

The Sou'wester

southwestern at memphis

vol. 62 no. 16

memphis, tennessee 38112

february 28, 1978

IMPACT OF AN ERA

by David White

The final movie in Dilemma '78's film series will be presented on Wednesday, March 1st at 7:00 and 10:00 p.m. *Dr. Strangelove, or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*, stars Peter Sellers and George C. Scott, and is considered to be one of the most powerful and influential products of the mass media during the 1960's. Directed by Stanley Kubrick, *Dr. Strangelove* was revolutionary in its use of technological effects and black humor techniques.

The film is a satirical, ironic examination of America's Cold War defense policy and begins with accidental war breaking out between America and Russia, giving rise to the potential for a nuclear holocaust which would make the earth uninhabitable. America then contracts the services of DR. Strangelove, an ex-Nazi who plans to build underground bomb shelters to save all the U.S. militarists who will propagate a new race of people and rebuild the country in their own way.

Dr. Strangelove was not well-received by most people, being variously labelled as "subversive" and "downright insane." William O'Neill, one of Dilemma's scheduled speakers, says in his book *Coming Apart* that the movie was eventually "not only a cultural triumph but a

political, even psychological one. It showed what the country's "defense" policy was really like... Dr. Strangelove was certainly not restless or predestined. People laughed through it, but not easily. Every joke pulled the audience several ways, making for an extraordinarily complex experience."

By Mary Jernigan

So far, the overall reaction to the upcoming "Dilemma '78" has been encouraging. The student body has shown a surprising spark of enthusiasm through its response to the committee requests for help and suggestions. Now, after two of the three movies scheduled to set the stage for the weekend, I detect a note of particular interest in this year's program. People are not only talking about the movies, the sixties in general, and what they remember, but are beginning to feel for themselves something of what we hope next weekend will be.

Speaking for myself, both "The Strawberry Statement" and "Hearts and Minds" were films of intense emotional impact. Watching them, I somehow felt apart and different from the people represented. The college students in "Strawberry Statement" were fighting for something together, risking their separate identities for the sake of mass ideals. The young Americans

who fought in Vietnam: how could they allow themselves to become so enmeshed in that huge game of power where the lives of one tiny nation were the pawns? I found myself not identifying with it, wondering what it was that made these people of one decade ago so different from me. I look at our times in comparison and see the sharp differences in individual concerns, how we stress personal ambition and the understanding of our inward selves.

These thoughts and questions are what make me look forward to "Dilemma '78." The program has been planned to represent a variety of interests and hopefully many people share my anticipation of it, whatever their reasons may be. If you have not given it much thought until now, I urge you to take a second look. The committees have worked hard to put together a great weekend. "The Sixties; Impact of An Era." It's happening right here on our campus starting Thursday night. Participate, and share an experience.

By Edward Wheatley

The Operations Committee of Dilemma '78 is pleased to announce the selection of hosts and hostesses for speakers this year.

Eugene McCarthy will be hosted

by Carol Massenburg and Don Ramier; David Halberstam by Neil Mara and Helen Theo; Frances Fitzgerald by Katrina Oliphant and David White; June Goodfield by Larry Higginbotham and Molly McLemore; James Lawson by Vivian Lanier and Melissa Kent; D'Army Bailey by David Green and Gloria White; William O'Neill by Mary Palmer and John McPherson; and William Parker by David Granoff and Caroline Lavender.

The Operations Committee would like to thank all those who applied for these positions, and they are encouraged to apply again next year.

Help is still needed in two areas. The Dilemma office in the basement of the student center is being staffed by volunteers for one-hour shifts all this week. Those who are able to help should see Carol Lee Collins, Sandy Deeser, or Mary Jernigan. Also, the Staging Committee needs volunteers to help set up the gym and other lecture sites around campus. Anyone interested should see Phil Mischke or Taylor Phillips.

SOU'WESTERS, looking for articles and tid bits that may highlight the past decade. Those of us who are seniors now graduated from high school in 1974 as the war was ending for us, with Kent State and Cambodia two years back in our memories, and the Humphrey-Nixon election probably only a fond memory of our naive politicking in junior high school, where we began to become really aware of the world in which we were living. We might, if we are lucky, remember what we were doing when Kennedy was shot in Dallas.

But the era which will be examined this weekend began with the Kennedy-Nixon election back in 1960, which is where I began my perusals. Not many of us are aware of the events and thoughts that were current, except by what we have perhaps studied in our schooling, or by the things that we saw in the early '70s which came of them. Very few of us know what it is like to be involved in some sort of demonstration, protest, campaign, or other form of expression that marked the '60s--know what it means to be a part of an idealistic movement—and perhaps shall never know. But to understand the era, to appreciate what it has effected, we must at least make the attempt. And as an effort to help foster that attempt, I present this special issue of THE SOU'WESTER.

"What the hell is Minor doing now?" you may be asking. Many times I have asked that of myself this past weekend as I have pored over ten years of old

The Nixon-Kennedy 1960 Presidential Race

Southwestern For Nixon & Lodge

NOVEMBER 4, 1960

By Glenn Jones

The time is practically here for the nation to choose the man who will be the next President of the United States. None of us can possibly comprehend fully the necessity of making the right choice. This decision is crucial to our very way of life.

Over and over the partisans have stressed the need for "experienced" and "effective" leadership. By now we are all tired of these hackneyed phrases, but we must overcome our disinterest and choose our leaders on a basis of conviction and what facts are available to us.

NEO-DEPRESSION ERA?

The entire Democratic campaign has been in one aspect an attempt to instill in the American people the idea that we are in an internal crisis similar to that of the Depression years. The crisis is not one internal, but one of facing our external challenge, Communism.

This is post-war and post-depression America. We are sound industrially, agriculturally, and enjoy a high standard of living.

There are internal problems not to be ignored or denied. We are sound industrially, agriculturally, and enjoy a high standard of living.

There are internal problems not to be ignored or denied. The increased government spending as proposed by the Democratic party is

certainly no solution. As a matter of fact, this is one area which needs considerable attention—attention to the point of curtailment. This problem and several others have come to the forefront during the current campaign, but the attitudes propounded by the Democratic Party are not short of alarmism in regard to the internal situation.

SEN. JACK ANALARMIST

Senator Kennedy has resorted to rash statements with regard to our international position. These statements are for the most part based on conjecture and misinformation. It seems that his plan has been to create an alarmist attitude toward our positions at home and abroad. In this way he is seeking election.

It is true we must move forward in our endeavors for an even better America here and in leadership of the world, but do we have to move so far to the left in order to move forward? Radical changes in our economy and social structure do not have to be made.

Evolutionary capitalism has proved effective thus far and can continue to be effective. A shift to a near-socialistic system is not necessary. On the contrary, it is both unnecessary and could prove exceedingly harmful to the nation.

Senator Kennedy's five-point program, his plan for mandatory medical insurance for the aged, and method of Federal aid to our schools are certainly means for solving many of the present problems, but the far-reaching effects of these solutions would only create a more complex

Continued on Page 2

Southwestern Youth For Kennedy

Bill Pennington and Jim Harper

On election day will you choose fear and stagnation in the tradition of Harding, Taft, and Goldwater, or will you summon what courage still lies within you after these deadening past eight years and help us revitalize and reactivate this floundering nation in the tradition of Jackson, Wilson, and Roosevelt?

Let us put side by side the aspirations, methods, goals, and appeals of the two parties and their respective candidates in order that we might obtain a clearer contact and perspective.

There has been a contention by the Republican party that certain actions of the party in power should not be criticized—this being for the good of the country. No doubt there are those in this world who agree and practice this philosophy; Castro, Trujillo, Mao-Tse-Tung, and of course Mr. Khruschev.

On the other hand we of the Democratic party, believing in the constitutional principles of our forefathers, and in the inherent strength of the Democratic system, refuse to abrogate the right to freedom of speech guaranteed to us in the First Amendment to the Constitution. Our dedication to this principle is such that neither thoughtless demagogery nor uniformed public opinion shall impede us.

There is one issue and one alone

in this campaign: the very physical survival of our nation, the free world, and even that of the entire globe.

The situation today is this: the prestige of the U. S. is at a 20th century low. No sane person of moral integrity can but acknowledge that Russia leads the U. S. in conquest of space, in development of space programs, and more ominous in the deadly race to be the first missile power. Khrushchev has stated many times that the nation that is second in missiles will eventually be no nation.

This terrifying situation is made worse by the desertion of free world countries to the communist bloc. Make no mistake about it: America cannot survive economically isolated. In short, as Adlai Stevenson pointed out, the failure has been in lack of vision, perception, awareness and ability to cope with a world in revolution.

The goal of the Republicans is to continue this dismal record of calamity and indecision. Their true aspirations can best be seen by their record of past performances: fat profits for big business, tight money, unemployment and a total lack of

any or all humanitarian values. Everyone knows the methods of Richard Nixon: Pay no attention to truth—merely smear, smother, and stifle all opposition. His appeal to personal greed and national complacency is so without regard to truth that the *New York Times* and Walter Lippman have constantly risen up against his demagogery in this campaign.

Let us examine John F. Kennedy's campaign. He is a part of a party that has traditionally shown itself to be perceptive to new situations, new problems, and new methods to solve these problems. The Democratic party has made mistakes as it proceeded to new programs, but it has never made the mistake of being afraid to meet a changing world.

The goal of the Democratic Party is to go forward in the spirit and idealism of Roosevelt's New Deal. We must have a rebirth of the "new worth of Freedom." The aspirations of the Democratic party are seen in its humanitarian principles of abolishing poverty, protecting individual rights, and showing true concern for the poverty-stricken throughout the

Continued on Page 2

Sou'wester
Box 724
2000 N. Parkway
Memphis, TN 38112



THE SOU'WESTER

EDITOR Stephen Minor
BUSINESS MANAGER Rich Brown
CIRCULATION Greg Hughes
PHOTOS John Worden, Kathryn Carver, Deck Reeks, Kathleen Smith and many more whose names I've forgotten
STAFF Kelly Bass, Kevin Jagoe, Jill Johnson, Eva Guganheim, Alice J. Smith, David Dwiggins, Martha Mitchell, Buck Thompson, Edward Wheatley

Southwestern for Kennedy

(Continued from page 1) world. The Democratic party is proud to put its platform before the people. The Democratic party is not the plutocracy of the G.O.P. It is the

"natural aristocracy" of Jefferson and Plato. The Democrats welcome (not wear) the bright, most intellectual minds of the nation. It

appeals to hard work and true dedication to the interests of all of the people. Walter Lippmann says

of Kennedy: "It has been truly impressive to see the precision of Mr. Kennedy's mind, his immense command of the facts . . . his singular lack of demagoguery and sloganizing, the stability and steadfastness of his nerves and his coolness and his courage."

The choice is up to you. Will you have Richard Nixon's brand of deceit, demagoguery, and lack of

vision, or will you have courage, progress, and ability with John F. Kennedy?

Nixon-Lodge

(Continued from page 1) situation. Indeed we must revamp our policies toward economic relations with some of the socialist countries of the world. We need not, however, resort to such drastic changes in our national economy. We are charged by future history to continue as a people to achieve our national purpose; a purpose of world leadership in government, culture, and peace to name a few. Will we achieve this purpose by the way we have pursued this end during the last eight years with a new Republican administration, or shift to an entirely different means? The question is yet to be answered, but we must remain convinced of our national goals and of achieving them in sound ways economically, militarily, and diplomatically.

