

# Physical battle ends in Gamecock victory

by Chris Cobbs  
Sports Editor

Dean Smith stood at the base of the dimly-lit sloping corridor leading to the UNC dressing room in the bowels of Carolina Coliseum. He held a menthol cigarette in

one hand, a soft drink can in the other.

A cluster of newspapermen crowded in to hear him.

"It was a most unusual game," Smith began. "Neither team played up to its capabilities."

The 72-66 score favoring seventh-ranked South Carolina gave some indication of the truth of his statement.

The No. 8 Tar Heels, with the second best field goal shooting percentage in America, made only

three field goals in the first half and only 15 for the afternoon.

Most of the regionally televised contest was played at an aggravatingly slow pace, broken repeatedly by fouls.

In fact, a Coliseum record of 58

personal fouls were detected. "I don't think any of the players harbored any animosity for each other," Smith said.

He was perturbed by the actions of Gamecocks John Roche and John Ribock, however. Roche, high scorer in the game with 32 points "swore" at Smith and "asked me how good a player I used to be," the coach related.

Ribock was even more offensive, according to Smith. The 6-8, 240-pounder stepped on fallen Carolina guard George Karl on one occasion and elbowed reserve Kim Hubbard as he walked to the foul line another time.

Smith incurred a technical for protesting the former incident. "A coach is worthless if he doesn't protect his players," he observed, more than a little disgusted.

Each hand went to his mouth, then he continued.

"I've been in the Atlantic Coast Conference 13 years but this was the first time anyone ever did what Paul Dietzel did." The USC Athletic Director sat directly behind Smith and tried to calm the hostile Gamecock crowd.

"I want to publicly thank Coach Dietzel," said the Tar Heel mentor. "Both he and Coach (Frank) McGuire tried to control the fans."

Smith also praised McGuire's coaching. "Frank has done an excellent job, he's got a terrific rebounding team. They are good enough to beat anyone in the country."

The Gamecocks, seldom allowing UNC more than one shot, outbounded the visitors 38-26 and outshot them from the field 52.2 per cent to 36.6.

Smith grinned for a moment. "They actually payed us a nice compliment by holding the ball on two occasions. I think that helped account for the low score."

The Gamecocks delayed, with Roche handling the ball, for the last two minutes of the first half, when they ran up a 12-point lead.

They also held it when Carolina rallied to cut the difference to 50-45 after 12 minutes of the second period.

Then came the turning point, as Smith related the story.

Tar Heel Dennis Wuycik, driving for two of his team-high 21 points, incurred a charging foul. USC's Bob Carver was awarded two free throws and he sank them both.

That nullified Wuycik's hoop, made the score 56-51 and set up Carolina's final surge.

The Cocks extended the margin to seven before UNC rallied in the last four minutes. "We thought we'd win then," Smith related. "We were really disappointed not to come out with a victory."

Roche put it away with a pair of free throws after Tar Heel guard Dale Gipple was off target with two jumpers in the concluding 30 seconds.

The loss left the Tar Heels 17-4 for the year, 9-2 in the ACC. USC is 16-4 and 7-4 with three league games remaining.

Behind Wuycik for the losers were Bill Chamberlain with 17 points and George Karl with 16.

Smith refused to let any Tar Heels talk to the press. He feared in the tense atmosphere someone might make a statement that would find its way to an opponent's bulletin board.

"You're dead this year in the ACC if you give anyone any extra incentive," he said. "I rarely close the dressing room, but this is certainly an unusual occasion."

Thus ending, as he began, with an understatement, Smith crushed his cigarette, said "thank you" and rejoined his team.

## Thursy Tar Heel

Years Of Editorial Freedom

Vol. 78, No. 100

Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Monday, February 22, 1971

Founded February 23, 1893

# Speakers hit repression of women in professions

by Jessica Hanchar  
Staff Writer

"There is a message in Womens' Liberation that is just as appropriate for women in the professions as well as for women in the movement," Sheila Tobias told members of the N.C. Business and Professional Women's Club this weekend.

The message, delivered by Mrs. Tobias, associate provost at Wesleyan University, and by U.S. Rep. Martha Griffiths (D-Mich.) at the 16th annual Spotlight on Women conference.

"You don't have to decide if the message is true or not," explained Mrs. Tobias, "because it just rings true."

While Mrs. Tobias, a founder of the National Organization of Women, brought to the group an awareness of the "problem that has no name." Rep. Griffiths brought examples of the problem in the way of court cases and specific legislation.

"The Supreme Court has never

permitted any woman to win a suit under the 14th amendment," said Mrs. Griffiths. "The Court is talking about women in the Middle Ages when it comes to their rights."

Rep. Griffiths successfully introduced the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution last session. The amendment was opposed and amended by N.C. Sen. Sam Ervin and defeated in the Senate. Mrs. Griffiths plans to re-introduce her amendment this year.

Mrs. Tobias related the message in Womens' Liberation by asking the women to "look at the experience on the job of working women and find the analysis that rings true." She proceeded by giving examples of psychological and social obstacles to working women.

