

Budgeting: Is Sinking

Library they are talking about "treadwater" the weekly staff publication there, defines (eting) in which one keeps his head above water wherever and eventually he just gets tired and a ragous little journal, was speaking about the Advisory Budget Commission's method of budgeting for the library. The library has been a victim of "treadwater budgeting" for a long time. It got its biggest slap-in-the-face last week when the Advisory Budget Commission recommended only \$250,000 be appropriated for two years' worth of library books and journals. The Library had requested \$330,000.

The reaction from one library official was pretty definite. Andrew H. Horn, retiring head librarian, said: "I was really shocked. This puts us back to the book budget we had in 1953."

Of course, it is practically impossible to get out of \$250,000 this year the same thing we got out of it five years ago.

How did the budget get cut so drastically and, apparently, so foolishly?

This state operates financially on a biennium basis. Funds are appropriated by the General Assembly, meeting now in Raleigh, on a two-year schedule.

The University, along with all other state institutions and agencies, tells the State Board of Higher Education how much money it wants for its various functions, in great detail.

The State Board of Higher Education considers all such requests, adjust figures (usually downward, out of necessity, since everybody requests more money than there is available), and sends its recommended budget to the Advisory Budget Commission.

The Advisory Budget Commission performs much the same task as the higher education board, but on a much larger scale. It must receive and approve budget requests from all state agencies.

Since practically all state agencies request for more than they could receive without doubling all state taxes, the budget commission must do considerable shaping of the requests. It must cut where it feels budgets can stand cutting. And, as Gov. Hodges said this week, "We

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 and examination and vacation periods and summer terms. Entered as second class matter in the post office in Chapel Hill, N. C., under the Act of March 8, 1879. Subscription rates: mailed, \$4 per year, \$2.50 a semester; delivered, \$6 a year, \$3.50 a semester.

- Editor — FRED POWLEDGE
- Managing Editor — CHARLIE SLOAN
- News Editor — NANCY HILL
- Business Manager — BILL BOB PLEET
- Sports Editor — LARRY CHEEK
- EDITORIAL STAFF — Woody Sears, Frank Crowther, David Mundy, Cortland Edwards.
- NEWS STAFF — Clarke Jones, Pringle Pipkin, Edith MacKinnon, Wally Kurall, Mary Alys Voorhees, Graham Snyder, Neil Bass, Page Bernstein, Peg Humphrey, Phyllis Maulsby, Ben Taylor, Walter Schruntek, H-Joost Polak, Patsy Miller.
- BUSINESS STAFF — Rosa Moore, Johnny Whitaker, Dick Leavitt.
- SPORTS STAFF — Dave Wible, Stewart Bird, Ron Milligan.
- Subscription Manager — Dale Staley
- Advertising Manager — Fred Katzin
- Circulation Manager — Charlie Holt
- Assistant Sports Editor — Bill King
- Staff Photographer — Norman Kantor
- Librarian — Sue Gishner
- Night Editor — Graham Snyder
- Night News Editor — Charlie Sloan
- Proofreader — Bill Weekes

YOU Said It: Reader Tears Apart 'Unwarranted And Wanton' Attack

Editor: I shall make it clear from the beginning of this letter that I do not wish to appear as a "Defender of the Faith," but I do believe it is the duty of anyone who sees unwarranted and wanton material to defend the side that is wronged, and who cannot answer back.

Mr. Editor, for weeks now you have been arguing that athletics at Carolina are rotten, but consistently you have evaded stating why these athletics are so rotten. You have attacked them on the grounds that they are money sports and that this same thing leads to the end-view and corruptness.

Certainly, anyone can see that the money entering into the cost at games is necessary, or else how could the gym be kept-up, uniforms bought and many other things. I think your statement that "the athlete is an athlete first, a student second" is an unwarranted attack, for these boys keep their grades as respectable as some of these fraternity brothers, and some even higher than these.

This is stupid, for we see that Coach McGuire released recently two of his star players for these low grades, and we all know how much this must have hurt.

And again I see no cause for the printing of the allusion that sportswriters, coaches, etc. have erected a golden haze around athletics. Athletics has always had a place in the American way of life, and certainly it was not built or put there by writers, but the reverse of this, the athletics have put the coaches, sportswriters and others in their positions.