The Quintessence of Kennedyism

JANUARY 11, 1963

By WAYNE GOLDSWORTHY

The record of the Kennedy administration thus far does not lead one to believe that it will be a government unlike any that has preceded it. Mr. Kennedy and his men do not possess a new doctrine or preach a new system. In fact, our new government is perhaps most distinguished by the degree to which it incorporates within its ideas the purposes and the failures of previous administrations. It is significant that upon Kennedy's inauguration, Mr. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. said that it was Kennedy's job to take up Franklin Roosevelt's unfinished business. (In truth, Kennedy sees his task as being much greater. Jackson's, Lincoln's, Wilson's, and Truman's work must be completed also). One may consider the Ole Miss situation as an object case.

The postponed, almost regretted but nevertheless firm action taken against the irresponsibles in Mississippi was completely within the traditional American consensus of what the Federal government should do when challenged on a basic issue of sovereignty. Fortunately, Kennedy even managed to avoid the basically un-American precipitousness of Eisenhower's military action in Arkansas. President Kennedy knows that he must maintain federal authority as the prime feature of our con-

stitutional system. Those periods in our history when the American president did not hold this opinion more strongly than any other are those times most characterized by thievery, foolishness, and deprivation of rights.

At the same time, the President is not out to start a crusade for human rights and federal power. All good presidents have dreaded crusades like the plague. The American people crusade badly. We are normally so concerned with our own interests that, when we do wrench ourselves far from petty concerns and inhale the exciting air of mass action, we fail to find a good basis for action and run terribly amok. Kennedy issued no stirring appeals, though he is capable of them; he enunciated no grand ideals, though he may countenance them privately; he sought no mass, public support, though some thought he needed it. When he did finally speak, it was only to defend the upholding of federal power. Even that statement was cloaked in conciliatory phrases and marked by a certain lack of intensity in delivery.

The policy Kennedy followed in Mississippi will not lead immediately to a radical change in American society. It is, therefore, unpopular with the radicals of both the right and the left and with the idealists. However, that policy does meet the demands that most people place upon a government.

The fight over integration

SEPT. 21, 1962

A Call For Courage

The Southern Negro is awakening. In his struggle for equality he knows that education based on ability, not race, is a primary goal. A school is only as good as its teachers, regardless of the building, and Negro elementary schools in the South have never caught up with the white ones. This situation retards the high schools, and likewise the Negro colleges are academically inferior. When graduates of Southern Negro colleges go North for advanced work, the universities lower their postgraduate degree requirements in recognition of this fact. The vicious circle is completed: without strong colleges to produce teachers, the children are stuck with inadequate schools. True, the situation is gradually improving, but before it gets much better thousands of Negro children with high ability and a thirst for knowledge will be denied the opportunities readily given white children of similar ability; they will soon learn that the search for real knowledge is futile in inferior schools.

Southwestern is in a fortunate position: without control by a backward legislature it can act realistically and from conviction. Perhaps no qualified Negro has ever applied for admission to this college, but the important question is admissions policy. Is the door closed to Southwestern open or closed to qualified Negro applicants? There is doubtless much segregationist pressure from slow-thinking conservative presbyteries and rich contributors. It may even be difficult for the administration to make an open statement regarding the matter. However, the choice is clearcut: right or wrong. Southwestern should not use race as a qualification for admission.

ROGER HART

SEPT. 28, 1962
ANSWER TO "A CALL FOR COURAGE"

In reply to Mr. Roger Hart's letter published in The Sou'wester on September 21, I would like to present another side of the integration question posed by Mr. Hart. He said, in effect, that the only way to produce educated Negroes is to improve their elementary schools, high schools, and colleges, which are presently academically inferior to the white schools of the South. I agree. He also stated that "when graduates of Southern Negro colleges go North for advanced work, the universities lower their postgraduate degree requirements in recognition of this fact." Then he turns around and suggests that Southwestern admit qualified Negro students. Now, he has just told us that the Negro secondary schools are inadequate, so it seems that Mr. Hart is telling us at Southwestern to follow the example of the Northern schools and lower our standard. To my way of thinking, this would create, rather than solve, a problem.

Mr. Hart admits that the Negro's opportunities and facilities for education are improving, though slowly. Today, most southern states are doing more to improve the Negro educational system than the white system, for the express purpose of helping the Negroes become informed, responsible citizens. I believe that people who busy themselves trying to give the Negro equal social, political, and educational status are making a mistake, because, for the most part, the southern Negro is not yet ready for such equality. This new status and the responsibility which goes along with it would only confuse him. It seems to me that these "do-gooders" do more harm than good. If they would leave the problem to the better qualified educators and

legislators, it could be solved more quickly, more efficiently, and with less ill feeling between and among races.

OCT. 5, 1962

OPEN LETTER TO SANDRA SANDERS

I was profoundly absorbed by Miss Sandra Sanders' letter of last week, especially by several passages and theories which seemed to form the basis of her reasoning.

Miss Sanders advocates a "separate but equal" doctrine in order to keep White and Negro cultures from being mixed, but she also believes that Negroes should "work hand in hand with white educators, citizens, and students," and that they should "join forces with caucasians and Orientals" for the betterment of the Negro race. These passages are contradictory; yet they form the main point of her argument.

Let us examine the concept of "mixing white and Negro cultures." When we study this topic we find that when the Negroes first arrived in America, the culture they brought from Africa was mixed along with the cultures of all other nationalities who came to America, and the best each group had to offer survived.

Negroes exchanged their African food, dress, religion, language, customs, and ways of thinking for American counterparts. On the other hand, jazz and the Negro spiritual have been the only original contributions America has made to the world in the field of music. On countless occasions we have vigorously applauded Negro entertainers and sports heroes. The reason the Negro's contributions to American culture are not greater is that he has had little chance to develop because of lack of contact with other peoples.

Miss Sanders tells us that the Negroes are "waking up" and possess the energy, ambition, and desire to better themselves, but she argues that the best interests of both races would be served if Negroes make their advancement inside their own racial lines, and are not allowed to benefit from our experience. In such a case, the rest of America can utilize neither the energy, thirst for improvement, nor many accomplishments that as Miss Sanders correctly assures us are forthcoming from the Negro race.

It is time we asked ourselves whether it is more important to preserve the white and Negro races as separate entities, or to preserve the ideals and material benefits that America represents by constantly striving to improve our nation and the world. If the latter is more expedient, we should encourage and enable the Negro to work together with all other Americans, not within the narrow bounds of a single race or faction, but for the good of mankind as a whole.

HARVEY CAUGHEY

OCT. 12, 1962
DEFENSE OF BARNETT

There is a saying to the effect that you can get away with any lie, provided it is big enough. The lie in this instance is that mob violence never accomplished anything. While I do not defend certain actions on the part of the mob to our South, neither do I defend the actions of certain individuals in the mob action which resulted in the American independence. According to the history books, a mob always loses, fighters for freedom always win. Whether or not the rioters in Mississippi remain a mob, or, historically become heroes, is entirely a matter of whether they win or lose.

The only true slavery lies in a conformist society which does not allow anyone beyond the boundaries of conformism. If all the world is the same, then surely some groups are slaves. As long as there is one area

where Negroes are allowed equality, and another where the whites are allowed their supremacy, and there is free travel between these areas, no-one is enslaved. To attempt to put down segregationists and give the Negroes their "rights" is to enslave one minority at the expense of another.

If a person does not wish to bathe, he may join others who do not wish to bathe. Society tolerates Beatniks. Yet society will not tolerate those who do not wish to associate with a certain class. In supporting the inalienable freedom to eat at lunch counters, our government is denying certain citizens the ancient right to choose one's own companions and friends.

The law is not sacred. Those who successfully rebel against it fight for freedom. Governor Barnett's great sin lies not in fighting, but in failing to fight effectively. Obviously the mob action which resulted was foredoomed, and thus Governor Barnett is guilty, for having allowed it to start. As governor he is responsible for any action on the part of the people of his state.

However, this does not mean that everyone who believes and even fights for segregation is wrong, or "insane." Rather, to me it would seem insane for a government who stockpiles atomic bombs to condemn so harshly a man who throws bricks for a cause in which he believes.

RICK NORWOOD

REPLY TO: DEFENSE OF BARNETT

I have noticed that the letters to the editor generally fall into the pattern of beginning with a liberal allegation followed by a conservative rebuttal—or vice-versa. However, I THINK THAT A CONSERVATIVE'S REPLY TO A FELLOW CONSERVATIVE'S LETTER OR A LIBERAL'S REPLY TO A FELLOW LIBERAL'S LETTER WOULD SOMETIMES SERVE TO REACH A MORE PROFOUND UNDERSTANDING OF POSITION. I am attempting a conservative reply to his letter.

What disturbs me in Rick's letter is that statement: "The only true slavery lies in a conformist society which does not allow anyone beyond the boundaries of conformism." The most obvious point for disagreement is that this is certainly not the only form of slavery. Even more disturbing is that Rick uses this to deduce that giving "Negroes their 'rights'" is to enslave one minority group at the expense of another.

The idea that where there exists uniformity of opinion there exists a subtle mental slavery which does not tolerate error, is a point conservatives have long tried to remind liberals of—especially when the rightness of a cause makes people forget the dangers of uniformity. Ask yourself this question: If our government can force some other state to do wrong? I see this as something not completely unlikely.

But now that I have pointed out what I think was right in Rick's stand, I must point out what I think was wrong. The question of "rights" is not which minority group is not going to have them so that the other can have them, nor the "getting" of rights by Negroes or the "giving up" of rights by our race. The issue finally resolves itself to how we are going to define the concept of human rights in the time of crisis. Regardless of our racial views, we must not fail to recognize that the security of the rights of all of us depends on the security of the rights of every minority group—for none of us are secure unless all are secure.

The greatest question of the race issue has been whether we are ready to grant equal rights to all our slaves. As long as there is one area

(Continued on page 4)

The great James Meredith debate

Calling a spade

NOV. 15, 1963

To the majority of people in this neck of the woods, Southwestern's reputation as one of the top educational institutions in the nation is impeccable. This is illustrated by the "catch phrases" such as "The Princeton of the South," which are mouthed so glibly by anyone wishing to extol the virtues of this hallowed institution without having to point to anything concrete, and which serve to spread an incorrect image.

Anyone who has spent some time at both Princeton (or any other college with a truly intellectual atmosphere) and Southwestern would not be guilty of making such a comparison. Neither the fact that students generally have to spend long, tedious hours poring over assignments, nor the fact that more is expected—quantitatively, of course—from a student at Southwestern than from students at most other colleges in the region is enough to nullify the fact that outside the bounds of required study, concern for knowledge at Southwestern is to a large extent nonexistent.

Perhaps one of the problems is illustrated by this last sentence. Does an education consist of memorizing an aggregate of facts substantial enough to pass the exam, after which the facts are forgotten except those needed for professional purposes later on? If so, Southwestern might be said to provide a good-education. But if an ideal college education goes any deeper than this, then Southwestern, except in a limited sense to those who actively seek this education, is most assuredly not the great intellectual center it is often pictured as.

The fault here lies partially within the student body itself. It is certainly not the case that Southwestern students are incapable; it is rather that they look upon education not as an end but as a means to a comfortable job or a secure place in a complacent society.

This is not to say that Southwestern is completely devoid of creativity or interest in knowledge. Exposed to a process that is as highly conducive to intellectual activity in the true sense as college study is, a student who never has a single original thought or who never feels a desire to learn just for the sake of knowing must be almost totally immune to the world outside him. But such creativity is the exception rather than the rule with most students.