"Working women are the victims not only of overt discrimination, such as pay and promotion, but also of myths and definitions of our roles," she said. "We are asked to perform typically female roles on the job, such as making coffee, and then we are denied promotion for

just these reasons." This she termed role conflict.

"Men are also supervisors of offices made up only of women," Mrs. Tobias said. "I doubt any of you have ever been in an office where a woman was supervisor of a group of men."

Another example of discrimination, she said, was job segregation. "We are channeled into positions that are less rewarding. Jobs are sex stereotyped so that there is no interchangeability of roles."

She asked women in the audience to compare their positions in the career world with those of their brothers or men they started out with in the same office as proof of job discrimination. "Women are in dead end jobs and made to feel natural to be there," the NOW founder charged.

"Job segregation is the key to keeping women down," she added. "This way women don't see the difference between them and the men being promoted, don't see the discrimination."

Mrs. Tobias explained that social and psychological obstacles to women begin very early in infancy and are part of the socialization process. "Boys are taught to be stimulated and to control their environment while girls are taught to fear it and adapt to it."

She showed examples of how children's books reinforce the stereotyped images of women. "Boys are shown in achieving situations and are taught to please themselves. Girls are shown in situations where they are pleasing others."

Mrs. Tobias said part of the problem lies in the attitudes of women toward other women. "Women resent working for women because it is part of our condition to feel natural to take orders from men but not women."

"Women are taught very early that they have to please men to get anywhere, either in marriage or on the job. So we resent other women's competition," she added.

"The only way is to change our own behavior," she explained. "We don't want to become like men but raise our own consciousness. If we can make women demand what is our right, the pillars will fall."

During the question and answer session that followed, the women in the audience affirmed the examples Mrs. Tobias raised in their own experiences.

"If these examples fit you, then you are as much for Womens' Liberation as the college women," she said.

Rep. Griffiths gave the women's group examples of the problem outside the working world. One example was the recent court case concerning a Florida woman who was denied employment because she had children under six while a man with children under six was hired for the same job. The Supreme Court sent the case back to the lower court. "This kind of discrimination happens often," according to Mrs. Griffiths. "The courts are not the place to settle equal rights; the place is in the legislatures. The Congress should make federal, state and city laws apply equally."

"The working woman should not have to go to court to demand equal protection. The Equal Rights Amendment would force legislative bodies to do it," she said.

Rep. Griffiths expressed the hope that "some day some president will finally have the sense to appoint a woman to the Supreme Court. Someday the Supreme Court will look down and say this plaintiff or defendant may be a woman but she's human and the Constitution of the United States applies to her."

In reference to actions by Sen. Ervin to defeat the amendment, Mrs. Griffiths said, "They aren't living in a real world up there in the Senate. They are totally unaware of the millions of women working to put their children through school or add to their standard of living."

# Anti-draft rally slated

by Marc Shapiro  
Staff Writer

An anti-draft rally sponsored by the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) will be held Tuesday at 7:30 p.m. in 202-204 of the Carolina Union. Featured

speaker will be Jerry Norton, national college director of YAF.

State Chairman of the YAF, David Adcock Thursday appealed "to everyone on campus," to attend the rally. The purpose of the rally is to solicit support for passage of U.S. Senate bill S-495 to

institute a volunteer army by cutting off conscription, raising pay and improving living conditions within the Army.

The bill, introduced by Senators Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) and Mark Hatfield (R-Ore.), if passed would take the place of the President's authority to draft soldiers which expires this June 30 under the Selective Service Act of 1967.

A similar bill last year lost by a vote of 55-37. Adcock says with the addition of new senators, including William Brock (R-Tenn.) and James Buckley (Ind-N.Y.), both favorable to the bill, a swing of only five votes would be needed to secure passage.

Adcock stresses the fact that support in North Carolina is important since Senator Sam Ervin (D-N.C.) is one of those pivotal senators who may switch their vote from last year for passage. Senator Everett Jordan (D-N.C.) voted for a volunteer army at that time.

If the bill fails, barring any other attempts to change, the draft will continue in its present form for three more years.

At the rally petitions will be signed and plans for further action will be made. Under the direction of Phillip Skeen, who heads Repeat the Draft Program of the YAF on this campus.

Adcock calls the rally "a golden opportunity for students to try to work within the methods of society to institute change."

# Students, trustees discuss GM issue

by Woody Doster  
Staff Writer

The Consolidated University has become involved in the current attempt to reform General Motors (GM), because it owns 6,100 shares of GM stock valued at almost \$500,000.

The reformers are the Project on Corporate Responsibility, a national group which seeks to give GM consumers and stockholders a greater voice in decision making.

At this morning's 9:30 meeting of the Finance Committee of the University Board of Trustees, 20 minutes will be devoted to discussing whether the Consolidated University should give their 6,100 votes to GM's status quo management or to the Project.

Three students will be allowed to attend the previously closed meeting. The three are UNC's Gerry Cohen and Bob Blair and N.C. State's Gene Tyson.

Student Legislator Cohen will address the 10-member committee to explain why the Legislature favors the three proposals of the Project on Corporate Responsibility.

The first proposal, on shareholder democracy, would make GM directors more responsive to shareholders' concerns by permitting all shareholders to make nominations for and choose among opposing candidates for director.

