

SL Must Support Students Or Be Abolished

The members of Student Legislature have a challenging decision to make on the future of student rights when they meet tonight.

Essentially, the legislators must decide whether they will champion the right of students to decide policy questions concerning their private lives or whether they will bow to the will of the administration.

Contrary to the assumptions of many students the fight over the students' right to entertain members of the opposite sex in their rooms did not begin during the past several years.

Likewise the administration's policy for imposing arbitrary, restrictive regulation upon the students is steeped in tradition.

The Interfraternity Visiting Agreement, in force during the 1952-1953 school year, began with the statement:

"The privilege of entertaining

unchaperoned women in fraternity houses is based upon the acceptance of certain basic standards. This acceptance is made in the form of a pledge to uphold these standards, and the pledge is binding on the fraternity that gives it and on every individual of that fraternity."

The first restriction states: "There shall be no consumption of alcoholic beverages in the presence of, or by, women students in the house or on the premises of any fraternity."

Most students today could agree on the absurdity of this restriction.

Then on April 1, 1954 the President of the Student Body presented to the University administration a statement to the effect that students had discussed the Visiting Privileges Agreement, and decided that certain parts of the agreement were no longer in effect.

The statements said, "Women students

will now be allowed to drink in fraternity houses with fraternity men."

The president's statement was followed two days later by the administration's response which read:

"The statements were not proposals for consideration by the faculty and administration... Since this meant a basic alteration by the students in the terms of the agreement...the action posed a serious question of University policy respecting Student Government.

"It was agreed (by the administration) that the effect of the action taken by them (the students) was to nullify the Visiting Privileges Agreement altogether. This meant the basis on which women students have been permitted to visit fraternity houses without chaperones was removed by student action.

"This left the administration no course but to suspend University approval of the visiting agreement.

"I am hereby advising...that visiting by women students in the fraternity houses is not now approved by the University and that the University will hold the fraternities and individuals responsible for observance of this suspension."

The letter was signed Fred H. Weaver, Dean of Students.

The action by the University, while the

technicalities of the incident are different, is strikingly parallel to the current situation.

This incident was followed by the announcement in September of 1958 that discussion would be held concerning the arrangement of a coed visiting agreement in men's dormitories.

The discussions were held between Don Furtado, president of the student body, and Dean of Women Katherine Carmichael. No action resulted.

A full decade later on October 18, 1968 a petition containing the names of 4,000 students requesting the instituting of visitation privileges was presented to Dean of Student Affairs C. O. Cathey.

At that time Dean Cathey said, "We believe in participatory democracy and that's the procedure we're following now."

Finally on December 5, 1968 the blessed event occurred. The Administration released its "Policy on Open House Functions in University Residential Facilities."

Living units were not permitted to hold visitation more than 10 times each month or more than 3 times each week.

When visitation was held the total number of hours allotted could not exceed eight each day and doors had to remain open.

This policy was released at a time when the state universities of Florida and Georgia had policies of self-determination.

The current policy is little improved over the original document.

Last spring Student Legislature voted on a visitation policy that would allow the individual living units to determine their own visitation policy.

Legislature voted last Thursday to reaffirm the right of individual residence houses to determine their own policy guidelines.

Two residence houses, Carr dorm and the fourth floor of James dorm, decided to adopt a seven-day-a-week, 24-hour-a-day policy.

Dean of Men Fred Schroeder, following the precedent established by Dean Weaver in 1954, informed these dorms that they have no visitation until the administration policy is accepted.

Fortunately, these two living units have decided to stand by their original rejection of the administration's policy. In fact, students residing on the fourth floor of Hinton James have voted unanimously to reaffirm their original stand.

Project Hinton has now voted to join the other two living units in rejecting the administration's policy.

Student Legislature must now decide if they are going to serve the interest of the students or return to the meaningless conciliatory realm of the mid-fifties.

If SL does not have the courage to back the students, the students should have the courage to dissolve legislature.

The Daily Tar Heel

Opinions of The Daily Tar Heel are expressed on its editorial page. All unsigned editorials are the opinions of the editor and the staff. Letters and columns represent only the opinions of the individual contributors.

Tom Gooding, Editor



David Adcock

'Tommie Yellow' Blows His Mind

Once upon a time, there was a great University located in an ancient kingdom called the United States of Armeric. This great University had given its nation presidents, senators, representatives and generals. The reputation of its hallowed halls spread all over the earth and rendered any graduate of the University an instant success.