However, factors of the student's environment are generally responsible for the rather sterile intellectual climate at Southwestern. The society from which most of the students of Southwestern are drawn are more concerned with the perpetuation of their culture rather than in intellectual achievement. The student therefore is usually brought up and conditioned to be a part of that culture rather than a creative individual. Furthermore, virtually all the student body comes from the same culture, and has no chance to exchange ideas with students from different environments. The rising cost of an education at Southwestern limits financially the type of students who come to Southwestern. Admissions policy limits them geographically. About 7/8 of the student body is drawn from the five-state area immediately surrounding Memphis. Less than five per cent of students come from north of the Mason-Dixon line. To realize the full impact of this policy, step outside of Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama and take a survey of how many non-Southwestern alumni and non-Presbyterians have ever heard of Southwestern.

It is doubtful whether the majority of either students or administration would be willing to make the transition from a sterile to a productive intellectual climate. But if this is not done, the administration should take steps to qualify what is meant by a "good" college in Southwestern's case whenever it proclaims the merits of the college. And until it does change Southwestern will remain like so many other small, unknown colleges that hold delusions of greatness, but leave much to be desired.

HDC

Straw vote tomorrow

NOVEMBER 22, 1963

The student body will decide in a special vote tomorrow whether the Student Council will invite James Meredith, first Negro graduate of the University of Mississippi, to speak to Southwestern students Monday afternoon.

The Student Council, in a four-hour meeting last night, passed a resolution inviting Meredith to speak, following the administration's refusal to let Meredith speak at Southwestern, saying that students have the right to hear speakers of their own choosing in order to examine various pertinent issues. The vote was 17-5.

However, the Council afterwards voted unanimously to take a poll of the student body Saturday and abide by their decision. The issue was presented to students today in student assembly.

Things began last week when two students, Howard Romaine and Ted Morris, discovered that Meredith would be available for a talk next Monday, and talked to the administration concerning the possibility of bringing him to a chapel program. They were refused on Monday of this week, primarily, they said, because the administration didn't think Meredith was of sufficient intellectual calibre and because he didn't fit into the educational context.

In a special meeting Wednesday night the Council decided that

students have the right to bring speakers to express their ideas at Southwestern, and voted 19-2 to invite Meredith and Rubel Phillips, recently defeated Republican Gubernatorial candidate from Mississippi, to speak at Southwestern. According to the Council, Meredith would have spoken Monday and Phillips at a later date.

But the administration refused the Council permission to bring Meredith on campus, although it raised no immediate objections to Phillips. The Council then voted Thursday night to invite Meredith to speak Monday at an off-campus site to be determined, with Phillips still invited later.

The Council quickly decided that students have the right to hear speakers they want to bring on campus because of the conception of a university as a free market place of ideas. But discussion raged over whether to express their student right by actually inviting Meredith.

Before the final resolution to invite Meredith and Phillips was passed a proposed amendment by Cyril Hollingsworth, which stated the Council's position, but said that the Council would not embarrass the college by issuing the invitation, was defeated 10-13.

Poll cancelled

DEC. 6, 1963

Because of the day of mourning proclaimed by President Johnson for the late John F. Kennedy James Meredith was not invited to speak in Memphis November 25.

In a decision reached at a meeting the night of November 22, the Student Council cancelled the straw vote which was to be held the following day. The straw vote was to have decided whether Meredith would be invited by the Student Council. There are no plans at present to extend another such invitation to Mr. Meredith.

Tomorrow's Election: A Crossroads

NOV. 22, 1963

There is nothing that we would like better than to be forced to eat our editorial words of last week, and it appears that the time has come for those words either to be proven true or to be flung back in our face.

For the many who finessed last week's editorial entitled "Calling a Spade," we said among other things that among Southwestern students the quest for truth for its own sake was to an almost overwhelming extent non-existent. But the events of the past few days and the events of the next few days are steps which in the long run will either prove or disprove this thesis.

Tomorrow students will vote on whether they have the right to place issues under the microscope of truth themselves or whether they must accept the right of others to decide for them what they shall and shall not do in the course of striving for knowledge. This is the abstract principle involved. The university can have no basis for existence whatsoever if this basic student right is ignored, because a college is founded on this principle. And yet, in this situation as in all human activities, the principle only emerges when a specific, case concerning that principle is involved. Unfortunately the individual case can be so potent that it clouds the principle and makes it seem that the specific situation and not the absolute principle is the ultimate consideration.

Thus, tomorrow students will vote on whether to allow James Meredith to be brought to express his views to the students Monday. Two hundred students have expressed a desire to hear Meredith speak. With integration of Southwestern being imminent, one of the concerns most

vital to Southwestern students should be this issue. In the true spirit of knowledge students should demand to hear every side of this question, whether they agree with a particular speaker or not.

But many forget that a universal can only express itself in terms of specifics. Many students have defended the theoretical right to hear the speakers they want, but say that Meredith, for various reasons, should not be invited to speak, although a large percentage of students have expressed a desire to hear him.

These reasons are as various as they are confused. Most are totally irrelevant, but a few are worthy of comment. Firstly, the student must have a free mind to seek the truth, and must depend on the administration and faculty as a guide to but not a source of knowledge. When someone seeks to stifle this free quest of the mind he is acting contrary to the very purpose of a college. Secondly, there can never be an "open-market place of ideas," without controversy. Controversy breeds the critical analysis which distinguishes truth from falsehood. If the student's right to hear a speaker were limited only to those cases where the speaker were non-controversial, the right would be meaningless.

Thirdly, if students really believe there exists a right entitling them to hear and decide for themselves, it cannot exist only as a theory. As we said before, universal rights are only manifested through particular instances. How then can one claim an absolute right which he will not put into practise in individual cases? If as students we have this right, we must defend this as well as all other cases in which a large number of students desire to hear a certain speaker, or the right ceases to exist

for us.

The issue then boils down to whether the students feel they have the right to search for the truth on their own, making up their own minds by calling in all the sources at their disposal in the form of both the written and the spoken word. Southwestern cannot be the in-

tellectual community it aspires to be without this student right being recognized. And the only method the student has for asserting his desire to mold Southwestern into a greater center of learning is to assert his right to distinguish truth from falsehood for himself.

HDC

The origins of Reading Day

for the school. Both professors and students will be delighted if the plan goes through. Everyone will appreciate not only the extra time but

APRIL 1, 1965.

A group of entrepreneurs, who call themselves The Dealers, Inc., announced this week that their long debated plans to put into full use beginning next fall are nearing fruition.

The spokesman for the group said that since the entire food-drink-etcetera concession along with Bob Poole and Blondie will be moved into the new Student Center next September the group began thinking of some way to utilize the vacant Lair for the students' benefit and their own profit.

They came up with the idea of making the old Lynx Lair into a taproom. Several difficulties lay before the Dealers, Inc., before they could realize their plans (and profits). The most outstanding of course was the traditional dictum that no alcoholic beverage are allowed on campus.

Going over the head of now President Peyton Rhodes, The Dealers, Inc. went to the man who would have the full authority next September when their plan would go into effect. New President David Alexander was queried on the matter and the answer was in the affirmative for the group's plans.

Alexander said in part: "Yes, I think that the renovation of the Lair and the establishment of an on-campus bar would be a good idea. This would save students the

Obviously, it is impossible to have a free day this semester, but we are assured that the petition has been turned in early enough to be thoroughly debated before exams next semester.

The Student Council may be justly proud of their attempts to provide something truly beneficial

trouble of going off campus for a beer and keep the regulation of drinking on campus where we could control it better. Besides students should have somewhere close-by to go and get a quick one before such trying experiences as classes and convocations, particularly during REW week." The Dealers, Inc. were forced to cut Alexander in for 20 percent partnership, however.

The entrepreneurs also hope to turn their new establishment into a kind of combination discotheque and night club. Such favorites as Lynx Lair stand-by Bob Fischbach will offer folk music and the group is in the process of trying to sign the ethnic duo Weber and Frank.

Sometime cafeteria employee "Gomer" Harlan will serve as the bouncer and also offer his comic antics from time to time to add to the atmosphere.

To add the flavor of New Orleans and Bourbon Street the new proprietors of the Lair hope to present a burlesque show several nights a week. Possible coming attractions along these lines are the world renowned "Four Horsewomen of the Apocalypse" and the 1965-66 cheerleaders minus "Jumping" John Williams.

As far as refreshments go Schlitz and Michelob will be on draught as well as Katz beer, added for the benefit of Browne Mercer and Rick Duschl.

APPLICATION FOR A DATE WITH A SOUTHWESTERN GIRL

October 28, 1960

Name in full _____ Age _____
 Address _____ Height _____ ft. _____ in.
 Weight _____ lbs. Is your hair long? _____ If so, do you
 like long-hair music? _____ Do you study much?
 Can you fly? _____ If so, do you have a magic wand?
 If not, does your roommate have one he might let you borrow?
 When on a date do you like to go to the movies (not open air)?
 Do you have a qualified chaperone for your dates?
 List references:
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

Do you understand that you cannot kiss one of our girls until you have had four dates with her? _____ Do you also understand that a girl and a boy cannot be lower than a 90 degree angle to the horizontal on this campus? _____ Are you a member of a fraternity?
 If so, which one? _____

(The girls understand that they cannot go out with members of the following brotherhoods):

KA—Knights of Alcohol
 SAE—Sex Above Everything
 KS—Knights of Sex
 ATO—Antagonizers of Traditional Obedience
 (The girls are also aware of the fact that we are partial to the following fraternities):
 PiKA—Phly-Kids of the Air
 SN—Society of Nobodies

Do you have a job? _____ If so, does it pay much? _____
 How much? _____ Would you be willing to donate to campus funds?
 Signed _____

Please fill this out and return to the Dean of Women's office so that your name might be considered for our date list. It is important that this be correctly filled out as a boy must be on the approved list before he will be allowed to date one of our girls. Perjury and forgery are crimes punished by a committee of honor dates.

Election draws 80,000

NOVEMBER 15, 1963

NEW HAVEN, Conn. (CPS)— Eighty thousand Mississippi Negroes have cast ballots for Aaron Henry in the "Protest Vote for Freedom" held Saturday, Sunday and Monday. Spokesman at the campaign headquarters in Jackson feel that the number of votes may reach 100,000 when all returns have been counted.

The northeast section of the state had what was described as "a whopping turnout." Clarksdale, a city in that sector, reported 6,501 for Henry, while the county lying directly outside of Clarksdale added another 10,401. The returns in Coahoma county also located in the northwest part of the state reflected the extensive three week campaign of the SNCC workers, Stanford students and Yale students as 17,000 Negroes cast protest ballots for Aaron Henry. Additional votes are still expected from the Gulf Coast area.

The satisfaction with the protest election results was unanimously voiced by campaign manager for Aaron Henry, stated that the protest election was "an historic event. For the first time Negroes are going to realize that they are in touch with each other because of the freedom vote. The virtual isolation of the

Bosaquet was released on \$500 bond. At the insistence of the British consulate, charges were later dropped. Last night Bosaquet made a second trip to Jackson jail after being charged with "speeding and suspicion of car theft." He was fined \$25 on the speeding offense and was later released when he presented his car registration papers.

