

The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Bill Amlong, Editor

Don Walton, Business Manager

Pamela Hawkins, Associate Editor

Wayne Hurder, Managing Editor

Rebel Good, News Editor

Kermit Buckner, Advertising Manager



Mike McGee

Carolina Coed Isn't That Bad

MIKE MCGEE
 Someone has finally done a scientific and comparative study of the Carolina Coed—and come up with some unexpected results, which may help to alter the ghastly image the Carolina Gentleman has of that flower of our womanhood.

Barbara Thomas, a psychology student at UNC-Greensboro, started out with the hypothesis that Carolina girls would select a prospective date on the basis of appearance alone, whereas the Greensboro girls would not find appearance nearly as important as the status of his activities.

She pasted pictures on a board with lists of activities under them, of three good looking guys with high status activities, three good looking

guys with low-status activities, three ugly guys with high status activities, and three ugly guys with low status activities. Then she asked girls in two dorms on campus here and at UNC-G, a total of 100, to say for each picture whether they would really want to date him or not. The Greensboro girls were expected to be less selective overall.

Not so. The Carolina girls were no more selective in any category than the Greensboro girls! Gentlemen, take heed! Read on to find out what the girls really think.

There were no significant differences when girls of the two schools were contrasted; but when all the girls were taken together an interesting pattern emerged. In both schools, looks took precedence over activities almost every time. High status activities ran a poor second. The most often chosen types were, of course, those with good looks and high status activities, but the second most often chosen were those with good looks and low status activities. The others followed in descending order. So men, if you look good and aren't in a single club you stand a better chance than all those ugly student government types and football players. And you stand about the same chance whether you're in Chapel Hill or Greensboro.

What about you ugly apes with no campus status? Cheer up, some girls on both campuses selected you too. Anyway, these are ideal choices. If everybody waited until their ideal date came along, then nobody would date anybody.

Another interesting result concerned the year in school of the girls. Contrary to popular opinion, freshmen seem to be less selective in their dates by appearance, and more interested in status activities. Senior girls are more concerned with looks than anything else. I have a good explanation for that: freshmen are "climbers", but seniors have "arrived" and would not be seen with someone less beautiful than themselves.

So, my fellow students, the myth of the Carolina Coed is not so rock-ribbed as a lot of us think. In scientific comparison with students at the almost all-girl UNC-Greensboro, the girls here are no more choosy than the women we go so far to see to get away from our own Carolina lady.

One criticism I had was that no interviews were conducted at UNC sorority houses. Barbara assures me that there were some sorority girls in her sample, but I doubt it was a proportional number.

Some of the girls were very enthusiastic and took great care in selecting pictures. Some spent as long as fifteen minutes deliberating before making final decisions. I wonder how they ever make instant decisions over the telephone. Well, they probably have their minds made up one way or the other long before you surprise them by calling to ask for a date.

NCAA Blackout? Too Many Tickets

Guess what you might not see tonight?

The first round of the NCAA Regional basketball tournament, that's what.

It's this nasty little rule that the National Collegiate Athletic Association has, you see: tournament first rounds usually aren't sell outs, so they "black-out" a 75-mile radius of the area surrounding the game site to help ticket sales.

Which means that neither Durham nor Raleigh television stations will be able to carry the game, unless the NCAA heeds their appeals and lifts the ban today.

The game will, however, definitely be broadcast on Greensboro's Channel 2, but that almost makes you just want to say "So what?" and turn on the radio rather than take the trouble to coordinate the atmospheric conditions and the direction of the antennae in hopes you'll be able to pick up Channel 2.

But, why in the hell should the 15,000 students of this

University—who, in case the NCAA's forgotten, have produced the Tar Heels from their midst—have to worry about scrounging around for a way to see the game.

Indeed, they shouldn't have to.

Ideally, intercollegiate sports should be played for the benefit of the colleges concerned, and especially of the students of those colleges.

That's the kind of high-sounding bull the NCAA's always spouting anyway, in those spot announcements they inject into television broadcasts of NCAA events.

But apparently, that's not how it works when it comes to real life.

For it is the NCAA who is making it nary impossible for the students of the University of North Carolina to watch THEIR basketball team play in the eastern regionals.

Why?

Because there are so many tickets that haven't been sold yet, that's why.



