

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

Robert Hodges J. D. McNairy
Joe Jones B. C. Moore

CITY EDITORS

E. F. Yarbrough K. C. Ramsay
Elbert Denning J. E. Dungan

SPORTS EDITOR

Henry L. Anderson

ASSISTANT SPORTS EDITORS

Browning Roach J. G. Hamilton, Jr.

REPORTERS

Holmes Davis	Kemp Yarbrough
Louis Brooks	Clyde Deitz
Charles Rose	George Sherman
Mary Price	Frank Manheim
J. P. Tyson	B. H. Whitton
Nathan Volkman	J. M. Little
E. C. Daniel	Bill Arthur
W. A. Shulenberger	George Wilson
G. E. French	Harold Cone
Sadler Hayes	Jack Bessen
W. W. Taylor	Everard Shemwell
Vass Shepherd	Ted Newland
B. H. Barnes	Jack Riley
M. M. Dunlap	John Patrie

Tuesday, January 14, 1930

"Somebody Ought To Do Something About It"

Every few days complaints are voiced in campus conversations and through the editorial and Readers' Opinions columns of the Tar Heel against undesirable conditions in existence on the campus. Stealing is said to be widely prevalent, the dormitories are represented as strongholds of rowdiness, cheating on examinations is alleged to be the rule rather than the exception, and gambling dens are reported to be flourishing throughout the campus. Audiences at the local theatre and at entertainment programs on the campus are described as utterly devoid of artistic appreciation, addicted to manifestations of carnality and vulgarity. Student reading outside of that required on courses is declared to be limited almost entirely to periodicals catering to devotees of the obscene; even those few who read literature are said to confine their interests to pornography.

Although there is a modicum of truth in these complaints, they are vastly over-exaggerated. A few instances of poker playing of the habitual and obnoxious type were revealed recently, unwarrantably boisterous conduct is occasional in the dormitories, and thefts are not unusual. But the interested observer is impressed by the number of students who have genuine literary tastes. Although there are instances of boorishness at public performances in Chapel Hill, they are almost invariably confined to a small group. Cheating is by no means unknown, but it is not nearly so common as one might infer from campus gossip. The epidemic of petty thievery which occurred before the holidays could probably be traced to a half-dozen or so individuals.

All of us are aware that the student body includes quite a few undesirable. We are inclined, however, to overestimate their numbers and unduly emphasize their misdemeanors. Quite frequently an insignificant minority are hailed as representative of the majority. Two or three individuals may create disturbances in a dormitory which render studious pursuits almost impossible. Yet many of

the other occupants of the dormitory will conclude that a large portion of its residents are rowdies and reprobates.

We vociferously lament the existence of undesirable conditions—"somebody ought to do something about it," we wail. But when it is suggested that we do something about it ourselves we hurriedly change the subject.

Often an individual moves out of a dormitory because he "can't stand the noise." He writes a letter to the Tar Heel bemoaning the lack of quiet in the dormitory, but even though he is perfectly aware of the identity of the disturbing element he seldom considers revealing their names to the proper authorities.

The "somebody ought to do something about it" attitude is characteristic of most men, but it is rarely productive of real results. Acknowledgment of existing evils, willingness to face the facts, are necessary prerequisites to any attempt at improvement, but they must be accompanied by positive action. Names of offenders must be revealed to authorities if their efforts to improve conditions are to be effective.

Systematizing The Day

This queer type of animal, the collegian, about which so much has been said and written, is, according to general observations and most authorities, a lover of freedom and liberty. Whether liberty is a real passion in his make-up, or merely a fad among his comrades, we won't attempt to say. It is nevertheless present, and it exerts no small influence in shaping collegiate attitudes.

Imbued with such a passion for liberty, he despises regularity and system. He tries to arrange his schedule so that he may sleep late in the mornings, and when he does have early classes, sleeping through them is not an uncommon occurrence. He delights in courses which do not require of him specific work each day. He likes to do, and usually does, things which he wants to do: recreation and pleasure seldom interfere with his work; he studies when he feels like doing so, which means at short intervals; and if he does not want to do certain things which are required of him, he is certainly not coerced. He eats at irregular hours. His actions and manner of living being such, his academic work suffers and his personal development is retarded.

What is lacking is a proper division of time. Nobody can accomplish a certain amount of work each day if he cannot divide his time and put amusement, recreations, and bull sessions in their proper spheres. We have in mind a graduate of last year's law school. Besides making perhaps the most brilliant scholastic record in his class, he worked in a dean's office before and after class hours, and he continued his undergraduate athletic activities. Those who knew him best said that the secret of his success lay in his system of planning each day: meals, sleep, study, work, and recreation—all at a specific time every day in the week.

Of course system and regularity, if we should spell them with capital letters, are monotonous and colorless. But a little more system in the day's proceedings and a little more regularity in doing things would do no ill to the local collegian, as far as we can see. He must have some method in going about things if he is to make his four years here count for much, and certainly no time is more opportune for adopting new methods of procedure than the present, the beginning of a new quarter. —B. M.