SEPT. 13, 1963

Next week the Student Council will distribute name tags to all

Southwestern students both old and new. Transparent plastic wickets will hold the name cards, which will be of one color for new students and

The fight over integration

Continued From Page 2
 citizens. I think this battle for human rights has been battle for human rights has

The greatest question of the race issue has been whether we are ready to grant equal rights to all our citizens. I think this battle for human rights has been largely won. The problem remaining is how we shall effect our commitment to this principle. And I do not think this is a problem of such pressing im-

minence as to call for placing federal troops into a recalcitrant sister state or for Mississippi's own violence for the lost cause of white superiority. I hold with William Faulkner that it is the South that must grant the Negro human rights, if these rights are going to real and meaningful. The issue can not be forced. It can, however, be hastened by the moral support of every Southerner

Graham Smithwick

NAACP treasurer to speak

FEB. 14, 1964

The National Treasurer of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Alfred Baker Lewis of Connecticut, spoke to a group of twenty-five Southwestern students Monday, February 11 at 8:00 in the Burrow Library.

Mr. Lewis was introduced by Roger Hart, president of the Westminster Fellowship at Southwestern. The WF sponsored the meeting, Hart said because "we feel that it is the obligation of Christians to encourage responsible concern in social problems."

Mr. Lewis first gave a brief history of the NAACP and explained its organization. He listed a number of "atrocities" committed against Negroes about which he felt most southern white young people did not hear about, such as the arrest of Harvey Turnbow, a worker for Negro voter registration, when whites threw a flaming bottle of gasoline in his home. The charge was arson.

After his talk Mr. Lewis invited questions from the students. One question concerned the right of discrimination. Mr. Lewis stated that it was the right of the individual to discriminate privately, but not publicly. He said that even in old English law, the innkeeper must accept all of the public.

On the topic of boycott when a public accommodation owner allows his establishment to become integrated, Mr. Lewis indicated that when all have to integrate, no one loses business.

Should the federal government force integration?" was asked. The speaker said that the country has become more closely knit. Therefore, what happens in one part of the country affects another. When transportation isolated small areas, the state rightly had most of the power, but now it was the duty of the federal government to step in. "States' rights," Mr. Lewis stated, "are used as a cover up for human wrongs."

John Lewis, chairman of SNCC, echoed the prevalent opinion in stating that the "Mississippi Freedom Ballot is one of the most significant events of the civil rights movement. We believe that its importance lies in the fact that 80,000 disenfranchised Mississippians in over 100 towns and cities had an opportunity to participate in the electoral process for the first time in their lives."

Southwestern's only roofball court is located south of the

'Roofball' gains campus-wide recognition as SW's most popular Spring pastime

MAY 3, 1963

By Bob Gilbert

Southwestern's campus, due to its unique architectural design, has, in recent years, witnessed the initiation of a new pastime in the lives of its male students. Although the disinterest in this sport is not as widespread as it is in . . . say . . . student government, it is still possible that there will be a few who read this article and who will not fully understand what roofball is. For those, this brief word of explanation.

Southwestern's only roofball court is located south of the

The rapid progress of acceptance of the Negro in the South naturally, without intervention of the government, was mentioned to Mr. Lewis. He attributed this to the increased proportion of educated Negroes. He also declared that the Army, which is completely integrated, is responsible to some degree for the advancement of the status of the Negro.

To conclude, Mr. Lewis compared the acceptance of the Negro to the acceptance of women as individuals. He cited the case of the admission of the first three women to attend

Vanderbilt, and commented on how daring the act seemed at the time. He implied that a century from now, racial integration will seem no more daring than the acceptance of women did at that time.

PROGRESS—AT VERY DELIBERATE SPEED, a pamphlet by Mr. Lewis, was placed in the Burrow Library. Published by the Negro Labor Committee, the pamphlet discusses voting rights, economical opportunities for Negroes, equal education, equal housing, important court victories, sit-ins, and civil rights laws, from the NLC viewpoint.

Protest group causes mixed reactions at Vandy

JANUARY 11, 1963

Sit-ins in Nashville which involved members of the Vanderbilt student body and faculty brought mixed reactions from official organs and individuals from both the college and elsewhere.

Focus of the controversy centered around assistant physics professor Dr. David Kotelchuck, who was involved in the protest movement. A photo showing an employee of a picketed lunch counter taking a swing at Dr. Kotelchuck was widely circulated throughout the country.

The Vanderbilt Student Senate immediately passed a resolution condemning the sit-ins because of the violence connected with them and introduced another resolution requesting an investigation of those members of the Vanderbilt community who participated in "an organized program of deliberate violation of the law" and urging that all members of the community, without regard to political or moral considerations, refrain from engaging in actions which are apt to incite a riot and thus bring adverse publicity to Vanderbilt.

Vanderbilt's college paper, the *Hustler*, retaliated against the Senate's stand in two editorials, which denounced both resolutions on sit-ins.

"To oppose sit-ins because they are unorderly is to avoid the problem, and it is this sort of avoidance that makes sit-ins necessary," asserted one editorial. "Sit-ins aren't good, but the discrimination they show up is worse, and that discrimination is what must be either opposed or rationally defended by responsible people."

The second editorial said that the school had no business investigating the "political and moral commitments of the members of its community" and attacked the "refrain from adverse publicity" clause of the proposed resolution. The *Hustler* and the Senate have conducted a running feud for some time over numerous issues.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, in Nashville for a conference on racial problems, also denounced the Senate stand, saying that "if a student has convictions . . . he should express them in every way possible."

the oldest and most experienced pioneers of the game, David Lindsey and Rusty Vance, who compose Southwestern's championship roofball team.

David Lindsey had this to say about roofball: "Yes, I feel that roofball has definitely become an integral part of college life to many Southwestern students. I have considered suggesting to the administration that the physical fitness program be replaced by roofball because it makes you tough. Once you have run into the wall, slipped on the manhole cover, and tripped over the steps a few times, you get tough."

Other suggestions by Lindsey include holding a National Invitational Roofball Championship match with the Ivy League colleges (the only other schools with roofball facilities); removal of certain strategic patches of ivy ("we've lost several roofballs in the ivy and they're a rare commodity, hard to come by"); a rerouting of the walk to the Lynx Lair to prevent constant interruption; installation of another court near the new student center; installation of lights for "night" roofball; and the drafting of a set of rules "so Browne Mercer can understand the game."

When asked if his wife had any resentment toward the game and if she felt she was a "roofball widow" Rusty Vance replied in a whisper, with the faintest glimmer of a smile, "she doesn't know I play."

another for returning students.

The obvious purpose of this is to enable new and old students to get to know each other and to promote a friendly atmosphere among the campus community. "Rush" and pre-school orientation activities obvious operate at too frenzied a pace to allow students to remember the names of more than a few people. It is only when the college settles into a more relaxed atmosphere that students can be expected to come to know a large number of people with whom they will be closely associated throughout the coming year.

To speed up this "familiarizing" process, the Student Council has gone to much trouble and expense to furnish name tags. It will take a conscientious effort on the part of

all students in order for this effort not to be wasted. Changing name tags from shirt to shirt or blouse to blouse each time the student changes clothes is a bothersome procedure.

But in the interest of his fellow students, each Southwesternite should feel it his duty to remember to wear his tag at all times during the first week of classes. If we start off on the right foot, Southwestern students can make this a year to remember. But a prerequisite to such a year is a student community permeated with an atmosphere of friendliness and familiarity.

Start off right. Wear your name tag so that people may learn who you are, while you learn the names of most of your fellow students.

HDC

The issue of compulsory Chapel

OCTOBER 6, 1961

SENIORS PETITION FOR EXEMPTION FROM CHAPEL

Claim Maturity, Freedom of Choice, Before Administrative Committee

Although seniors have enjoyed exemption from chapel services over the past few years, a new administrative policy has been enforced this school year. Seniors are now required to attend chapel on three designated days each week, as does the rest of the student body. Last week the senior class presented to the administrative committee a formal declaration of its stand on this issue. This declaration was the following petition:

We, the undersigned of the senior class, wish to formally protest the compulsory chapel attendance which is being enforced this year. We do not plan to request a privilege purely for the sake of having one. In order that this protest not be misconstrued simply as rebellion, we set forth the following reasons for this action—reasons which we feel to be entirely valid.

- (1) Southwestern enjoys a constantly increasing status among the best recognized academic institutions. We feel that this increasing academic standard has not been accompanied by a corresponding increase in recognition of student maturity. It would seem that, since coping with increasing academic demands requires a higher level of maturity in any student group, this maturity should be recognized and accorded greater respect. For the past few years Southwestern seniors have enjoyed a solitary class privilege: exemption from compulsory chapel attendance. In keeping with increasing academic demands, we feel that increased recognition of our maturity, even in the form of privileges, is not only deserved, but sorely needed.

- (2) Compulsory chapel attendance often causes inconvenience in following areas:
practice teaching
senior tutorials
advanced laboratory work
and, in the spring, in studying for comprehensive exams.
- (3) We recognize the value of the opportunity presented by convocation of hearing distinguished speakers. But we also feel as mature men and women that we could and would take advantage of this opportunity on our own.

own. We further feel that as seniors we should be entitled to exercise our own judgment in these matters. Denial of this right denies us the very freedom of choice.

On Friday, September 20, Dean Jones presented this petition to a committee consisting of President Rhodes, Dr. Benish, Dr. Taylor, Dean Caldwell, John Turpin, Dr. MacQueen, Dr. Reveley, and Dean Diehl. Immediately thereafter a student committee consisting of Bob Gay, Larry Kinney, Pete Cornish, Jane Cook, and Marilyn Stewart was summoned to act as spokesman for the senior class and to further explain and discuss its position. The administrative committee was most cooperative in presenting their reasons for initiating this compulsory system and in listening to the student counterpoints. After a thorough discussion the student committee withdrew leaving the administrative committee to agree on the recommendations which it would present to the faculty at a later meeting.

And more letters to the Editor

NOVEMBER 1, 1963

JEFFERSON HAD A WORD FOR IT

To the Editor of the Southwester:

May I intervene in the exchange between Mrs. Feltus and Stellwagen to suggest mature reflection upon the need for freedom of conscience, debate, and inquiry in any open society primarily devoted to the rights of the individual and the general welfare, and more especially in any Christian community dedicated to the advancement of learning? At a time when stated legislatures are rarely overflowing with wisdom and enlightenment, we might well remember what the legislature of Virginia, guided by Thomas Jefferson, had to say upon the subject in the preamble to the Virginia Statue of Religious Liberty, enacted in 1786.

WHEREAS Almighty God hath created the mind free; that all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do; more... that the impious presumption of legislators and rulers, civil as well as ecclesiastical, who being themselves but fallible and uninspired men, have assumed dominion over the faith of others, setting up their own opinions and modes of thinking as the only true and infallible, and as

such endeavouring to impose them on others, hath established and maintained false religions over the greatest part of the world, and through all time... that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them.

Or, as Justice Holmes said, "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market..."

JOHN M. HEMPHILL II

EFFECTS OF REQUIRED RELIGION

My Dear Mr. Stellwagen,

I use your address to reemphasize the condescending tone of your letter, the very attitude that Mr. Feltus so justly resents. This condescending tone indicates that whatever any student may say, you will not judge it not on the merits of the argument but upon your belief that students cannot possibly say anything of value, and, even if they do, you won't listen to it anyway. This is your attitude and Dr. Patterson's attitude and the attitude of so many latter day Savanarola's, petty religious authoritarians who feel that they can produce conversion through compulsion. It is not that I doubt your sincerity, but absolute sincerity does not give one the right to force others to do as he thinks best.

Your letter was filled with much talk of "duty to worship our Creator" and "man's only justification for existence is to worship God." This may be true or not, but in any case many people may believe that "good music," and pious phrases may be out but Casper Milquetoast methods of escaping reality, and that true worship might better be found in meaningful action as against contemplation.