Again, I see no hero-worshipers on this campus, and I see no professional athletics, unless you consider the recent "football" incident that led to the release of the player involved, therefore that leads to no conclusion that there is corruption in athletics. You have made comments that our administration is doing nothing about this, and that they are subject to pressures, but our administration has been quite firm in its policies, and I am further assured that there are no pressures. Your paper's policies, it is evident, seem to attack the administration constantly for no reasons.

I suppose that you feel quite safe behind "the freedom of the press" rights, but it seems that you are prostituting a basic freedom, which is one of the most abysmally contemptible things I can see.

So, all your arguments, if we respect them enough to call them such, are against just one individual—Mr. Tatum. You have no argument, but constantly yell empty words of corruption, vice, etc. You then start upon Mr. Tatum himself.

It is obvious that the statements made do not reflect anyone's views but your own. Mr. Tatum is in no position to answer in defense of himself, so it is someone's duty to do it for him. It is obviously stupid to say that the coaches have "made policies that are not in the best interest of academics," since you can not

validate them. I have heard of no liquor-and-women-parties that any coach has ever had, and this seems to be the most unethical thing anyone could say.

You contrasted Mr. Tatum with Mr. McGuire in such a way that you lead one to believe that Mr. Tatum is a dirty back-guard and Mr. McGuire a pussy-footer. This is the most unheard of thing I can conceive, for both gentlemen are liked in this community.

Mr. Tatum is not pampered. He has made no Grid-Iron Club, the athlete has not been taken away from the University, and certainly these athletes are not machines.

Your arguments are baseless, and if they do have a base they

are on emotion. You seem to dislike athletics so much you stick your neck out so far as to make a ridiculous farce of yourself. Because of your dislike for Mr. Tatum, which is without doubt unwarranted, you attack athletics and call them corrupt without cause.

It seems that once before Mr. Tatum was attacked by this paper, and it seems that the people who elect, and pay for the same took the action, which wisely determined the course of a new policy; but it seems that you want to revive ill-will between students and faculty and athletics. You cannot use an organ of the student body, such as The Daily Tar Heel, for a personal argument; this violates the purpose of the

paper, which is to express the news, and not the falsity of an emotional argument.

Perhaps your whole argument is based upon "sour-grapes", and that you feel badly because you are no public hero, but this is not to be an accusation on personality; but an accusation of your unwarranted, slovenly and wanton attack on an individual through the organ of the student body, based on your own opinions, with no validity to them.

I'm sure that you owe an apology to Mr. Tatum and to athletics; because you have certainly lowered the editorial policies of your paper by printing base slander, and false, emotional argument.

Julian L. Sessoms

Tatum Has Got The Bad Break

Woody Sears

We have indeed reached a sorry state when we can't see beyond the ends of our noses. It's bad when we can't find the garbage for the smell. It's almost comical.

So let's get down to the crux of the matter. What is it? Why it's "big time" athletics, of course. And what is "big time" athletics? There are probably as many definitions as there are people to give them.

Mr. Tatum seems to be the symbol of "big time" athletics. Those who are in favor of whatever it is like him, and those who are opposed to the idea don't. And in the middle, sitting on the fence, are those who don't like the idea but don't dislike Mr. Tatum.

This interpretation makes the whole thing sound rather simple, but it's about the best I can do. I don't want to get into the discussion of money, either over or under the table, and I don't want to discuss the pros and cons of segregated athletic societies.

What I would like to mention is this business of fighting over whether or not Mr. Tatum is a good man or a bad man, like in the Saturday afternoon western flicks.

And that's all it is when you strip all the fancy terminology off the surface. Terms like "prostitution of scholastic standards" and "succumbing to financial pressures" are not uncommon to this topic. Questions about where the athletes shall eat and where they shall sleep become very important. And honestly, actually, factually, does it make a great deal of difference?

I'm going to perch on the top rail of the fence for a moment to make one statement. As I see it, there is only one question worth considering, and that is the question of academics. And I speak of academics alone, not of academics vs. athletics, "big time" or otherwise. Can this monster, this ogre, this whatever it is become detrimental to the academic standards of the University of North Carolina? This is the question, and as I see it, it is the only question which merits more than a passing glance.

Now I'm going to hop off the fence, stick my neck out and let go with strictly personal opinions.

It is my opinion that there is no one man in the whole Greater University who could single-handedly corrupt the academic system or standard of any part of the University. It is ridiculous to assume that one man, especially one who is not in the administrative unit, could perform such a monstrous undertaking. That would call for a real superman.

