

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.

HAL V. WORTH Circulation 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. Yarborough K. C. Ramsay

Elbert Denning Sherman Shore

SPORTS EDITOR

Henry L. Anderson

ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITORS

Joe Eagles Crawford McKethan

REPORTERS

Howard Lee Frank Manheim

Holmes Davis Mary M. Dunlap

Louis Brooks Clyde Deitz

Charles Rose George Sherman

Kemp Yarborough Robert Hodges

Mary Price John Lathan

J. P. Tyson B. H. Whitton

Browning Roach Nathan Volkman

Al Lansford George Stone

Peggy Lintner Jack Riley

E. C. Daniel T. E. Marshall

W. A. Shulenberg George Wilson

G. E. French J. S. Weathers

Bernard J. Herkimer Jack Bessen

Browning Roach Russell Williams

Sadler Hayes Stanley Weinberg

J. G. deR. Hamilton, Jr.

Thursday, December 5, 1929

Tar Heel Topics

About the most convincing evidence of the liberalism of Bertrand Russell that we can imagine is the fact that he consented to speak in Swain hall.

From the reports of the Northern Tour we gather that politicking in Mexico, walking the streets of Chicago and motoring to Thanksgiving Day football games are perfectly safe pastimes in comparison to Play-making around these parts.

The Soviets Show Their Teeth

Moscow surprised the world Tuesday when it unexpectedly made its own peace with Mukden over the Chinese Eastern Railway dispute in Manchuria, thereby enhancing the international prestige of the Soviet Union immensely.

Especially severe were the rebuffs handed the United States for Secretary of State Stimson's note relative to the dispute, most of which, it must be admitted, were justified.

The masterful manner in which the Soviet government has conducted itself throughout the Chinese Eastern Railway affair is indicative of its potential power and diplomatic shrewdness.

Throughout the negotiations for a peaceable settlement of the dispute the American government has demonstrated a patronizing attitude of condescension toward both Russia and China.

As a nation we have come to have a somewhat exaggerated idea of our own international importance; too frequently our diplomats have im-

parted the impression that we expect all the nations of the world to kowtow to us, to bow down in humility before the majesty of our great wealth, our marvelous natural resources and our powerful army and navy.

Probably the independent attitude of the Soviet government toward our thinly-veiled commands during the Manchurian trouble will have a healthy effect upon Washington.

Another highly significant aspect of the Soviet Union's conduct in its difficulties with China is the augury of future world power that it predicates.

The Russians have advanced more rapidly during the past few years than any other nation.

They are building for the future; almost half of the wages and profits of Russian industry are utilized as new capital for the development of a greater Soviet Union.

It is true that living conditions among the workers are deplorable, due to the fact that a large proportion of their earnings are turned back to the state as new capital.

But these heroic measures cannot fail to build a strong nation. Russia is indeed the coming nation of the world.

The Soviets have shown their teeth to the great international powers, and these powers have found them strong and extremely sharp.

The Liberal In Our Midst

Much food for thought was contained in the lecture of Bertrand Russell, delivered here Tuesday night. His points were carefully but almost casually made, yet they left a profound impression.

Nothing very startlingly radical was said by the English philosopher, and there can be few who objected to his remarks or any part of them.

Bertrand Russell is known as a liberal thinker, so liberal that the faculty of the University of Wisconsin objected to his being allowed to speak before the Liberal Club of that institution.

During the war, his government considered him dangerous enough to send him to China, in order to get him out of England.

What Mr. Russell said can be chiefly characterized as common sense, the type of common sense which is the result of careful thinking and a long and full life.

His ideas appeared unusually felicitous and acceptable because they were the ideas most of us hold—but either cannot or are afraid to express.

We are delighted to hear someone set forth our thoughts, particularly a speaker who is acknowledged one of the foremost philosophers of our day.

If we find that we agree with the lecturer, we applaud him. In reality, we are applauding ourselves.

What Bertrand Russell has that most of us lack is courage—the courage of our convictions.

We may believe that we agree with him, that he is voicing the opinions and ideas we hold or should hold, but we leave him to set forth those opinions. True, most of us never bother to think about truth, beauty, morals, culture, or patriotism, but there are some who do among the students and faculty.

If we are a progressive institution, or if we can truly be characterized by that glib phrase, "the most liberal university in the south," then we should extend our liberality to the people on the campus, as well as the speakers we invite to it.

Therein lies the value of liberality—an actual practicing, unafraid liberality which allows free play for personal convictions and a chance to form the ideas which will later be the background of life.—H. J. G.

Readers' Opinions

OUR DEAD RELIGION

Editor The Daily Tar Heel:

That was a fine editorial in last Wednesday's Tar Heel entitled "This Question of Religion." At last some one has spoken with plain horse sense and has not been afraid to tell all he knows.

