

The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Carolina Publications Union 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 at Chapel Hill, N. C., under act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price, \$3.00 for the college year.

J. Mac Smith Editor
Charles W. Gilmore Managing Editor
William McLean Business Manager
Jesse Lewis Circulation Manager

Editorial Staff

EDITORIAL WRITERS: Stuart Rabb, Lytt Gardner, Allen Merrill, Voit Gilmore, Bob duFour.
NEWS EDITORS: Will G. Arey, Jr., Gordon Burns, Morris Rosenberg.
DESKMEN: R. Herbert Roffer, Tom Stanback, Tim Elliot, Jesse Reese.
SENIOR REPORTER: Bob Perkins.
FRESHMAN REPORTERS: Charles Barrett, Adrian Spies, David Z. Stick, James McAden, Miss Lucy Jane Hunter, Carroll McGaughy, Winston Broadfoot, Miss Gladys Tripp.
REWRITERS: Donald Bishop.
EXCHANGE EDITOR: Ben Dixon.
SPORTS EDITOR: R. R. Howe, Jr.
SPORTS NIGHT EDITORS: Jerry Stoff, Frank Holeman, Laffitte Howard.
SPORTS REPORTERS: Ed Karlin, Harvey Kaplan, Shelley Rolfe, Fletcher W. Ferguson, Larry M. Ferling, W. L. Beerman.
STAFF PHOTOGRAPHERS: Herbert Bachrach, Frank Bowne.

Business Staff

ADVERTISING MANAGERS: Bobby Davis, Glen Humphrey, DUREHAM REPRESENTATIVE: Dick Eastman.
LOCAL ADVERTISING ASSISTANTS: Stuart Ficklin, Bert Halperin, Bill Ogburn, Morton Bohrer, Ned Hamilton, Bill Clark, Billy Gillian.
OFFICE: Gilly Nicholson, Aubrey McPhail, George Harris, Louis Barba, Bob Lerner, Ed Kaufman, Perrin Quarles, Jim Schleifer, Henry Smernoff.

For This Issue

News: Morris Rosenberg Sports: Frank Holeman

Graham's Speech

(Continued from first page)

special discriminations. Regulations develop not as discriminations but as controls to meet situations. All student activities have some regulations. Regulations increase with need and develop to meet practices and abuses. The more intense the competition and the wider its appeal, the higher the need of codes of fair competition. If sixty thousand people and more should come distances to attend a Harvard-Yale orchestral contest, it would not be fair for Harvard to induce the most accomplished members of the Boston Symphony orchestra to be her representatives against Yale. Rules regarding residence, transfers, scholastic standing and subsidies would be proposed and adopted to meet actual situations as they developed to the end that the inter-collegiate musical contest would be not a contest in subsidies but a contest in fair representation and educational development. No college sport, on the basis of its strong appeal inside the college and its wide appeal outside the college, needs more educational control than inter-collegiate football. The vast crowds overrunning the stadia, the vaster numbers listening in Saturday afternoons, and the still vaster numbers reading the vivid sports pages every Sunday morning from September to December in homes across a continent, suggest the public appeal and power of inter-collegiate football.

Protests

Commercialism and subsidies, code violations and hypocrisies, over-emphasis and educational devaluation, exploitation of youth and other attendant evils, have stirred a small but increasing number of student leaders to speak out in protest. However differently these students are taking their stands it is wholesome that they are unafraid of taboos and are intent upon the open discussion of hidden things. It is to be hoped that they will continue the discussion. They stand variously but they stand for honesty above amateurism; sportsmanship above victory; sports without gate receipts; and equality of students on the basis of their total merits as adjudged by faculty committees in the award of scholarships, loans, jobs, and other material aids as the basis of representation honest, amateur, democratic and in line with the primary purposes of the colleges as educational institutions. Of these several different stands the first two are apparently the simplest and the easiest and the last the most difficult and will require the longest and most baffling struggle.

Public Interest

This new student sensitiveness may be increasingly aroused by the mounting and enveloping public interest with its educational implications or may be due to a clearer awareness of the deep damages of the old practices of misguided partisans who hiddenly violate the code of fair competition. An answer to the first danger is to keep the public out. This is hardly the answer of a democracy. An answer to the second danger is to give up the struggle, surrender to the chisellers, and allow those who violate the code to make the code conform to their violations. This cannot long be the answer of higher education.

Subsidy

Meantime, however, the treaty breakers with their hidden and devious ways of providing subsidies to athletes with attendant lying and hypocrisies, are causing a large number of students, faculties and several athletic conferences to favor college sanction of special subsidies to athletes.

