

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, where it is published daily, except Monday, examination and vacation periods, and during the official summer terms. Entered as second class matter at the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C. under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates mailed \$4 per year, \$1.50 per quarter; delivered, \$5 and \$2.25 per quarter.

Editor: BARRY FARBER
Managing Editor: ROLFE NEILL
Business Manager: JIM SCHENCK
Sports Editor: BIFF ROBERTS
Assoc. Ed.: Bev Baylor
Assoc. Ed.: Sue Burrell
Sub. Mgr.: Carolyn Reichard
Asst. Sub. Mgr.: Delaine Bradsher
Natl. Adv. Mgr.: Wallace Fridgen
News Ed.: Jody Levey
Circ. Mgr.: Donald Hogg
Soc. Ed.: Deenie Schoeppe
Asst. Sots. Ed.: Tom Pencock
Adv. Mgr.: Ned Becker
Night Editor for this issue: Rolfe Neill

Ban Bowl Games?

President Gordon Gray made clear his position on post-season football games when he told newsmen Wednesday afternoon that he favored an "institutional conscience" method of regulation rather than a blanket ruling against the participation of Southern Conference members in bowl games.

Gray indicated that, although he remained in opposition to post-season grid events, he would not fight the lifting of the Southern Conference ban at the December meeting if such were the minority view of the institutions and their presidents.

We stand opposed to any code or ruling which would prohibit a member of the Southern Conference from accepting a bid to play in one of the New Year's Day bowl classics, with conference suspension and boycott being the automatic penalty for violation.

We interpret the banning of post-season games as a sincere move on the part of the conference officials to harness and de-emphasize the monster known as "big-time athletics." The ineffectiveness of this suppressive legislation was vividly demonstrated last season when both Maryland and Clemson resigned themselves to the bad graces of the Southern Conference rather than forego the glittering invitations to take the field against outstanding college elevens on January 1.

The restriction on bowl games is a valiant but misoriented approach to the inter-collegiate athletics problem. We can see no evil in big time athletics per se. We have no objection to the fervent nation-wide football enthusiasm and we harbor no malice against those schools whose teams consistently manage to pummel their opposition in the colorful Saturday spectacles and wind up primping their feathers in one of the major bowl games.

We are concerned only with the evils tangent to big-time athletics and not the deflation of the program itself. The elimination by executive ruling of post-season participation is a futile and unrealistic solution to the basic problems of bribery, over-subsidizing of athletes, academic manipulation in favor of halfbacks, and the other imperfections in American inter-collegiate athletics which proponents of the de-emphasis hope to correct.

The calculated obliteration of big-time athletics in order to wipe out the evils is tantamount to chopping off an arm to cure arthritis. Although an excess of public attention may warp a player's perspective and increase the opportunities for corruption, the clean-up crusade should be applied to the individual level. If there are no bribe givers or bribe takers, there will be no bribery. If a college administration rigidly adheres to a policy of academic non-favoritism, the specter of automatic passing grades on football players' transcripts will vanish.

What's wrong with a dynamic grid program, provided the players live up to common standards of honesty, the professors insist upon diligent work on the part of the athletes, the alumni refrain from exerting undue pressure, and the entire football program remains in its proper proportion within the university community? What's wrong with bowl games, provided the players themselves are genuinely willing to forfeit a Christmas vacation?

True, these observations reek with an uninhibited idealism, but we are still unconvinced that a legislative ban on bowl participation is unlikely realize the noble result which its perpetrators desire.

Express Yourself

United Front

Editor:
In regard to Harry Snook's article concerning this new "cure all" called gromwell, I have a question. Has Mr. Snook ever heard of morals? Does he think a woman is chaste only because of a fear she will become pregnant? What a sorry world this would be if that were the case! Obviously the words "high morals" and "standards" are not ones Mr. Snook has included in his gigantic vocabulary.

Free love may be accepted in some circles and societies but I think most of the women in the U. S. are just slightly opposed to it! Just how many restrict sexual activities because they fear bringing a "bastard" into the world? Maybe some, but an awful lot more fortunately—have a sense of values and decency.

I believe most of the other women on this campus and other campuses will back me up in this feeling of indignation concerning the sex activities of the female and our so-called "release."

A Co-Ed

Through Rose-Tinted Glasses

Editor:
Hallelujah! Awake ye people! Joyous times are here! We have it on the authority of no lesser one than our own venerable Harry Snook, bicycle repairman turned philosopher, that all of the world's Freudian frustrations will be ended, thanks to a new wonder drug, gromwell, which will enable men to revert to apes.

According to this erstwhile sorcerer of things to come, we will no longer have to hold to our outmoded convention of monogamous possession of a mate. Instead we can now safely adopt the good old Eskimo doctrine of "pass the old lady around boys, there's plenty for all." When we get tired of our spouse we can simply trade her to our next door neighbor for his. The time consuming and unhealthy emotion of love would pass out of the picture.

