

From The News & Observer

Big-Time Football

By an interesting coincidence, The Daily Tar Heel, student newspaper at Chapel Hill, and Carl Snively, former University football coach, chose successive days this week to condemn the big-time, big money aspects of football at the University.

Snively, who was, in effect, fired at Chapel Hill when his team was not doing much worse than the current one, did not attack big-time football at Chapel Hill directly. His remarks in an interview in St. Louis, where he is now coach at Washington University, were expressions of his satisfaction to get out of "big-time" football and into coaching at a university which has de-emphasized athletics. However, his criticism of the football situation at Chapel Hill was evident.

"The emphasis on winning was too great at North Carolina," he said. At Washington University he does not have to face "the desperate, absolutely unyielding demands for victory." At North Carolina a coach, he said, had to face a "money schedule." "Football must show a profit at the big school and so you have to arrange a schedule that will bring in money. But you have to win and play interesting football to make that kind of a schedule."

Snively went on: "There's another difference, too. We can't demand the same kind of rigid practice schedules out here. The players even miss practice a few times because their school work is too exacting. . . . Some boys don't even make the trips because of school work. But what the heck, they don't get anything for playing here."

Some of those who thought that the University might do better in the big time if they got rid of Snively may even in this disastrous season think the ex-coach is talking about sour grapes. There is, however, no connection with his interview and the Tar Heel's platform:

We are against the student and alumni philosophy which says, "Let's have a winning team at all costs. If these boys can't do it, let's buy better ones."

We are fighting the idea that big-time sports belong in our University. We seek to debunk the arguments which say big-time sports bring more good than bad. We are striving to convince the University it should not add athletes to its payroll. We are trying to return our University to the main function for which it was created — learning.

The Daily Tar Heel stands for the primary role of the University as an educational institution. The necessary . . . athletic program should be included, but it would be in a niche and not on a pedestal.

To effectuate such a program, the Tar Heel proposed:

1. Abolish University grants-in-aid to athletes as such.
2. Abolish the Educational Foundation.
3. Grade average of C should be required of athletes.
4. Cut out or reduce price of admission of games.
5. University should resume direct control of athletics.

Certainly those are interesting proposals coming from such a responsible source. Undoubtedly there are some who feel that regardless of the money put up by alumni through the Educational Foundation and also by the University itself, the University this year, on the basis of scores and showing, has unintentionally already gotten out of anything that could be accurately described as "big-time" football. Even with low scores, however, the problems which former Coach Snively and the Tar Heel stress remain in the athletic situation at Chapel Hill — and some other North Carolina institutions of higher learning.

Coach Snively's expressions of relief at getting out of hell-for-leather and cash-for-players football may reflect some personal feeling. The Tar Heel's campaign to put the first emphasis on education in all things, including football, at Chapel Hill, however, deserves the attention of all those who believe it is more important to educate men than to win any or all games, fill stadiums, or pile up athletic cash.

The Daily Tar Heel

The official student publication of the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina, 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, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

Editor _____ ROLFE NEILL
Managing Editor _____ LOUIS KRAAR
Business Manager _____ JIM SCHENCK
Sports Editor _____ TOM PEACOCK
News Ed. _____ Ken Sanford
Associate Ed. _____ Ed Yoder
Night Editor for this issue: Rolfe Neill

Another Look

If reviewer Ted Rosenthal was right in saying the first act of "On Borrowed Time" lacked vigor and dragged on the play, his opening-night criticism must have given the cast one tremendous goose. For we saw the show Friday (it closes tonight) and are still grinning. It was a delightful performance with the first act as sparkling as the last.

It must be admitted we went with a prejudice produced by Rosenthal's and similar comments by other first nighters. But maybe we relaxed and slipped into the spirit of the thing when the always-courteous usher seated us and said, "I hope you enjoy the play." We did. And the full-house crowd was enthusiastic, too, from light dimming to curtain call.

"On Borrowed Time" is playwright Paul Osborn's reminder not to take oneself or the world too seriously. It spoofs doctors (the AMA would cry "foul!"), society, death, religion and anything else which comes in range of its witty lines. We found it quite even-flowing except once when Death, in the person of Mr. Brink, philosophized from an apple tree.

Darling of the show was Pud, done by six-year-old Michael Casey whose daddy is in the UNC phys ed department. As was pointed out in the earlier review, Pud's role was long. He did it, however, without a bumble. His inflection was captivating and he played his part as naturally and as vivaciously as had he been in his own Victory Village living room.

