

# The Daily Tar Heel

76 Years of Editorial Freedom

Wayne Hurder, Editor

Bill Staton, Business Manager



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

## A Bland Simpson Original

# The Wednesday Night Frat Make

Let's talk about something everybody knows. Frats are slick guys, and when it comes to sex, there just ain't no slicker. Right? Just ask the good old boys down at the house. They know.

The image of the frat-man at Carolina, or anywhere, for that matter, is cool. His prime cool is sex. All the girls, sorority and otherwise, fall all over the frats. I mean, this is absolutely no lie. You've seen him, tooling around campus in his 1969 souped-up double-breasted, bored and stroked, uplifted and downtown, 789 super-sport bedroom on wheels, with honie at side, waving madly at all her friends, enemies, and casual

acquaintances just to show off her glorious association, while super-stud stallion himself just kinda cools it. Well, you can just tell by looking at all this riggamarole (meaning honie, bedroom on wheels, and all) that ole super-stud stallion ain't just doing it to put ten extra miles on the "789", cause what he's really got in mind is what an expert, fired-up, well-practiced, and hungry cat he is. In other words, he's wheeling on in the direction of Finley Golf Course, Eat-O-Rama Motel & Restaurant, and otherwise what we herein call sexual Valhalla just to prove to himself, God, and nature what a fantastic layer-downer of steps he is. Great God A-mighty, he's gonna do that jamboree!

But, wary readers, don't worry about honie, whether she be Suzie Grit, Connecticut Carol, or any other mean nasty and ugly coed you might have seen around there parts, 'cause she likes this big scene. So here we all are, sitting on this wall downtown, watching this superfine flick about frat, bedroom on wheels, and honie, when The Man comes up and says, in a voice as cheap as Rose wine, "It ain't so." So you, me, and everybody else in the whole wide, wild, moving out world get all upset, start jumping around, mad and not believing that The Man knows what's really going on, because we've been sitting here on this wall for three years and we just can't believe for one single minute that it ain't so.

But before we can get settled down enough to ask The Man who he thinks he is, The Man takes the blasted initiative and says, in a voice as loud as a thousand sardines, "You all just come along with me and I'll show you where it's at." Not wanting to miss out on this head-splitting exposition which The Man had just forthwith and herein guaranteed, we hopped off the wall onto our skateboards and flexible flyers and took off, soon noticing that The Man was heading straight, smack dab in the gol-darned direction of (Ta-Da!) the House. And there it was, big as life.


## Gardner Demagoguery An Insult To The State

The Daily Tar Heel stands fully behind Chancellor J. Carlyle Sitterson's freedom to speak that has prompted a demagogic, moronic attack by Republican candidate for governor Jim Gardner. Not only do we back up the right of the Chancellor and Dean C.O. Cathey to criticize state and national marijuana laws but we are proud of them for displaying the courage to come out in the open and make their critiques of the stringent laws. Gardner's last ditch effort to dig up votes by appealing to the non-thinking elements among the voters brings a chill up our spine when we think that a man so unscrupulous, demagogic, so out spokenly against civil liberties could become governor.

What is most frightening is that Gardner says that if he were governor he would do something about the Chancellor having made such a statement and about the students marching over visitation. What is frightening about that is that for him to do anything to prevent such occurrences he would have to limit the Chancellor's freedom of speech and take away from the students their freedom of assembly and speech. All because the Chancellor dared to say a law was too strict and because students decided to hold a march to show their support for visitation and the committee that was working on the visitation agreement. At no point did the Chancellor say the laws should be ignored nor did he say the University wasn't going to comply with the civil authorities in enforcing the laws. Likewise, the students in their action at no point