There will be many more advantages which come from the changes in our lives that gromwell will bring about, hints our versatile sage. Much time that is now wasted chasing women will be saved. For instance, a boy in the lower quad will only have to walk over to one of the coed dorms, and say, "Girls, who wants to be the lucky one tonight?" The young lady of his choice will then get a pill from a gromwell vendor which will be conveniently placed in the dorm. Now the couple will stroll down to the arboretum, check out a blanket from a University operated check out booth at the entrance, and proceed to seek primitive pleasure in modern freedom, without fear of ostracism or progeny. The University of Virginia and her Marguerita's will have nothing on us then.

Of course, as is the case with all things, the good is tempered with evil. The streets will be crowded with unemployed prostitutes. Since marriages will be contracted only by the season (much as rabbits, birds, and seals) expensive wedding rings will become impractical; hence the jewelers will go broke. Preachers will be deprived of an extra source of income and psychiatrists of the fees of their frustrated clientele. But these will have to be overlooked. We cannot hold up the progress of the masses for the benefit of the few.

Yes, happy days are coming. Do not despair at their slowness for verily, verily, I say unto ye, my fellow students, mighty Snook has thrown his inestimable weight behind the wheels of progress, and with his help the bars of prudism and morality will be broken down, thereby enabling us to enter into a glorious existence the like of which the world has never before known.

Jim Alley

Gauntlet

Editor:
You are right that Communism is not a palid, insipid political party but a malicious growth out to bring the downfall of democracy. I too like to think I am a Liberal; but I don't think Communism should be outlawed.

As we are citizens of the

"Sic 'Im, Checkers"



Drew Pearson

The Washington Merry-Go-Round

WASHINGTON. — General Eisenhower has nothing to worry about in the way of political reaction when it comes to the tax exemption which the Treasury granted him on his house, 12 servants and living expenses at Columbia. The General wrote a letter to the treasury about this on June 17, 1948, explaining that he wouldn't need so many servants if he were not President of Columbia and asked that the house, servants, etc., not be treated as income.

The capital-gains-tax ruling given him on his book, "Crusade in Europe," is likely to have less favorable public reaction. In this case the General called personally on his friend, A. Lee M. Wiggins, then Undersecretary of the Treasury, following which the ruling was given highest priority. One letter from the treasury to Ike was even rushed to him by special courier. Ordinarily, rulings of this kind drag on for weeks or months.

And after a preliminary draft opinion favorable to Ike was written in the treasury, Undersecretary Wiggins took the unusual step of sending it to Internal Revenue Commissioner Schoeneman with a note attached reading: "This agreement should be approved." Eisenhower's first letter to the treasury was dated Dec. 20, 1947, and the treasury replied on Dec. 22 — with almost unheard-of speed. Since then, Congress has passed what has been dubbed "The Eisenhower Amendment" making it impossible for others writing only one book to get the reduced capital gains tax.

The General's letter, requesting that his house at Columbia and upkeep not be considered as taxable income, was addressed to Commissioner Schoeneman. It stated, in part: "In my capacity as President of Columbia University the trustees provide an expense allowance to cover the cost of the upkeep of the large house in which Mrs. Eisenhower and I must live by reason of university tradition, the desires of the authorities, and by the daily requirements of the position. A staff of 12 servants is necessary to maintain this residence. Their salaries as well as all upkeep costs are paid from the expense allowance provided by the University."

Several other unimportant letters were sent to the treasury, and in November, 1948, Internal Revenue gave Ike a favorable ruling. Two years later, Nov. 3, 1950, after a long wrangle, the treasury permitted a somewhat similar ruling regarding hotel managers who were forced to live in their hotels. The free use of rooms, meals were not to be considered as taxable income, the treasury finally decided. This was similar to the ruling that the upkeep of Eisenhower's house was not taxable income.

It took the treasury months of additional wrangling to give a similar ruling to nurses who are required to live in hospitals. This ruling did not come down until Aug. 2, 1951, three years after Ike got his ruling, and even then it was not as clear-cut as Eisenhower's. The treasury also has ruled that the head janitor of a build-

Susan Fink

Tommy Sumner

VITRIOL

During the campaign preceding the Campus Elections last fall one party failed to comply with the duly established provisions of the General Elections Law. Specifically, they failed to meet the deadline established for the filing of candidates.

The Elections Board ruled that the candidates of that party were disqualified; however, after this ruling had been made the Chairman of the party concerned appeared and persuaded the Board that its first decision should be reversed.

This was done despite the fact that the law was clear and that the former decision was correct. The illegality of this was recognized by a member of the Board and a fellow student who appealed the decision to the Student Council.

After four hours of hearings and debate—closed to the student body of course—the Council handed down a very interesting ruling. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful if even the streamer headline in the next morning's Daily Tar Heel made an impression on the student body which was commensurate with the weight of the decision.

I have the original copy of the official ruling of the Council at hand, but in it I find only a disregard of the law passed by the Legislature. There is no question of the fact that the law was violated. There is no question of the constitutionality of the law. There is only the question of political expediency.