Just as good was Christian Moe as Gramps. He never strayed from his character part. Mrs. Les Casey, who in real life is young Michael's mother, played opposite Gramps. We found her at ease in her part.

William White was the lawyer, Pilbeam. White made quite a hit in "Mister Roberts" and again in "On Borrowed Time" he proved his ability, this time in a different type of role.

Jane Barringer as Demetria Riffle has been criticized for being too stereotyped in a stereotyped role. Miss Barringer struck us as doing a nice job in this characterization. Perhaps some have never encountered the particular type of aunt played by her. We have.

Rick Faw played Mr. Brink, i.e., Death. If his early acting is any indication of what death is like, one easily sees why many hate to go. He did get better as the evening progressed, however.

"On Borrowed Time" seems a wonderful show for the Playmakers to take on their annual tour of the state and southeastern circuits, much more than last year's panned production of "The Inspector General."

There have been many of the Playmakers' offerings in the past which got good or even excellent notices when we considered them below par. Now a reviewer finally gets around to panning the group and his criticism seems good for one night only. This is a tribute to the reviewer, and the company, perhaps, since the reviewer seems to have stimulated the reviewed.

Frankly, we had a fine time on borrowed time.—RN.



Washington Merry-Go-Round

Drew Pearson

WASHINGTON — Secretary of State Dulles is not happy, to put it mildly, over Vice President Nixon's impromptu diplomacy on his Far Eastern tour. He feels that Nixon has reached for too many headlines, may have put personal publicity ahead of American foreign policy.

After Dulles announced that the United States may someday recognize Red China, for example, Nixon assured Chiang Kai-Shek in Formosa that the Secretary of State really didn't mean what he said. Naturally, Dulles was furious.



PEARSON

Again, in Indo-China, Nixon pledged U. S. support to Syngman Rhee in his struggle for a United Korea. Rhee promptly interpreted this as meaning that the United States would help him fight his way back to the Yalu, in case the political talks break down. Yet this isn't American policy at all.

All this is why Nixon is now reading from prepared manuscripts—manuscripts which are scrutinized by U. S. diplomats in advance.

So many Congressmen have been demanding free airplane rides around Europe that the Air Force mission which is supposed

to train French pilots has kept most of its planes busy catering to vacationing Congressmen.

Since Congress adjourned three months ago, 246 members of Congress, believe it or not, have shown up at the Air Force mission in Paris demanding free transportation.

Most of them have been accompanied by their wives or secretaries. Some have been accompanied by both their wives and secretaries—plus even their secretaries' wives.

When President Eisenhower, who is on a diet, had breakfast the other morning with hefty GOP Congressman Clarence Brown of Ohio, also on a diet, the conversation naturally got around to their respective weights.

"I'm doing all right on the scales," said Brown. "I'm down to 206 pounds. Believe it or not, that's almost exactly what I weighed when I played my last game of football back in 1916. It was a semi-pro game. Before that I had been a regular on the Washington and Lee University team."

"Well, oddly enough, the same is true in my case," grinned the President. "I weigh 174 stripped, which is exactly what I weighed when I played my last game of football for Army. I gained about 10 pounds during the summer but have since taken them off by dieting."

The two dieting ex-footballers both ate a light breakfast—half a grapefruit, one soft-boiled egg, toast, marmalade and black coffee. But they seemed to enjoy it.

Secretary of the Air Force Talbott is still in the Pentagon doghouse.

After his return from Europe,

Harold was called on the carpet by his boss, Secretary of Defense Wilson, to explain his unauthorized statement about sending A-bombs to Spain. Talbott swore it was all the fault of the Spanish translators, and that what he had said was: The United States would support Spain with A-bombs. The way the translators scrambled it, Talbott claimed, the word "support" came out as "supply," so he was quoted as saying the United States would supply Spain with A-bombs.

Wilson, however, still wasn't appeased. He pointed out that Talbott had kept on sticking his foot in his mouth even after he left Spain, and had made a remark about cutting down the size of our forces in Europe, though President Eisenhower had announced no such idea was contemplated. Furthermore, Talbott made a statement about going full-speed ahead on bases that the U. S. intends to take its time building. And he promised Turkey F-86 jet interceptors, when she is really going to get F-84 jets for ground support.

As a result of all this, Talbott was warned to watch his words in the future or be fired.

U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge lost a private argument with Secretary Dulles last week over whether the United States should condemn Israel for its armed attack against Jordan.

