

## The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publications Union Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is printed daily except Mondays, and the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Spring Holidays. Entered as second class matter at the post office of Chapel Hill, N. C., under act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, \$3.00 for the college year.

Claiborn M. Carr. Editor  
Thomas Walker. Managing Editor  
Joe Webb. Business Manager

### Editorial Staff

EDITORIAL BOARD—Virgil J. Lee, Jr., chairman, John F. Alexander, A. T. Dill, Vermont C. Royster, F. Pat Gaskins, Milton K. Kalb, William H. Wang, Ben C. Proctor, Jeanne Holt, W. A. Sigmon, Jean Smith Cantrell, W. R. Eddleman, Don Becker, Nelson Lansdale.

FEATURE BOARD—Joe Sugarman, chairman, Walter Terry, Ed Goldenthal, John Wiggins.

CITY EDITORS—Carl Thompson, Phil Hammer, Jack Lowe, Bob Page, Irving Suss, Bob Woerner.

DESK MEN—Nick Powell, Walter Hargett, Eleanor Bizzell, Elizabeth Johnson.

SPORTS DEPARTMENT—Bill Anderson and Jimmie Morris, co-assistant editors, Morrie Long, Ralph Gialanella, Smith Barrier, Tom Bost, Jr., Milton Scherer.

EXCHANGES—W. C. Durfee, ditor, Margaret Gaines, Harold Broady, Norman Adelman.

REPORTERS—Don McKee, Reed Sarratt, Jim Daniels, Sam Willard, George MacFarland, Edwin Kahn, Emery Raper, Francis Clingman, Margaret McCauley, Ralph Burgin, Roy Wilder, John Eddleman.

### Business Staff

ASST. BUSINESS MGR.—(Sales) Agnew Bahnsen, Jr.  
COLLECTION MANAGER—James Barnard.

OFFICE MANAGER—L. E. Brooks.  
DURHAM REPRESENTATIVES—F. W. Smith, Henry B. Darling.

LOCAL ADVERTISING STAFF—Butler French (manager), Hugh Primrose, Phil Singer, Robert Sosnick, Herbert Osterheld, Niles Bond, Eli Joyner, Oscar Tyree, Boylan Carr.

CIRCULATION MANAGER—Raito Farlow.

CITY EDITOR FOR THIS ISSUE: IRVING SUSS

Sunday, March 4, 1934

### Answers

The questions asked in Mr. Lloyd's letter in the "Speaking the Campus Mind" column are as intelligent as they are reasonably stated. Let Mr. Lloyd remember, however, that not for three University years has a scandal comparable in the number of persons it affected or the amount of attention it drew, broken on this campus.

The reason why the DAILY TAR HEEL printed a full account of the thievery, together with the names of the persons involved was not because the campus already knew about it, but because it didn't know the truth about it. The story was printed in an effort to present the facts clearly and coherently and put an end to the grossly exaggerated rumors which were prevalent in every corner of the campus. It was felt that an authentic account of the criminal acts would, in a measure, clear the persons involved of a number of things of which they were falsely accused. As usual, the facts in the case were much less damning than the rumors, the grounds for which were in those facts. The men who collaborated in writing up the story were at great pains to get the facts in the case, and get them completely and accurately. For precisely the same reason, the names of the three instigators of the crimes were given. In an effort to clear a number of persons mistakenly and unjustly involved in the campus gossip concerning the matter, the DAILY TAR HEEL printed the names of the persons who were involved.

As to the matter of topping the story "with a fat two-bank head," we must point out that that is our business. When it was decided to use the story, its position in the paper was determined by its news value, the number of people it involved, and its length.

Would discrimination have been shown if the men had been fraternity men? Mr. Lloyd wants to know. With reference to our general policy, and as applicable to any situation, we prefer not to think so. In this case, certainly not.

This is not the first time this year that the DAILY TAR HEEL has acted with all possible frankness in a difficult year. The printing of the circumstances surrounding the resignation of the head of the medical school came as a distinct surprise to many old readers of the paper.

The printing of Friday's story involved no radical change of policy. There is not, generally speaking, any occasion for the publication of the facts involving every case of suspension or expulsion before the student council, for the reason that most of the acts involved in such proceedings are more or less personal matters, and do not affect the campus-at-large. If a similar situation again arises, Mr. Lloyd may rest assured that the paper will act without partiality. The policy of the DAILY TAR HEEL is as pliant and as adjustable as the needs and demands of the student body for whom that policy is maintained.—H.N.L.

At Beloit College a girl may not take a bath after 10:00 o'clock in the evening without suffering demerits. Further demerits threaten the Beloit girl who wears mules "or any by-slippers with soft soles throughout the building after the retiring bell."

Brigham Young University insists that boys and girls be housed separately.