But beyond all this, we must face the fact that compulsion is admission on the part of those in power that their programs are so lacking in intellectual or moral appeal to college students and that they are so empty and devoid of vitality that force must be used to achieve attendance. Further, the effects of enforced religion must necessarily be negative. For those who already have some antipathy towards such "religiosity," compulsory attendance is the perfect pathway to extreme dislike and concrete rejection. And, for those who worship out of duty, (as apparently Mr. Stellwagen does) compulsory chapel necessarily removes any feeling of virtue they might gain by willing themselves to attend—out of duty—for they have no choice. Thus compulsory chapel does no one any good, it removes the right of all to choose, and it furthers the suspicion that if religion were not constantly enforced, like a flimsy hut, it would crumble out of sight.

HOWARD ROMAINE

The revolution in Lair policy

APRIL 8, 1960

By Sallie Meek, Jr.

Whether it was pre-election fever, or just spring fever, a revolution in Southwestern Lynx Lair Policy occurred this week. Whatever the causes of the revolution, its implications offer hope to the weary and those who heavy burdens bear, etc.

Sometime Wednesday night the revolution began. All was peaceful outside the boys' dorm, save for the steady tap tap of typewriters and the assorted obscenities floating forth from the Sou'wester office. Inside the Lair, one or two people wandered about buying Kleenex. Then, suddenly, at about 9:30 it happened. A crowd, a mob, out of nowhere, materialized in the dull deserted Lair, turned out the lights, and began to DANCE.

As the evening wore on, the crowd grew thicker, louder, more excited. Rock 'n' roll music throbbed out

into the spring night as avid campaigners for the next day's election bounded voluntarily into jam session after jam session.

Perhaps the whole thing took 45 minutes. Then the mob, quieter, and docile, dispersed peacefully and the girls (campaigners and non-campaigners) were walked back to

the dorm by the boys (campaigners and non-campaigners). Bill Reed grinned suspiciously, as if he'd been the instigator of the whole thing. However, some observers felt that the revolutionary movement could only have been started by some subversive group like ODK or the Communists.

President Urges Maturity

OCT. 5, 1962

While speaking in student convocation Tuesday, President Peyton N. Rhodes made direct reference to the Ole Miss crisis, stating that "The basis of conduct of calm maturity-of citizenship in a democracy-is the ability of everyone to say his piece and yet observe the law."

In response to the reports, at that time unconfirmed, of Southwestern

students observing and/or participating in the recent outbreak of hostility, President Rhodes warned that students should avoid getting involved in a situation "that has become so fantastically mixed up that it would be impossible to exert any leadership or influence for good. If any Southwestern students have been so unwise as to become engaged in this situation, they have demonstrated a lack of the maturity which they are supposedly trying to

Letters to the Editor

OCT. 11, 1963

Chapel System Attacked

In a recent issue of the Sou'wester the college chaplain was quoted as saying that a student referendum on the question of compulsory chapel attendance would have no effect on the college's policy. This reflects an attitude that seems to be prominent among the faculty and administration.

"It would seem to say, "Our Admissions Department carefully selects our students from the best available and we give them the best available education!" All of this is standard Admissions Department propaganda, "But in spite of this, our students have no sense and therefore their opinions are not worth consideration. We even have to MAKE our seniors come to EVERY Bible class."

It would seem that the little men have climbed so high up on their Gothic tower that they have lost touch with reality. "The trouble certainly couldn't be chapel itself. There is nothing wrong with Senior Bible. Our students (although many Juniors and all Seniors are old enough to vote) just don't know what's good for them."

The faculty and administration refuse to recognize when a program or class is so irrelevant as to be a waste of time. Instead, the trouble is thought to be with the students and is simply corrected by having required attendance. Isn't this like cutting your nose off to kill the smell?

It might be appropriate if some people took a look out through the windows of their Gothic tower and instead of remembering where we've been; ask, "Where are we going?" and, the student MIGHT have some answers. After all, the students ARE Southwestern.

DAVE FELTUS

OCT. 18, 1963

My dear Mr. Feltus:

You have posed some interesting questions in your article and I would like to attempt to answer some of them and pose a few more for you and others who may share your opinions. The problem appears to center about the "compulsory chapel." Before beginning let us define "chapel" and a religious service and "convocation" and a secular meeting. Unfortunately the "compulsory chapel" appears to be the case where there has been either lack of responsibility or maturity on the part of the student to recognize the value of the program. As I see it man's only justification for existence is to worship God and it is devoutly hoped, by the very few who took the time, trouble and initiative to improve the past chapel program to what it is at present, that the time set aside for us in the academic week for this chapel will encourage and impress upon us the duty to worship our Creator. I need not remind the students of the totally unworshipful atmosphere of Hardie Auditorium as compared to the service as it now occurs at Evergreen Presbyterian Church where you have the opportunity to hear good music, a succinct sermon and have a worshipful atmosphere. Now this atmosphere is what you students make it, for it directly reflects your reverence, if any, and your mature recognition of man's frailty and need for guidance introspection.

I feel one errs when making a statement that a proper chapel service is a "waste of time" or "irrelevant." This appears to me to be a confession of ignorance as to one's spiritual estate. Now, the chapel service can, I am sure, be improved and if we all work together constructively to improve it Southwestern will have something of value, beauty and quality. As students come to Southwestern for intellectual and spiritual stimulation and pay good money for it I cannot see the justification for anything but the very best in all areas, especially with our most precious trust or possession, namely the soul.

Here are several questions I would like to pose: (1) Studying is not compulsory here but are all of you using this time, probably the only time in your life you can devote all your energies to this privilege, to the best of your ability? Perhaps the answer to question bears a relationship to the "why" of a "compulsory chapel." (2) Do you really believe reaching the physical voting age implies intellectual maturity? (3) Do you really believe that the capable faculty of Southwestern look upon the student as "not having sense?" I might add here that if a student "had good sense," i.e., could study effectively, reason well and above all THINK, it wouldn't be necessary for him to attend college. Perhaps the confusion here centers about the instructors' recognition that students do have opinions, right or wrong, but with maturity and in light of more experience with life may temper or change these same opinions. This attitude of the faculty may lead the student to think he does not "have good sense."

As to "where we are going" depends upon the present students as affected by the faculty who are, in turn, judging their effects upon the alumni. If students are not being challenged to think or not being encouraged to develop their talents to the fullest extent, then I would question the value of that program and seriously take steps to remedy it. This, of course, infers mature questioning of an area and an attempt to improve it before acting.

KENTON W. STELLWAGEN
(Organ and Sacred Music)

acquire through their liberal arts studies."

Dismissing as pretentious the expressed purpose of obtaining first-hand information on the situation, President Rhodes stated that "rumors travel with a speed exceeding that of light" and added that it is extremely difficult even to be an eye-witness and get the facts straight. Amid crises and rumors, it is only the very mature person who keeps his emotional boiling point

under control. Mobs occur when people's emotional boiling points cannot be controlled.

"The liberally educated person, in addition to having his mind stored with a knowledge of great and fundamental truths and an intellect capable of clear and logical thinking, is, as Thomas Huxley put it, a person whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience."

Campaign '64: Goldwater versus Johnson

Large Crowd Greets Goldwater

As Candidate Visits Memphis

SEPT. 18, 1964

By George L. Walker

On Wednesday, September 16, Senator Barry Goldwater visited Memphis during his campaign tour of the South. Goldwater arrived from Knoxville at noon on his private jet and was greeted at the airport by some 2,000 people. After receiving the key to the city from Mayor Ingram and making a short address to the crowd, Goldwater proceeded uptown accompanied by a motorcade of twenty-two cars and a police escort.

Gathered on the river bluffs of Memphis were over 50,000 enthusiastic people who had come to see and hear the man whom they are supporting for the Presidency of the United States. Some of these people had started to gather early that morning, bringing lunches and chairs for the long wait; many had driven miles from surrounding states such as Mississippi, Arkansas and Missouri. Republican leaders and some Democrats from the vicinity were present to see the Senator from Arizona.

After a few short opening remarks, the invocation and pledge of allegiance, the main speaker was introduced by Dan Kuykendal, Republican candidate for the Senate seat now held by Albert Gore. Senator Goldwater spoke for about thirty minutes, hitting hard at the policies of the Johnson Administration. Goldwater sharply criticized two passages in a prepared speech by Johnson which said that "Castro was not spreading Communism," and "Castro was not a threat to the peace of the United

States." Goldwater called these statements "incredible" and "fantastic" and suggested that the President's attitude toward Cuba left much to be desired. A group of Cuban exiles present seemed complete agreement.

The Senator then turned to internal issues. Charging that the Democratic Administration was pushing toward a larger and larger Federal government, with complete centralization of power in Washington and removal of state and local powers, Goldwater called for a return to government under the Constitution, a document "just a valid today as when it was written." The Republican nominee reminded each man of the responsibility of the citizen in our Republic and asked that the citizens of America "help keep that America I have known and not the America we seem to have been moving toward in the last few years." He called for a return to spiritual values in the nation, "which under the Constitution are the source of our freedoms." Goldwater asked that "God be put back in our nation" and that the government learn to respect the individual, a quality sorely lacking under the present Administration.

After another tremendous ovation the Senator shook hands for a few minutes and then returned to the airport to continue his campaign trip. From press reports Memphis seems to have been a high spot in his current swing through the South, with an exceptionally larger enthusiastic crowd. From the reception Goldwater received today it seems likely that he will carry Shelby County by a large margin in November.

BIGGEST CROWD IN MEMPHIS HISTORY

Welcomes President L. B. Johnson

OCT. 30, 1964

By George Conroy

The biggest crowd in the history of Tennessee greeted Lyndon Johnson as he charmed Mid-Southerners from six states in Memphis last Saturday. The President told a cheering throng of over a quarter of a million people, waving banners, home-made placards, and chanting in the familiar "We Want Johnson," that it would be one of his goals in the next four years "to erase the Mason-Dixon line," as well as what he called "the color line across our opportunity."

"The mandate of this election is going to be a mandate to unite this nation," the leader said, "to bind up our wounds, heal our history, and make our nation whole as one people, indivisible under God. I want any who wish us ill to understand that America cannot be divided by region, by religion, or by race!"

Then the smiling Chief Executive heard the huge crowd roar approval when without mentioning the name of his opposition he lashed out at

"the doom-mongers and naysayers."

From the moment he stepped from his big "Air Force One" Boeing 707 Jetliner, he was swarmed by well-wishers and outstretched hands yearning to touch the hand of the hero. The tireless campaigner heard word after word of encouragement and praise, posed for picture after picture, and in the estimate of White House Press-Secretary George Reedy, "The President must have touched literally thousands of hands."

The President was welcomed officially to Memphis by George Grider. And the Governor of Tennessee, Frank G. Clement introduced the President in a stirring ovation. In turn, the president has many a word of praise for all of Tennessee's Democratic candidates, speaking of Grider as "the next congressman from this district," and saying of Senator Albert Gore, who seeks reelection to the Senate, "The people of Tennessee need men like Albert Gore in the Senate, and the country needs

him in Washington." Master of ceremonies for the event was James Irwin, chairman of the Shelby County Democratic Campaign Committee.