Lodge wanted to rebuke Israel in very mild language, indicated to friends that he feared a tough resolution would lose Jewish votes for Republicans in the next election.

But Secretary Dulles flatly refused. He instructed Lodge to draw up a strong denunciation of Israel.

YOU Said It

Scholarships For All

Editor:

"They are getting paid for it."

That ugliest of remarks (that you hear in Kenan Stadium ONLY when we are losing) should be used impartially. For instance: let's say it in Latin class when a scholarship "A" student gives a recitation. Let's tell the physics professor that the boy he sets store by as a brilliant student is here on a dirty old scholastic scholarship.

Let's razz the cum laude students at commencement, if they were here with "aid." And shame, shame forever on a Rhodes scholar or a Fulbright student. Let's turn our backs on all G.I. students, the dirty things, using "our" money to get an education.

Look in the mirror, all of you users of "He's getting paid for it." Isn't somebody paying your own way? The percentage of boys who go through college on their own, without one bit of aid, is so low, it is a mere shadow on the campus. What are these mighty sums the boys are paid? Brother, you should get your brains and body knocked around for the amount MOST, and I mean most, of the boys are getting.

If all the critics of our "aid-ed" athletes would rush to Woolen Gym and say: "Here am I, take me, a BIG and clean American boy. I will train as you say. I will practice in rain and cold and heat and snow. I will study in my spare time to maintain my scholastic average, thereby giving up all social life. I will do it for God, for country, and for Carolina."

That way, dear critics, we won't need any grants-in-aid, but neither will we have much of a team, because coaching is a profession and coaches want the best material possible.

If you want a college without good, tough, competitive teams, there's always St. Johns in Annapolis, Maryland, established for the likes of you. Small, debative, and STUDIOUS. You have to pay though, so be sure to notify whoever is "aiding" you here, before you make the transfer. It will cost them more up there.

Dottie O'S. Mare

A Tenacious Struggle

Editor:

Your crusade for abolishing big-time athletics deserves merit, if only for your tenacity of struggle. It is not my right to question your motives in this campaign, but let's look at your methods, i.e., your argument, for a minute.

In the Tuesday editorial page, you outlined five points on how to get out of the big-time. To my mind comes a question—do we want to get out of the "big-time?"

1. "It should be made clear, however, that the undergraduate who applies for aid will not be refused because, he incidentally happens to be an athlete." Here you're unconsciously driving subsidization underground again—like the so-called scholastic scholarships at Princeton.

2. "Abolish the Educational Foundation." Without some kind of check on alumni grants and gifts, sponsored and controlled by the University, the dam will spill over and we will find ourselves back again in the wholesale bartering of the '30's and middle '40's.

3. "Grade average of C should be required of athletes." Not only will this method induce undue pressure for grades (an uneducational theory) but isn't an overall C average required of all students for graduation and wouldn't this embrace our athletes? Or are they allowed to graduate without it?

4. "Cut out or reduce price of admission to games." It would be fine if appropriated funds could take over and finance our entire school physical plant—to "big-time" football and we kiss away one of the finest intramural programs in the country, the but so far this hasn't happened. We kiss goodbye W. A. C., over half of our other varsity sports programs, and in conclusion, an area where 90 percent of the student body engages in something during the school year.

5. "University should assume direct control of athletics." Mr. Editor, for just such a question, I'll ask you one. Would you personally find out exactly what the Athletic Association is and please publish its membership breakdown and duties on your editorial page?

Bernie Shields

(Regarding No. 3: Yes, athletes are required to have a C average for graduation. However, to compete on the field they only need have a half C average. Thus our athletes can play on an average which wouldn't make them eligible for graduation. All other students in extra-curriculars must have an average of C to participate in campus activities.

(Regarding No. 5: Director of Athletics C. P. Erickson says the president and vice-president of the Athletic Association are elected by the student body; A. W. Hobbs is faculty chairman of the group; its members include the entire student body; its duties are those of policy making for all athletics other than murals.—Ed.)

Others Said

In the queer mess of human destiny the determining factor is Luck. For every important place in life there are many men of fairly equal capacities. Among them Luck decides who shall accomplish the great work, who shall be crowned with laurel, and who shall fall back into obscurity and silence.—William E. Woodward.

Christmas itself may be called into question if carried so far it creates indigestion.
—Ralph Bergengren.

A little accuracy sometimes saves tons of explanation.—Hector Hugo Munro.

