

THE TAR HEEL.

Vol. 11,

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, N. C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1903.

No. 19.

THE OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE UNIVERSITY ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

PROSPECTS OF THE BASE BALL TEAM.

Coach Curran's Good Work---More Material Wanted on the Diamond.

It is admitted in the outset of this article that this is an early date to tell exactly the men who will compose the Varsity. No such thing is going to be attempted. But to understand the present and judge the future correctly a little knowledge of the past is necessary. Therefore we are going to say something about the old and new material.

Before we begin on the personnel of the team, however, we want to say a few words about our excellent coach. His name is Jack Curran and his home is in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. He learned the rudiments of the game at St. Mary's College, Belmont, N. C., during the spring of 1897. He was captain of St. Mary's College team in 1898. In 1899 and 1900 he was captain of the Pittsburg College team, Pittsburg, Pa. During the summer of 1901 he played with the Raleigh League Team of this State. Last year he was with the Durham League Team. His record is a good one, his knowledge of the rudiments of the game is thorough and his willingness to work unqualified. "Jack," as the boys familiarly call him, has done more real work up to this time than our last year's coach did the whole year. And though the present outlook is not as good as it has been at times in the past, we believe this year's team will be a winning team because we have a coach in whom we can trust and to whom we can look for the best team possible. When asked about the prospects of the team and who were the most likely candidates Coach Curran said: "I cannot say who will make the Varsity. It is too early to set an estimate upon any player's ability. What I want is more candidates for the team. I believe there is good material in college and if you will give me the material I will do my part. No man is sure of any certain position on the team, but each man is to be used where he will add most to the strength of the whole team." Concerning the men who are to play certain places very little can be said. Of course, Captain Donnelly will take his old place in left field. Captain Donnelly has done splendid work for Carolina on the gridiron and the diamond. He has given and given freely his time and skill to University athletics. For this he has the thanks of the entire student body. He has always played good ball but we predict that he will play his star game this spring. Captain Donnelly says, "The man who works hardest will win out."

Earl Holt, the old reliable, will care for 1st base. It is useless to say that the whole college has implicit confidence in his ability to play this position as well as any

man in the South. It is admirable to see how hard and how anxiously he is working to make the team a good one.

Smathers, the old 3rd baseman, is at 2nd base now. Can't tell how long he will be there.

Will Carr, the old short stop, has been unwell and has not come out for practice. He will be out in a few days.

Other infield men are: George Graham, our popular and excellent manager, John Cheshire and Hal Worth.

For catcher, Wilcox, Moore, Cox and Noble have made the best impression. It is sufficient to say that one or two good catchers can be developed from these.

Oldham, McNeil, Hart, and Greene are trying for the position of pitcher.

Wade Oldham is trying for an outfield. It is reported that "Fatty" Giles and Murray Allen will be here in a few days to try for outfield positions.

Others who have showed up for practice are: Neill Graham, Harris, Pritchard, Condon, Fenner, Sifford, Norton, Engel and Ham Jones.

A word about that much abused phrase, College Spirit, and I am done. Every man in college has the inalienable right to stand on the side lines and yell until his throat is sore. Moreover it is your duty to cheer on the team. Last fall there was plenty of the right sort of college spirit behind the foot ball team. Every student in college knows the record of that team and speaks of it with pride. College spirit sent 250 boys to Richmond, Virginia, and college spirit made the score 12 to 12. Heretofore there has been no college spirit behind the base ball team. Instead there has been a "cuss-out" spirit. That is when one of the team happens to make a costly error the above mentioned spirit finds expression in such phrases as these: "I told you he was no good and I don't see how he ever made the team;" "I knew he wasn't worth anything;" "I expected that fool (Abe Shivers?) to lose the game by some of his rotten work."

Boys, such a spirit will never win. On the other hand it will ruin the best team that ever went upon the diamond.

Now let's rise above this. Let's go out and watch every practice, encourage every good play and every good effort. Sympathize with the man who makes a costly error; it pains him a thousand times more than you, hence to "cuss him out" only makes bad matters worse. Let's show every man on the team that we have confidence in him whether in victory or defeat. The coach is going to do his part, the captain, we know, will do his and the team as a whole will do its utmost if we show our interest. From today on let's go out there and help develop one of Carolina's best teams.

