

# The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor  
Bill Staton, Business Manager



Dale Gibson, Managing Editor  
Rebel Good, News Editor  
Harvey Elliott, Features Editor  
Owen Davis, Sports Editor  
Scott Goodfellow, Associate Editor  
Kermit Buckner, Jr., Advertising Manager

The Daily Tar Heel is published by the University of North Carolina Student Publication's Board, daily except Monday, examination periods and vacations and during summer periods. Offices are on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone numbers: editorial, sports, news-933-1011; business, circulation, advertising-933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514. Second class postage paid at U.S. Post Office in Chapel Hill, N.C. Subscription rates: \$9 per year; \$5 per semester.

## Bland Simpson Middle Of The Big Time

Out of the hills of Saxonville, by roller skates, sting-ray, plane, train, or any other means of getting here that got them here, came the Jocks.  
Detected by the magnivox 8000 superfine hearing ear eyes of the athletic department's recruiting staff, then selected by the A-1 legislative & academical "processing for play" commission, furthermore connected to appropriate Team, these aforementioned Jocks roam about campus broadcasting the unrealized reality that "We are the Team, hi-hi-hodi-hoo-hoo-ha-ha, yes, we are the Kings, Heeroes, wipeout musketeers supreme!"  
And if you and I, general average clods & jerks that we are, don't see fit or happen to forget about that we should oughta get outta the way, bow down, scrape, etcetera, then "they" go right on and BLUNK! sock it to us. In other words, they exercise their royal privvy-ledge and run over us.  
Down We Go  
So all this sockin' and over-runnin'

that these Jocks are doing tends to remind us that we oughta be out to the stadium and down to the Carmichael paying proper homage and respect to these guys our friends and on-the-field crusaders. So we go.  
"Hip, hip, zoobie, bap, bap, hop, hop, whappa kop, bleep, blip, hipa flip, zip, wham, wham, bam." Listen to them cheerleaders go to town, lettin' you know that you, generally average clod or jerk that you may be, have a definitely necessary and (almost, if you listen to them) major part to play in getting the ole football freaks up off the field to WIN!  
Guess what? No matter how hard you drink, yell, and go wild over the prospects of the Jocks winning, they don't. So you and imported honie leave the game wondering why it is that the football Jocks keep losing.  
ANSWER: It takes piles more money to turn a losing team into a winning team than to support a winning team. And since we have 485 coaches and coaching assistants (in the football division) to support, it pays to keep the team consistently in the losing column.

## Sitterson Deserves Praise For Coed Hours Policy

The University took a major step out of the past and into the present today with its announcement that as soon as possible junior and senior women will be able to set their own hours.

The new policy, Chancellor Sitterson correctly explained, is "a significant step in recognizing the maturity and responsibility of our women students."

The Administration is to be congratulated for their taking this step not just because of the need for them to recognize the maturity of women students, but also because of the circumstances under which they formed the new policy.

The Administration is to be congratulated for their taking this step not just because of the need for them to recognize the maturity of women students, but also because of the circumstances under which they formed the new policy.

Rather than waiting until students started marching and possibly sleeping-out to force the

Administration to give them self-limiting hours, the Chancellor and his student-faculty-administrative committee recognized that women students are very strongly in favor of the policy and that they are mature enough to conduct themselves properly under such a policy.

Such a move on their part is very encouraging coming at a time when students are having to put a great deal of pressure on the Administration to try to get the right to determine for themselves whether they can have visitation in their dormitories.

Having now shown themselves very reasonable in granting junior and senior women self-limiting hours we hope they will take the next logical step and recognize the maturity of male students and allow them to determine for themselves whether they want visitation in their dorms, and if so, what rules and hours are to be followed.



Mike Cozza

## AAUP Should Investigate Discrimination Charges

The University is engaging in discriminatory practices that need to be investigated by the American Association of University Professors.

