

The Tar Heel

"The Leading Southern College Semi-Weekly Newspaper."

Member of N. C. Collegiate Press Association

Published twice every week of the college year, and is the official organ of the Athletic Association of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C. Subscription price, \$2.00 local and \$3.00 out of town, for the college year. Entered at the Post-Office, Chapel Hill, N. C., as second-class matter.

Business and editorial offices rooms 8 and 9, New West Building. Office hours 2 to 3 p. m. daily, except Saturday and Sunday.

J. J. Wade Editor

C. B. Colton Assistant Editors
G. W. Lankford
E. H. Hartzell Managing Editor
G. Y. Ragsdale Assignment Editor

REPORTERS

H. D. Dale R. C. Maulsby
E. D. Apple C. C. Rowland
Walker Barnette W. T. Rowland
W. S. Berryhill L. T. Rogers
F. M. Davis, Jr. J. M. Saunders
A. L. Dowd J. O. Bailey
H. R. Fuller W. M. Saunders
J. E. Hawkins J. M. Roberts

T. P. Chesborough, Jr., Business Mgr.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT

Staff
B. H. Miller J. H. Lineberger

CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT

W. C. Perdue Circulation Manager
T. D. Wells Ass't Cir. Manager
C. L. Jones Ass't Cir. Manager

Staff

R. L. Briggs G. R. Ivey
R. F. Stainback E. N. Anderson
S. B. Teague W. B. Pipkin

You can purchase any article advertised in The Tar Heel with perfect safety because everything it advertises is guaranteed to be as represented. We will make good immediately if the advertiser does not.

Vol. XXXI, March 14, 1923 No. 41

SPECIAL EXTRA

On account of examinations the editors and managers of The Tar Heel had planned to call off the two issues for this week, until this question of co-education came up. It was then decided that such a grave and important question as this could not be passed up through the columns of The Tar Heel, regardless of the inconvenience of issuing the paper at this time. So we have prepared this Extra, devoted to a discussion of this question, and dedicated to the killing of this plan now under consideration.

SUCCESS DOUBTFUL

The Tar Heel has grave doubts as to the success of a state basketball tournament as proposed and apparently favored by a number of the coaches in the state.

There would be an unavoidable conflict between the Southern tournament now held annually at Atlanta and the state tournament, if such was formed. And the Southern tournament is now well established and is proving to be one of the greatest athletic events of the South. More college teams in North Carolina should enter this tournament in Atlanta rather than form a new state tournament.

Take Carolina: we could hardly participate in both the Southern and the state tournaments, and it means far more to this University to have a team in Atlanta and figure prominently in Southern athletics at large than it would be to confine its activities to the narrow bounds of the state. The purpose of the proposed tournament, it is said, is to have a better method of determining the winner of the state championship. There is no doubt but that the tournament method is better than that now employed, but schedules could be so arranged as to get rid of this difficulty, and there is no need to form a tournament merely for that purpose.

Certainly a state tournament has very little attraction to this institution.

HOW DO THEY GET THAT WAY?

How does the faculty get that way, in cutting short our holidays after faithfully making a promise to grant us an extra day at Easter when one of the Thanksgiving holidays was given up.

We can see it to be nothing less than a breach of promise if the faculty sticks to its decision and does not let college out until the last classes of the week. There is a rumor that the students are enlisting a movement of revolt to petition for the holiday promised. It seems to us that the faculty should come across with what it promised.

UP TO THE COMMITTEE

There appears to be some dissatisfaction prevailing among many students over the number of monograms presented by the Awards Committee to the basketball squad this year. Only five monograms were awarded, and many say that there should have been

WOMEN STUDENTS NOT WANTED HERE

A question that vitally affects the future of the University of North Carolina is hanging in the balance, and will be decided more or less definitely for all time the early part of next week. That is the question of co-education: Are the Trustees going to sanction general co-education at the University, and will the Building Committee use the money appropriated the University to construct a co-ed dormitory?

The Tar Heel takes a definite stand against co-education at the University on any such scope as would necessitate the construction of a woman's dormitory here, and believes that the co-educational enrollment should be limited to residents of Chapel Hill, and to graduate and professional students. In its fight to have any such proposition as the construction of a woman's dormitory and encouragement of co-education killed for all time it has sought the opinion and sentiment of the leading students of the University, and is presenting these facts in a symposium in this Extra edition. This issue of The Tar Heel will go into the hands of those in authority to decide this vital question, and we are unable to see how this body could vote to have co-education here with such a mass of student sentiment against it.

