

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.

GLENN HOLDER, Editor
WILL YARBOROUGH, Mgr. Editor
MARION ALEXANDER, Bus. Mgr.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS
John Mebane, Harry Galland

ASSISTANT EDITORS
J. Elwin Dungan, J. D. McNairy
Joe Jones, B. C. Moore

J. C. Williams, City Editors

E. F. Yarbrough, K. C. Ramsay
Elbert Denning, Sherman Shore

SPORTS EDITORS
Jo: Eagles, Crawford McKethan
Henry L. Anderson

REPORTERS
Howard Lee, Frank Manheim
Holmes Davis, Stowe Moody
Louis Brooks, Clyde Deitz
Charles Rose, George Sheram
Lawrence Harris, Robert Hodges
Mary Price, John Lathan
J. P. Tyson, B. H. Whitton
Browning Roach, Nathan Volkman
Al Lansford, George Stone
Joe Carpenter, Lawrence Miller
Peggy Lintner, Jack Riley
E. C. Daniel, T. E. Marshall
W. A. Shulenberg, R. T. Martin
G. E. French, J. S. Weathers
Stanley Weinberg

Sunday, October 27, 1929

The Ideal Week-end

President James Rowland Angell of Yale has launched a movement to compel college students to remain on their respective campuses on week-ends. In his opening address to the Yale undergraduates, Dr. Angell declared that "the men who systematically withdraw from New Haven each week-end are not only depriving themselves of the opportunity to make valuable friendships on the campus, but they are subjecting themselves to fatigue and excitement which brings them back jaded and unfit to do their college work on Monday." He intimated that University authorities might be forced to curb such activities by requiring one or two registrations every Sunday by Yale undergraduates.

Every week-end a large percentage of the Carolina students betake themselves to Greensboro, Raleigh and other nearby cities where the female of the species congregate in large numbers. The campus is almost deserted on Saturdays and Sundays when no major athletic contests are scheduled here.

Without doubt the scholastic level of the University would be improved if the undergraduates could be persuaded or compelled to remain on the Hill over the week-ends. Saturdays and Sundays offer by far the best opportunities of the week for study and recreation. On the other hand, the undergraduate mind, released from the grind of class attendance, is prone to shake itself free of scholastic incumbrances during the two days of freedom, and to turn toward more diverting forms of activity than those concerned with books and compositions. Social affairs and recreational activities are uppermost in the thoughts of Carolina men on week-ends, quite naturally. Since opportunities for such activities are lamentably few in Chapel Hill, it is expected that a large proportion of the students should spend their week-ends, in other places which offer far greater inducements to the recreation seeker.

We doubt seriously that President Angell's plan of compulsory presence on the campus during week-ends would be either practicable or desirable here. It would be a decided infringement upon student prerogative, which

all undergraduates are inclined to defend zealously. Perhaps the better solution of the problem here would be to offer more Sunday band concerts, social affairs, such as houseparties and dances, attractive programs at local churches, even performances by the Playmakers and intramural athletic events. And if the narrow-minded Blue Advocates could be prevented from protesting too vociferously, Sunday movies and entertainment program performances would be highly desirable. In our opinion two days of leisurely social and recreational activities on the Hill, with just enough work on the affairs of the curriculum to prevent the mind from disrupting its scholastic continuity, comprises the ideal week-end.

The Taylor Society

Every student of economics knows who Frederick W. Taylor was and what he did. His methods of personnel management in industry are still recognized—fifteen years after his death—by economists and business leaders as the most efficient ever devised. He was the first man to look upon personnel management as a science.

Taylor was interested in all phases of industry in so far as improving efficiency is concerned. It is said that he used over twenty-five thousand tons of steel in demonstrating to the iron men the increased efficiency to be gained by scientific steel cutting. His very nature was of the inquisitive sort. He even eliminated nightmares by which he was troubled by fastening to his back a contraption which made him sleep on his sides. (He was visited by nightmares only while he was sleeping on his back.) Taylor, thus equipped by temperament, offered some plan for the improvement of everything with which he came in contact.

It is after this man that the Taylor Society, a national organization for the promotion of efficiency in production and of scientific personnel management, is named. A local student chapter of this society was organized last year largely through the efforts of Professor G. T. Schwenning, of the commerce school. Last year's activities, according to leaders of the group, justified the bringing here of the chapter, and this year's interest has been fairly satisfactory.

However, the Taylor Society, in bringing to the campus industrial leaders of national importance, merits the credit of the University and deserves large membership among the students. It is the type of club which is composed entirely of members who are earnestly interested in the activities of their organization.

Readers' Opinions

THE DRAMATIC CRITIC ANSWERS HIS CRITICISERS

To the Editor:

May I, through your column, express my thanks for the kind attention of A NEW YORKER in criticising my column. His letter was very interesting, and shrieks for itself.