That the University is discriminating against some organizations in such a manner as to constitute censorship was proven in a letter the New University Conference wrote to Law professor Dan Pollitt, president of the UNC chapter of the AAUP.

The NUC provided evidence that while Students for a Democratic Society weren't allowed to use University facilities for a fund-raising program last year, both the Germans Club and the Scabbard and Blade society were allowed to make money off shows that were

held in University facilities. This very definitely and clearly constitutes discrimination against SDS.

The AAUP should step in to do something about the matter since one of its resolutions states that "the institutional control of campus facilities should not be used as a device for censorship."

The AAUP should take whatever action necessary to discourage the University from continuing its discrimination against organizations that haven't won the Administration's favor.

If such actions are allowed to continue they could spread to many other aspects of campus life to provide an improper check on activities by such organizations.

## Soccer Team Unusual

In an age of increased professionalization of college athletics, when the best athletes are given free educations by colleges and cars and wardrobes by alumni, it is extremely difficult to find a team anywhere that succeeds on love of the sport and not on money and fame.

Such teams do exist, and UNC is fortunate to have one example of the phenomena in its soccer team.

The soccer team lost yesterday, unfortunately, to one of the better teams in the country, Michigan State. Not surprisingly, Michigan

State relies heavily on scholarship players; UNC does not.

UNC finished its most successful season in its history yesterday. Only once did they lose to a team

that doesn't give out scholarships, that was Duke. Its other loss was to Maryland which subsidizes heavily its minor sports.

The UNC soccer team, coached by Marvin Allen, doesn't get the publicity that the football or basketball teams nor do they get the money that these teams get. When they travel it isn't by airplane but by uncomfortable bus.

When someone goes out for soccer it's because of love of the sport.

We're sorry that the booters lost to Michigan State yesterday but don't think its anything to feel bad about. To have done so well this year without prostituting the sport with heavy financial subsidies is cause for pride in the soccer team.

The two seething issues on campus—drugs and visitation—bubbled to the surface last week and Student Government again demonstrated its inability to reflect student desires.

In a close 21-17 vote Wednesday night Student Legislature voted down the progressive Jeffress drug policy and adopted instead the Williford-McMurray bill, which makes possession and transfer of any illicit drugs an offense against the student body and extends the functional double jeopardy of student courts.

Then, on Thursday, while the student politicos stood around and watched, SSOC elevated the visitation struggle with a walk to the chancellor's house followed by a bold presentation of grievances to the audience gathered in Memorial Hall to hear Gov. Scranton.

The significance of both actions is that Student Government is losing losing touch with student sentiment while SSOC is moving in to fill the void.

To understand the drug issue adequately, you have to know what went on in Student Legislature Wednesday, and that has really told.

The issues involved were clearly functional double jeopardy and

representative government.

Supporters of the Jeffress Bill—most notably Mark Evens, Richard Fox, Bruce Jolly, Ritchie Leonard, and Raphael Perez—argued that students were strongly opposed to the functional double jeopardy of the Williford-McMurray Bill, and they had some good evidence.

Evens reported that the Morrison Senate had passed a resolution favoring adoption of the Jeffress Policy. The vote there had been 16 for Jeffress, 14 for no policy at all, and 1 for Williford-McMurray. Fox reported that the King College Senate had passed a similar recommendation by a 13 to 10 vote. Perez said he had conducted a poll of over 150 students in the lower quad with similar findings.

Supporters of the Williford-McMurray bill—most notably Harry Diffendahl and John McMurray—argued that student sentiment was irrelevant.

Diffendahl claimed students didn't know enough about the issue, and only the "elite" (his word, not mine) Student Legislators could make a decision. McMurray made allusion to Profiles in Courage and said he didn't see anything wrong with voting against the will of his constituents.

On that kind of reasoning the

legislature struck down the Jeffress policy and proceeded to adopt Williford-McMurray.