Police officials estimated the crowd at between 250,000 to 300,000 people. Several officers and members of the press who had also been present for the Goldwater rally earlier in the campaign, told this reporter that the Johnson crowd was from two to three times that of the GOP nominee. The size and friendliness of the throngs should quell boasts of Republicans that this is Goldwater country. Memphis is Johnson country if the reception the candidates received here is to be an indication. Bill Hidson, chief photographer for the Associated Press, who was present for both gatherings said when asked to compare the two. "It is like trying to compare the St. Louis Cardinals to a high school team. This is the greatest crowd I've ever seen in Tennessee, and one of the best and warmest of the campaign so far.

The Very Best of Davy's Locker

OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1966

Dear Davy,

Last night I was parking with a friendly Chi-O I picked up at the library. Suddenly seven hoods in white jeans began rocking the car and threatening to molest her. What should I do in a case like this?

Lunk

Dear Lunk,

Nothing. A friendly Chi-O around here is like a box of cookies from home; pass it around and let everybody grab a handful.

Davy

* * *

Personal to L.H. "Love is like a butterfly, it would just as soon land on an outhouse as a rose."

* * *

Dear Davy,

Who was that Chi-O I saw you with last night?

HH

Dear HH,

That was no Chi-O, that was a box of cookies.

* * *

Dear Davy,

We are very angry about your remark last issue about Chi-O's and eating cookies. It was in bad taste.

Chi Omega

Dear ChiO,

I must not comment on that, I must not, I must not. . . .

* * *

Dear Davy,

Is it true that if an eleven-year-old girl were to walk across campus, a dozen seniors would ask her for a date?

Brownie Troop No. 69

Dear Kids,

I can spot a phoney letter from a mile away. This was really written by the AOPI pledge class, wasn't it? I

can tell. You can't fool me. Come on. Walk across. Just once! I dare you!

* * *

Dear Davy,

Justify the ways of God to man.

Fred

Dear Fred,

Okay, next week. I promise.

* * *

Dear Davy,

What is the definition of "Social Pressure"?

XKA

Dear Pal,

Y

Dear Davy,

Could you tell me the two most important organizations on campus? Would they be SGA and the Honor Council? In that order?

Don

Dear Don,

Sorry, but you're wrong. The two most important groups on campus are G.O.M.E.R. and C.L.I.F.T.O.N. The initials, in case you haven't guessed, stand for "General Organization for Meals of Extreme Rancidity," and "Collegians' League In Favor of Tearing Off Nighties."

Davy

* * *

Dear Davy,

Is it condered gross to attack our date in the show?

Beginner

Continued on Page 7

Beatles make varied impressions on Southwestern campus critics

By Dale Seay

"Monetarily speaking, I think they're cute." Bob Poole was merely referring to their influence on his jukebox, but he probably expressed the opinions of their agent, as well as a couple of recording and wig companies, Ed Sullivan, and tax collectors.

They came to the United States from England — from Liverpool pubs, to be precise — to make money. They have.

And even sophisticated SOUHTWESTERN HAS FELT THEIR INFLUENCE. "They sure don't look like Arians!" Eike Thuermann commented.

Sara Lee Mixon states, "I crave

them!" Miss Mixon is not without her reservations, though, for she resents the fact that they have taken the place of the "Lone Teen Ranger" in the Lair Top Ten.

John McQuiston, who claims to be Ringo Starr's second cousin, says "They sing off-key, they really do, they sing flat." Don Snow remarked that "they're just so bad, they're almost good. That Paul, he'd be good-looking if he'd cut his hair."

Graham Smithwick thinks they're "cool ... groovy." Bo Montgomery likes them all right, but he's gotten "damn tired of listening to them."

John Kibbons, who spent his junior year in France and is probably well-qualified to give the

Continental point of view, summed them up thusly: "The English parents of children who like the Beatles don't mind this like as contrasted to the American parents, because despite the hair, the long hair, the Beatles are well-scrubbed and bathed, giving in the end an overall good effect and only one bad one, which is, in fact, but a fleeting fad like the hula hoop or the sack dress, since after all who wouldn't mind their child dating someone making one and a quarter million a week? But really now, would you want your daughter to marry one?"

Thurman Ragar said he'd rather have his daughter marry one than a Mississippian.

Some students believe it is the individual church's right to decide who may worship within its confines. The reports from the Feneral Assembly of the U.S. Presbyterian Church, however, point out that these religious leaders feel no one should be refused from a service of worship because of race or color. These men at Montreal, N. C., stated this belief in a resolution that passed overwhelmingly, but at the same time they reaffirmed their decision to hold the 1965 convention at Second Presbyterian Church. Several of the ministers present correctly viewed this action as contradictory, for any body that decides to hold its assembly in a segregated church is not supporting a stand of non-discrimination.

Because of the detrimental effect a meeting at a segregated church would product, these ministers have publically stated they will picket or boycott next year's convention. Their action, however, stems from a deeper feeling than one which is merely concerned for the U.S. Presbyterian church's "name." It is born in the very doctrine they preach on Sunday — doctrines of Christian love and the community of God. To these men and to those who stand on the sidewalks of Second Presbyterian Church, the barricade of prejudice and hate that separates Negro worshippers from the fellowship of God is entirely contrary to every basic Christian principle.

The majority of students on campus seem to agree that it is hypocritical for a church to prevent "true worshippers," no matter what color, from entering the house of God. But, with one argument or another, they attempt to reduce the protesting group from the realm of worshippers and thus feel their display is ill-motivated and unjustified.

I would submit, however, that it is exactly the members of this non-violent demonstration that are the "True worshippers." A worshipper is not merely one who regularly attends church or sings hymns or reads his Bible, although these are valid characteristics of worshipping. A "true worshipper," if such a person exists, is able to

Nonviolent Group Gains National TV Recognition

MAY 8, 1964

Bob Hall

For nearly two months several Southwestern students have joined Negroes from other schools in Memphis in an attempt to desegregate Second Presbyterian Church. The repercussions caused by this group's passive protest have now reached a level that was once unimaginable to the initial participants. But while these events are making national news, the majority of Southwestern collegiates are still ignorant of the true situation that exists. In the past three weeks I have had over a dozen persons approach me about this matter, but each fails to grasp the full scope of what is happening.

THE VIETNAM WAR

Anti-Vietnamese War Demonstrators Protest; Anti-Anti-War Demonstrators Protest Protest

APRIL 29, 1968

By Jack Burch and Dick Jennings

Curious about the Anti-vietnam War Demonstration, advertised to be a Memphis first, we piloted El Verro Verde to Union and Parkway, Saturday April 23, where we encountered two opposing camps composed largely of students who were clasified by one another as other "Peace Creeps" or "War-

mongers." Not wishing to be identified with either force, we were assigned as assistants to civil rights photographer Ernest Withers. Surely no American GI marching through Vietnamese jungles has undergone greater unpleasantries than we on this hostile march. Consisting of a core of forty-three demonstrators the march soon included a dozen members of the

Press Corps, twenty-five officers, and two hundred angry citizens and irate onlookers. The five mile track was highlighted by:

Forty-one marchers who refused to give their names . . .

The Rev. Jim Lawson of Centenary Methodist Church who expressed disappointment over the apathy the Memphis clergy on social and political issues . . .

A forty-year-old, two-hundred-pound, red-faced political conservative who stood on the balcony of her duplex and shouted, "Remember Cuba! Remember Cuba . . !"

The pacifist who master minded the march to end at the main post office, unaware that a war memorial had been constructed in front of the building . . .

The Police Officer wearing badge number 69 who, in a moment of patriotic frenzy, covered the lens of photographer Withers when a fight broke out, thereby depriving Withers of his constitutional rights and his means of earning a living . . . The grandmother who stood before the nautical flags of the Admiral Benbow Inn and prayed for rain to wash the marchers pure . . .

The Cuban refugee who, tearing a

surgical brace from his neck, screamed to Rev. Lawson: "You black & *%, I'll fight you right here and now . . !"

Rev. Lawson replied, "Why don't you drop by the church sometime and we'll talk about it . . ?"

A weary marcher who, four miles after the march began, suddenly did remember Cuba and abandoned the demonstration at Nathan Bedford Forrest Park . . .

The Southwestern student who had to quit marching because his placard was torn up and his bicycle spokes kicked in by a fellow Southwestern student . . .

The pick-up truck filled with a handful of hot-voiced citizens, who carried three American flags and tossed firecrackers after each shouted obscenity . . .

CBC Frosh president Ray Baum who wants to bomb Vietnam (not having read Eric Fromm or listened to his mom) . . .

The little old lady who missed her hound when she stepped from a cab and was confronted with the hoard of crusaders, protesters and counter-protesters, policemen and newsmen, and thought it better to get back in the cab . . (At's aw right baby you can cash the ticket in tomorrow) . .

The scores of onlookers who called anyone who happened to be using the sidewalks (with or without placards) "Communist perverts," "nigger-lovers," "dirty queers," etc. . .

The policeman who maintained that if he hadn't been wearing his uniform he would have been right in there fighting the "Peace Creeps" . . . (Your correspondents speculated on the trouble that could be caused by a nude policeman fighting over forty demonstrators single handedly) . . .

The bystander who said to a marcher, "Hey Susan, you shoulda been in class today." And was answered with, "I'm not Susan, I'm Bob; Susan's over ther."

In retrospect, while both the name callers and the marchers were well within their rights to be on the street, the educational benefits of marching and heckling seem to be doubtful. Demonstrations provide an emotional stigma which can hamper a more rational solution. And patriotic Americans who shout profanity from the windows of speeding automobiles are making fools of themselves. We would suggest more effort toward solid thought, same discussion, and rational petition.

Valhalla Now!

FEBRUARY 12, 1968

Students all over our fair land are protesting now. Students in Latin America are always protesting. Students in Russia are busy throwing rocks at the American Embassy. Students in China are enlisting in hordes. Students at the University of South Viet Nam (sometimes called Dien Bien Phu U.) are organizing a coup.—. THUS GIVING RISE TO THE POPULAR PHRASE: "Coup for you are Dien Bien Phu U." But what are we doing at Southwestern? The answer, as everyone knows, is nothing. Laziness is our keynote, lethargy is our cry. No one hears clarion calls to action here. Across the glade no heroic passions are aroused by slogans like "Remember The Zoo U. Coup."

Fellow students unite! Arise! GO FORWARD! Stand foresquare for Truth, Beauty, and The American Way. Our rights have been flagrantly, willfully and wantonly violated. Do you doubt? It is true. This insidious evil has too long been perpetrated. No one need ask what this oppression is. All are aware. Yes, you have guessed it. Students are not allowed to drink during chapel.

In the churches throughout the nation the spirit flows like a mighty river. But at Southwestern? No! There is no spirit in Chapel. Religious students throughout the history of the institution have deplored this grieved situation. The Bible department has long pointed out this need. But do not despair. If we act quickly and forcefully we may be able to correct this lamentable condition.

One thing is in our favor, we have at hand a group of courageous leaders. Long a secret underground movement this body has notified the Sou'wester that it will lead the fight. These brave men have even consented to be named. For the first time thier long concealed code appellation will be made public. It is the Secret Wine Inbibing and Lechery League (known for short as SWILL.)

Everyone interested should meet at the foot of the Tower at 9:30 every day next week. Co-operative professors have promised to let their classes out early for the Cause. At these rallies warm-ups will be held. For those of you who are still non-continental in your outlook wine will not be de rigueur. As a concession to the school's geographical location Tennessee sippin' whiskey is to be permitted.

The members of SWILL look forward to a new era in enthusiastic Chapels. Support them, This is Your fight. Everyone who participates will be made a member of the Secret Wine Inbibing and Lechery League.