The Student Government of the University was its one deficit. Throughout the years the students were controlled by big campus political machines and consequently elected half-witted idiots to the high position of the President of the Student Body—but then came Tommie.

Tommie Yellow was an Independent President, that is, not of any particular political party. He promised when elected to "keep the high and mighty office to which I have been elected, out of any partisan political activity." That was Tommie Yellow's first trick and he followed trick upon trick to reach the top.

Tommie Yellow's first official act was to place himself at the helm of a great movement to protest Armeric's policy of military assistance to a neighbor over the mountain. Armeric's mountain neighbor had been attacked by the forces of the Red Knight and Tommie felt that since there was a whole mountain between Armeric and the Red Knight, Armeric's own security was not threatened. Tommie Yellow also felt that Armeric's mountain neighbor's sole export of dominos was not of strategic value. (The Red Knight once said, "Every domino is worth a drop of blood.")

On the day of the protest, Yellow forgot his pledge to keep his office out of politics. He stood on the village green and shouted obscenities at the King of Armeric and said that he, the high President of the Student Body, was not willing to tolerate anymore foreign wars. Boy, he had guts.

Amazing things happen to Tommie Yellow as the year progressed—notably his head started swelling and his political tricks became more polished. Tommie's next feat was to pull the old "cat's got my tongue" trick. When the Duke of Carolina's High Court ordered the student government to come to grips with some of their mistakes, Tommie Yellow disappeared. In his campaign he promised to be the essence of student rights, but when he was confronted with a situation he melted. It was reported that President Yellow said to his special advisor Lord Fauntleroy, "If I buck the Duke of Carolina, I might not be elected King in thirty years." Oh, Tommie, you certainly were perceptive.

President Yellow determined that his swelling head was due to a swelling brain so he decided to get into academics. Yellow started a class labeled "1917-X Propaganda Science." Yellow was, of course, extremely experienced in this subject—he had been practicing it since high school. Yellow, while professing freedom of speech, excused all those opposing his isolationist-interventionist, conservative-liberal, reactionary-radical philosophy. Yellow, pointed this out

during his sermonette in the class by saying "Freedom of speech in the popular context means freedom for Tommie Yellow to speak."

An interesting historic note to all this is an incident Yellow had on campus one day. Yellow was escorting 121 deprived, under-privileged, oppressed, black, Negro, colored, Afro-Americans on a tour of the University when they passed a stand erected by Young Armeric for Freedom. Low and behold, these fascists had the gall to sell posters of Barry Goldwater, the Common of Sense, Tommie gawgawed and slapped the deprived, under-privileged, oppressed, black, Negro, colored Afro-American on the back and said, "Look at that, isn't it silly?" They all agreed and walked on but then Tommie Yellow ran back to the YAF booth and said, "Goldwasser did have some good ideas."

"Whose side are you on?" asked Arnie Aristocrat, the typical YAF stereotype as he scratched his pair of Sear's blue jeans. Yellow said, "Everybody's—but especially mine."

Well, Tommie died one day when his head exploded but his work had a great effect. The Red Knight slaughtered the populace of Armeric's mountain neighbor when Armeric forces were withdrawn. The University was controlled completely by the Duke of Carolina after Tommie had an attack of laryngitis. Tommie's example of student activism became popular. Courses in obscenities were inaugurated by the Yellow Vulgaric Society.

Soon the University and Armeric were destroyed. Tommie Yellow, the great and high politico, hastened its destruction.

Tony Lentz

'Oh, Summer Session': A Review

Mix two cups of scrambled bird brains, a plate of spinach and a gallon of used dog food.

You have now undergone an emotional experience almost as overpowering as attending a performance of the Liberal Wing Theatre's "Oh! Summer Session!"

This moving farce has bumbled through the summer with the energy of an atomic blast and the excitement of a hand-crank skin flick in a penny arcade. The experimental production, although plagued by exciting obstacles

like court injunctions and parking tickets, has managed to present an upsetting account of legalistic legerdemain in the old South.

The story line centers around the adventures of Tom Swift and his electronic Legislature Machine.

Tom, wearing his white hat and good guy badge, decides late one night that he should save the farm for pretty, precocious Suzy Student-Body.