broke, or threatened to break, any state laws. "What is happened to the moral fiber of North Carolina?" Gardner asks. If Gardner should win the election after using this low, low ploy, that will be a very good question. If North Carolinians do not have the courage to accept some criticism of their laws then they have reached a new low. If North Carolinians cannot accept students demonstrating legally against the status quo, then they have become pathetically lacking in commitment to the more basic values of American Democracy. We believe that most North Carolinians have too much sense to fall for Gardner's demagoguery and will reject him completely on election day. We find it hard to believe that a majority of the voters in the state have such a low opinion of democracy that they would threaten free speech and free assembly in this state by electing him governor. Regardless of how the election turns out, we hope the chancellor and others in the Administration in the future will continue to show the courage in speaking out that Sitterson and Cathey have shown in this case. Likewise, we hope that students will not hesitate to hold demonstrations if they feel it necessary in order to express their opinion. Should anyone, such as a blowhard like Gardner, come along to try to take away from the University the freedom of speech and assembly that all citizens are supposed to be guaranteed, the University community should be prepared to go to any length to protect those rights.

Last week seven persons were arrested at 322 W. Rosemary in connection with a drug raid. Bags of marijuana and blocks of hashish were found in Apt. 6 at that address. The previous week the Chapel Hill Weekly had singled out the establishment at a "hippie haven," and letters to the editor decried the residents. Last year police raided the house, ostensibly for drugs, but ended up arrested two persons for cohabitation. The arrest brought a flurry of sarcastic comments about the ludicrousness of a cohabitation arrest in Chapel Hill. Once More



Scott Goodfellow

## 322 West Rosemary

Interior, but were told that they were covering much faulty wiring. Improvements began for the front porch, but the city stopped that, too. It seems no building permit had been issued. Meanwhile, what might calmly be labeled an outrageous controversy persists, in which one side wants to plaster a metal clasp across the front door. This, they say, would keep it from continuing as a den for dopers, pot-heads, acid-droppers, speedpoppers, etc.

Unfortunately, it would seem that Chapel Hill's incredible drug problem—which has resulted in only seven different arrests in the last year—will not be affected by sending 322 W. Rosemary to house heaven. If the city really wants to put pressure on apartment owners not to rent to curly-haired young men or other unsavories, surely closing buildings is not how to do it. As was pointed out at the Board meeting Monday, the police are quite adept at keeping watch over "known hang-outs." Putting the issue of whether the group arrested last week was really hurting anyone aside, if the city wants to enter the people clean-up campaign, they better do it mightily carefully.

There are a great many people in town who throw the term "hippie" around both with abandon and with a derogatory twang. If the Aldermen are in the mood to cotton to this group, it is vital to the academic interests of the town that extreme caution be used. When addresses start appearing in headlines instead of people, it's time for a little introspection.

David Sumerel

## Wallace's Racism Stands Out Easily

"The University of North Carolina is going to get run over so big down in North Carolina it'll be as if they didn't exist." These words were spoken recently in Washington by George C. Wallace, candidate for the presidency of the United States. Carolina students might well be the first to seek the meaning of these words and the meaning of the man who spoke them. On the surface, the statement is a counterattack on the Chapel Hill liberals. As the only town in North Carolina with an open-housing law on its books, the overwhelmingly liberal Chapel Hill would certainly take its state away from Mr. Wallace if it could.

everyone across the intellectual spectrum, from the erudite scholar all the way down to George C. Wallace, candidate for the presidency of the United States. Two words in the above quotation, "run over," stand out. There is an echo here of an earlier Wallace statement that any demonstrator who lay down in front of his car would not do so again. It seems Wallace has an easy answer to any opposition. Add to this his willingness to use police force to keep deprived people deprived. Add to this his prediction of revolution if he is not elected. Add to this his appointment of bomb-happy LeMay as his running mate, and a clear trend emerges. Reckless disregard for human rights is a telling trait of this man George C. Wallace, candidate for the presidency of the United States.

