

The Daily Tar Heel

The official newspaper of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where it is published daily during the regular sessions of the University at the Colonial Press, Inc. except Mondays, examination and vacation periods and during the official summer terms when published semi-weekly. Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Chapel Hill, N. C., under the act of March 3, 1879. Subscription price: \$8 per year, \$3 per quarter. Member of the Associated Press, which is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news and features herein. Opinions expressed by columnists are not necessarily those of this newspaper.

On-Editors: CHUCK HAUSER, DICK JENNETTE
 Business Manager: ED WILLIAMS
 Managing Editor: ROLFE NEILL
 Sports Editor: ZANE ROBBINS

Neal Cadieu, Ado. Mgr. Shasta Bryant, Circ. Mgr.
 Oliver Watkins, Office Mgr. Bill Saddler, Subs. Mgr.
 Staff Photographers: Jim Mills, Corneil Wright
 News staff: Don Maynard, Andy Taylor, Faye Massengill, Walk Dear, Nancy Burgess, Edd Davis, John Noble, Barrett Bouliware, Stanley Smith, Billy Grimes.
 Sports staff: Frank Allston, Jr., Joe Cherry, Lew Chapman, Art Greenbaum, Bill Roberts, Harvey Rich, Bill Peacock, Ken Barton.
 Business staff: Tate Erwin, Boots Taylor, Marie Withers, Charles Ashworth.
 Business staff: Tate Erwin, Boots Taylor, Marie Withers, Charles Ashworth, John Poindexter, Hubert Breeze, Bruce Marger, Bill Faulkner, Pat Morse, Chuck Abernethy, Martha Byrd, Marie Costello, Marie McGerity, Lamar Stroup.

SOCIETY STAFF
 EDITORS: Faye Massengill
 ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Nancy Burgess
 REPORTERS: Evelyn Wright, Margie Story, Marvel Stokes, Sarah Gobel, Lula Overton, Nancy Bates, Helen Boone and Jimmy Foust.
 Night Editor, John Noble Sports, John Noble

NONPLUS

by Harry Snook

SNOOK'S FAN MAIL

Editor:

It is gratifying to note that Harry Snook's column has occasioned several responses in The Editor's Mailbox. This would seem to indicate, as Mr. Snook has pointed out, that the column is somewhat of a success, since even his most avid antagonists "condescend to read" it. All of which makes me rather happy, as I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Snook (as a writer, not a philosopher) and his column (as a diversion, not a criterion). On the other hand, it is impossible that such controversial issues as those treated by him could pass without comment. Mr. Snook is treading on many sets of toes, in flagrant violation of the aged adage that a gentleman never discusses women, religion, and politics. Of course, in these times of literary prostitution, one must make the choice of being a gentleman or a columnist. Mr. Snook has obviously made his choice.

Accordingly, I do not feel that his observations on UNC's academic status should pass without comment. He seems to be in agreement with the opinions quoted in a late issue of the New York Times magazine: "An American university is an athletic institution in which a few classes are held for the weak-minded;" or "Our universities have a great accumulation of knowledge; the freshmen bring some in and the seniors take none out, and thus it accumulates." In general, this is probably true; but it is no more true of Carolina than of any other school in the country. It must be remembered that every state university, including Carolina, owes its existence to "the modern idea of education for the masses." In accordance with this precept, anyone who is qualified must, within numerical restrictions, be admitted to the university. It is inevitable that these should include a "bunch of irresponsible idiots." But the whole concept of mass education is based on equal opportunity; what each individual makes of that opportunity is his responsibility, not the institution's. There are "irresponsible idiots" in every facet of society throughout the world; this has not prevented great men from becoming great. Rather, it has magnified their greatness by contrast. As for Carolina's "inferior academic status," I cannot, nor, do I believe, can Mr. Snook, speak with authority. I do not think, however, that the association of the reputation of the graduate school with that of the entire university is erroneous. A university is judged by its graduate school, which is only natural, if one considers that most important advances and contributions to the general knowledge are made by graduate students and faculty working in close coordination. And I think even most undergraduates will agree that the graduate school rates a respected, if not exalted, place in the university administration; for it is only here that a student, after the necessary academic background, can plunge seriously into the art of learning and cross the line that separates a student from a scholar. Is that not the highest fulfillment of the purpose of education?

Before I close, it might make Mr. Snook happy to learn that I, for one, am more or less in agreement with his views on pre-marital relations and religion, though I should hesitate to stick my neck out in print. That takes guts, Mr. Snook, but you seem to have them, so more power to you. More power, also, to the Tar Heel, whose editorial policy apparently not only allows, but encourages complete freedom of expression for the iconoclast as well as the conventionalist. There are few such publications in today's world.