SWILL President Malcolm Y has sworn not to stop with these limited objectives. Next on this brilliant crusader's agenda is a full scale protest on behalf of lechery. But conservatives within the ruling clique have persuaded him to modify his demand for the time being. The editors of the Sou'wester must second this caution. One step at a time seems the wisest policy.

One last note. Before you come to the warm-ups be sure to practice our slogan: SWILL IS SWELL. See you at the tower.

It's like the weather

There's something wrong with a school that has as high a suicide rate as Southwestern.

There's something wrong with a school that has as many drop-outs as Southwestern.

There's something wrong with a school that over a three-year period has burnt out the finest collection of journalistic talent this school has seen in decades, that this year has broken two editors and three managing editors.

When a school destroys people the way Southwestern does, then something's very wrong. But the people who have gone are lucky; they have a chance to put themselves back together. About the only way to remain at Southwestern and stay sane is to cease caring. And that's what this campus has done: it's ceased to care. Students have withdrawn deep into themselves, building a wall of apathy as they went.

It's tempting to say that the only thing students care about is themselves. But they couldn't care

about even that or they would work for more freedom. Most people on this campus just exist from moment to moment, searching for no more than temporary distractions to ease the boredom. If Southwestern students had led the Boston tea party, it would have degenerated into a drunk with everyone sitting down to play cards before they ever made it to the harbor.

Students feel no responsibility to this school, this community, to their fellow students, or to themselves. Dilemma is \$1000 in the red. Only one-fifth of the students came; two fraternities held parties on the last night; one fraternity sponsored a car-wash that day. The SGA is crippled; the politics on this campus consists of petty personal feuds and childish concerns.

Apathy is destroying Southwestern and everyone knows it. But it's like the weather: everyone talks about it, but no one does anything about it.

This paper tried. This paper cared. But there are limits to what a few dedicated individuals can do.

"Requiescat in Pace"

FOCUS: Bomb for a bomb

FEBRUARY 19, 1968

By Roger Hart

Advocates of full-scale American military involvement in Viet Nam for the purpose of wiping out the guerillas in the south and restricting the influence of the North Vietnamese government to its own borders often implicitly or explicitly base their position on certain unexamined assumptions. The first assumption is that the "free" Vietnamese want us there. It should be kept in mind that there is no accurate way of knowing the sentiments of all the Vietnamese people. Those who do express gratitude for the presence of American military power (such as the South Vietnamese government) generally seem to be those who

JAN. 20, 1968

Sometime Saturday the administration is expected to be considering a proposal which if passed will halt attendance for expectant mothers. This news is strictly in the rumor stage and comes from the mouths of students alone. Details and explanations are not plain. From student viewpoint, this proposal is being made for the following reason, "pregnant students are an inconvenience." When other girls view the sight of this catastrophic condition it is nothing but pure unadulterated certainty that they will also desire this state of being. This will inevitably mean an increased desire for marriage . . . now we can't have that sort of stuff going ON. Aside from the fact that pregnancy will create jealousy among peers, there is the assumption that pregnancy will interfere with classwork. Naturally those poor unfortunate girls who have been the victim of both marriage and nature, and have heard from reliable sources that this proposal is being planned, are considerably shook. Can't say that I blame them. If ever a stupid rule was passed on this place then this one will shine like a blow torch. Go to it administration, you'll make a blunder yet.

Just how "In" is "going to a MAN lecture drunk?" Max Bromo

directly benefit from American power; it is obvious that many in that land disagree with their government on this point. This first assumption is at best uncertain.

A second assumption is that the American mission in Southeast Asia is to maintain the dislikes against Communism, to protect freedom democracy, apple pie, etc. But Jeffersonian democracy is hardly prototypical basis. The war in Viet Nam is simply a clash of empires, parading to inspire loyalty and confidence among troops. The United States may have as a goal

stable, autonomous governments responsive to the needs of their people, but the national interest is the overriding consideration in Washington as in every capital.

A third assumption might vaguely be described as the belief that any problem can be solved by the application of enough force, or that the United States is invincible. Through their history Americans have come to expect clear-cut victories, won by sufficient application of muscle and money. A more rational and sophisticated approach is necessary in the case of Viet Nam.

More Davy's Locker

(Continued from page 6)

Dear Beginner,

Yes, unless you paid for both the tickets.

Davy

Dear Davy,

What is an "E girl?"
Dudley Shutout

Dear Dud,

An "E girl" is a social phenomenon peculiar to Southwestern; commonly possessing good looks, craving for alcohol, a sleep-debt, twinkle-toes, and deep regard for Greek goddesses, particularly Minerva.

Davy

Dear Davy,

Just how "In" is "going to a MAN lecture drunk?"

Max Bromo

Dear Bromo,

Last year it was between "putting sorority decals on bathroom doors" and "making grass whistles at the PRC picnic." This year it has risen in popularity to just above "walking through the Student Center in jockey shorts." For a girl, it corresponds in coolness to "going to a beer party in a net shirt and overalls."

Davy

Dear Davy,

Is it considered improper here to ask a girl out less than two weeks before the date?

SN

Dear SN*

Generally speaking, yes.
HOWEVER THERE ARE SOME TRADITIONS AMONG THE FRATERNITIES WHICH ARE TOO WELL ESTABLISHED TO BE CHANGED.

Davy

Dear Davy,

Often when I go to the Refectory alone and walk into the dining area with my tray, there is no one there whom I know. Since I dislike eating alone, would it be proper to seat myself at the table of, say, an attractive young lady, and introduce myself?

Roger Cool

Dear Cool,

Why not? My favorite device is to lean over and whisper desperately, "Will you be the mother of my children?" You can add "Eh?" if you like.

Davy



Hurry Up Please, It's Time

OCT. 10, 1969

It is becoming painfully obvious that our country has erred in Vietnam. Denying the 'call to arms' of our military-industrial complex and the 'stop-Communist-imperialism' mentality of our administration, a grass roots movement to end the war has begun.

Inspired by such intellectuals as Eugene McCarthy and Robert Kennedy and the tireless dedication of such men as Tom Hayden and David Harris, the jailed husband of Joan Baez, the spirit of freedom has moved countless youth to protest against what Senator David Hawk has called "a disaster for America."

Youth have continued to lead the anti-war protest, not just because they are the ones to be drafted, but because they are the ones that must finally suffer the future infirmities that our present actions are creating. Some of the problems already fermenting are divisions within our own community, alienation of the world community, and an increased probability of military solutions to other Vietnams.

Power gives

MAY 16, 1969

Eric Hoffer, author of *The True Believer* and *The Ordeal of Change*, is a man who is difficult to comprehend. Mr. Hoffer, who has been favorably recognized as a philosopher, social critic, and longshoreman, appeared before the Senate Friday as a witness before the investigation subcommittee.

On the grounds that students are intoxicated with power, he claims that the only hope is college officials and mayors "who will get up in the morning and spit on their hands and say, 'Who am I going to kill today?'" Referring to students, he said, "These people have tasted blood... they have a taste for academic flesh." You might notice that here Mr. Hoffer conspicuously indicated his belief that college students are, indeed, people.

Mr. Hoffer is also a member, conspicuously, of the National Commission on the Cause and Prevention of Violence. Enigmatically enough, the solution according to him is the fight fire with fire because "If Grayson Kirk had got mad and got a gun and went out and gunned (shot with a gun) a couple of them down, he might have saved Columbia." But instead, alas, he lost it.

HOFFER THEN EXPLAINED the positive side. He suggested a reform wherein students would pursue their own interests for four years and then take one

Hoffer jitters

final examination. After all, too many universities are "glorified high schools," so it's not our fault that we want to rebel.

But still he said "The new generation that is coming is much more fierce. I shudder to think what some 13-year-olds I know will do when they get on campus." I don't know anything on any of Hoffer's 13-year-old pals, or peers or whatever, but I do feel that it would be a bit impractical for them to go off to school, pay \$1500 a year tuition to collect stamps and press flowers for four years, take their 72-hour final examination, and then go off to face the world.

A student who failed, Hoffer said, would get a certificate verifying that "this sonofabitch isn't good for anything." It is unimaginable to me that a man of his background would degrade anyone as being worthless simply because of his lack of formal education.

SENATOR ABRAHAM RIBICOFF was the only man who dared to dispute the old man's hoarse shouting. Ribicoff saw campus unrest as a "catharsis" which will lead to better universities. One must admire his audacity in daring to contend with an old former worker who has, no doubt, seen life in the raw.

By no means would I want to advocate violence on anybody's campus, but it is a bit distressing to me to

(Continued on page 9)

Vietnam Moratorium moves

SEPT. 26, 1969

By Bruce Levine and Debbie Sale

The Vietnam Moratorium, a series of national, escalating anti-war actions, will begin October 15. Students at more than 500 colleges are already committed to spending the day in the community with door-to-door campaigns, teach-ins, rallies and vigils.

THE MORATORIUM from "business as usual," has been called to bring attention to the problem of continuing United States action in Vietnam. The one-day October action would be expanded to two days in November, three days in December, escalating until the war is ended.

On Wednesday, Sept. 24, Leo Arnault, student body president at Christian Brother's College, and coordinator of the Memphis Moratorium Committee, addressed the UFO to explain the city-wide activities planned for the day.

THE TENTATIVE schedule calls for speakers and activities on individual campuses from 10 a.m. until 12 noon. A solemn Memorial March to commemorate the Memphians who have lost their lives in Vietnam will be held that afternoon. Those who wish to participate will assemble in the Spanish War Memorial Park on Central and Parkway at 1 p.m. The group will march single file to the Overton Park Shell.

Activities at the Shell will run the gamut from speeches on the effects of the war on American culture to rock and folk groups who have agreed to perform in sympathy with the aims of the moratorium.

Mr. Arnault stressed that the purpose of the activities was to

educate rather than to alienate those who are uncertain as to the justification of the war. If the war is to be ended it will require a joint effort of all who are concerned with the present U.S. position rather than confrontation from what those who are making U.S. policy discount as the "radical fringe."

THE SEPTEMBER 20 issue of *The New Republic* ran a front page editorial endorsing the moratorium in which it stated: "Vietnam comes first. To say that is not at all to say that the war is the root cause of all our disabilities. It is to say that without an end to the war we cannot begin to take hold of our other problems.

"The university is not normally organized—and in our opinion should not normally be organized—

to function as a political institution. But the times are abnormal. It is the principal custodians of the public interest—the politicians—who are most responsible for that, not the custodians of enlightenment. The academy has been left no choice but to engage itself in the democratic process, to demonstrate the power of knowledge, to provide a model of rational discourse and persuasion.

We hope that every member of the academic community, from the youngest freshmen to the most august college president and trustee, will move into the breach. The planned, one-day national convocation of the community of scholars on October 15 is their opportunity. Seize it.

SGA resolution survives protests; US troops to be sent packages

NOVEMBER 5, 1969

The voting Wednesday, November 3, on the Vietnam resolution brought to a close a week of debates and discussions.

The resolution was divided into two parts and the results of the vote are as follows:

583 supported the condemnation of the illegal acts protesting United States presence in Vietnam, 130 did not support it.

590 approved the presence of the United States in Vietnam; 73 disapproved.

Sunday night, October 31, Chip Hatzenbuehler led a discussion in Voorhies social room of those men and women students interested in the resolution. Tuesday evening, November 2, a filmed interview with Senator Wayne Morse, from Oregon, was shown in Hardie. He deplored the United States policy in Viet Nam and advocated the

presentation of the situation to the United Nations for settlement. Later that night discussion groups were held in Voorhies and in Bellingrath. Wednesday, November 3, in Student Assembly Mike Whitaker and Don Hollingsworth debated in support of the resolution; Jack Burch and Steve Johnston spoke against it.