Pro

The sanction of the athletic subsidy is strongly favored for such appealing reasons as the following: sanction by the college will bring under-cover practices into the open and put an end to lying and hypocrisy; the amateur principle is a hangover of old-world standards and, in its aristocratic implications, is out of place in democratic America; it affords the only way for many worthy boys to get a college education; and, summarily, the boys who do the work should get at least part of their share of the gate receipts which their exploits make possible.

Two Policies

For providing special subsidies to athletes with college sanction, two main policies now obtain in a good number of institutions. According to one policy, special subsidies are provided by the college itself, and, according to the other, by alumni and friends outside. Both policies commend themselves by their clear purposes of openness, honesty and competitive fairness through the elimination of the advantages of the chiseler. The solution of one of the most perplexing educational problems is not as simple and clear as this purpose. Other considerations and developments which will involve this purpose must be taken into account.

Special Subsidies

The special subsidies provided by the college raise new problems of their own. If the subsidies come out of gate receipts, then the gate is under the obligation to carry not only the whole major and minor athletic program as now

maintained but also all the athletic subsidies. The gate becomes even more commercial. The football gate is under the triple pressure to carry all the football load, most of the other major and minor sports, and the athletic subsidies. Subsidies add to the mounting commercialism and weaken even more the educational position of the college as it becomes more involved at the gate.

Budget

If the inside college subsidies are not to be carried out of gate receipts, then they have to be carried out of the general college budget at the expense of the salaries of the faculty, the equipment of departments, and the basic educational program of the college. The open use of general endowments, state appropriations, or general student fees for special athletic subsidies, has not answered the still basic question of integrity, in this case the integrity of the college itself. If the legislature, or a private benefactor, or the student body would authorize, respectively, the use of appropriations, endowments, or fees as special subsidies to athletes, then this particular question of integrity would be answered, but provision for subsidies out of such sources or out of gate receipts would lay the foundation for new evils. The open inside college subsidies may become the basis for more outside under-cover alumni subsidies. The men who violated the old agreements can violate the new. The necessity of new regulations brings on the possibility of a new train of old abuses, evasions and hypocrisies. Outside under-cover money added to the top of inside open money has not simplified, much less solved, the many problems. Whether the subsidies come from the gate, general funds, or special funds, the position of the college is undermined because the college itself through participation and approval has become a partner in subsidizing athletes. The college can with less convincing sincerity say to the alumni, "we will subsidize but you must not."

Alumni

On account of such considerations, the proposal is made that while the college itself should not provide special subsidies, yet the college should sanction the raising of athletic subsidies outside by the alumni. The main questions involving openness and secrecy, honesty and hypocrisy, can be guaranteed not to arise only if these alumni subsidies are to be entirely unregulated. This open, clear purpose speaks its own commendation. We all hold that honesty is far more important than amateurism. However, the experience of many institutions shows that the years will bring developments in unwholesome attempted control of the college and will develop educational implications which will impair the honest values of the original clear purpose. With all our regulations about residence, migration, scholarships, and student aid inside the college, if we have no regulations or attempts at regulation by the college with regard to the purposes and amounts of money provided outside the college as subsidies to athletes, then money with college sanction becomes too pivotal a basis for participation in inter-collegiate athletics.

Contributions

With no attempts at control many alumni who would otherwise respond to the stand of the college against subsidies become subject to the pressure to contribute to athletic subsidy funds as sanctioned by the college. Students run the danger of representing outside athletic interests rather than the college. The athlete and the college may become subject to irresponsible money pressure from outside the college. Outside money pressure thus will come to hold a more strategic position for undermining and encroaching on inside control. The college will thus be not in as strong a moral position to withstand pressure for favoritism to athletes inside the college. The educational responsibility of the college is to refuse to yield to both inside and outside pressure.

Auction Block

Without attempts at regulation, the college is in danger of sanctioning the auction block, upon which boys in high school sell themselves to the highest bidder. As a reality to a favored group and as an example to all youth in their most plastic years, money primarily for athletic ability bulks too large and becomes too decisive in the life of the boy and the college. College executives and editors in some areas are already observing that the desire for pay for what have been unpaid youthful sacrifices and joyous volunteer services on college campuses will subtly spread to include the unsung heroes, the scrubs, who now take the blows without either honor or subsidies, students in minor sports, and many other students in wholesomely voluntary student activities.