Paul T. Chase

P.S. Please let us in on the secret of Mr. Snook's identity, or identities. You will be putting an end to considerable wild speculation.

(Snook is a real live student Check Central Records for verification.—Ed.)

"Haven't You Heard? The Wolf Was Killed In Korea"



Tar Heel At Large

by Robert Ruark '35

It probably is not possible to refuse fresh American citizenship to the celebrated Mr. Gary Davis, the orchestra leader's boy who sought to reform the world by renouncing his American birthright in Paris a few years back. He appointed himself, as I recall, World Citizen No. 1.

Dr. Davis has wed, since, an American citizen, dwells among us currently, and in due course of time (normally three years from the date of his residence as an American's spouse) is entitled to naturalization. This happens to war brides of all nations, and possibly should not be denied to Mr. Davis, a sort of international peace bride, himself.

Except that the fellow insults his homeland three times, on his own action. First, he purposefully turned in the solidest passport in a troubled world for a fuzzi-headed jihad (Arabic, best word I know for angled rabble-rousing under quasi-noble aim). Then he says in his letter to U. S. Atty. Gen. J. Howard McGrath, that he only renounced his citizenship as a publicity stunt.

"My renunciation of citizenship in Paris in May 1948, was an action intended to dramatize the cause of world peace, world citizenship and the One World principle. My loyalty to my homeland has at no time been in question."

Then he says, in requesting immediate restoration of rights as a citizen. "This I feel will give my belief in world citizenship the solid foundation necessary to its eventual realization." This you might say is the double-barrelled publicity stunt, but with the temerity to involve what millions feel to be the most priceless possession of modern mankind as the cheap gimmick. It appears to me this American boy is being just a little cavalier in his treatment of an idealistic commodity for which a great many people

have died or risked their lives in order to obtain. No matter what your estimate of American citizenship, it is not a public relations gimmick for a feather-headed young man with delusions of Messiah.

Mr. Davis writes, in his request for reinstatement that "because, along with the inalienable human rights which will accrue to me as an American citizen, I wish to assume with a minimum of delay these rights."

You may well dismiss Mr. Davis as a crackpot, but unfortunately he proved to be the kind of hot-eyed zealot who was most disturbing to the orderly resettlement of Europe, and his cult acquired great following both there and here. At best appraisal he has been a lousy advertisement for his country, and a lovely hunk of propaganda meat for the Russians. This could be partially our fault; we gave him an awful lot of space when he fired his country, as one would report an infant's abandonment of an ice-cream cone.

I don't even know why I bother with him much, except that Davis is a beautiful composite of a type I least admire. He is, first, the ad-lepted idealist, bereft of practicality, meddling in men's business while clad in emotional rompers. He is, secondly, the kind of long-hair-cut sneerer at his land who deserts it while exploiting it, and then rushes back to mama's apron when the stuff hits the fan. In this respect he is kin to the esoteric creatures who dwell abroad on American capital during the '20's and '30's, knocking their nation in high flown phrases, and deserting their villas and attics for the first plane back when Hitler started to move.

Turns out I am not much annoyed at Gary Davis. Just feel sorry that we can breed such a small gnat to inflame the international eye.

Now See Here

by Jack Lackey

Tomorrow you are going to select a new editor of this newspaper. The election is necessary because the editor who was elected last spring has been unable to return to the campus this fall. We would like to point out a few things which are often overlooked during campaigns for the election of a Daily Tar Heel Editor.

Comparisons are often made between this paper and regular metropolitan dailies, particularly with regard to the manner in which editors are selected. This is not a reasonable comparison. A regular newspaper has a publisher who owns, or represents the ownership of the paper. He selects the editor. The man selected must continue to satisfy him at all times. You are the publishers of the Daily Tar Heel and it is up to you to select the editor that you want.

As owners of this publication, how can you make the best decision? Through what medium can you express your collective decision once it has been made? How can the most qualified candidates be presented to you? These are not new questions. They have been debated at Carolina ever since this paper was first printed nearly 60 years ago. The present system of electing him at a general campus election was evolved a long time ago. It has been criticized a great deal. So far, however, none of the alternate plans has met with general acceptance.