Readers' Opinions

THE OTHER CHEEK IS TURNED

Editor of the Tar Heel:

I have heard a great deal about the slicker robberies, but this is the first time that I have heard of anyone stealing the coat to a suit and leaving the pants and vest behind. Sunday morning sometime between eight and twelve o'clock some moronic and malicious person entered my room in the Klutz building and took the coat to a practically new suit, leaving the pants and vest.

As I do not imagine that the coat will do the person any good, and I know the pants and vest are of no value to me, if the person in question will call by my room in the Klutz building I will be more than glad to let him have the remainder of the suit.

I am in my room from seven on in the evening.

M. M. J.

URGES MORE FRATERNITIES

Editor of the Daily Tar Heel:

The writer is a new student at Carolina, and has been rather disappointed. He comes from some distance with perhaps a wrong idea of some of the college institutions.

One of these is the fraternity system. He can see great good in it, the association of a group of men with common interests and ideals, mutual help, and friendship.

The writer has not received an invitation to join a fraternity. He does not feel an inferiority complex as a result, as some are said to feel. But this is because he feels that he is as good a man as the average fraternity man, and realizes there is but one reason why he is not benefitting by the advantages of a fraternity, viz., there are three times as many men as the fraternities have room for. Some must be "outside."

It does not seem to be the fraternity idea to build up a feeling that a student is "all right" if he's in, and otherwise if he is not. The remedy would seem to lie in the creation of more fraternities.

The writer would be glad to know why this is not done. Perhaps other "Tar Heel" readers could inform him.

Thanking you, I am,
Frank Adamson

THE DORMITORY STORES PRESIDENT RESPONDS

After reading the editorial in the Saturday issue of the Tar Heel under the heading "Why the Dormitory Stores Should be Abolished," we feel that a few corrections should be made to a few things brought up in that article. As everyone knows the dormitory store is an experiment that was put into effect last fall by the University authorities for the purpose of eliminating the room-to-room canvassing that heretofore has had no restrictions. It was thought that this plan would greatly decrease the wholesale thievery which has been gradually gaining momentum in the past few years. According to all reports from dormitory residents everybody is pleased with the new plan.

The merchants of Chapel Hill have many objections to the stores in the dormitories. Some have gone so far as to say that each store makes a daily profit of \$15 per day. Others say that nothing is being made by the agents, but that it is merely a waste of time to the operators. Neither of these statements is true. We make a profit in pro-

portion to the other self-help work available. We do not make such a profit to justify the fight being made by the merchants. Most of the money that is taken by the dormitory agents is put back into circulation here in Chapel Hill either directly or indirectly.

We must grant that several statements made by the Tar Heel writer accurately described the situation as it existed before the opening of this quarter. Most of the stores did handle punch boards then, but by University regulation it has been abolished. Before the end of the fall term there were rumors on the campus of whiskey being sold in one or possibly two of the dormitory stores. This condition has been removed and we trust it will never again appear in a dormitory store.

Sanitary conditions must be kept in accordance with the state laws. These stores have been inspected at intervals during the year and the inspector has made his reports to the buildings department.

The statement was also made by the writer last Saturday that a number of men were operating the stores who were really not self-help men, and that a number of stores had been sold to other boys by the men who were originally appointed by the authorities. We wish to ask the Tar Heel to cooperate with us and prove that such conditions really exist, and also aid us in eliminating any other evil that has grown out of the running of the stores which we have overlooked and which has come under the observation of any other person. We realize that the dormitory stores are not functioning perfectly as yet, but because of a few errors must they be condemned and abolished without a fair trial? They work for the best interests of the student. They were founded on that principle, and as long as they exist they will be run according to this principle.

J. H. SHEFFIELD,

President of Dormitory Stores.

A DORMITORY STORE-KEEPER ANSWERS

Editor of the Tar Heel:

In order that correct information may be given the readers of the Tar Heel, several erroneous ideas contained in Saturday's issue about the dormitory stores should be corrected.

The impression left by the writer of the article on dormitory stores was undoubtedly that such stores, operated under the supervision of the University, are virtually gambling dens and boot-leg joints. Due to the fact that the stores for the fall quarter were experiments many things were allowed to go that time would correct. Doubtless, the writer of Saturday's article was not aware of the changes that have been made.

University officials put the ban on all gambling devices long ago. If any exist in any store I do not know of it, and I am closely associated with the stores. Should any agent keep one, he holds his job at a peril.

The agents of one dormitory are reputed to have either directly or indirectly dealt in liquor. Their agencies have been revoked.

From observation, one can see that the stores are kept neat and clean. They are periodically inspected by a government health officer.

It is true that the stores are not paying taxes, but a great deal, not all, of the taxable merchandise is bought from a retailer who had already paid the

tax on the goods.