Scholarships

The subsidies primarily for athletics and activities will in effect encroach upon the resources available or to be available for scholarships. These scholarships promote the pri-

mary purpose of the college as educational centers. As now administered, they are awarded mainly on the basis of scholarship, need, character, and general worth, including, in some cases it may be, athletic ability as a secondary consideration. The change of the basis of award through the system of athletic or other subsidies not based primarily on scholarship, character, and need would result in a campus unwholesomely divided into the subsidized and the unsubsidized and create campus problems undreamed of in our philosophy. Unsubsidized voluntarism in athletic, religious, and civic enterprises, generous campus services, the giving of youth to a cause, all develop a robustness of individual struggle and team play, and a voluntary enlistment in public causes release the idealism of youth and the highest aspirations of the human spirit. Despite all our frustrations and failures, these things are worth the continuous struggle against their violations and the evils which follow in their train.

Carnegie Survey

The struggle of the universities with the longest inter-collegiate athletic experience and the highest educational standing; the observation of many faculty athletic committeemen in many parts of the country who, without favor to athletes or fear of athletic partisans, have done their thankless work year in and year out; the revelation of the Carnegie survey; and the history of seventy-five years of inter-collegiate football not only make a common educational case against subsidies to athletes as athletes but also indicate the basic principle and practical procedures of regulation against such special subsidies inside and outside the college. The purpose of the basic principle is to provide fair consideration of all worthy students in the award of financial and other material aids. In view of the strong inter-collegiate athletic rivalries, this basic purpose specifically seeks to provide against favoritism to athletes as the center of a zealous partisanship and a vast public interest.

Complexity

The point is made that a simple statement of a simple purpose should suffice and that no code of explicit regulations should complicate a clear principle. The complexity of life, democracy, industry, inter-collegiate sports and all other human relations does not lend itself to such simple solutions. This position in its practical working out may become the sanction of the very things which violate the simple principle. In the early nineteenth century in England and later in Europe and still later in America as industry made its progress across the seas and continents, it was argued that the state should not complicate or interfere with the simple freedom and benevolent purposes of industry by regulations establishing a code of fairer and more humane competition. But experience proved that the more general and less explicit the regulations the more ruthless and destructive the competition. Although the letter of the law killeth the spirit when reliance is placed on the letter rather than the spirit yet it is also true that the sincerity and effectiveness of regulations are often tested by both their comprehensiveness and explicitness. As civilization has advanced and social codes have developed to meet complex situations, explicit regulations have been found necessary to give effect to simple principles and general ideals.

Equality

The general principle that all financial and material aids to students should be equally open to all students on their total merits is a fine ideal but has been found to need more specific implementation. The simple principle does not follow through without regulations for actual situations. The experience of several institutions in some part illustrates them all. Jobs, for example, were vaguely supposed to be open to all, but athletes often got a disproportionate share. In some cases the jobs nominally open were actually under the control of special interests. Awards were made without fair notice to or provision for applications by all qualified students. As long as the simple principle was left to enforce itself the special interests made no protest. The simple principle became a living force only through definite local regulations that no scholarship, job, loan, or other material aid within the control of the college should be awarded to any student unless equal public notice had been given to all students and fair consideration had been given to all applicants by a faculty committee who then were to make their awards on the basis of the total merits of the applicants as to scholarship, character, need, and general worth, and never primarily on account of athletic ability. Special interests immediately mobilized in protest. Refusal to discriminate in favor of athletes was held to discriminate against athletes. All jobs within the control of the college, including stadium jobs and "concessions," were thereafter awarded by

a faculty committee at the front door to students as they stood on their merits so to speak in an open single line without any more backdoor preferential awards to athletes by special interests. A full time able secretary of student aid digests the materials in regard to each applicant for the respective faculty committees. Careful records of applications and awards are kept, are published when it is desirable, and are always open for inspection. This open, fair, and thorough administration by the several faculty committees on jobs, loans, scholarships, and other material aids to students inside the college have won the support of many faculties, student bodies, and more thoughtful alumni both as a sound athletic and a sound educational policy. Opposition to the principle of no special aids to athletes in a good number of institutions is withdrawing to the outside and consolidating its forces against any determined effort to apply the same principles to the more baffling problem of athletic subsidies provided outside the college.

Opposition

Many of the interests formerly opposed to the adoption of staunch and explicit regulations of inside special aids to athletes now most strongly oppose provisions for the control of outside aid to athletes. The ultra-athletic, many sports pages, the most vocal alumni, the special interests, and athletic pressure groups, combine against regulation of outside aid to athletes. To the stock argument in favor of a few simple but vague principles of fairness to all students receiving aid as against additional explicit regulations with regard to athletes receiving preferential aid was added the more powerful cry against hypocrisy. The campaign against the control of inside aids to students on account of athletic ability was and to some extent still is based on the charge of discrimination against athletes. The movement against attempts to control outside aids has emphasized rather the impracticability and even impossibility of controlling so elusive a matter. The charge that it is hypocritical to attempt the impossible became an effective battle cry.