Take A Good Look At The Tar Heels Right Now ... because you might not get the chance tonight

After Fuller Quits...

From The Chapel Hill Weekly

A great many people in Chapel Hill were vastly relieved when Howard Fuller resigned as a part-time lecturer at the University. They didn't care so much why he had decided to resign. His mere presence had caused the University some strained relations and it was enough that he was leaving, for whatever reason.

Now it appears that Howard Fuller not only was ending his association with the University, but was kissing off his struggle to improve the Negro condition by working with the white establishment.

Howard Fuller is now associated with Shaw University in Raleigh. His mission at the moment, we are told, is to make Shaw an all-black university, with an all-Negro faculty and all-Negro student body.

One conclusion that can be drawn from this, if the report on Fuller is accurate, is that he is leaning toward the Negro separatist movement, if indeed he hasn't already joined it.

That would be an extremely discouraging development. Regardless of how some are fretted

by his style and manner, no one can deny that Howard Fuller tried, at least in the beginning, to present Negro grievances in conventional and generally accepted fashion. He took his case to duly constituted authority, and he tried to channel the Negro protest into the ballot box.

As it turned out, it was a mutually unsatisfactory dialogue, but it was nevertheless a dialogue of sorts, and that in itself was something. Now it appears there will not even be dialogue as far as Howard Fuller is concerned. Many will welcome a protracted silence on the part of Negro activists such as Fuller. But for those sincerely concerned about the situation—a situation that Fuller already sees as a war—the silence, the end of communication no matter how desultory and unproductive, can only be disheartening and ominous.

If one as knowing and articulate as Howard Fuller can no longer see the point even in talking, what hope is there for understanding, cooperation, and the sort of progress that must be achieved to solve our society's most agonizing problem.



Letters To The Editor

Adam's Choices 'Not Acceptable'

To The Editor:

Maynard Adams' shorter letter clarifies his argument but does not make it more acceptable. He offers young men choices that are severally indefensible and thereby endeavors, in a manner not unprecedented in philosophy (sorry about that, Maynard) to foreclose the conclusion of the debate by establishing the terms in which it can be conducted.

Choice 1: "... he has a prima facie overriding moral obligation to abide by the laws and governmental policies established by agreed upon decision-procedures in the society." This is Eichman's defense, repudiated by all who have considered the ques: on deeply. My moral responsibility cannot and must not be shifted to another.

(A more humanist, less rationalist, approach might have saved a valid position. Given the general steth and wickedness of men, the preservation of orderly process is a positive good to be weighed in the moral balance. But no one else can make

that decision for me.)

Choice 2: "If he thinks an error of magnitude has been made, he may be justified or even morally obligated to protest by disobedience and acceptance to the penalty involved." In our circumstances this is obviously ineffective. The authorities want ineffective dissent since that enables them to have the cake of power and eat it too; they have "permitted" dissent and thus demonstrated their democratic convictions while paying neither attention nor respect to dissent. If the dissenters peacefully accept a criminal status by going to jail they have thereby affirmed the moral as well as the legal authority of a particular administration.

Choice 3: The dissenters may confront the government by force "only if convinced that it is systematically unjust and thus a power without moral authority." This is not a nice choice; the individual may now rebel against an administration armed with enormous power

and clearly prepared to sacrifice any number of persons in defense of its political opinions. Would an administration willing to drop bombs and napalm on even friendly civilians balk at shooting rebels?

It is this point that is decisive. Professor Adams is offering the young men a choice between servile obedience, passive acceptance of a criminal status or open rebellion. These are obviously ineffective. They also agree on accepting the moral authority of the present administration which is exactly the point the dissenters want to deny (and, at that, why should they be bullied by the likes of General Hershey?)

The problem is precisely that Professor Adams' position is impeccably sound in traditional reasoning and has produced morally repellent consequences. These crimes are not committed by wicked despots of a Nazi state; they are committed by very ordinary men who have blundered into high office and have run a government no more than usually corrupt and rather more just than some. It is, in short, the democratic process itself that has produced this horror. Our tragedy is that all we have loved and believed in, all the procedures and institutions that have, in all their imperfections, produced great human good, have culminated in a monstrous end.