Suzy has one of those fancy double-last-names because her mother was a French street-walker who liked fancy double-names.

But back to the story. Snidley-Joe Whipcrack, dressed in a steel-grey three-piece jump suit, has a meeting with his notorious Backwoods Buckaroos.

"If Tom Swift wants to save the farm," Whipcrack squeaks, "he'll do it over your dead bodies."

The Buckaroos break into spontaneous tears as Whipcrack tells them, in a voice shaking with emotion, that he'll be right behind them all the way.

"I'd like to go with you, boys, but somebody's got to write the checks."

The Buckaroos, fully aware of the dangers in meeting the wily Swift face-to-face, begin furious preparations for the upcoming conflict. This consists mainly of gathering wrenches, stumbling blocks and other semantic nonsense to clog, break and otherwise destroy Swift's powerful Legislature Machine.

Swift, meanwhile, has contacted his technical advisors, confidantes and appointees. A plan of operation is worked out in the wee-small hours of the night.

This was because, as everybody knows, advisors and other flunkies work best in the wee-small hours of the night, even though they waste a lot of time during the day.

The plan is for the Magnificent Legislature Machine to meet in a special session at the nearby college campus. This site was chosen because there were lots of pretty summer session coeds around to titillate the Machine's tubes.

This added incentive was necessary because the Machine had gone home for the summer and half its cogs were in cold storage.

The Machine was to cut its budget for the upcoming year and thereby save enough money to buy the mortgage on sweet Suzy Student-Body's farm.

Tom Swift, it turns out, has a thing going for Suzy. And besides, he would lose his good-guy badge if she wrote her congressman.

Things proceed according to plan until Whipcrack's Buckaroos show and start throwing wrenches into the Machine.

Swift gets desperate. If the Machine dies before it can save the farm it means he can no longer print the Good-Guy News in the farmhouse basement. And there'll be no more pickled-peach preserves for breakfast, either.

Suddenly he overpowers the Buckaroos with what they think is magic. Standing in the middle of the line of fire Swift begins talking to both the Machine and the Buckaroos out of the respective sides of his mouth.

Over-powered by this display of verbal agility, the Buckaroos leap on their red-white-and-blue steeds and race away. The Machine coughs up the cash, then dies in a shower of nuts and bolts.

Swift is over-joyed. The Buckaroos have been defeated once again.

Then, in the most moving part of the whole shindig, Swift suddenly realizes that he has bought the farm. Visions of things like fire and hail insurance flood his brain, and the pressure is too much.

Muttering emotional epithets like "responsibility" and "My poor machine," Swift stumbles off into the distance, tearing his clothes as he goes.

Suzy Student-Body, meanwhile, decides she should have stayed in France with mother, and traipses off to the nearest bar to set up shop.

Everyone should see this moving story of life and death on the old plantation. Now playing on second floor, Carolina Union.

Letter

Ripley Column Saddening

TO THE EDITOR

It saddened me to see an indictment of the Christian Church in the first Sunday issue of the Tar Heel. It sounded like advice to freshmen.

It is unfortunate that Mr. Ripley has not been close enough to the Church to see beyond the hypocrites to those who are painfully aware of their shortcomings and who recognize that they stand in continuing need of the grace of God.

I could also wish Mr. Ripley were willing to make a fair assessment of the "practical application" of the church's faith (the Inter-Church Council in Chapel Hill, for example).

Further, does Mr. Ripley recognize

his own indebtedness to institutional Christianity for the "religion" he affirms? Of course faith without works is dead, but works may not be forthcoming without a motivating faith. The love that Mr. Ripley recommends did not originate in a vacuum. Affirmation of the Lordship of Jesus was central to the life of the early Church.

In short, Mr. Ripley serves up an unbalanced "soul food" meal, and he seems to be a rather inexperienced cook.

Robert Scymour
Olin T. Binley
Baptist Church

The Daily Tar Heel

78 Years of Editorial Freedom

Tom Gooding, Editor

Rod Waldorf Managing Ed.

Mike Parnell News Editor

Rick Gray Associate Ed.

Harry Bryan Associate Ed.

Chris Cobbs Sports Editor

Glenn Brank Feature Editor

Ken Ripley Nat. News Editor

Doug Jewell Business Mgr.

Frank Stewart Adv. Mgr.