

**Point Blank by Larry Keith**



**Pill Plan:  
Sin Now,  
Pay Later**

Let's hear it for Scott Goodfellow, The Daily Tar Heel editor who advocates birth control pills for unmarried coeds.

"It seems to us," the 19-year-old Morehead Scholar wrote recently, "that is more immoral to have pre-marital intercourse without effective contraception than with it."

You bet, Scotty.

And I understand that retroactive pills are now available from your friendly neighborhood druggist.

Sort of sin now, pay later.

It is a thought worth considering, however. If a fellow (good or bad) can't have an uninhibited relationship with a girl, what can he have?

Indeed, there is a theory, which I have often heard discussed, that apple pie and coffee after a movie is a substitute pleasure. Pills, presumably, would put everything on the up and up by putting them on the down and down.

**--Impartial Study Needed**

But what of the problems such a practice would cause? Distribution, for instance.

Should the coed have her name put on a mailing list or would containers be centrally located around campus with instructions readings "For a pill, just pull?"

Who would run the operation?

Some might say the dean of student affairs, others the student union director.

It is a touchy situation but perhaps an impartial committee would reach a solution acceptable by all.

Would there be a limit to the number of pills a coed could receive in a month's period?

Let's face it, some girls have it and some don't. Those who have it and need it would need to have it. And there are some girls on campus who might go a full semester, nay, an entire year, without once requiring a pill.

Of course, the problem here is easily seen. With taxpayers' money being appropriated for the pills, there should be no discrimination in pill practices.

**--Economy Would Benefit**

Indeed, as I see it, pill distribution would expedite this matter of intergration considerably.

So much for some of the basic questions. Let's look now at what the far reaching aspects of this practice would be.

The marriage rate would go down. Shotgun weddings would be a thing of the past, because the evidence of premarital chicanery would never arise.

Hotel, motel and drive in movie business would go up. Thus, the economic boost it would give to the tourist industry is well worth considering.

Another obvious advantage, which directly follows: it would clear the streets after dark. For that matter, traffic congestion would be noticeably diminished before dark as well.

Therefore, let this matter be given much thought and consideration. Let wisdom and understanding prevail.

**Your Very Existence Could Depend On Toothpaste Used**

BY FRANK CATON

Would you believe that your social prowess, your public acceptance, your next customer, your success with the opposite sex, your success period, and even your very existence could hinge on the brand of toothpaste, mouthwash, hairspray, hair dressing, odor-arm deoderant, or the brand of cigarettes you use?

You say that's hard to believe. I say that someone is spending billions of dollars each year to make you believe it.

I also agree with Adolf Hitler that if you keep telling people something long enough and loud enough, they will eventually believe. The question is are one minute commercials long enough? God knows they're loud enough! I thought they're loud enough! I thought the ICC or the FCC or some public watchdog put an end to the inhuman practice of increasing the volume every time a commercial is shown.

Radio commercials are not guilty of the sadistic practice of ear-drum bursting; they use a more ghoulissh tactic of springing one of those minutes of melodious mirth on you approximately every three minutes. That's a total brain washing time of 8 hours out of every 24.

It's a bit more difficult to estimate the frequency of television commercials. I don't mean you can't predict when they will be shown; you can bet your last Bull Durham that there will be at least one every quarter hour. What you can't predict is how many.

I must inject at this point that I'm not knocking the free enterprise system. Every economics student is familiar with the wisdom that Brother Dave Gardner imparted to us, "If you have something that other people want, it doesn't matter if you live in the wilderness. People will beat a path to your door. Of course, advertising helps."

It is necessary for the capitalist to advertise his wares. My question is must he be so prolific? Advertising is one thing; advertising with avengance is quite another.

We the American public have been lulled into accepting the advertising establishment, usually referred to as Madison Avenue, as a basic institution. In the wake of our complacency, Madison Avenue has assumed responsibility in every phase of our personal life.

Does that not sound profound? Stop and consider it for a moment. Did you have a good day yesterday? If you didn't have a good day, what was the reason? Did you not sleep well? Perhaps it's your mattress. Did you offend people? Perhaps it's your toothpaste, mouth wash, or deoderant. Was it a headache? Is your pain reliever strong enough? Haven't you heard of the short headache? You're not still taking those little round pills are you? As long as we're getting personal, is it irregularity? Hemorrhoids perhaps? Please! Not while I'm eating!

It's not enough that we are pumelled by suggestions, implications, solutions day in and day out. It's not enough to sell the product in the middle of a program, state

its merits and the competition's lack of them.