Arguments that the dormitory stores are keenly competing with the merchants of Chapel Hill are not convincing. Probably the merchants are experiencing a bad business year; but what business men are not? Almost nothing, except drinks, are being handled in the stores that was not handled by canvassers heretofore. How many boys will walk down the street for a drink at night? The small profit made by the dormitory store agents is evidence that no large amount of business is taken from down-town merchants. In fact, as was said in Saturday's article, "some boys have given over their stores to others" (though I have no information that this statement is true). If the agent was making any profit he would not sell his concession. The fact that "most of the revenue in many stores is made from the punch boards" goes to show that little business is taken from Chapel Hill merchants.

In the past the University has had a serious problem in trying to deal with stealing. Dozens of strangers coming through the dormitories every day made the detection of the thief next to impossible. As many agents calling in each room made un-interrupted study impossible, it was necessary that a new method of merchandising in the dormitories be made. Under the present system no agents are allowed to canvass the dormitories (newspaper representatives excepted). By handling pressing and shoe mending, plus a few refreshments and every day necessities, many needy students are able to earn a part of their expenses. The services above mentioned are rendered the occupants as lessees and the University as lessor.

Lack of experience on the part of the University and its store agents in an endeavor of this kind leaves many problems yet to be solved. But experiments here to date, and of other universities in the past, warrant a prophecy that the dormitory store plan will prove a great benefit to the University and its students.

H. B. P.

At The Carolina

January promises to be "Greater Picture Month" at the Carolina theatre, judging from the fine run of bookings announced yesterday by Manager E. Carrington Smith.

Marion Davies comes on Tuesday in "Not So Dumb," and the ever popular team of Farrell-Gaynor in the big hit "Sunny Side Up" will be the feature on Wednesday.

The Duncan Sisters, famous in vaudeville, come in "It's a Great Life" on Thursday. Another popular team, Jean Arthur and Buddy Rogers are the stars of "Halfway to Heaven," coming on Friday, and on Saturday it will be William Haines in "Navy Blues."

The bookings for the remainder of the month show a corresponding number of hits and favorite stars. Outstanding among pictures to be shown during that time will be:

Harold Lloyd in "Welcome Danger," Conrad Nagel in "Dynamite," Ted Lewis and His Band in "Is Everybody Happy?," William Boyd in "His First Command," Douglas Fairbanks and Mary Pickford in "Taming of the Shrew," Ramon Novarro in "The Devil May Care," Norma Talmadge in "New York Nights," Helen Morgan in "Applause," Norma Shearer in "Their Own Desire," Ruth Chatterton in "Laughing Lady," Maurice Chevalier in "Love Parade," Alice White in "Playing Around," Sally O'Neill in "Jazz Heaven," and Corinne Friffith in "Ladies of the Field."

Merely Meandering



John Mebane

something about women

(Women have, in general, no love of art; they have no proper knowledge of any; and they have no genius.—Rousseau: "Lettre a d'Alembert".)

It is not unusual to hear a man say that he does not understand women, but it is strange that he should be prompted to utter such a statement when the shallowness of the female is so completely obvious. Schopenhauer says: "You need only look at the way in which she is formed to see that woman is not meant to undergo great labour, whether of the mind or of the body." And yet with quaint old American absurdity we have labelled the present day that of prohibition and the emancipation of woman, which two factors go hand-in-hand in that we have passed laws by means of which we propose the attainment of both, while knowing that we can no more prohibit woman from remaining contentedly in the sloughs of mental indolence and physical luxury than we can the good old American from pulling corks out of bottles.

Our educators with a pedantic fervor invoke the gods to aid woman in attaining intellectual freedom—and no less than a god can do it. We propose to educate them for business when the only business for which they are fit is love-making and deceit, each of which is a complement of the other.

Perhaps the statement that women are deceitful will be challenged. Will not the challenge be rewarded with a score of rapier points flashing? Are not women deceitful when they pretend in that habitually sophisticated manner of theirs that they admire the arts? Woman attends the theatre equipped with an amazing supply of scandal which, at the rise of the curtain, she proceeds to dispense among all available acquaintances in a voice just loud enough to drown out that of the performer. At an excellent recital she affects boredom: at a poor one her cherubimic smiles drift before the gaze of an attractive gentleman across the aisle. She reads Byron, Shelley, and Keats because she hears that this trio is assigned to the libraries of the cultured. She listens with closed eyes and complacent brow to music when she cannot distinguish between a Bach sonata and a Schubert symphony.

You may ask why women often make excellent teachers. Let me assure you that it is not because of any mental superiority, but because of the fact that women, fitted for bringing up children, are accustomed to accept, as a natural part of their duty, nursing and teaching. Women make great actresses only when they act naturally: acting is inherent in them.

We often wonder why it is that women can get away with murder. It is because they are born actresses, with faces of angels and the deceitfulness of—well, quite a bit of deceitfulness. Is it not to man's credit that he is beginning at last to reject that attitude of gallantry inherited from the romantic (and dark) ages and to accept woman as she is—a creature inferior to the male of like species?

Now we've done it!

Mexican bull-fighters have formed a union, and the Wall street variety seems to be pretty well organized, too.—New York Evening Journal.