### Honor Among Thieves

Together with Friday's surprising revelations as to what students were terrorizing the campus with a pernicious campaign of thievery, it was likewise known that the ringleader of the group was at the same time the zealous genius of the honor council which functioned to make this campus safe for the honor system.

The campus and this newspaper were sucked in and might as well honestly admit it. In a sincere effort to revive the honor system they allowed a secret organization to act in the dark. Because it acted in the dark, it furnished the background against which its leader could play a dual role. While the campus threw up its hands in holy horror at the thought of substituting a proctor system for the honor system, it countenanced the activities of a group that thought to enforce the honor system, but which in fact was a reversion to an out-worn vigilance. Today is 1934 in the civilized East, not 1850 in the western gold fields. We don't need, nor do we want, any more vigilance committees. If the honor system cannot be made universal—if the honor system is in truth out-worn and cannot stand on its own feet—if the honor system needs to be enforced by a secret, extra-legal organization that is self-appointed as guardians of peace, law, honor, and campus culture, then the honor system should be abandoned. It ceases to be an honor system under such circumstances, as must now be bitterly obvious to a disillusioned campus.—D.B.

### Dangers To Consider

The story on the Williams curriculum plan carried by yesterday's issue points out, we believe, one of the greatest dangers that changes at this University must avoid. Before the so-called "liberalized" first two years were inaugurated at Williams, freshmen and sophomores were hindered from taking the interest that college work should give them by having to take certain compulsory courses during these years.

We quote from the article: "For many years the unbalanced demands of the various departments and the compulsory election of certain courses made of the first two years, a period of stagnation rather than stimulation. Interest frequently was stifled and procedure within the narrow limits of the restricted curriculum had disadvantages to the student with particular interests."

Nothing shows more clearly the danger of restricting the student in the choice of his courses during the first two years. We do not mean to deprecate all compulsory courses. We are speaking chiefly of the proposed plan for curriculum changes now before the faculty, which, as yet unmodified, will force upon every student, with certain ill-defined exceptions, the same plan of courses for his first two years.

This was, in general, it seems, the situation at Williams a number of years ago. It is significant for this campus that such a plan was a failure in so far as it did not stimulate the student during these all-important first two years to a healthy interest in college work.

When the final plans are drafted for curriculum changes at the University, we hope that the example of such colleges as Williams will demonstrate the importance, to use the expression of the Williams editor, of a "liberalized first two years."—A.T.D.

### To Be Exterminated

This provoking bore exists in every class in the University—the obnoxious student who is forever asking some worthless question on a trivial point, or who asks a "bull-session" question as the Old South bell is ringing for the next class. Many a professor is deceived in thinking that he has a genius in his class, whereas he merely has a professional bull-shooter.

The Daily Kansan reports that a Harvard class, afflicted with just such a member, decided that each student was losing four dollars worth of education every hour the obnoxious classmate argued. The class organized a revolt and every time that member opened his mouth, a great shuffling of feet created such a disturbance that he was forced to discontinue his questions.

The professor isn't to blame when he comes into his class five or ten minutes late; he has merely been discussing why the philosophy of existence is exasperating or what is the future for socialism or nudism with one of these talkative brutes.

Not only is this perverted beast found in the class room, but he is also an unwelcome guest at lectures. He simply has to question the lecturer in order to show off his high-sounding knowledge. Thus, the lecture drags on for another hour to the joy of this freak and the snores of the rest of the audience.

A guillotine or an electric chair, situated by the Old Well for daily functions, is the only solution for ridding the campus of these creatures. Otherwise, this pest will continue to put students to sleep in classes and strain the knowledge resources of our professors.—W.C.D.

## With Contemporaries

### The Opposition

(Kentucky Kernel)

It is often surprising to find opposition to certain important issues before the people of today. It is still more surprising to find those who make up the opposition. Such is the case of the church in its position in regard to the Child Labor Amendment. Almost everyone supposed that the churches of the state would heartily support such a movement, but instead it has been taken in body and soul by the selfish interests which are opposing the ratification of this amendment.

The opponents of this law are either ignorant of the provisions of this bill or else they have such a poor case that they are afraid to be frank and truthful with the people. It is to be hoped that the first condition is true but being guilty of either is quite an inexcusable fault. The amendment is composed of two parts—first, the right to regulate the hours of labor of children under eighteen years of age is given Congress; second, that what ever law the Congress may pass, in this regard, is to supersede the various state laws. These are the only two provisions in the entire amendment and no specific law is mentioned. But to hear the opposition one would think that the law provided that the children were to be taken from their homes and completely controlled by the state. Such a condition is of course not true and nothing of the like is desired by the proponents of this law, and furthermore no such condition as this will exist if the amendment is adopted.

