

The Tar Heel

LEADING SOUTHERN COLLEGE TRI-WEEKLY NEWSPAPER



Published tri-weekly during the college year, except one issue Thanksgiving, the last two weeks of December (holiday period) and the last two weeks of March (examination period 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 \$3.00 out of town, for the college year.

Offices in the basement of Alumni Building.

WALTER SPEARMAN Editor
GEORGE EHRHART Mgr. Ed
MARION ALEXANDER Bus. Mgr.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT
Harry Galland Assistant Editor
John Holder Assistant Editor
John Mebane Assistant Editor
Will Yarborough Sports Editor

Reporters
Holmes Davis J. E. Dungan
Sherman Shore D. L. Wood
W. C. Dunn Dick McGlohon
J. P. Jones George Dannenbaum
C. B. McKethan E. F. Yarborough
J. C. Williams B. W. Whitton
E. H. Denning J. D. McNairy
J. E. Huffman J. P. Huskins
J. C. Eagles Henry Anderson

BUSINESS DEPARTMENT
Executive Staff
B. M. Parker Asst. Bus. Mgr.
Leonard Lewis Adv. Mgr.
Sidney Brick Asst. Adv. Mgr.
H. N. Patterson Collection Mgr.
T. R. Karriker Asst. Col. Mgr.
Gradon Pendergraft Circulation Mgr.
Ben Aycock Subscription Mgr.

Advertising Staff
Harry Latta H. Merrell
H. Jameson J. Schulman
Jim Harris J. G. deR. Hamilton, Jr.
Tom Badger W. G. Boger

Thursday, April 4, 1929

PARAGRAPHS

And now we may long for the "good old days" when elections were elections and not pink tea parties.

We sometimes enjoy siding with the minority, but in this set of elections there isn't even a respectable minority to become good losers. How can our campus leaders learn to be good sports if they aren't given a chance to lose occasionally?

It was rumored about the campus yesterday that the "Bridge of San Luis Rey" was just another one of those weekly pictures given for the Engineering School boys.

Since Dr. Booker's plan of student government was rejected by the Di and Phi, we suppose the campus is safe in retaining its present system.

And here is an item of news value: the Playmaker production offered this week-end does not include a play by Paul Green!

Go West, Young Man, And Discover Blue Ridge

One of the treats of the year is the opportunity of spending a week or ten days at the annual Y. M. C. A. conference of students held at Blue Ridge. There are gathered representative students from all the colleges of the South for a period of study, fellowship, and recreation.

Daily discussion groups and addresses go deep into the problems confronting American youth of today and seek to offer acceptable solutions worked out by the young men themselves. For leaders, men of national repute in various fields are secured, men who have had wide experience in dealing with young people and who possess an understanding of their problems. By means of these thought-provoking discussions the men in attendance at Blue Ridge are stirred to a broader interest in the life about them and are awakened to a greater sense of responsibility as to their own duties.

Study, however, is merely one phase of the conference. Of equal importance are the contacts made with young people from many different colleges and the give-and-take of personal experiences and individual interests. All the activities of the college campus are represented. Editor may talk to editor and thresh out his own particular questions.

Student body officials discuss the honor system as it functions at various schools. Y. M. C. A. men meet those engrossed in the same work and may profit by mutual confidences.

Athletics, too, comes in for a full share of conference attention. Baseball, swimming, tennis are provided for the boys and long hikes throughout the surrounding mountains are the order of the day—even to climbing Mount Mitchell, the highest point east of the Rockies!

And then there is the natural beauty of the landscape, the unsurpassed loveliness of those Blue Ridge mountains of western North Carolina. That alone is worthy of several weeks' vacation spent at the conference. The man who stands upon the porch of Robert E. Lee Assembly Hall and looks out across the mountains, the man who discovers all the beauties of Blue Ridge, is as fortunate as that discoverer of the Pacific Ocean, "stout Cortez" who gazed spellbound at the wondrous sight before him, "silent, upon a peak in Darien."

Sir Esme

Speaks to the Class

The class of 1929 is fortunate. It will have many memories to look back upon and treasure, and not the least will be the memory of the address by Sir Esme Howard at its Commencement Exercises.