Hypocrisy

It is presumable that those who engaged in under-cover violations not only provided a basis for sincere cries of hypocrisy but also perhaps themselves added to the hue and cry as the most effective counter assault on any real efforts at regulation. The argument is that it is basically more honorable to sanction what is educationally unsound than to attempt to control what it is practically impossible to control. The eighteenth amendment, as the overtime illustration, rather teaches us that any real regulation must be accompanied by continuous education. The forces of counter education are wide and powerful in which participate agencies supposedly educational. The logic of the cry of hypocrisy, if surrendered to rather than harkened to for more enlightened and determined effort, would strike down all human struggles for social controls of difficult and complicated situations and relations in behalf of a fairer and more decent society.

Responsibility

The acknowledged difficulties of the struggle for the elimination of under-cover violations and the sincere reluctance of colleges to be the objects of suspicion and gossip do not relieve the colleges of the responsibility of being primarily educational institutions. Part of that educational responsibility is to educate athletic staffs, students, alumni, partisans, sportswriters, special interests, and the public toward cooperative educational control of both inside and outside aid to athletes. Much misinformation and misrepresentation need to be cleared away. It needs to be understood that athletes, with college sanction, can win awards of aid inside the college in open and fair consideration of them along with all other students, and that athletes, with college sanction, can receive outside aid as worthy students but not primarily as athletes. When it is realized that checks and controls are necessary not only in the interest of fair competition, wholesome voluntarism in sports, and larger educational values, but also to prevent inter-collegiate athletics, with the sanction of the colleges, from drifting under the influences of irresponsible funds for athletic subsidies and gambling pools, the public will understand and support the colleges in their struggles for educational controls.

Own Rules

The colleges which are resolute to keep the colleges from becoming involved in subsidization by participation inside or sanction outside can keep up the struggle. Individual institutions, whether in or out of a conference, should never enter into a competition in subsidies. In so far as the conference for a time falls short, the institution should have its own regulations to protect the educational

(Continued on last page)



By Allen Merrill

One outstanding professor in the University ranks our alma mater about 34th or 35th among the nation's institutions of higher learning.

Yet we stand well in the American Educational Association's list of the country's 25 finest schools.

Reason one why we are not nearer the top, says the professor, is the student body.

Reason two: the faculty.

His advice to students who are patriotically anxious for a bigger and better University is to "study harder."

The campus vogue, he points out, is to make the maximum in grades with the minimum of work. A stigma is placed on the classroom, and academic pursuits become extra-curricular to other phases of college life.

If studying harder will solve the problem of the student body, reason two, the faculty, still stands in our way.

The educational system, it has been suggested, glorifies the "researcher." Because of the time and concentration required, a professor's research activities may be at the expense of his classroom activities.

If teachers should be salesmen as well as scholars, a researcher may or may not be a teacher.

The student body should study harder; maybe the faculty should relax and not study quite so much.

POINT OF VIEW

By Ramsay Potts

Reflections On A Convict

On October 23, 1937, Paul Cook was released from Alabama's Kilby Prison. He re-entered an old world, a world of anti-lynching bills and steel strikes, a world of Roosevelt and Hitler, a world of Shanghai massacres and Tom Dewey crime-cleanups.

But it beckoned invitingly and mysteriously to him. Fourteen years ago he heard sentence fall. Guilty! He was, of grand larceny and burglary; and not yet 20. Society would correct and guide another erring son.

His life in prison gave him time to observe and reflect; time to think of what he should have been and what he would like to do. His hope for a clean start never ceased to spur his thoughts.

What answer do we give to Paul Cook today?

"No work now. Come back later."

"Sorry, we can't help you. You know how it is."

"We must think of our customers; your record, you know."

"It's impossible to promise anything."

"Come back next week."

And so his hope turns to despair, and he eyes every man with suspicion and hatred. We give him the answer of prejudice, and shrug it off with the inevitable "Oh! what can you do with people like that?"

To answer that question, and many others, is the purpose of the forthcoming Religion-In-Life conference. Instead of stressing the narrow orthodoxies of conventional forms, this conference will emphasize man's relation to the problems of justice, beauty, truth, and goodness? We never know, but we can do our best to find out what Dr. Koo of Shanghai, Dean Wicks of Princeton, Stanley High, and the other speakers of the conference have to offer from their personal experiences.