A proposal on constituent democracy would give three of GM's most important constituencies—consumers, dealers and employees—the right to select three directors.

The third proposal, on disclosure, would encourage an informed electorate

by giving shareholders the minimum information necessary to judge whether GM is meeting its public responsibilities in areas such as air pollution control, automotive safety and minority hiring.

"The University as a social institution must be socially responsible," Cohen said. "If the University is concerned about the issues of environmental pollution or constituent democracy they must vote for the three proposals."

ECOS is also urging the University to vote with the Project. "We are sympathetic to their plans and I have urged University Vice President (Felix) Joyner to speak to the Finance Committee," said ECOS Director Watson Morris.

"The purpose of the Project is to make sure large corporations are responsive to consumers and shareholders," Cohen said.

"Right now, corporate democracy in American business is a myth," he continued.

The Project is focusing its reform efforts on institutions, such as banks and universities, including UNC, because collectively they own 35 per cent of GM stock.

The University's stock is owned by the Endowment Fund, used mainly for student aid. According to Cohen, the dividend loss resulting from the proposals would be "negligible."

"The loss to the environment the University will suffer if these proposals don't pass is surely greater," Cohen said.

To inform people of the issues, Cohen plans to ask Board members to attend panel discussions on the University campuses with students, faculty and Project members from Washington who have already agreed to attend.

"If the Board can't reach a decision today, we will ask that they meet again or conduct a vote by mail," said Cohen.

The Project on Corporate Responsibility conducted a similar campaign to reform GM last year. The Project's request that their proposals be put on the GM proxy was refused.

The Securities and Exchange Commission intervened and forced GM to include the proposals, but the Project couldn't send along any supporting material.

As a result, only 3 per cent of the 2.5 million GM shares voted for the proposals. At that time a campaign was conducted on campus to have the Finance Committee vote with the Project.

The Board, however, voted with GM's management as they have in the past.

## Witness deadline

The deadline for signing up to go Washington, D.C. Tuesday with Washington Witness is today at noon.

Washington Witness II will leave Tuesday morning at 4:30 a.m. from the Morehead Planetarium parking lot.

The trip was organized by students and faculty members to discuss specific legislation, primarily the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971, with Congressional leaders, in an effort to end the war in Indochina.

The cost of the round-trip bus transportation is \$12. Interested persons may sign up at the YM-YWCA.

## Medical school question

# ECU: academics or politics?

by Lou Bonds  
Staff Writer

There are two battles being waged over the proposed East Carolina University (ECU) medical school.

The first is one of academics. "Is it feasible to locate a medical institution at ECU?" Most of the medical experts hired to answer that question have reached a definite agreement. Their reply is "no."

It is on the second battleground, a political front, that the answer will finally be given as to whether or not ECU will obtain the medical school. And it is here, in the N.C. General Assembly, that ECU President Leo Jenkins seems to be gaining a slow victory.

In 1963, the idea of locating a second state-supported medical school in Greenville was first discussed. The General Assembly then decided it would be a good idea to have some sort of study done to see if the idea was feasible. Each of the medical groups recruited for the study returned the same answer—"not at ECU."

But ECU has enough pull in the General Assembly to skirt each of the pessimistic reports by experts. In 1963, the General Assembly decided to include ECU as one of the locations for a proposed medical school.

In 1965, it persuaded legislators to okay a two-year program if it could meet standards by the first day of 1967.

## News analysis

And when an affiliate group of the American Medical Association told the General Assembly in 1967 ECU was not able to meet prescribed standards, legislators approved the school anyway and made East Carolina a state-supported school.

At a meeting of the State Board of Higher Education Friday, East Carolina won another small but strategic battle. The education board voted to recommend a one-year ECU medical program over the proposed two-year plan. As Jenkins said, it was not what ECU wanted but it was a step towards eventually locating a full four-year school there.

At that meeting, Gov. Bob Scott, chairman of the UNC Board of Trustees, gave his support to the board's recommendation and struck out at University officials for trying to "block the approval of medical education at East Carolina University."

The Governor referred to Consolidated University President William C. Friday's refusal to support another Jenkins strategem that would have graduates of the

proposed ECU medical school complete their third and fourth year of training at UNC.

Friday indicated he preferred expansion of UNC's own medical school, including the establishment of a one-year medical program at N.C. State University.

For this decision, Friday received a verbal lambast from the Governor during the board's meeting. Scott went so far as to compare Friday's refusal of Jenkins' plan to "The so-called blue bloods of society who look down in contempt on anyone whose ancestry doesn't date back to the pilgrim fathers."

Scott made it clear he supports not only a one year ECU medical school but a four year school there in the future.

Several questions have evolved out of the issue, most of them concerning Scott's position. Why would Scott, who presides over the UNC trustees, offer his assistance to an ECU proposal rejected by leading medical authorities?

Part of the answer may lie in the 1968 governor's race. One of Scott's active campaigners was none other than Leo Jenkins.

Why would Scott support a program costing taxpayers \$500,000 for a one-year school and over \$150 million for a full four-year school.

That is the question William C. Friday is asking himself at the moment.