The president's office, from which goes forth the invitation to commencement speakers, has always been careful to seek men who are particularly well-known and worth listening to. Recently, the invitations have been accepted by unusually qualified men.

Walter Lippman, an editor of the New York "World," was recently a Commencement Speaker. And now the jump has been made from the newspaper world to the sphere of diplomacy. Sir Esme Howard is one of the most important diplomats in Washington. He is respected not only because of the importance of his position as the highest representative of a great nation, but as a man who has achieved much more than the average public servant in the course of a lifetime. He is today perhaps the greatest influence for Anglo-American friendship.

The choice of the British Ambassador is undoubtedly pleasing to all who are concerned with the Commencement program. He is a man of importance for an important function, and what he says will be worth while. The Tar Heel and the campus as a whole appreciates the efforts of the President's office to secure men of the type of Sir Esme Howard to speak at the Commencement Exercises.

—H. J. G.

Where Two Heads Make Better Grades Than One

Not very long ago a report was printed in the TAR HEEL to the effect that a certain college would, after a given date, disbar married men and women from their classrooms. And now we have another report, this time stating that "Marriage improves students' grades" and that there is a greater tendency to settle down in the state of wedded bliss and attend more strictly to books.

It all seems to boil down to a question of time-wasting. The unmarried students, say the proponents of marriage, fritter away their time. Professor Herbert Howe of Oregon wants all his students married. "If they were all married they would waste fewer evenings, and marriage would be for the betterment of scholastic standing," he says.

And there is the touching domestic scene painted by Tom Barnhart of the University of Washington. "If I have anything to do, I can do it around meal-time. At home it's just a case of moving one chair from the study table to the dining room." In fact, Tom finds that being married has raised his grades from C's to B's and B's to A's.

There have been cases, however, of unmarried students getting along beautifully, and even making a few A's. True, there was no wife to lighten the burden by adjusting the

study light, and sharpening the pencils, and perhaps attending a lecture or so for hubby when he was temporarily indisposed. But somehow the unmarried students have gotten by without these helps.

As a bachelor, if you can and will call a person of our age that, we have found it very possible to spend an unwasted evening or so. We can even make a little trip of five hundred yards from the dining-table to the study-table, and still get some work done. In fact, we believe the unmarried student has the edge. The marriage enthusiasts fail to take into account the time spent evenings with the baby.

But then, we haven't given the real reason for going off the handle about this question of marriage for students. "Intelligence tests show that persons who get married have a higher intelligence rating," says the University of Oregon expert. Well, we don't know. The very fact that the married ones heeded the call of the wedding bells is against them, we believe.

—H. J. G.

Open Forum

BOOKER REPLIES

To The Editor of The Tar Heel:

Of course, I am very much pleased with the unlooked-for consideration given the bi-cameral plan of representative student government, and especially with the spirit in which the students have approached the problems it presents, as evidenced, for instance, by the recent Report of the Committee appointed by the Di Senate to investigate the student government question, Messrs. Dungan and Gilreath.

Their Report, though unfavorable to the bi-cameral plan, was all one could ask in fairness, thoughtfulness, and earnestness. It presented, however, to me, at least—two tantalizing defects: it lacked documentation—about as desirable in a fact-finding committee as is a voice in a singer;—and it doesn't join the issues as I see them in three of its strictures on the plan.

The Committee submits its report "after four weeks of exhaustive research, during which time interviews with interested students and faculty members have been freely resorted to, in addition to which your committee has drawn upon the experiences in student government of important colleges and universities throughout the entire United States, and having resource to mature judgment, and given weight to sound reason." Quite unconsciously, I am sure, the Committee creates a bias in favor of its Report, by passing judgment upon its own efforts—something that is customarily left to History. There, for instance, is where I am content to leave the question raised in the Tar Heel as to the paternity of the bi-cameral plan. The Committee might have told us, instead, whom it consulted, which systems it studied, and what it found in them to base its conclusions upon. Who does the approving or disapproving among our students and faculty members, for example, would make a considerable difference to me; and, to mention only one instance, the results of a similar plan that, I recently heard, has been followed at the University of Texas would interest me exceedingly. Documentation has its indispensable uses.

