

accepted today.

The students at the University of Chicago recently asked the authorities to permit them to adopt the Chicago Bears, professional football team, as their team and to make arrangements with the professional management so that they might be admitted to the Bears home games on an athletic activity fee basis. The Chicago students wanted to cheer for a winner.

Last week the University Daily Kansan sports editor, Clint Kanaga, came out for subsidization of Kansas athletics, especially football.

The petition of the New York University students offered three policies: (1) The abolishment of football as an intercollegiate sport; (2) The arranging of a schedule to fit the ability of the players; and (3) Open subsidization. The first two propositions were considered untenable by the students as the students did not want football abolished, and the University authorities admitted their inability to arrange a suitable schedule to fit the ability of the players. Thus, they concluded subsidization was the only alternative.

It seems that the student bodies of schools with losing teams are in favor of subsidization, feeling that most of the successful big time teams are adequately subsidized. It is an open secret.

When certain Pacific Coast athletes were declared ineligible by Commissioner Atherton these same students entered another university *not* in the Pacific Coast Conference.

I certainly have no objection to a boy receiving a subsidy for playing, because that thing is happening in a great many of our American universities at the present time, but on a sub-rosa basis. But when colleges resort to subsidization they have moved to outright pro-