Today, commercials must be entertaining as well as "informative." I think the reason there are so few good television shows these days is that the advertisers will not allow the shows to be more entertaining than their commercials. From all evidence, more writers are involved in commercials than in other unimportant aspects of T.V. programs.

What can you do in one minute? I'll tell you what some commercials do in one minute. Some commercials tell a complete love story in one minute.

You've seen those of course. There's this girl, see, and she never gets a date. Her room never gets a date. Her roomy very tactfully queries that some people have swamp breath and suggests gargling with Preparation

"H" or something.

You know most of the rest of it. You know everything except why this girl's roomy is home all the time with no dates. There are myriads of variations on this theme, and there are an equal number of cartoons, comedy skits, and even musicals.

But not all commercials are entertaining. There are very strong arguments for certain products from the scientific point of view. There may be more scientists and engineers developing nasographs, models of the human anatomy that drip real acid and react to various cure-alls than there are working on the space program.

All in all, commercials are setting the standards of day to day living. Commercials are solving all problems. All you have to do is jump on the band wagon, do as the stars do, listen to scientific reason, and let your brain get mushy.

**Feelings Toward Liquor Expressed**

BY FRANK COLEY

Question: What criticisms or comments do you have concerning the liquor law which is before the state Senate?

John McQuay: "I'm against liquor-by-the-drink, but I feel sure that brown-bagging will be legalized. The revenue from the sale of liquor will definitely be helpful to the state."

Jay Eaker, Student: "I'm for liquor-by-the-drink, by the bottle, brown-bagging, the works. People are going to drink so you may as well make it easy for them. I feel that the issue is really a religious one."

Richard Robinson, Student: "I'm for liquor-by-the-drink, by the bottle, as well as open bars. I'm pro everything. The money from the legalized sale of liquor is definitely beneficial."

Dale Norwood, Student: No comment.

Johnny Smith, Student at Central Piedmont: "Well, I'm from Oxford, Mississippi and have seen what North Carolina is debating. As a result of this, I'm definitely against open bars, but feel that liquor sold Stores would prove to be highly successful. Liquor is an essential part of business meetings, conventions and the like. The people must be happy so give them what they want."

Rebecca Hamyck, Student: "At the present I have no comment."

Vickie Stilwell, Student: "I think the whole thing should be revised. The state should first decide whether it should legalize liquor-by-the-drink or brownbagging. Then the various counties should be allowed to take individual

stands on the issue. The whole law is too contradictory."

Peggy Maynard, Student: "I don't really know enough about it to comment."

Harold Pulley, Student: "Appetizing can't be controlled. There are controls, but they can't be political. These controls must be initiated by the individual. As I interpret it, there is no scriptural condemnation of alcohol. The only control is temperance. This is a writing of Paul to which I am referring."

Dr. Morrill, History Asst. Prof.: "Well, I'm for free and easy access to one of the finest enjoyments of life. Through surveys of large cities such as Richmond, Virginia and Charlotte, North Carolina, it has been demonstrated that the method by which liquor has been distributed has no relation to the frequency of alcoholism. The individual should certainly have the right to decide."

Sandra Hoover, Student: "I'm in favor of a person choosing whether or not he should have the right to drink because it's a matter of conscience whether or not a man should drink."

Neely Cunningham, Student: "I think it should be passed so that people can drink if they want. I don't think liquor-by-the-drink will be the method because bars produce a bad atmosphere in a town."

Dr. Sohn, Psychology Asst. Prof.: "I hope that brown-bagging will be legalized. I do hope the Senate will at least go this far. County option, or the degree of wetness should be determined by the counties themselves."

**THE CAROLINA JOURNAL**

Published weekly on Wednesday except during holidays.

- ELLISON CLARY, JR., . . . . . Editor
- Frank Crooks. . . . . Business Manager
- Libby Holshouser. . . . . Feature Editor
- Donna Hughes. . . . . Sports Editor
- Geraldine Ledford. . . . . Cartoonist
- Nancy Kohler, Fred Jordan. . . . . Photographers
- Staff: Sally Hagood, Paul Boswell, Earleen Mabry, Corny Stilwell, Frank Caton, Jan Ballard, Patrick McNeely, Bobbe Berry, Carol Haywood, Sandy Caudle, Rosemary Lands, John Lafferty, Gayle Watts, Kay Watson, Carol Durham, Louise Napolitano, and Larry Keith.

**The Tams  
Are Coming  
Back**