign that is being carried on among alumni to raise \$250,000 with which to build a new gymnasium and student activity building.

Members of the committee, which represented every section of North Carolina, reported a whole-hearted loyalty of Wake Forest alumni, which should, if the first reports are correct, result in the early success of the campaign.

ALUMNI CLUB ENTERTAINS HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

The Mecklenburg county alumni club of the University will entertain the graduates of the Charlotte high school at a barbecue in the Municipal park of Charlotte from 6 to 8 o'clock Monday evening, May 26.

From the University, Coach Bob Fetzner, Bob House, executive secretary of the University, and J. Maryon Saunders, secretary of the University Alumni Association will attend the affair. George Thomas, '09, of former football fame, is president of the club, while John S. Cansler, '14, holds the office of vice-president and John R. Purser, Jr., that of secretary and treasurer.

Morrow's Views on Prohibition Similar to Woodrow Wilson's

An interesting point about Dwight W. Morrow's statement on the question of national prohibition is the close similarity it bears to Woodrow Wilson's last pronouncement on the subject. Of course Wilson is known to have been opposed to national prohibition, and therefore it might be considered unnecessary to recall what he said about it. But the identical reasoning of Wilson and Morrow with regard to the difference in function between the federal and state governments, the emphasis which each places upon the divergences in popular beliefs and habits within the United States and upon the hopelessness of the federal government's attempt to change the habits of great populations in wide territorial limits—here is a parallel that seems to merit attention.

In March of last year Senator Carter Glass of Virginia contributed to the New York Times an article in which he included a "tentative platform" (hitherto unpublished) prepared by Wilson for submission to the Democratic convention of 1924. This draft, said Glass, was transmitted by Wilson to a select circle of friends but was not presented to the convention.

Its passages relating to prohibition are here placed alongside passages from Morrow's address of last week:

Dwight W. Morrow:

The habits and character of the people, the size of the community, the extent of the participation of the people in the exercise of their political rights, are all important factors in the determination of how far a community can go in restricting individual liberty for community good.

The peculiar characteristic of the government of the United States is its federal form. Under that form of government we look to our several states to perform certain governmental functions and to our federal government to perform other governmental functions.

With the coming into force of the prohibition amendment, a vast new criminal jurisdiction was assumed by the federal government. This involved not only the organization of a new police force, but—what is even more important—it involved a new attitude of the people toward their federal government and of the federal government toward the people. The extremely delicate and sensitive problem of interfering with the individual liberty of a man for the sake of the social good of the community was thereafter dealt with not in terms of small communities but in terms of a mighty nation of 125,000,000 people, with great climatic, racial, and social divergences.

In many states, where it is in accord with popular sentiment, national prohibition is generally believed to be successful. It is successful because of the active co-operation of the people and their officials. In other states, including those with the greatest populations, the system works badly because the people and their officials do not co-operate with the federal agents, and the federal agents alone are not able to exercise effective control. In these states there exists resentment against the attempt to oppose a control which the prevailing conscience of the people does not accept. Is it well that large portions of our people should conceive of the federal government as an alien and even hostile power? It is well to have as a result a lawless, unregulated liquor traffic, attended by a shocking corruption?

I believe that the way out of the present difficulty is to recognize clearly the fundamental difference between the nature of the federal government and that of the state government. I believe this involves a repeal of the eighteenth amendment and the substitution therefor of an amendment which will restore to the states the power to determine their policy toward the liquor traffic, and vest in the Federal government power to give all possible protection and assistance to those states that desire complete prohibition against invasion from the states that do not.

So long as the eighteenth amendment and the statutes thereunder are the law of the land, I favor generous appropriations for their enforcement. I favor the use of such appropriations in the first place, for that portion of enforcement which is pre-eminently the duty of the federal government. This means that the federal government would first direct its efforts to keeping liquor from coming into the country and to keeping liquor from passing into interstate commerce. While there is no doubt of the power of the federal government under the eighteenth amendment to perform, local police duty in the suppression of the liquor traffic, it should be remem-

Woodrow Wilson:

The eighteenth amendment made prohibition the law for the nation. The Volstead act prescribed for the nation what liquor should be deemed intoxicating. But the people, when adopting the amendment, recognized fully that the law could not be enforced without the cooperation of the States within the nation. Hence it provided in Section 2 that "The Congress and the several states have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." The intention was that each government should perform that part of the task for which it was peculiarly fitted.

The federal government's part is to protect the United States against illegal importation of liquor from foreign countries and to protect each state from the illegal introduction into it of liquor from another state. To perform that part of the task effectively requires centralization, unified action and the employment of the large federal powers and resources. Experience has demonstrated that to perform adequately this part of the task will require all the resources which Congress makes available for enforcement of this law. To this part of the whole task of enforcement the federal government should therefore devote its entire energies.

The protection of the people of a state against the illegal sale within it of liquor illegally manufactured within it is a task for which the state governments are peculiarly fitted and which they should perform. That part of the task involves diversified governmental action and adaptation to the widely varying conditions in and the habits and sentiments of the people of the several states. It is a task for which the federal government is not fitted.

To relieve the state from the duty of performing it violates our traditions and threatens the best interests of our country. The strength of the nation and its capacity for achievement is in large measure due to the federal system with its distribution of powers and duties.

There should be frank recognition of the fact that the prime duty of the federal government is to protect the country against illegal importation from abroad and from illegal introduction of liquor from one state into another, that the full performance of this duty will tax the resources of the federal government to the uttermost, and that for the rest the people of each state must look to their state governments. But the eighteenth amendment should remain unchanged. And the Volstead act should remain unchanged.

Dwight W. Morrow:

bered that it has a vast task in the purely federal field. Until it performs that task it might well leave all local police duty with the states who have concurrent power with the federal government in the local field. Such a method of enforcement would distribute responsibility where it belongs.

The solution will be found when we realize that the issue before us is a governmental problem. How can the control of the liquor traffic be divided between federal and state governments in a way that will recognize the habits and sentiments and moral principles of the people in the different parts of the country? I see no way of settling that question satisfactorily without a further change in the Constitution.

Now, Wilson's opinion (which is also Morrow's) that the federal government should confine its efforts to "protecting the United States against illegal importation from foreign countries and protecting each state from the illegal introduction into it of liquor from another state," is regular wet doctrine. Most of the federal government keep its hands off in states where the prevailing sentiment is anti-prohibition. It was for holding this very view that Smith was denounced by the dries in the 1928 campaign. It is this view that is today vigorously and tirelessly opposed by all the dry leaders.

The passages relating to the divergent habits and beliefs of (Continued on last page)