The idea of a freshman, a mere babe in arms, trying to preach to his mentally superiors—it was ridiculous.

Some people can't seem to realize that the days of purity, self-sacrifice, ideals and all that bunk are gone forever.

We are living in a modern world—a world of "get out of life what you can and let the devil take the hindmost."

Then too that phrase "doubtful pleasures." What could our freshman have meant by that.

Doesn't he know that all that sort of thing is relative. There is no such thing as evil or wickedness—merely the standards of the times in which one happens to be living.

We have one thing to be thankful for: fewer and fewer people who possess the innate ability to think are going to church.

It's a fine thing to tell children about love and righteousness; but when a boy goes to college, it is time that he woke up to the fact that he is a man.

He will soon see that if he ever expects to get anything out of life, if he ever expects to enjoy the real things of life and make a lot of money, why he has got to climb the ladder of true success by stepping on the faces of others, though it may seem hard to him at first.

Yes, "R. H." that article of yours was great. We would all be a whole lot better off here in Chapel Hill if everybody would use any common horse sense he too might happen to have.

Congratulations again. Forever, A DISILLUSIONED SENIOR.

ANOTHER WORD ON RELIGION

Editor The Daily Tar Heel:

The very naive but utterly unconvincing editorial published in the Tar Heel last Wednesday and headed "This Question of Religion" is very illustrative of a group among us who would seek to justify their every action by calling it modern, and who would scoff at those who love religion as dogmatic Puritans or sad-faced Quakers.

The author stated that stories of faith, divine love, and righteousness in the modern world are fables and admonishments that are absurd.

It seems just possible that such stories might not affect everybody in the same way. He went on to say that there is no place for monastic seclusion.

As his letter was written in opposition to a previous letter advocating going to church once a week, we wonder if that is what he meant by monastic seclusion; or just what the devil did he mean.

He then said that religion is being infused more and more with common sense in spite of the combative forces of the pulpit.

This leads some of us to wonder when he last saw a pulpit. It would lead those of us who have had that opportunity to the unfortunate conclusion that it was some time during the middle ages.

He stated further that we have ceased to draw stringent lines between good and bad. Some of us wonder if those who avail themselves of this convenience wouldn't find it more convenient to remove the lines altogether and justify themselves by their worn out slogan that there isn't any Hell.

The author spoke of the absurd disputes between one Protestant denomination and another. This leads us to wonder whether he read of these disputes out of some medieval history book or whether he opened his eyes to life around him.

If he had followed the latter path it seems just possible: that he might have seen all Protestant denominations at Chapel Hill uniting on various occasions in common services in Memorial hall, that he might have seen all the student societies of the various denominations meeting together to discuss their common aim, that he might have been surprised to see the number of Christians of one denomination attending the services of another.

The author then spoke of the big business church in which the financial magnate leads the congregation and adds, somewhat sarcastically, "What a group this comprises!"

There are many of us who would rather have had him say openly just what a group he does think this comprises. If it were possible with his apparent knowledge of churches to state the exact figures it is probable that this group would not appear so enormous.

That some few churches may have in their congregations those who take pride in an outward show of wealth and generosity, and that these individuals may deceive many is not denied; but this is neither a general rule nor the teaching of

The College Honor System

ARTICLE IV.

Some Specific Problems

It is the hope of the National Student Federation that all colleges in the United States will give careful attention to the question of the Honor System and make an honest endeavor to do something of value about the question of honesty among students.

A keen critic of student affairs and college administration has penned the statement "that the college that winks at dishonesty in scholastic work and other student relations is doomed."

Colleges must assume the responsibility of inculcating into the students firm principles of right dealing with their fellows.

But the problem is not to know what the weakness is, but it is to determine how best to remedy this weakness.

A large majority of the student representatives at the Fourth Annual Congress of the N. S. F. A. last December expressed confidence in the uplifting power of the Honor System.

Therefore, the N. S. F. A. recommends this system to colleges that do not have it; and to colleges that do have it, the N. S. F. A. expresses an intense desire that they exert every possible effort to make the system as efficient as possible.

But the question arises: "Should every college attempt to institute the Honor System?" To do so would hardly display wisdom.

There are some colleges in which the Honor System is not needed, e. g., institutions in which all the examinations are conducted orally.

There are others in which certain local conditions militate against its successful operation.

But in the vast majority of the state, city, denominational, privately endowed, and teachers' colleges, as well as the normal schools, there is opportunity for much development in this field.

However, before any college attempts to adopt the system, the field should be thoroughly prepared by faculty members and student leaders.

There is reason to believe that this was done prior to its adoption at the University of Virginia, even, in the summer of 1842.