The reasons for such an uncompromising stand against any proposition of the co-education nature are as obvious as they are convincing. It does not take any special study of the situation or research work to perceive them. The Tar Heel's position and reasons for its position are essentially the same as those expressed by the president of the student body. The state has provided another institution—the college at Greensboro—to take care of women students, and has appropriated money to enable this college to supply all the needs that the women who would go there should desire. There are other girls' colleges in this state, and there are sufficient facilities to take care of all the women students, without sending them here from the high schools.

If there are girls in the state who insist that they get their education along with the masculine sex there are other co-educational institutions in the state which they are privileged to attend, but the men students at this University have no desire for them here, and never will have any desire to have them here unless such a dreadful mistake is made as the construction of this woman's dormitory, and the University becomes overrun with girl students, and an effeminate influence of sentimentality becomes paramount.

We need all the money appropriated by the state for the construction of more buildings to take care of the men students, for this is a University for men, and we have none to spare to sink into a woman's building even if we had any desire for any such building. New dormitories, new class buildings, new science and department buildings, a new gymnasium, are structures badly needed here. No greater mistake could be made than spending this good money for the construction of a dormitory for co-eds, when any such building would be so distasteful to the mass of men students here, and when this would sanction co-education at a place inherently for the education of men, and men who desire no women around.

The Tar Heel hopes that its position is plain and not misunderstood by the few scattering women students now here. We have no objection to girls who live in Chapel Hill getting the benefit of the University, nor do we object to those women who come here to go into higher education after getting a degree at a woman's college, nor to those who wish to enter the professional schools. If there are girls in the state who have ambition enough to wish to pursue their education in such a way, we see no reason why the advantages of the University be denied them, and we do not censor the present limited plan of co-education that has been in vogue here for many years. The institution remains a man's University, and has no ear-marks of a co-educational college. But to take care of the women students who fall into this category, we have no need for a special woman's building. Already we have adequate facilities to take care of them, and the present woman's dormitory appears to be housing other than co-eds and is not filled with women students.

But for the University to sanction co-education in the general sense does not please the students here. We can think of nothing more distasteful than such a thing. To have classes composed of as many women as men students would prove a serious handicap in the teaching in some of the departments. The women here would only prove a distracting influence, could do no possible good, and would turn the grand old institution into a semi-effeminate college which would certainly have no attraction for us. The University could make no greater mistake than this step of co-education, and we have confidence that any such movement will be checked now, next week, and we pray to the heavens that it will be stopped for all time.

"SHAVES AND SHINES BUT NO RATS AND ROUGE"

There is a matter of finances connected with this proposition of constructing a woman's dormitory at the University and the opening of these doors to women students. It is, too, a right considerable matter when cold facts are considered, and when we look the situation squarely in the face and consider it from every angle.

The state appropriated, during the recent session of the General Assembly, \$1,650,000 for general improvements for the University, and \$1,350,000 for general improvements for the North Carolina College for Women at Greensboro. This fund was appropriated to carry on the building program of the University, to take care of the men students; and the money appropriated to the Greensboro college to continue improvements there to take care of the women students. We quote a member of the Budget Commission in saying that "One of the items cut out by the Budget Commission in making out their estimate was the woman's dormitory on the ground that they did not have the money to do this together with other expediences." Thus, the state has appropriated money for the women at Greensboro, and money for the men at Chapel Hill.

Now the Building Committee, flooded with sentimental pleas from some of the women students now at the University, and some of the politicians of the state who are seeking the favor of women in North Carolina and have their eyes on some of the big jobs, is considering using part of the money appropriated the University to build a woman's dormitory. This dormitory complete will cost in the neighborhood of \$350,000, to say nothing of the others that would naturally follow, and the facilities that would have to be provided to complete the equipment to educate women here. A separate gymnasium and entire physical training equipment would have to be constructed in time, rest rooms, social rooms, and all the other luxuries that must be had by the girl at college. Three dormitories can be built for men at about the same cost that one can be built for women, and a man's dormitory will house 120 men while a woman's dormitory will take care of only 75 women. In other words, it takes far more to educate a woman than it does a man, and the facilities that must go to furnish her the education are several times as expensive. On the other hand, it is a known and accepted fact that separately educated the expenses will be much lower than when both men and women are educated at the same college.

Chapel Hill is rigged up for men, and if women are to be here there must be a complete outfit of facilities. All of this will cost thousands of dollars. Why not expend this money on the college at Greensboro and let our own University remain a place for men? The money now appropriated the University is needed to take care of the men students—every dollar of it—and we can not see how the Building Committee can pass up these needs and build a dormitory for students not even wanted here.

at least six and possibly seven or eight awarded.