In recent weeks it has been suggested that it would be better if the campus political parties did not make nominations of candidates for the editorship. The stated reason for this is that it would help keep politics out of the selection. It is a noble objective, but we think it is rather unrealistic. You can't keep politics out

of an election in which as many as 7,000 students are going to vote. The purpose of political parties is to select qualified candidates and to present them to you. If this selection does not take place it will greatly reduce the source of information about those who are running for the position. This does not mean that we condone general mud-slinging in any election. When such a situation occurs it is the fault of those who engage in it, and not necessarily of the political party system. The campus parties can and should be a great aid in selecting properly qualified candidates for the editorship. To eliminate them would only open the door to nominations by pressure groups and more mud than was ever seen in the past.

Every so often someone decides that the editors you have elected are not quite good enough. Sometimes they suggest that a board such as the Publications Board should make the decision. Or perhaps the student legislature, or the student body president, or the staff of the paper. Those who make these suggestions are forgetting a very important point. It is still your paper. You pay for it. You read it. You own it. If it does not meet their standards let them try to persuade you to make a change. Don't let them talk you into giving up your right to make the selection.

Look over the candidates that are now running for the editorship. Weigh their qualifications. Make your decision and then vote for the man that you think will make the best editor. Remember, it is your decision and your responsibility.

The Editor's Mailbox

Bad News

Editor:

Please print this letter.
 Bad news. How do you take bad news? (This letter is not directed at you Dear Editor). How did you take the news that North Korean Troops had crossed the 38th parallel? You probably took the news as I took it; just another international incident, it'll be over in a little while. That's just the way I took the bombing of Pearl Harbor as I sat in a tent at New River, North Carolina. Exactly eight months later my heart was palpitating a helluva lot faster and I was finding it hard to swallow; I was going ashore at Guadalcanal. No need to tell you the rest; it was tough, tough as hell, all war is tough. But this article is not meant to explain my own good fortune, it's to tell you that I got the bad news this week. Yeah, a very good friend of mine got it... got it good... he was killed in action on Korea.

I still can't believe it. I know how things like that are, yet I still think there might be a mistake.

This friend, James D. Jones, was not only my friend but the friend of lots of students here at the University. He worked with his brother-in-law Max Mitas at the University Restaurant. His sister, Eleanor Mitas, is known to some of you, let me tell you what she told me. J. D., as he was known to everybody, wrote a letter on the 18th of September. He said he had been on the side of a hill for eleven days, he hadn't had a shave or bath in over a week and he hadn't had any food to amount to much in days. He said at the time of writing the letter that shells were falling so close that he could taste the powder. The 19th he was killed. Tuesday morning this week, Mrs. Mitas received a call from her mother in Wilson telling her that she had received a telegram from the War Dept. to the effect, "We regret to inform you..."

Sure other guys are getting it... getting it good... others are just getting it. No matter it's hell, it's a rotten stinking hell that men must die so young. J.D. was 19, a kid that had never done a wrong thing in his life. I can see him smiling now always friendly to everyone. He was a great guy and there are others that are suffering the same fate.

J. D. wanted to get married when he came back, just like any of you want to do some day. I hope your lives are not shattered like his and his families and the girl he wanted to marry.

I sound as if I'm up in the air about something; yes I am. I've seen hundreds of Americans and Japs dead. I've smelled them rotting, I've seen them go into the stomachs of sharks. It may happen again. I hope and pray not. May God not let it happen.

You may ask, "what can I do?" You can when you pick up a paper, look at the pictures, the headlines and realize that men are fighting and dying so that you can read those headlines and see those pictures. Don't pick them up, read a little, allow your intellect to grasp its meaning, and then forget it. Let it go into your heart, let it make you feel that you're thankful that men are keeping Our Country Free.

Some of you may have had such news as I have had in the past, maybe there is someone close to you over there now, if so I hope he comes back, maybe there will be someone you know go over there. I hope not, but let's pray for them, let's get behind Uncle Sam and buy Postal Bonds. LET'S REMEMBER THAT WE'RE NOT OVER THERE.

I've had damn good buddies get it out there last time, drinking buddies, poker buddies, but I never thought exactly the same way about them as I felt about J. D. Jones. So folks don't have bad news rammed down your throats like I did... it's hard to think and even swallow afterwards. Let's at least think about what's going on over there.

Thomas J. Williams

Go Forward in Legislature

Ride with Bill Carr—U. P.