Conscious, in my own case, of possessing a plentiful lack of facts about student government, I hope the Committee will supplement its Report by giving the facts and the opinions, together with the names of those expressing them, that it collected.

One of the serious difficulties in debate is the joining of issues. And in this I wish to acknowledge my full share of responsibility.

1: The Committee (Paragraph a) objects to the plan on the ground that it would abolish Di and Phi in their present forms, in which forms their "primary objective" is "forensic." Leaving out of consideration now the matter of whether or not the debate of live questions is more or less "forensic" than the debate of hypothetical problems, leaving out now the matter of possible benefits of the plan to Di and Phi, I wish to point out, as I pointed out to the Committee, that the plan could be put in operation without drawing in Di and Phi, at all. I would have appreciated the Committee's reporting this among its findings; but, of course, the fault is mine; I should have divided my proposal into two proposals—first, that a bi-cameral plan be put into operation; second, that Di and Phi become the two chambers of

the proposed plan.

2: The Committee (Paragraph e) objects to the division of the campus into wards or precincts, on the ground that such a division would threaten the campus solidarity. But I didn't recommend that division. Realizing that the successful unit of representation would be a student inspiration, I avoided recommending any unit. I merely mentioned several possibilities. The ward was not among them; it came up in conversation with the Committee—as a possible unit.

The unit of representation is the most difficult problem in the plan. For instance, the comment has been made by several who possibly don't care to be quoted, that a ward unit of representation would insure the control of only one ward to the fraternity group instead of the control of the whole campus, which that group is supposed to exercise now. I don't know anything first hand about this phase of the whole question. The unit of representation is certainly a delicate matter; but it should be approached frankly and fearlessly and on the assumption that the fraternity group is capable of placing the good of the whole student body above any contemporary political advantage it may now hold. After all, the fraternity men are the same stuff fundamentally that the rest of the student body is made up of; money and social glamor alter only superficially the decencies.

3. The committee (Paragraph f) objects to the plan, on the ground that it aims at a sweeping abdication of practically all faculty supervision of student government. In the matter of supervision—whatever supervision there is—the plan contemplates neither more nor less for the present than now exists. Paragraph II of my proposal says: "That the student body thus organized make and execute the laws governing its life in all fields that may be relinquished to it from time to time by the faculty and trustees". Which says as plainly as I can say it where the ultimate control of all University activities lies, recognizing, at the same time, that student government, like all government, is not static, but dynamic, and should be adjusted to the capacity of the governed at any given stage of their development. This principle is tacitly acknowledged by the Committee when it recommends in Paragraph c of its own plan that the University release to the Student Council the control of bad checks and cheating.

The fundamental difference between the Committee and myself is one of political faith. It is revealed in a parenthesis of its Report (Paragraph c). Parenthesis are often the most revealing passages of a discussion. This passage reads: ("It is quite generally known that the smaller the group the more efficient and expeditious its business.") There you have it. The Committee wants expedition; I want participation. I think, with the Committee, that the smaller the body, the more expeditious the business—right on down the line to benevolent tyranny. But I believe, after the old-fashioned manner of Anglo-Saxon particularism now dying out, that no achievement in government is worth the stultification and atrophy of a people's self-governing energies.

The Committee recommends a modification of our present system of government. The same Tar Heel that carries its Report records the results of the recent student election. The news columns, funny columns, and leaders supply all the commentary necessary on our present system. I haven't a word to add to it. It shows that stultification set in long ago and atrophy has been now achieved. Government is a matter of taste; Personally, I shouldn't want the millennium at that price.

JOHN M. BOOKER

The Campus

By Joe Jones

The sophomores had a smoker in Swain Hall night before last. It was a good smoker; the expected music-makers failed to show up, their absence was apologized for by President Wyrick, the sandwiches and ice cream were happily eaten, being good and needing the apologies of no one. Class business was gotten to—that is, the sophomores were told that their dance tomorrow night was to be formal, but that if anyone didn't have a tux not to hesitate on that account, but to come on anyway in spite of his infirmity, and that "if you can't get a girl bring a co-ed." (Faithful quotation.)