It is not up to us to determine to whom basketball monograms should be given, nor for that matter up to the student body. The authority is vested wholly in the Awards Committee, which is composed of those who are best in position to know just who deserve monograms. It seems to the Tar Heel, therefore, that it is somewhat of a mis-

take for the students to try to dictate in any particular case who should get monograms. Yet the Tar Heel does believe it is possible that the Awards Committee has made a mistake, and that it should reconsider its action and by weighing all the facts make sure that its awards are correct. There is, of course, the danger of giving out too many monograms, that it is somewhat of a mis-

giving the value and standard of a Carolina monogram, and the committees should always try to steer clear of such a mistake. Yet, on the other hand, there is also a danger of not giving out enough letters, and especially in cases which are especially deserving. The winning of a monogram is the ultimate aim of all those who go out for athletics, and there is little to draw men to try out for the teams when it looks as if the men already have their monograms "cinched" and the Awards Committee will give out no more than to just the varsity team. "A team is no better than its substitutes," and the awarding of monograms, it seems to us, should go down a little into this group of men who are always there to play the game when the varsity needs the reserve strength.

COMMUNICATIONS

NOTE.—This column is for the free exchange of opinion among our readers. Use it if you have anybody to kick or anything to praise. All articles must be accompanied by the name of the author; no anonymous communications will be published.

To the Editor of The Tar Heel:

The issue of co-education is clearly before us and is one that vitally concerns the future welfare of the University.

The co-eds tell us that they are citizens of North Carolina, possessing the right to vote and participate in the business and political life of the State, and therefore ought to be permitted to come to the University in unlimited numbers. We realize that they are citizens of our State, but I fail to see where that is an absolute argument for their coming here. On the basis of that argument we could justify the admission of negroes to the University. Perhaps we should permit them to do so, but where can we find a same white man or woman in North Carolina who believes that we should?

In order that I may clearly show where I stand on this matter of co-education, I will say that I am in favor of letting girls come here to enter the professional and post-graduate schools, just as has been done in the past. It is probably alright to also let the professor's daughters and town girls enter the undergraduate classes as heretofore, but when it comes to letting them come in unlimited numbers, deliver me.

The co-eds tell us that we are discriminating against them if we do not let them come here. But regardless of what they say, with conditions as they

exist today in North Carolina, it is a grave injustice to the boys, and I might say to the girls, to let them come. I say it is an injustice to the boys because it is nothing short of discrimination. If we let the girls enter wholesale here at the University we will be doing the boys a grave wrong unless they be permitted to go to N. C. C. W. Just think, suppose I should go to N. C. C. W. and apply for entrance? Why, they would send me to a lock-up to await an examination of my upper story. As I see it I have the same right to go to school at N. C. C. W. as the girls have to come to the University. I realize that I have no right to go to N. C. C. W. and say the same with respect to the girls coming here. N. C. C. W. is a girls' school and the University is a boys' school and we must keep them such if we are to progress with the times.

I do not have space to show why I oppose co-education here because of financial reasons, but will say that it would be a double expense to provide for athletic and other facilities for girls. It is far cheaper to maintain N. C. C. W. and the University as in the past, one for girls and the other for boys. The proponents of co-education here at the University can only justify themselves

by doing away with N. C. C. W., and combining the funds expended there each year with the University funds. Before this is done, which should never be, co-education in unlimited numbers should be excluded from the University.

C. C. POINDEXTER.

Mrs. J. M. Bell is out of town on account of her mother's death.

Monroe—Seen Howard recently?

Weirfield—Yes.

"What's he doing?"

"Writing plays."

"What! That fellow writing plays?"

"Yes, he's chalking down scores in a bowling alley."—Brooklyn Standard-Union.

The glib insurance agent had persuaded Rastus to undergo his physical examination. All went well until the doctor started to fill out the personal question blank.

"Do you use wine, spirits, or malt liquors?" he asked.

"Ah, knowed it! Ah, knowed it!" exclaimed Rastus, jumping for the door clutching his collar and tie. "Ah, s'pected all de time you wuz prohibition agents!"—California Pelican.

COMPLIMENTS

OF

LAUNDRY DEPARTMENT

U. N. C.

All That's Worth Printing Is Worth Printing Well

And it costs money. But the sense of satisfaction lingers long after the price has been forgotten.

Burlington Printing Co.

P. O. BOX 851 Incorporated BURLINGTON, N. C. Orders Received by Mail Are Given Prompt Attention

The Appropriation!

THE STATE has appropriated a handsome sum for the development of your mind. It remains for you to appropriate a small sum for your physical development. Physical development is dependent upon proper nourishment.

YOU CAN GET PROPER NOURISHMENT

—at—

GOOCH'S CAFE

QUALITY SERVICE

Since 1903