## Letters To The Editor

Dear Dean Cathey: We are writing in regard to an article that appeared in the Tar Heel on Wednesday, October 18, 1968 ("Cathey Receives SSOC Petition," p. 1). We assume that the article quoted you correctly regarding the handling of the SSOC petition (which asked for dormitory discretion in deciding visitation rules): "We believe in participatory democracy and that's the procedure we're following here." We also can only assume that the content of "participatory democracy" you refer to is the specific steps outlined in the article. We find it impossible to see any notion of democracy at all in the procedure outlined. The procedure calls for consultation with students and faculty—nothing more, nothing less. If this is what you favor, this is one thing. But hardly is the procedure democracy—participatory, direct, indirect or otherwise. Democracy (and especially the notion of participatory democracy) minimally implies that those involved in

an issue have some say (often through representatives) in deciding the outcome of an issue. Nothing of this sort obtains in the present case. Students of industrial organization have found that often management refers to consultation and occasionally participation of workers in minute decisions as democracy. Such writers point out that this is clearly "pseudo-democracy." The procedure outlined in the Tar Heel is pseudo-democracy—nothing more. You misrepresent "democracy." It is valid to question whether the university should be a democratic institution (we favor a strong dose of democracy). It is not valid to claim democracy for the procedure you are using. Sincerely, New University Conference

More Ignorance However, there is more than fear of liberalism involved here. The whole thrust of his campaign has been toward increasing the ignorance of the country and playing down "intellectualism" (i.e. "intelligence"). Wallace has presented his own denunciation in his many phrases devoid of reason and pregnant with emotion. That anti-Wallace sentiment runs high in the academic community is obvious to

## Letters

ALL LETTERS TO THE EDITOR ARE WELCOMED. THEY SHOULD BE CONCISE, TYPED AND A DUPLICATE COPY MUST BE ENCLOSED.

## Student Reformers Can't Ignore Univ. In Society

Prior to the Berkeley Free Speech Movement in 1964 when trouble broke out on a college campus it was usually of a localized nature, having no implications outside the college, or often outside the area of grievance within the University. However, with the Free Speech Movement there came a new emphasis among activists on college campuses on the role of the University within the society and on the complicity of the university in that society. That new emphasis confused people, and is still confusing them. Administrators have liked to say that the university was a separate island within the society where a person didn't encounter the problems of the society that he would face when he graduate and got a job. As students since 1964 began to talk more and more in terms of the University being an active member of society and being just as guilty of its wrongs as any part, the Administrators began saying the students were drawing the campus into national politics, from which it had always been fairly free. This is wrong, as National Student Association President Bob Powell pointed out Tuesday night. The University has always been an active participant in setting the direction of our society, and it hasn't always been as a progressive force. It has often been and still is a strong defender of the status quo. How is it an active participant in

the shaping of our society? There are many ways. For instance, through admissions policy the university decides for which segments of society a college education, and therefore, a good job, are open. In the past it has managed to restrict blacks legally from entering college; in today's society it does it more discretely, by use of admissions criteria that are culturally biased. If students are to seek changes in their University so it will be more attentive to their needs they must become aware that they are not operating in the island that some administrators try to say they are. They must realize that they are working with an institution that is just as responsible for many of the problems of our society as any other. Any change that a student seeks at the level of the University will have its ramifications for the rest of the structure of the society. Thus, any change that would drastically effect the rest of society, particularly if it would make a change unpopular with the power elements in that society, will be strongly resisted, at the level of the society and the university. Students seeking an improvement of the University must be aware of this interrelation or they can expect to have their movement crushed. Likewise, if they want a change in the university they must be willing to fight for the same from the society.

More References Later in the speech Wallace made other references to North Carolina. It should be hoped that every North Carolinian will take offense at his implications. Ostensibly, they referred to our state's right to control state schools, but the Wallace racial motif shows through this facade all too clearly. He is where he is today because he is an Alabama segregationist, because he stood for white supremacy, because he liberally used the degrading term "nigger," and because Alabama liked it. But North Carolina is not in Alabama, and most people in this state, when they really think, don't like it. Worry not that a vote will help elect Wallace—he will not be elected—but worry that every vote for Wallace will hurt race relations in this state and this country. Yes, racism is another trait of this man George C. Wallace, candidate for the presidency of the United States.