Professor Adams' arguments seem to me a sophisticated version of the assertion that those who dissent from the war are un-American for he offers them a choice only between obedience to or acceptance of the discipline of the government or open rebellion. There are a variety of motives among the dissenters but the principle one is a passionate desire to defend what America stands for and to deny that Johnson and Rusk represent it. They do not want to reject or rebel against America but to defend the principles that have motivated our best history. American democracy may, indeed, be the last, best hope of earth and it is love of that hope that motivates most of the dissenters and the protests against its profanation.

The methods of their protest have been crude and, what is worse, ineffective. They have failed to define the issues clearly but since it is our reasoning that has produced these cold, gray, moralistic stones for their nourishment, I think we are hardly in a position to criticize them. Rather we should try, with them, to find what there is so corrupt in our national life that this wicked war could happen and see if our of the suffering we have inflicted on so many people might at least come some new sense of moral purpose.

John W. Dixon, Jr.
216 Glenhill Lane

Gophers To Rescue

To The Editor

With all the row over which method of solving UNC's parking problem is best, a student named Bernard Weazel, a graduate in Miscellaneous Studies, has come up with a plan which, if adopted, will solve UNC's problem to the satisfaction of all, at little or no cost.

Limiting automobile privileges to grad students, faculty and staff violates the constitutional rights of undergrads. A high-rise facility would be expensive and would sully the quaint beauty of the campus.

The only universally acceptable plan would be a subterranean parking lot.

Here the cynic will leap to his feet, shouting "But that would cost a hell of a lot of money!"

Mr. Weazel can answer that accusation in a single two-syllable word: gophers.

Those of agile brain will recognize the beauty of Weazel's plan immediately. But for those of us not so quick of wit, here, briefly, is how the plan would work:

—The university would broadcast a plea to the nation, asking that all gopher-hating suburbanites parcel-post their gophers to Chapel Hill.

—The gophers would then be taken to Raleigh to be trained at State. Everyone knows that State guys know a lot about

animals. The training would probably consist of teaching the gophers to respond to commands of "Gee" and "Haw."

—State would also train UNC students as gopher-handlers. To attract people to this job, perhaps an Experimental College course could be designed around it.

—The gophers would then dig the subterranean parking facility. Though it seems far-fetched, doesn't it stand to reason that if one gopher can dig a tunnel, could not a thousand thousand gophers, in a direct, concerted effort, dig a parking lot? And what a thrilling sight it would be! Hordes of the little beasties working, sweating to make UNC a better place for truth, justice, and the American Way!

To offset any expenses accrued by the project, and perhaps to make a nifty little profit, at the end of the project the gophers would be sent back to State for re-training as watchdogs. They would then be sold to eager families throughout the state and nation.

Mr. Weazel's plan is obviously foolproof. It should be implemented right away.

Get cracking, Administration.
John Martin
213 Ehringhaus

Johnson Edit Negative

To The Editor:

The editorial which appeared in The Daily Tar Heel on Tuesday, March 12, was disappointing in its negative emphasis. The editorial listed several reasons why UNC students, faculty, and staff should vote against LBJ in the mock presidential primaries held on campus. It contributed little to the development of positive citizenship among those who are beginning to assume the responsibility for the sound government of our country in increasingly critical times.

An editorial should carry the responsibility of objectively encouraging honest and clear development of sound opinions in the minds of each reader. It would have been more encouraging to see a positive editorial on the subject, possibly one which: 1) Objectively lists the positions of all candidates on key domestic and foreign questions—civil rights, riots in the cities, racial realignments, the draft, taxes, foreign travel, the Vietnam war, the national and international economic situation, foreign aid, etc. . . .

questions which are increasingly affecting the lives and futures of us all. 2) Urges all voters to thoughtfully review the positions of each candidate, and then to decide which candidate he believes will best serve the country. 3) Urges all students to participate fully in the elections and to exercise their privileges as citizens, both in the mock elections and the real ones (in a larger sense than we brought out in the editorial.)

A contribution to the development of positive citizenship among those who are preparing to assume the responsibilities of our society is needed more and more, as our country shows increasing signs of internal crisis. The students of UNC today will be the spokesmen and leaders of many elements of our society in the near future. Our country critically needs progressive citizens of honesty and integrity to fill these roles.

Ken Barger
407C Mason Farm Rd.