Charles Jeffress commented after the vote that "We've said to the student body that we aren't willing to lead them in their drive for more student rights." And Presidential Assistant Buck Goldstein said the Day administration's role in promoting the Williford-McMurray bill was "a tragedy for Student Government." "The trend it reaffirms may well signify the end of S.G. as a viable force for change," he added.

And this, of course, brings us to SSOC.

As it stands now, SSOC is the only alternative for voicing student desires. And the role the group has played in the visitation issue may be an indication of the kind of thing we're going to see in the future.

While student government "representatives" have sat around conference tables in secret talk for several around conference tables in secret talks for several months, SSOC has moved to publicize the issue and move towards action. In so doing they have thrown off the mantle of the radical left and consolidated strength on a broad base of student support.

The 4000 name petition, the 1000 strong march on the visitation committee October 28, and the walk on the Chancellor's house Thursday may be strong indications of who really represents the students.

SSOC's critics will argue that only 200 people showed up for that last walk, and many of them dropped out after the Chancellor wasn't home and Buck Goldstein suggested the group proceed to Memorial Hall. But remember this—it was a cold night and there was a nationally known speaker on campus.

And when the hell has Student Government ever produced 4000 signatures or turned out 1000, or even 200 students for anything?

That's the key to all this, and it's a tough question for the politicos to answer. Until they can, they had better get used to SSOC and the student body breathing down their necks and urging a return to representative government.

## 'Elite' Propell Wallaceite Chasm

What have we learned from the Wallace sentiment in this election year, if we can call ourselves a learning community? Wallace played a hand which the academic community has helped to deal, and it is the job of this community to change the situation.

Wallace capitalized on the tremendous gap between the educated elite and the working groups. The privileges of education accorded to parts of our society have too often been used as a sort of certification of superiority, carrying attitudes which trample upon the feelings of people to whom feelings have more validity than foreign rationalization.

The term "Redneck" is often used by supposedly intelligent persons with the same ring of "nigger" on the tongue of a racist. Such a term is just a superficial evidence of a failing of the academic community to relate sensitively to the common man of either race. If there is criticism of pseudo-intellectuals among white, worker Wallaceites, there is no less disenchantment among black groups who have cast deadweight liberals by the wayside. There is no doubt that we must bear the blame for this isolation of the campus and many are seeing the cruciality of reorienting the campus to the community. The fact of a Wallace for President should disgust us for our lack of

considerate person-to-person action in the community.

The SSOC approach to the Durham Wallace rally was truly dynamic because it stressed individual communication between students and so-called "rednecks." No doubt, the typical heckler approach or "the mob face-off method" was more thrilling to those with a low tolerance for the tougher individual confrontation. We are challenged to return to the community in just such a spirit of personal consideration.

Add to this the challenge now facing the administration and the Student Committee on Admissions to open the doors of UNC to the "whole" community. It is essential that UNC become a public institution with a representative cross section of the public. Our admissions are culturally bound and oriented to accept achievers of sterile information. We are just now waking to the person who has or can deal creatively with the information at hand.

All concerned individuals must now repair the mistaken views of what education and the function of the university is, and the biases of "who" has access to a tax supported privilege.

Has Wallace shocked us or have we shocked ourselves, and do we wish another dose in 1972?

—Rusty Maynard

## Letters To The Editor

To the Editor of The Daily Tar Heel:

May I recommend that the DTH obtain the services of a music critic who knows something about music and who also knows how to write?

Violinist Igor Oistrakh gave an outstanding concert in Memorial Hall on November 11th. Critic James Burnham's November 13th "review" did not, at any point, provide a serious criticism or evaluation of the artist's performance or interpretation. Instead, Mr. Burnham

contented himself with flip terms, sophomoric sarcasm, and a mish mash of paint; goulash, etc. Perhaps he had hoped to serve up a paprikash of a review, but he has produced a mess of garbage instead.

It does no good to excuse him on the grounds that "Maybe for Chapel Hill he writes this way." Indeed!

Sincerely,  
Yonina Rosenthal