Then there came a part in the program which set it above the usual programs of class smokers—a talk by Dr. Charlie Mangum, a talk so interesting that some 300 lit cigarettes dooped forgotten and unsmoked for long minutes in some 300 still hands.

And the man speaking — 58 years old, for 50 years in Chapel Hill, for 33 years connected with the University, for almost 40 years an alumnus of the University, and in all those 40 years he had never until Tuesday been asked to speak as an alumnus of Carolina.

Dr. Mangum took evident pride in making his first talk as an alumnus of his university; he told the boys new things about their school, in a new way spoke to them of honor and sportsmanship. And the boys were glad to listen to him, this man who forty years ago made his letter in football playing shoulder to shoulder with the late Dean Patterson, the great, quiet tackle. For thirty-five years Dr. Mangum has watched the student body of the University, and in his short talk Tuesday night he told something of what he has seen. There are few men who know the University as does Dr. Charlie, few men who speak of its history as clearly as he does.

He began his talk by telling of the conditions here when he was a student in the late eighties, when the only three dorms were Old West, Old South, and Old East, each room in Old South having an open fireplace and each room in the other two dorms having a stove, every boy having to buy his own stove, his own firewood, carry it to his room, and woe betide the man who roomed on the third floor. Moreover, there were no facilities whatsoever for bathing, and it was an old saying among the boys that "an itch is part of the curriculum." He told of the first intercollegiate football game in North Carolina played in 1888 at the Raleigh state fair, supposedly Carolina versus Wake Forest, but really Carolina versus Wake Forest and the town of Wake Forest. The center of Carolina's gridiron was where the gym now is, with a goal on the site of the law building and the other where the Playmakers Theatre now stands.

Dr. Charlie's talk led on to something else; here are some of the more

vital things he said:

"This old place in its crudeness developed a loyalty and faith which has held on through the years. There's something here we don't often speak of, but the men from this institution seem to have it to a pronounced degree.—Life on this campus has changed since the war; I see it everywhere, something that has weakened the fiber of the student body. It is largely a matter of sportsmanship, but I think it goes farther than that. This is the great difference—in the student body as a whole there is a lack of support of honesty! A student recently told me that if he informed on a man cheating, he himself would have to leave the University instead of the man doing the cheating. I believe he was about right. Deducing from what I've seen and heard I believe the honor system here is working in reverse. Speaking officially I wish to say that if you students don't do something about these conditions the honor system won't last out your generation on this campus. We have laid student government on your doorstep, and you aren't upholding it. It has gone about as far as self-respecting men can let it go."

Large Number Of Young People Hear Dr. Bernard Sunday

Dr. W. S. Bernard spoke to the Young Men's Bible class at the Methodist church Sunday morning on the subject of "Modern Gods". He raised the question as to whether or not the people of today really worship God, or other things as money, flesh and the devil.

A large crowd was out to hear Dr. Bernard. He formerly was teacher of this class and was very popular in church activities. Because of ill health he had to give up the class, but now he has returned and will probably be with the class for the rest of the year. Current questions and topics will be discussed each Sunday morning.

A DOLLAR AT BERMAN'S
WILL GET YOU MORE QUALITY AND
STYLE THAN ANYWHERE ELSE
BERMAN'S DEPT. STORE

Springtime Is Here

And a young man's fancy lightly turns, etc. Well, it does. And here's the thing to do about it. There will be two dances here this week-end. Take your best girl out in a U-Drive-It and enjoy the warm spring nights.

E. E. Pugh

DAY PHONE 3861

NIGHT PHONE 5706

The Carolina Playmakers

ANNOUNCE
THEIR

Final Home Bill Of Folk Plays

"Companion-Mate Maggie,"
by Helen Dortch

"Black Water," by Loretto Carroll Bailey

"The Lie," by Wilkerson O'Connell

PLAYMAKER THEATRE

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY NIGHTS
8:30 O'CLOCK

Admission \$1.00. Seats on sale and exchanged on season tickets at Sutton's Drug Store.