

The Tar Heel

LEADING SOUTHERN COLLEGE TRI-WEEKLY NEWSPAPER

Member of North Carolina Collegiate Press Association

Published three times every week of the college year, and is the official newspaper of the Publications Union 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.

Offices in the basement of Alumni Building, Telephone 403.

J. T. MADRY Editor
F. F. SIMON Business Mgr.

Editorial Department

Managing Editors

J. F. ASHBY Tuesday Issue
BYRON WHITE Thursday Issue
L. H. MCPHERSON Saturday Issue

D. D. Carroll Assistant Editor
J. R. Bobbitt, Jr. Assignment Editor

Staff

J. H. Anderson W. P. Perry
J. M. Block J. P. Pretlow
Walter Creech T. M. Reece
J. R. DeJournette D. T. Seiwel
E. J. Evans S. B. Shephard, Jr.
D. S. Gardner J. Shohan
Glen F. Holder F. L. Smith
John Marshall W. S. Spearman
H. L. Merritt Wm. H. Windley
T. W. Johnson Henry Lay

Business Department

W. W. Neal, Jr. Asst. to Bus. Mgr.
Charles Brown Collection Mgr.
G. W. Ray Accountant

Managers of Issues

Tuesday Issue W. R. Hill
Thursday Issue James Styles
Saturday Issue Edward Smith

Advertising Department

Kenneth R. Jones Advertising Mgr.
Young M. Smith Asst. Adv. Mgr.
M. W. Breman Local Adv. Mgr.
William K. Wiley Ben Schwartz
G. W. Bradham C. J. Shannon
Oates McCullen Edwin V. Durham
J. H. Mebane M. Y. Feimster
Walter McConnell A. J. McNeill

Circulation Department

Henry C. Harper Circulation Mgr.
R. C. Mulder Filer of Issues
C. W. Colwell Tom Raney
Douglas Boyce W. W. Turner

You can purchase any article advertised in the TAR HEEL with perfect safety because everything it advertises is guaranteed to be as represented. The TAR HEEL solicits advertising from reputable concerns only.

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

Thursday, March 31, 1927

The small attendance at the mass meeting called Tuesday night to consider the student committee's report was pretty conclusive evidence that the great majority of the students approved the report, and, being satisfied with what had been done, thought it useless to indulge in more discussion. But this apparent majority overlooked one important fact; namely, that by staying away they ran the risk of having the report killed by the insurgent minority.

Just remember that in the referendum tomorrow what you think won't count unless you indicate your thought on the printed ballots. If you approve the committee report, say so in no uncertain terms at the polls. Let the final judgment be really representative of the student body as a whole and not of the minority.

EVERYBODY TO THE POLLS

It is the duty of every single Carolina student to go to the polls tomorrow and vote. You may be sure that those who are trying to get the student committee report rejected will be out in full force and rounding up every vote they can. There is plenty of reason to believe that the great majority of the students are in favor of the student committee report, but unless this majority votes tomorrow the minority is likely to win.

If you want to show the state that the student body has no confidence in self-government, if you want to broadcast to the world that this campus is a haven for the protection of gambling, then stay away from the polls tomorrow.

MAKE THIS CAMPUS SAFE FOR STUDENT GOVERNMENT

University men who want to see student government survive the present crisis will vote to support the recommendation of the student committee when the case of the thirteen suspended students is put before the student body in the form of a referendum. The whole case reduces itself to a question of whether or not you want this campus made safe for student government.

The point is simply this: Will you as Carolina men have faith in any group of men you may select to administer the affairs of student government? Apparently some of you—even though you may represent the minority—will not. Just because thirteen students, inspired and led by two well known permanent campus members, have their names on a list of thirteen names present.

D. L. McBRIDE, JR.

that fact. There was no provision in the student government to force President Chappell to call a meeting of the Student Body to consider this appeal, but Chappell apparently wanted to go the limit to show that the Student Council was open-minded and fair. So he called a meeting of the student body, and at this meeting the students, by an overwhelming vote, decided to place the case in the hands of a committee to be composed of three representatives each from the undergraduate classes and graduate schools, the committee appointments to be made by the presidents of each class. What method more fair could anybody ask for? These men spent more than fifty hours investigating the case. They went thoroughly into every angle of the situation. Their report approved the sentences of the council, even though it did not approve of "methods of compelling men to testify."

The report of that committee should have been given 100 percent endorsement by the student body immediately. It is exceedingly fair and logical. It simply says this: We are sorry to part company with you thirteen men, but you have been convicted of gambling and it is expressly stated in the catalog that students found guilty of such charges are asked to withdraw from the University. Hence the Student Council was acting within its jurisdiction in making the suspensions. There are precedents galore to support this action. Not many years ago a University track coach—and he was one of the best in the country—was asked to withdraw along with a number of students, as the result of such charges.