It is certainly true that both parties wished the election to proceed without interference, and, so far as this particular instance is concerned, the course of action chosen by the Council was the most popular alternative open to them. If that were all there were to it the matter would be deadlier than the proverbial doornail. The difficulty lies in the precedent which this decision has set for the Campus judiciary.

The precedent is this: There is a law on the books which is unquestionably constitutional; although admittedly it is sometimes inconvenient. The law has been violated and the highest Campus Court has condoned the violation.

In denial of the tradition in which the law of this and other lands is based that a law is in force until repealed or declared void by competent authority, this law is being officially ignored when it suits the purpose of the politicians.

A similar situation has arisen this year. The Legislature has passed a bill to change the elections districts, but by law this cannot take effect for forty-five days. It is suggested that the law again be ignored and that this legislation be put into effect.

Student Government is said to be a training ground for democracy, but this is training for anarchy.

Are we digging a grave for justice?

John Sanders

Young Democrats

The world of "might have been" has come into prominence since the current presidential campaign has hotted up to its present incandescent condition.

Th. Jefferson, the first saint of the Democratic Party, has been clasped to the bosom of a variety of political god-mothers. In 1948, the Dixiecrats claimed him, because Jefferson, in his time, was the apostle of a decentralized government, or, to hear the latter-day communicants tell it, he was the first "states' rights" Saint Thomas

ing who has to live in it shall not be taxed for the value of his apartment, but the same does not apply to assistant janitors.

Hotel waiters who get free meals while serving at hotels and restaurants also got a none-too-lenient ruling. If they eat a free meal while at work, it is not taxable income. But if they eat the meal as they finish work, it is taxable income.

In Florida both Senators Spessard Holland and George Smathers have been sitting on their hands. They have made no speeches for Stevenson, lifted no finger for him, leaving it to ex-Senator Claude Pepper to organize the state.

At Tampa, Senator Smathers was invited to introduce Stevenson, but set the impossible condition that he be allowed to state during his introduction the reasons why he differed with the Governor. In brief, Smathers wanted to make a speech against Stevenson before Stevenson spoke. This was refused.

is reputed to have said that "that government is best which governs least."

Therefore, the Dixiecrats of 1948 and the "Eisenhower Democrats" of 1952 argue that they, and not the Stevenson-Sparkman forces, have true-blue democracy on their side. In short, "if Jefferson were alive today, he would make Monticello quiver as he wrote impassioned declarations for Ike." So say those who would dwell in the world of "might have been."

The preposterous nature of such an argument is characteristic of all similar attempts to prove a point in the world of today by snatching an isolated fact from the past and applying it, completely out of its "bourne of time," to the solution of problems peculiar to our own era.

To appreciate the error involved, it is only necessary to mention some additional views held by Mr. Jefferson. He was an agrarian. Therefore, if his belief in a decentralized government makes him a Republican, then his agrarianism makes him a Populist. (So they said in 1896.) He also looked fondly upon having a revolution every twenty or thirty years. This makes him a Communist. He founded a state university. That makes him a Socialist. He bought Louisiana without authority. That makes him a dictator. He owned slaves. That makes him a Confederate.

By the same "logic," Mr. Eisenhower, had he lived at the right time, could have been a Pisistratus, a Sulla, a Grant, or a Big Brother. Or is he?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12					13				14	
15					16				17	
	18				19				20	
21	22								23	
24				25					26	
27			28						29	
			34	35					36	
									37	
38	39	40							41	
									42	
43									44	
45									46	
									47	
50									48	
53									49	

HORIZONTAL
1. white poplar
6. explosive sound
9. asterisk
12. part of coat
13. reverential fear
14. pool!
15. first part
16. go back over
17. capital of Delaware
20. black snake
21. earlier
23. charge with gas
24. hollow
25. cuddle
27. fish sauce
29. club
30. unfashioned
34. charm
37. nothing
38. condition
41. recited
43. mark of omission
44. mere trifle
45. work
47. conserve of grapes

50. indulged
51. liquid pitch
52. finch
53. prior to
54. gnome
55. tend

VERTICAL
1. high mountain
2. except
3. yellowish-green mineral
4. citrus fruit
5. number of mountain ranges in India
6. young salmon
7. be obligated
8. sea bird
9. Manila hemp
10. cut
11. soothing exclamation
17. scarcer
19. place of nether darkness
21. town in Belgium
22. anoint
23. certify
25. salt
28. purvey
31. not alert
32. clamor
33. wapiti
35. deviate from type
36. push
38. extent
39. a candle
40. sharp mountain spur
42. wild talker
44. slave
46. dancer's cymbals
48. stannum
49. outcome

ANSWER TO SATURDAY'S PUZZLE
ARAS MAR SPAT
BURN ALE PONE
ANTIETAM RUNE
STEPPE ELATES
REI SMEW
LEIS RABELAIS
AVE DETER NRA
PASSOVER STEW
EVES BEE
RAIDER SATRAP
ANSA TREATISE
STET EAR LOIN
HIRE DYE ERAS

Average time of solution: 27 minutes.
Distributed by King Features Syndicate