THE WASHINGTON BIRTHDAY EXERCISES.

A Splendid Tribute to Ante-bellum Orators of the South by Dr. C. A. Smith.

The annual George Washington birthday celebration was held in Gerrard Hall Monday. Mr. McFadyen presided and Mr. Otho Ross performed the duties of Secretary. Mr. McFadyen said, in opening the exercises: "We have come together to-day not from a sense of duty but from a custom that springs spontaneously as it were, from the heart of every true American."

After a touching prayer by Dr. Meade, the president announced the first speaker as Mr. Z. V. Judd, of the Phi.

His theme was: "Progressive vs. Proportional Taxation." This subject, in the short time allotted, he gave a thorough treatment and interesting presentation.

He said in part:

"In a Democratic country one of the most ominous tasks for the law-making powers is that of devising a just scheme of taxation. It was especially so with Washington, his cabinet and the first Congress of the United States. The truth of this is all the more evident when we recall that our people had just rebelled against the Mother country because of unjust taxation.

"The two fundamental principles of taxation are proportion and progression. The theory of proportion is older than that of progression, though a little retrospect will show that the two principles have struggled side by side from the early legislation of Solon down to the present time. The arguments have been advanced in favor of progressive taxation, in three groups: The socialistic, compensatory and economic theories.

The foremost advocate of the socialistic theory bases his defence of progression upon the principle that it is the duty of the state to redress all inequalities of wealth among its citizens. This would lead us at once into socialism. But it is perfectly logical to repudiate the socialistic theory and still uphold progression on economic grounds. But before considering progression on an economic basis let us view the arguments of the compensatory theory. One of its chief exponents, President Walker, claims that differences of wealth are due to a great extent, to the failure of the state in protecting its citizens against violence and fraud; and to the state's own acts, having a political purpose, such as commercial treaties, tariffs etc., in which case he argues, allowance should be made therefore in the tax system. The defect of this theory lies in the impossibility of laying down any general principles by which this influence of the state, in creating inequalities of fortune, can be measured.

"Before considering the third—the economic theory of progressive taxation—let us observe that the real contest between the two principles of proportion and progression turns about the fundamental question as to the basis of taxation—the theory of benefits as the theory of ability. By the one it is held that a man should pay taxes according to the benefits that accrue to him from the state, by the other, that he should pay taxes according to his faculty or ability to pay. The benefit theory held that protection was the chief function of the state, and so concluded that taxes must be adjusted to the protection afforded. This conclusion was soon modified by the introduction of the theory of the minimum of subsistence; later it was discarded, and in its stead was put the cost-of-service theory, that is, taxes should bear a definite relation to the cost of the protection afforded. This was likewise set at naught, and for it was substituted the doctrine of ability or faculty. Faculty was at first interpreted to imply general property; later it came to denote income, and then only income or the excess of the minimum of subsistence. In other words the idea of burden or sacrifice was introduced. Human needs became a fundamental consideration, and it was declared that to impose equal sacrifices, we must tax the rich, not only absolutely, but relatively more than the poor. The tax must be, not proportional, but progressive.

"To most of the existing forms of taxation in the United States the progressive principle is difficult of application; but the principle is true, and it remains for our genuine statesmen who are actuated by a sense of truth and justice to remove the obstacle and apply the principle."

Dr. Smith's address on "Some Southern Orators of Ante-bellum Days," captivated those who heard it.

He said, in part:

"It must be remembered that the oratory of a nation is the product of the national life. There are periods in every nation's life when we have a right to expect great orators and there are other periods when the presence of great orators is an exception. Two conditions are essential for producing great orators: First, There must be a stir of popular life, associated with freedom of speech. Second, There must be vital questions, clamoring for solution—questions that appeal not only to the scholars but to the laboring man as well.

In America we have had two such periods: the Revolutionary Period, that immediately preceded and followed the Revolutionary, 1760-1832; and the Constitutional Period, 1832-1850. In the first, the questions at issue were relative to the formation of our constitution and in the second, the

[Continued on fourth page.]