So, regardless of what you think of the methods used to obtain the evidence, these men have been found guilty on their own admissions. As for the methods to be used in obtaining evidence in such cases—that is for you to decide when your Constitutional Convention meets this spring. Heretofore student councils have had no constitution, and hence they have set their own limitations. They have used whatever methods they have seen fit to use, and doubtless many of them have used the same methods employed by the present council. That the same hullyaboo that we now witness had not been enacted heretofore was due solely, in all probability, to the fact that the campus agitators of present-day fame were non-existent then.

Now if you want to set up limitations about your student council, saying what it can and cannot do, you will be given every opportunity to do so when you set up a constitution this spring. But until then let's be content to use what we have and stand by the decisions of our properly constituted representatives who have had every opportunity to learn a vast deal more about the case than the student body as a whole.

Before casting your ballot on this referendum, it is suggested that you make up your mind on the following points: (1). We are sorry that these men have to be suspended. We know full well how the folks back home will feel about the matter. But is it not far better to let these men go rather than reject the student committee report and have the whole press of the state condemning us for approving gambling at the University. For the men have broken not only a University law but a state law as well. It is generally reported that the faculty and trustees will take a hand in the case if the student body rejects the report of the committee. That would mean nothing less than the complete toppling of student government.

(2). All the upperclassmen recall the hurtful publicity the University got when announcement went out that all dances would be suspended until Commencement on account of drinking. Do we want a repetition of that sort of publicity? If not, don't be foolish and tell the world that we are not willing to back a student council or student committee that endorses the rules in the case of men found guilty of gambling.

(3). Will you make this campus safe for student government? Your Student Council, your duly delegated representatives, passed on this case. Then you selected a student committee, virtually the same thing as another council, which also passed on the case. These men—your representatives—studied the case from facts gathered at first-hand. This you admittedly have not had the opportunity to do. Do you presume to think then, for one moment, that you are more capable of passing judgment than they? What would you do then? Go on electing committee after committee and then rejecting report after report? It would seem so. Do you want representative government or do you want anarchy? It would seem that some of you want the latter.

(4). Have you ever stopped to consider the personal animosity involved in this case? Have you ever stopped to think that this whole opposition to the Student Council is based on the personal animosity of men who have been leaders of an anti-Chappell crusade all this year—men who were not satisfied with last year's bitter political contest and who have been reprimanded by the council this year? Have you stopped to consider that the men who are leading the present fight against the council are the same men who sponsored that yellow sheet last fall—*The Fawn*—and who defended the *Magazines* story "Slaves"? It is a well recognized fact that these men have been after Chappell's scalp all the year. They and a few others of their ilk apparently have seized upon every opportunity to keep the campus stirred up. They have tried to arouse the students to an anti-Chappell crusade, apparently losing all sight of the fact that Chappell is only one of the eight members of the Student Council, and apparently forgetting also that the action of the council in the suspension case was unanimous. We hardly think that such men as Vest, Watt, Warren, McRae, Core, Rose or Holsinger would permit themselves to be dictated to by Chappell or any other member of the student body. In fact, we are certain they would not.

(5). Had only three or four men been suspended instead of thirteen, or had they been suspended in relays of four at the time, nobody

would have objected. But here you had thirteen men who banded together for mutual advantage and inspired by two campus Hell-raisers. Even though they were able to command only the support of their personal friends, you can readily see they could gather around them some hundred or more sympathizers, or enough to make quite a little noise.

(6). Have you ever considered what the faculty or trustees would do with the case? From all that anybody can hear, they would back the council and committee just about 100 percent. Our poor old student government may not be so bad after all!

(7). Finally, the men who have been suspended should not take their lot over-seriously. True, they have broken the state law and the campus law, but, in the eyes of liberal folk, their offense is not regarded as a disgrace. Gambling not infrequently leads to suicides and thefts, but so far as anybody knows it hasn't taken on any such serious aspects in this institution. Let these men get considerable consolation out of the fact that some of the most prominent men in the state today were not only suspended but expelled from the University of North Carolina, and frequently on charges more serious than gambling. Don't take your lot too seriously, then, fellows. We would say to you, however, that gambling is usually poor business and suggest that you seek more legitimate fields for your coin.

CONTROVERSY

(By Holt McPherson)

Although the Carolina campus has been seething with controversy throughout the year there remains a group here who are prone to take no heed of the struggles being waged. Not only is the fact that we have such mental inertia lamentable, but it is a reflection on the character of the student body that there are men in our midst who prefer mental stagnation to intellectual progress.

The fact that we have controversy is positive evidence that we are intellectually awake, for controversy is certain to arise wherever there are growing minds. Hegel's philosophy of contradiction as the root of all life and movement is in a sense applicable to most progress. However, his dialectical process fails to carry through in the present situation, for there are too many angles to our controversies for them to ever be settled by the mere synthesis of the thesis and antithesis. Nevertheless in accordance with his theory we have for a large part been able to develop our government, science, politics, religion, educational system, and practically every institution that we have—all more or less the result of intellectual battles.