I should like to state, though, that my paragraphs in the Carolina Magazine were not, quite obviously, criticisms of some current plays, as he thinks, nor were they meant to be. (I should hardly try to write a criticism of a play in one short paragraph.) They were simply my personal impressions of what I had seen.

Since A NEW YORKER's examples of what dramatic criticism should be are hardly above the level of press notices, I can not accept them as models of writing. And as for coinciding

one's opinions with those of the newspaper men whom A NEW YORKER so admires, I prefer to form my own, right or wrong. Very sincerely yours, MILTON GREENBLATT.

EDITOR MEBANE ANSWERS

Editor of The Daily Tar Heel:

With interest I read in the last issue of the Tar Heel the open forum letter addressed to "the dramatic critic of The Carolina Magazine." Somewhat hesitant at first as to whether I should answer this letter, I concluded that, as the writer, "A New Yorker," was so obviously at a loss to understand the purpose of this column on the drama, I should, in fairness to him, point out the fallacies in his conclusions.

I asked Mr. Greenblatt, previous to writing his column, if he would contribute to the Magazine a few notes on the drama. I further suggested that these notes be limited to one or two sentences each in order that the appraisal of a number of plays might be presented. This, Mr. Greenblatt did. As to giving a critical and finished review of each of the plays mentioned, that was out of the question; lack of space prohibited expansive criticism. Appraisals parallel to Mr. Greenblatt's notes may be found in "Judge" and "Life" in which magazines the critics present the name of a play or picture and state whether or not it is worth attending. These statements as to the worth of the plays are, of course, their own opinions. Mr. Greenblatt saw each play he mentioned, formed his own conclusions about them, and presented his estimations to the campus through his column. Now whether or not "A New Yorker" agrees with the critic as to the worth of the plays makes little difference; their estimations are solely a matter of individual opinions.

It might be also argued that it is useless to present appraisals of many plays, when, by taking one or two, the critic could do a much more thorough job. However, as this particular treatment of the drama will not be a regular feature of the Magazine, it was concluded that it might be well to set an appraisal on a number of those which the critic saw during the summer.

The writer of yesterday's letter attempted, I fear, to indulge rather crudely in personalities. He implied that Mr. Greenblatt was in the habit of attending third-rate vaudeville. As to his remarks concerning various phrases which the Magazine critic used, I state again that Mr. Greenblatt attempted no polished and finished criticisms.

Now perhaps the main fallacy in the open forum letter under discussion is that the writer censured Mr. Greenblatt for daring to disagree with the New York critic! To say that this bit of fault-finding is remarkably absurd would be "putting" it quite too mildly. May I refer you to the last sentence of paragraph two.

It rather amused me that, after "A New Yorker" confessed that he was "insensible to the fine points of dramatic criticism" and that it was far from him "to point out the merits" of Journey's End, he goes so far as to forget these statements and to present a rather lengthy criticism of two plays. But perhaps he should not be censured for his "absent-mindedness;" that would be an attempt to place him on the same level with a much-abused type of college professor.

I hope that I have pointed out, to a certain extent, "A New Yorker's" errors.

JOHN MEBANE
Editor Carolina Magazine.

PANNED AGAIN!

To the Editor:

After reading A New Yorker's letter in yesterday's Tar Heel, I feel an irresistible urge to take up the job of razzing the Carolina Magazine's dramatic critic, with the hope that the magazine will benefit by my humble efforts.

To attempt to cover the field of "Drama and the Arts" in one column, as Mr. Greenblatt does, is somewhat bold. The superficial way in which he disposed of the New York theatre in last week's issue shows how futile the attempt was. "Street Scene," the current Pulitzer play, for example, the critic announced as "a well written piece of journalism." I'm sure Elmer Rice is very, very thankful for Mr. Greenblatt's condescending approval!

"Let Us Be Gay" Mr. Greenblatt considers "fairly amusing"; but it would have been better, thinks he, "if the author had not tried to make her characters speak like sophisticated English ladies and gentlemen." For the frowning critic's benefit, the author not only "tries" but succeeds in picturing "sophisticated English ladies and gentlemen." Actual, live, flesh and blood Englishmen speak as Rachel Crothers' characters do! The critic should go and hear some real Englishmen speak before he criticizes Miss Crothers' delineation of them.

The criticism of "Journey's End" and "Bird in Hand" has been sufficiently denounced. In his comments on three other plays—"Candle-Light," "It's a Wise Child," and "Porgy"—the Carolina Magazine's critic displays ignorance, poor judgment, and variations from the common verdict equal to those shown in his comments on the previously-mentioned plays.

Now that I have worked off my ire, however, I should like to say that I don't think the fault was really Mr. Greenblatt's, but the Magazine's itself, that the Drama column was so rotten. What in the name of the gods is the use in reviewing plays five hundred miles off in New York! Very few of the students will ever get a chance to see them; why waste paper in reviewing them! But if they must be reviewed, why not devote a little more space to the reviews? You can't comment on twelve plays in three-quarters of a column without making an ass out of yourself. The Carolina Magazine has tried and has succeeded. ANOTHER DAMYANKEE.