And in my opinion, Mr. Tatum is no superman, whatever else, good or bad, he may be.

HOW COULD HE DO IT? I'm not sure exactly why he would want to tamper with the academic situation, but for the sake of argument, let's say that Mr. Tatum has this in mind for his "modus operandi" to bring "big time" athletics to Chapel Hill. Now that we've made that broad assumption, I want someone to tell me how he's going to do it... by himself or otherwise. Seems to me (as a not particularly brilliant observer) that he would need some help, and it looks to me as though the help would have to come from an administrative source.

I think that implication should be lucid enough. There's another point I'd like to mention. Mr. Tatum has been roundly criticized for his statement to the effect that "Winning's not the most important thing, it's the only thing." In my (not necessarily unique) way of thinking, this establishes Mr. Tatum's character... as a man.

I frankly admire him for saying it. People raise their eyebrows in askance at such a statement... because they're not used to hearing people tell the truth. Do you think for a moment that an insurance man gets his salesman's endurance from his desire to keep you from leaving a destitute widow in the event of your untimely death?

Do you think that the Ford sales man wants to sell you a Ford because he thinks that you'll be safer in a Ford than in a Chevvie, or that he can save you money?

If these two questions deserve yes answers, then I've got the wrong slant on life and human nature. So I think that if Mr. Tatum is the "bad" man in this pathetic melodrama, there is a rich banker or a "big time" administrator behind him. But personally, I don't think he's the "bad guy" he's been painted to be by some parties... it has been my observation that few people ever are.

I mentioned in the first paragraph that this was almost comical, and the comical aspect is that there are so many people who are in this thing as I, not knowing Mr. Tatum or a dozen football players.

But it rankles my hide to listen to all this drivel.

And I hate to see a man crucified by know-nothing, see-nothing do-gooders. The way I see it, Mr. Tatum was brought here to do a job, and the people who brought him here messed around with it so long that they probably knew what kind of toothpaste he uses. I have heard it said that if he has ever done anything or ever does anything, it would be like calling the gun guilty because someone got shot.

Mr. Tatum is, after all, an employee. If you don't like him, get after his bosses, for no one is so big that there isn't someone a little higher up the ladder.

I think we're giving this fellow a bad break, and there is little evidence of fair play about. It's time for a change of attitude on the part of a lot of people.

And if all this ruckus is for the good of ol' UNC, then there should be some unity of purpose. I think it would be of the same stink if Adolf Bababuchi was the coach instead of the controversial Mr. Tatum.

Frankly, it's time to change mounds. Let's ride someone else for a while. We could devil a whole lot of folks if we got together on it.

Here's Another One We Can Cut—No Special Need That I Can See



YOU Said It: Set Up Campus Police State?

Editor: It is unfortunate that the question as to whether or not the honor system should remain has come up at all, although the strengthening effect on the system that may result makes the question in a better light.

David Mundy, defender of democracy in Goettingen, has certainly gone to extremes in his request for the abolition of the system. His requests that all

rules be enforced suggest that he would approve the setting up of a kind of campus police state to replace the honor council.

His ignorance and/or ignoring of the stated function of the council (The Daily Tar Heel, Feb. 13) certainly does not add weight to his argument.

The disregard of the administration for certain honor council decisions in the past does not

speak well for the faith of that body in student government. It is time for a revolution which will give student government a more honored position—and the revolution can only come through the dedication of student officers and the student body to the principles of self-government, which significantly is one of the important freedoms of this university.

Name Withheld By Request

Speakers: Untapped Resources

Even though it's only before spring elections that this happens, it is good to see the campus political parties turn out some interesting programs.

Two weeks ago it was the University Party which invited Director of Student Activities Samuel Merrill to speak at a meeting of the party.

It was the Student Party which heard Charles Bernard, assistant director of admissions.

This is good government. It is good for the students who attend such meetings, and it is good for those who hear or read reports of the meetings.

We have a large and heretofore untapped source of information right here on the campus. The University is loaded with men and women who have dedicated their lives to education or to some corollary of education. They will not speak to the students until the students invite them.

Congratulations to both parties for asking Magill and Bernard to speak. We hope there will be more invitations in the future—even after elections.

L'il Abner



Pogo



By Walt Kelly