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
30					31			32		
33					34			35		
			36				37			
38	39	40			41			42	43	44
45					46			47		
48					49			50		
51					52			53		

12-7

HORIZONTAL

- high broad tableland
- annex
- starting at
- woe is me
- to the right
- gentle breeze
- fertile
- ornamental evergreen shrub
- abstract conception of being
- before
- gropes
- shrub of pepper family
- seriform matter
- American writer
- mongrel
- cut off short
- operative solo
- speck
- military assistant
- matrix
- obtain
- ecclesiastical headress
- put on
- capital of Italy
- chemical analysis

VERTICAL

- ogled
- female horse
- dash
- Hindu
- classical language
- inquire
- Greek marketplace
- delete
- river in Scotland
- temples
- unmannerly
- city in Russia
- planet
- at a distance
- twilight
- Luzon
- Negro
- small strait
- son of Noah
- minnow
- small bird
- state of being
- lyric poem
- by
- hair
- ambition
- Spanish painter
- cut grass from
- hazards
- gardens
- flowers
- seaport in Palestine
- Irish playwright
- auction
- yield
- Italian princely family
- footless animal
- baptize by immersion
- tiny

Answer to yesterday's puzzle.

ARIA ARE ANTE
 COMMISSIONER
 TAP TARS ORT
 AS SEER SO RE
 TEEMS SENSE
 TIRES NOT ANI
 ENID PAD ALTO
 AGE CAT CLASS
 SPAR SHAD
 PA OM THIN AB
 IJO ELOIN ALA
 CONFLAGRATION
 ASEFA GAT ODES

12-7

Average time of solution: 25 minutes.
 Distributed by King Features Syndicate.

A Financial Hypocrisy

It's happened again, and this time something should be done about it before it is too late.

We're talking about the overall student budget passed by the Legislature last spring for the 1950-51 fiscal year. To make a long and involved story short and crystal clear, this is the situation: The budget was drawn up and passed on the basis of a "conservative" estimate of 1950-51 enrollment of 6,800 students in all departments of the University. That means that a specified amount of income had to come from an average of 6,800 students over the three quarters of this year or there would not be enough money to guarantee the appropriations made in the spring to various campus agencies.

Here's what happened: The enrollment for the fall quarter in which we are now working is just barely above the average enrollment estimated for the entire year. Since the number of students always drops down during the winter and spring quarters, that means we won't nearly reach an average of 6,800 for the entire year. The fall enrollment is 6,860.

Ever since the present block fee system went into effect, in which all student organizations are appropriated their operating money from a lump sum collected by South Building and turned over to the Legislature, all student organizations have been "shortchanged" each year because the law-making body, working with the Secretary-Treasurer and the Budget Committee, has estimated enrollment (and therefore income) too high. The reason the shortchange has resulted is that the Legislature has never left a healthy unappropriated balance in the budget after appropriations were completed, even though Mr. Harry Kear, accountant for the Student Activities Fund, repeatedly recommended \$5,000 as a minimum "cushion" of unappropriated balance if the Legislature were to guarantee its appropriations. And Mr. Kear says the \$5,000 recommendation was probably too low a figure. The unappropriated balance for 1950-51 is less than \$1,000.

For several years now every student organization has been gyped out of part of its promised appropriation because the Legislature has overestimated enrollment and income. For example, The Daily Tar Heel lost \$1,500 in 1948-49 whereas it should have made a profit of approximately \$250 if it had gotten the money it was promised. That \$250 is a small profit when you consider that this newspaper is a non-profit organization on a \$45,000 budget. It is a credit to the Publications Board that the budgeting hit so close to the goal, but a discredit to the Legislature that it should upset such a wise budgeting program with a mistake which had been made at least twice previously.

We know now that the same situation exists this year. Therefore something should be done immediately to prevent financial chaos at the end of the year, when we shall find that some organizations have jumped in and spent their budgeted (but partially non-existent) funds and left nothing for organizations which use part of their money right up to the end of the fiscal year.

We suggest that the Secretary-Treasurer immediately place the matter before the Student Legislature with a recommendation that the budget be taken from the files and reworked until it is more than just a financial hypocrisy.

No Unconstitutionality

The Chairman of the Elections Board, Julian Mason, tells us the Board has disqualified a candidate from running for office in tomorrow's special election because the man failed to appear at the compulsory candidates' meeting, didn't pay his dollar fine for missing the meeting, and gave as an excuse the fact that he was eating dinner at the time.

Mason went on to say that the candidate indicated he would appeal the Election Board's ruling to the Student Council. Our immediate question was: On what grounds was the appeal to be made? Mason said the candidate apparently didn't have any. We agreed.

If the Student Council even hears the case, which it shouldn't since there are no valid grounds on which to base an appeal, we can't see how it could rule any way other than to uphold the elections laws and the ruling of the Elections Board.

The only way the Elections Board's ruling could be reversed is for the Student Council to declare the elections laws on which the ruling was based to be unconstitutional. Otherwise the Council is merely disregarding the laws passed by our duly constituted representatives in the Student Legislature.

From here, we don't see any unconstitutionality involved in the case.