Even that institution, where the Honor System works certainly and swiftly, and where there is a tradition against cheating that has existed for nearly a hundred years, does not urge a col-

lege to adopt the system before the field has been thoroughly prepared. They say: "We have the amplest faith in the Honor System and believe that with proper care it could be successfully introduced into almost every American university and would be a salutary influence; but before beginning its introduction, we urge thoughtful, thorough and patient preparation of the field:

"1. By such general, pervasive conferences with the students as would produce practically unanimous conviction of the merit of the system in the minds of the student body.

"2. By the election to the Honor Committee of men and women who enjoy the amplest confidence of their fellow-students as to integrity, courage, sanity and sagacity.

"3. By agreement upon impartial and inevitable execution of such a uniform penalty for violation of the honor code as the Honor Committee shall impose, with no mitigation, pardon or suspension of sentence.

"4. By the rigorous exclusion from the purview of the committee of all offenses which are not true breaches of honor.

"5. By securing the unanimous consent of the president, professors and officers of the University to cry hands off and leave the student body the whole responsibility for dealing with well-defined breaches of honor.

"To neglect any one of these five precautions will be, in our opinion, to invite shipwreck," says this great institution.

The installation or administration of the Honor System requires much work that is spiritual, inspirational and intangible. The students must be educated concerning principles of honor. It must be shown them that if they are trusted, but that if they abuse the trust, they will surely be punished.

The work of an Honor Committee should be educational instead of corrective; it should be their aim to prevent dishonesty, rather than to punish it.

One thing is beyond question. Before an Honor System can function successfully, a spirit of honor must be inculcated into the students.

An educational program extending probably over a period of three or four years will be necessary. A strong tradition in favor of the Honor System is its greatest asset.

Christianity which says that the widow casting in her mite put in more than all the rest. The author continued in saying that religion will never be the idealistic dream one pictures in childhood. Whether this be true in the case of the author we do not know, but there are many of us who wonder if this gentleman isn't taking just a little too much for granted in assuming that religion is an idealistic dream to everybody and that those who hold contrary views are children.

He stated that it will always be an idealistic dream because human nature is quarrelsome, trivial, petty, intolerant, and unthinking. Are these qualities in human nature arguments against religion or do they all the more emphasize its need? Did the author omit one important quality in human nature, "Love"?

A SOPHOMORE.

The Campus



By Joe Jones

Of a recent afternoon Professor Koch and a small group of students were told by Dean Hibbard the difference between providence and fate.

This is how it came about: Dean Hibbard and Professor Koch and several students came out of Old South and got into Dean Hibbard's brand new Ford. The dean choked the engine several times before he got it started, and Professor Koch chuckled.

"Don't laugh," said Dean Hibbard, "or I'll tell about your backing episode."

"Oh, I'll tell that myself," said Professor Koch. "Boys, Dr. Hibbard and I once had a narrow escape together. One day before Bingham hall and the new library had been built I parked my car among the trees down back of Murphey. Dr. Hibbard was with me when I got in to go home, and he was tickled when I was unable to make the car back after I had started the engine. It wouldn't budge. 'Well, she's simply got to back out of here,' I said, as I stepped on the gas quite heavily. She backed out, all right. She gave a sudden leap and went backward through the trees at full speed. It was certainly only by the grace of providence that we came through without hitting a tree."

"Calling that an act of providence," said Dean Hibbard, "reminds me of an experience I had in a classroom of Old East some years ago. You know Old East was once a classroom building with three big rooms on each floor. I was teaching an English class in one of these rooms one day with the members of the class scattered about here and there over the big room. I asked them to move over to the right side of the room as I could, then address them better. So all the boys on the left changed their seats, and you would never guess what happened as they sat down. Well, the ceiling on the left caved in and crashed down on the seats the boys had just vacated. Now I call that an act of providence. Of course if the ceiling on the right had fallen in that would have been fate."

The young lady who sat in the tan alligator upholstered Isotta Fraschini parked on Franklin street for a few minutes on a recent afternoon may have felt like she was in a showcase, but she didn't appear that way. In fact, she was nonchalance supreme as the crowd of what she must have thought were boorish oafs gathered on the sidewalk and naively stared at her and her magnificent motor ultra deluxe etc. Her escort, too, when he put in his stylish Park Avenue appearance, was serenely oblivious of the gaping crowd. He expertly backed the great roadster out into the middle of the street, and drove around to the D. K. E. house, where he was visiting a relative. The car, by the way, cost about as much as thirty new Fords, something like fifteen or twenty thousand dollars.

What Congress ought to enact is a tariff to end tariffs.

STYLEPLUS TOPCOATS \$29.50 and \$32.50 Values Being Closed Out at \$19.95 BERMAN'S DEPT. STORE