Since the beginning of civilization conflicting schools have fiercely contended with each other, and out of these struggles has come our intellectual progress. When mankind is mentally awake he is militant, continually combatting false and outgrown ideas, always seeking greater freedom from the bonds which limit his life and thought. Those ages in which he has been mentally aggressive are the same ages in which learned and strong men have fought for ideas which conflicted with the then current opinion. The only ages of history that have been quiet have been dead ages.

Controversy is a wholesome and advantageous thing when rival ideas and hypotheses are under consideration, and those people who fear controversy have a perverted idea of truth and right. There are many people who regard it as an evil influence—an evidence of depravity. They fail to realize that it is the natural precursor of intellectual advancement, and seek to thwart its unpleasant realities by scoffing at it, or running away from it.

It is foolish for anyone to disparage or fear controversy. Necessarily it cannot always be pleasant, however many an evil has been rectified by its employment. Those who treat it with contempt, and belittle it as a squabble or wrangle and a futile waste of time, have no high regard for truth. Because controversialists fall into ugly moods, sometimes causes it to be branded as a malpractice, but unless a man can defend his position without losing his temper, it is not because controversy is a bad thing but because his is an undisciplined spirit. The only logical reaction should be to accept it as vitally necessary to our discipline.

Merely stating the truth and contending for it cannot be condemned, but it is the petty and unscrupulous manner in which it is carried on that makes it fall into disrepute. If the sluggish minds of the men who prefer mental tranquility to intellectual progress should be aroused to action along constructive lines this student body would need not shudder at the pitfalls and quagmires that threaten the wholesome existence of our institutions.

POLITICS!

(By Byron White)

It will be interesting to the campus to know that there are now two political organizations on the campus. One, as Dave Carroll showed in his *Driftwood Fire* explained on March 22, is headed by Taylor Bledsoe. The

other is under the guidance of several campus leaders. Walter Kelley is running for presidency of the student body in the newest group. This could be said to be the writer's trial editorial, as he is running independently for the TAR HEEL editorship.

And, as Dave says, "he who runs" is running thusly:

Presidency of the Student Body

Walter Kelley.

Senior Class
Charlie Lipscomb, President.
Hoyt Pritchett, Vice-President.
Buck Grice, Secretary.

Tar Heel

Jud Ashby, Editor of the Tar Heel.

Junior Class

Red Ellison, President.
Soapy Sandlin, Vice-President.
Jack Davis, Student Council representative.

Y. M. C. A.

Phil Dawson, Secretary.
Athletic Association

Billy Ferral, President.
Bill Sharpe, Representative at large.

Sophomore Class

Jack Ward, President.
Phil Jackson, Vice-president.
Charles Perry, Secretary
Bill Adams, Student Councilman.

This group states that it is absolutely not pledged to support each other. It is said that it should not be considered a ticket.

Kenneth Jones is running independently for the Publications Union.

The Other Group

The other group headed by Taylor Bledsoe follows:

For President of the Student Body, Charlie Jonas. Charlie is not connected with the group, has attended no meetings, and is under no obligations to any member of it. He is being supported as the logical candidate, says Taylor Bledsoe.

Y. M. C. A.

President, Nash Johnson.
Secretary, Walter Spearman.
Treasurer, J. W. Ray.

Tar Heel

Editor, Holt McPherson.

P. U. Board

Walter Creech, Mutt Evans, and Bill Perry.

Athletic Association
President, Gus McPherson.
Vice President, Ed Butler.
Representative at large, Harry Schwartz.

Debate Council

Ralph Noe and Bryce Parker.

Senior Class

President, Ed Hudgins.
Vice-President, Odell Sapp.
Secretary, Mack Fowler.
Treasurer, Aubrey Perkins.
Student Council, Mac Covington.

Junior Class

President, Steve Furches.
Vice-President, Buck Carr.
Secretary, Henry Brown.
Treasurer, Murray Borden.
Student Council, Ty Crabtree.

Sophomore Class

President, Pat Patterson.
Vice-President, Marion Alexander.
Secretary, John Thornton.
Treasurer, D. L. Moore.
Student Council, Sam McNeely.

"That's the ticket!"

A welcome summons to the best thing any cigarette can give — natural tobacco taste



No other cigarette offers a like measure of natural qualities, naturalness of character, purity of taste, and genuine tobacco goodness. Natural tobacco taste gives all that—and then some!

Chesterfield

They Satisfy - and yet, they're MILD

LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.

Settle Down at Gooch's For the Rest of the Year

About this time each year students who have not dined with us all the year begin to come in. There are certain distinct advantages in dining at Gooch's from now on until the close of school.

At Gooch's you eat when you want to and pay when you eat. You never pay for a meal when you miss—you never have to be here at any definite hour.

And at Gooch's you can eat as little or as much as you want, and of the things you like. You dine amid pleasing surroundings and a congenial bunch of boys. Come down and dine with us for the rest of the year. You'll like it.



Gooch's Cafe