The matter which is most distressing is the position of the churches in this regard. Several leaders of several different denominations have come out very definitely against it. The churches often wonder why they do not appeal to the young people as they would like to, the answer is quite obvious when such action as opposing the Child Labor Amendment is taken by several of the churches. In fact some have gone so far as to say that those who approved of this vital part of social legislation were unchristian and were seeking to destroy the principles of the American government. They have all fought this law on different grounds but they have fortunately for themselves omitted all reference to the principles of Jesus Christ.

Bishop Charles E. Woodcock in a recent radio address denounced the proposed law as "dangerous and unnecessary legislation." During the entire speech, as reported in the newspapers, the Bishop did not mention once any of the principles of Christ; he knew that they

would not favor his argument in any degree. We would like to ask the Bishop and all others like him a few questions in this regard. What principles of Christ say that children should work, on the street to sell papers from early in the morning until midnight? Where did Christ say that little children should work in mills and factories so that a selfish few might make higher profits and that the children should contract all types of diseases and die before the age of thirty? Did Christ ever say that He desired that helpless children should be exploited to the advantage of a few individuals with no idea of, or desire for social justice? The churches will do well to apply the principles of Jesus Christ instead of those they have been using.

The job for the Kentucky legislature to decide is whether or not it will apply the principles and follow the teaching of Jesus Christ or whether it will follow the wishes and desires of a few selfish individuals who wish to profit by human misery. It is a question of whether it will follow the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert C. Hoover, and Franklin D. Roosevelt or whether it will let the selfish rule in behalf of the selfish. The question is indeed serious and it is to be hoped that the legislators will consider this matter long and seriously.

### College Journalism

(Notre Dame Scholastic)

The great American tradition of working one's way through college appears to have been forced on an alarmingly large number of students this year. Men and women of all four classes have come to the campus with capital enough to last a week or a month and, nothing more, confident they can crash through with some sort of a job to keep them alive. And most of them will find their jobs. Too often have students footed their own bills at Syracuse to say that it is impossible. But is it worth the cost?

We've heard about the self supporter being the best student, and we don't believe it. There's no correlation between poverty and intelligence. There are as many studious sons and daughters of wealthy parents as there are of less affluent families. But all sons and daughters of the more fortunate enter college just as all other children enter high school. It appears that not more than a quarter of these fortunates are students; the rest "go to college." Among the poorer class, only the students consider matriculating.

Much has been written recently concerning college publications. The writers blatantly declare that they are unnecessary expense, a waste of the student's time, that they give "no fundamental news writing experience to any of the students," and that "their advertising departments

make nuisances in the business communities."

If the critics of our student publications would thoroughly investigate the conditions of our local collegiate (and we might add high school) journals, they would find that the college publication presents one of the few extra-curricular activities, both educationally and financially, on the campus.

Student papers may not give "fundamental news writing experience to any of the students," as one writer says, but strange to say, there are many alumni of college journalism who are enjoying successful careers in that field.

None of the advertising in our college papers is solicited as the business man's favor to the school. Students provide a live market for the products of modern business and wise business men seek their patronage through the closest medium—the school paper. National advertisers whose exclusive interest is collegiate realize the benefits of the medium of collegiate papers.

College journalism is not a fad nor a product of adolescent frivolity but an established institution with an enviable record of achievement.

## Dr. James M. Bell Dies of Heart Attack

(Continued from page one)

vives. From 1905-10 he was connected with the United States bureau of chemistry and soils, where he served as an assistant to Dr. Frank A. Cameron, who later came here to serve under his former pupil.

Dr. Bell was appointed associate professor of physical chemistry in the University in 1910 and to a full professorship three years later. He served under appointment as Smith professor of chemistry from 1919-26, being named head of the department in 1921. He was Kenan traveling professor during the scholastic year 1926-27. During the war he served with the chemical warfare service.

A thorough scholar, who had done considerable research, Dr. Bell was the co-author of a widely used textbook on physical chemistry, and he had in preparation another textbook on general chemistry. He was the author of numerous articles which had appeared in scientific journals.

He was a member of the American association for the Advancement of science, American Chemical society, society of the Chemical Industry, Elisha Mitchell Scientific society, Chemical society of London, societe Chemique de France, and American association of University Professors. Sigma Xi and Alpha Chi Sigma were his fraternities.

THE YOUNG MEN'S SHOP  
DURHAM, N. C.

## Enjoy the Special Sunday Dinner

at

## Gooch Bros. & Brooks Cafe

Served From Noon Until 8 P. M.

Come Down Town Nights and SEE Your Sandwiches Made Before Your Eyes

Beer in Bottles and on Draught

CIGARETTES  
CIGARS

MAGAZINES  
NEWSPAPERS

Fountain Service

NRA