THE THEATRE

(By Peggy Lintner)

A thoroughly enjoyable program of one act plays was presented for all introspectors, aimless wanderers and genuine theatre goers Thursday, Friday and Saturday evenings by the Playmakers. The fact that the audience was consistently appreciative throughout the run of the plays is a tribute to the organization, participants and management for it is evident that those seeing the Playmakers for the first time viewed the performance with a severely critical eye.

Paul Green's No 'Count Boy was a potent playlet and an impressionable bit of theatre. It was like "youth's song of yearning" embodied in a Negro spiritual, the refrain of which produced a sympathetic note in even the least imaginative person. Phoebe Harding, in the role of Pheele, was technically good but her sincerity wavered. On the whole, she seemed coached up to rather than down to her role. Holmes Bryson, The No 'Count Boy, got the feeling of the play and did an excellent piece of work save for slightly

College Life



The moon exerts a strong influence over the TIDE—and the UNTIED

With The Churches

Sunday, October 27

Baptist
O. I. Olive, Pastor
9:45 a. m.—Sunday School.
11:00 a. m.—Morning Services:
Sermon, "The Might of Motive," Mr. Olive.
7:00 p. m.—Young Peoples Union: Interdenominational Meeting.
8:00 p. m.—Evening Services:
Sermon, "A Life on My Hands," Mr. Olive.
Chapel of the Cross
A. S. Lawrence, Rector
8:00 a. m.—Holy Communion.
10:00 a. m.—Student Bible Class: U. T. Holmes, Teacher.
11:00 a. m.—Morning Service and Sermon: Mr. Lawrence.
6:00 p. m.—Meeting of St. Hilda's Guild: The Rectory.
7:00 p. m.—Y. P. S. L., Interdenominational Meeting at the Baptist church.
8:00 p. m.—Evening Service:
Organ Solo, N. O. Kennedy, Sermon, Mr. Lawrence, Tea will be served at the Parish House from 4:30 to 6:00 p. m.
The United Church (Christian)
B. J. Howard, Minister
9:45 a. m.—Sunday School:

Grady Leonard, Supt., Paul McConnell, Teacher of Men's Bible Class.
11:00 a. m.—Morning Services:
Sermon by Mr. Howard.
Methodist
C. E. Rozzelle, Pastor
9:45 a. m.—Sunday School:
Young Men's Bible Class, Dr. Bernard, Freshman Bible Class, Mr. Phillips.
11:00 a. m.—Morning Services:
Sermon, "Fact and Faith," Mr. Rozzelle.
8:00 p. m.—Evening Services:
Sermon, "Might, Power and Spirit," Mr. Rozzelle.
The Epworth League will join the other young people's societies in a union meeting in the Baptist church at 7:00 p. m.
Presbyterian
W. D. Moss, Pastor
9:45 a. m.—Sunday School.
11:00 a. m.—Morning Services:
Sermon by Mr. Moss.
7:45 p. m.—Evening Services:
Sermon by Mr. Moss.
8:45 p. m.—Young People's Social, Social Rooms at Presbyterian church.

insufficient restraint in the more emotional moments. Too, one noted that his voice and dialect suffered by contrast with that of Howard Bailey who took the part of Pheele's beau. Mr. Bailey understood his part well and played in accordingly.
Magnolia's Man, a comedy by Gertrude Wilson Coffin, is based on the life of a people found in the Carolina highlands and while it is most appreciated by persons from those parts, it is equally interesting to those unfamiliar with the locality. The play was interesting in its simplicity and sincerity. The humor of the swift dialogue was more like the sparkle of a mountain spring than like that of white wine—however, duly appreciated. Mrs. Coffin, in the role of Mis' Tish, was vivid and except for slight inconsistency in the work of Muriel Wolf, who took the part of Magnolia, the acting was on an even plane.
The theme of Being Married, Catherine Nolen's play of society life, is neither elegant nor unusual. It is pleasantly simple, merely giving us a picture of young people, earnest, vital, wise and otherwise—taking up

marriage vows and trying gallantly to make a go of it. It is estimated that they succeed, for a noble wife makes the traditional sacrifice and consents to give up the life she craves for the life an enterprising husband—still new in the art of husbanding—can offer her. And she is sincere. She loves him. However, one feels the pangs of curiosity and could care for an insight into affairs a few years hence.
Elzada Feaster, in the role of the wife, did not quite orient herself. Looking wistful was her strong suit. She spoke too quickly at times, lacked stage presence, waxed melodramatic and looked charming. Her work shows promise.
Milton Wood, as Jim, the model husband, was well motivated. His restraint was marked—too marked at times. The members of the Ladies Club spoke their lines well but were slow to fill in the gaps and take up their cues. Anne Melick and Howard Bailey did the most convincing work. They were not strained and seemed perfectly at home on the stage.