At the meeting of the Student Senate, Tuesday, November 2, Bick Johnson and Sid Strickland, Southwestern's representatives to the Intra-City Council, reported that organization's project for the U.S. soldiers in Viet Nam. The Intra-City Council, composed of the six

Memphis colleges, is preparing boxes of cookies, paper-back books, soap, etc. to send to the troops in Viet Nam. Money is also being collected. Goods for these packages are being collected in Palmer Social Room from 8 to 4 from now through Tuesday, November 7.

In Defense of Responsibility

It has been a heartening experience to witness the student body of this campus rising from its customary state of political lethargy to search itself for a meaningful and carefully considered answer to the challenge presented by those individuals and groups within certain other student bodies who vehemently express, to the point of going outside of the boundaries of federal law, their disapproval of the current United States policy toward Viet Nam. We have seen more soul-searching in the last two weeks than we have seen during the last four or five Religious Evaluation Weeks.

Rather than blindly accepting a resolution proposed by the Student Government Association condemning extra-legal student protest movements and proclaiming support of U.S. presence in Viet Nam (a resolution which would appear at the outset to be indicative of student opinion here, and one which would certainly garner praises from the local press and populace), students began to examine the merits and faults of such a proposal. Questions arose as to the propriety of such a declaration and as to whether or not it was correct in substance. Students objected to the resolution either because they felt it was not the province of the Student Government Association to issue it, or because they felt that the

resolution was morally incorrect. We shall not attempt here to pass judgment on the correctness of United States policy in Viet Nam. What concerns us is the rightness of declaring in public, as a student body, a definitive stand pro or con on an issue which has cast national doubt upon the ability of college students to express their opinions in a manner befitting individuals who supposedly are able to analyze questions rationally and give answers disciplined by careful reasoning and a minimum of emotional influence.

If we are to vindicate this responsibility to the maintenance of public respect for the American college community, then it becomes our duty to express our view on the Viet Nam question and denounce those who would destroy through irresponsible actions this respect for student opinion. For if we fail to insure respect for student opinion, right or wrong, will come to be ignored altogether and passed off as so much blather, hoo-rah, and pyrotechnics, inspired by the commies or something.

In overwhelmingly supporting the SGA Resolution after having been exposed to both sides of the question, Southwestern students have taken a proper and much-needed step toward insuring public recognition of the voice of educated and impartial opinion.

The fight over parietales

SEPTEMBER 12, 1969
By Nancy Hottel

Beginning today, all upperclasswomen living in the residence halls will have no curfew. Approved by the administration at the end of last term, this regulation is but one of several pronounced changes in social rulings and upcoming legislation this year.

ALTHOUGH the controversial card system for signing in and out of women's halls remains in practice, it awaits a re-vote of women dorm students, according to the executive president of the dorm board, Mary Lou McClosky.

Lesser changes in dorm rules for women include abolition of a limit on the number of guests a student may have and an increase in the number of nights out in Memphis a freshman may spend.

MOST OF this year's rules are actually carried over from decisions of the Social Regulations Council and administration effective May 1, 1969. The quintuplet of approved changes were:

1) Men may invite women into their rooms seven days a week from 1 p.m. until the women's curfew (12 p.m. Sunday through Thursday; 2 p.m. Friday and Saturday) pending re-vote this fall by SRC. According to Rick Hollingsworth, the new SRC president, the council wants to review this ruling immediately and to have the resident men vote on it.

2) Women may set up an experimental visitation program for men in the women's halls, pending SRC review. The women voted this down emphatically last spring, and if they desire such a program this year, the initiative rests with them. A revision of the *Co-ed Handbook* now requires a 3/4 affirmative vote to start a visitation program.

3) Except for the state health requirement of shoes in the dining hall, taste in dress is left to the individual's discretion.

4) The Student Center may allow drinking for those of age on special occasions.

5) Fraternity and sorority houses may set their own visiting hours.

THE QUESTION of abolishing the white-yellow-card system of women's dorms arose last spring when, after studying changes submitted by the Rules Revisions

Committee of the women's halls governing board, the SRC proposed that the cards were unnecessarily restrictive. They asked that the use of cards be discontinued. The dorm board and a noticeable number of women residents disagreed.

To determine whether the number of women in dissent was sufficient to overrule the SRC, the executive head of the dorm board, Tan Heslip, and the president of SRC, Joe Hebert, called a compulsory meeting of women. At this meeting, four plans were presented and discussed, and the group took a straw vote.

The four proposals were:

1) Keep the entire system intact. Women sign out of the dorm after 8 p.m. on a white card, supplying the date, the time of departure, destination ("out" is all that is required). If a student is staying out of the dorm overnight, she uses a

yellow card to sign out. Since upperclassmen have no hours now, they use this card only when going out of town.

2) Abolish all cards for upperclasswomen.

3) Have the system optional to upperclasswomen.

4) Discontinue white cards, but keep using yellow cards.

THE FOURTH plan passed by a narrow margin. The SRC considered the vote inconclusive and agreed to waive action until a later date.

Either the SRC or the women themselves may initiate action on the cards system. If disagreement arises between the SRC and the constituent group of women residents, a referendum will be called, and a 2/3 vote of the women will decide the fate of the card system.

Girls' dorm rules interpreted for benefit of Freshmen men

SPET. 13, 1963

While glancing through the girls' dorm rules the other day this reporter needed the wisdom of Freud to understand the intricacies of this collegiate gothic tyranny. At any rate the Sou'wester feels that some of these rules should be made known to the men of Southwestern, to the freshmen especially.

A girl may not be out later than 8:00 without signing out. Upperclassmen may have unlimited "nights out" and a freshman may have Saturday and Sunday out and may have one, two or three nights out during the week. Depending on her grade average.

She may have one extra night out every eight week period for a C average, two for a B, etc. Also a freshman may exchange a Saturday or Sunday night out for one during the week provided she goes through the proper steps to do it.

Freshmen may spend five of their nights out in Memphis with friends or relatives, and upperclassmen may spend the night out of the dorm 10 times per semester. Also a girl can have a total "lateness" of ten minutes per semester. All violations of the rules are handled by a point system. A total of five points make a campus, which means that a girl must be in at 6:30 on the days of her campus.

These are about all the rules that concern the men, but one penalty in particular was found most intriguing. It read: "One point for two messy slips." Think about this one.

SRC Extends Parietales; Hours Await Confirmation

SEPTEMBER 26, 1969
By Steve James

The Social Regulations Council passed a motion Wednesday night to have parietales extended to include open weekends. The present hours are from 1 p.m. to 12 p.m. on weekdays and from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. on Friday and Saturday. The final decision rests with the Board of Governors, consisting of administrative officials.

GIRLS' VISITATION hours in the men's dorm first came into effect last May. The legislation was passed on a temporary basis and goes out of effect on Monday, Sept. 29.

In a meeting Monday morning between the dorm residents and Dean Diehl, a motion was passed to put certain choices to the dorm residents. The choices and results were:

- a. keep the hours as they are (71 in favor)
- b. same hours plus open weekends (119 in favor)
- c. eliminate (16 in favor)
- d. open 24 hours a day (96 in favor)
- e. morning and afternoon hours (4 in favor)
- f. afternoon hours only (2 in favor)
- g. just weekends (3 in favor)

ON TUESDAY, the dorm presidents reconvened and voted on what motion to put before the Social

Regulations Council. Each dorm president voted as a representative of his constituents; however, a consensus of personal opinion showed that the dorm presidents were in overall agreement with the dorm members. The vote was 5-4 for parietales remaining as they were with the exception that weekends were to be open.

On Wednesday night, the Social Regulations Council convened primarily to discuss the parietale

approved. The vote was a clear majority (8-2) in favor of the motion.

THE SOCIAL Regulations Council's motion is not, however, the final word. The Board of Governors has the final power. They can vote either to accept the motion, reject the motion, or accept the motion with certain revisions. Final issue. Tommy Thomas, acting Dorm Board President, presented the Dorm Board's motion. After a great deal of candid discussion, it was

decision now rests with the Board of Governors which has 5 days to decide on the motion.

In order to deter any problem that may arise from over wrought men dorm members continuing to have girls in their rooms after the present law expires, the Social Regulations Council passed a motion to extend the present regulation til further notice from the administration. This too must be passed or vetoed by the Board of Governors.

Proposed Parietal Hours Vetoed

OCTOBER 3, 1969
By Kirk Hadaway

The administration has turned down the SRC proposal to extend open weekends to the men's dorms.

In a reply to Rick Hollingsworth, President of the Social Regulations Council, the administration, headed by President Rhodes and Dean Jameson Jones, stated its determination to preserve existing parietales hours, but did not approve the open weekend proposal. It is their view that "the sensible thing is to get more experience with the rule we now have before we make another change."

The administration also thought that "the present rule, ending visiting hours at 2 a.m., fits fairly well the normal social habits of people. To make the dormitories open for visiting throughout the whole night and during the morning hours as well appears to be an abnormality."

In its lengthy letter to the SRC, the administration was disturbed over the Council's entire handling of the matter. They expressed the idea that in this case the Council acted as merely a "referral agency" to the administration for any group that had a proposal, instead of exercising leadership and judging the timeliness of its suggestions.

Also in its letter, the administration went into a discourse on what rules are for, stating that the Council should take into account the reasons for some rules before proposing to change them.

In reply to the administration's letter, Mr. Hollingsworth conceded the fact that the proposal should have contained the Council's comments and interpretations. However, he stated, "the Council was certainly justified in its procedure in these two proposals and felt the resident men could handle the responsibility. The Council also felt that normal hours

can't really be defined with present regulations allowing no hours for upperclass women and no hours restricting the men at any time.

Finally, Mr. Hollingsworth stated that "in view of the fact that possibly more time is needed to work out existing problems with parietales hours and that intervisitation in the girls' dorms will soon be discussed by the Council, we can understand the decline by the administration on the new proposal."

Screwed

OCTOBER 3, 1969

The destruction of a carefully nurtured image has come as quite a shock to this community as a result of the administrative action of turning thumbs down on the SRC parietales proposals. The administration which has been

(Continued on page 10)

Power gives Hoffer jitters

(Continued from page 8)

read about someone encouraging our establishment to use disciplinary force as one might take a willow switch to a bird dog. Now that we see where the stimulative force in our government's thinking originates, the thing to do is to simply stop worrying about campus reform, get in big bus caravans, go out into the country on Friday nights and break up every cockfight for 50 miles around. We've already heard them talking about them

Gitlow sees student activism moving towards moderation

FEB. 7, 1969

In the second lecture of the University Lecture Series, Abraham Gitlow, Dean of the School of Commerce at New York University, presented his speech, "Student Activism; Today and Tomorrow."

Professing to have entered education in the pursuit and transmission of contemplative learning, Dr. Gitlow has none-the-less accepted the challenges of student "wild" life in America's largest city.

Dr. Gitlow stated that the two major forces that have stimulated student involvement are a concern over civil rights and the Vietnam War. Students have begun to look upon their actions as moral absolutes.

NO LONGER do means represent a prohibitive force against aggressive ends. This is why our country has seen an increase in violence directly proportionate to the popularity of Walter Cronkite.

hoopers at college smokin that LDO (Hey, pour me another glass of marijuana). We can glue longhaired wigs on their heads and wipe their necks with Clorox.

Yes, Eric was a big disappointment. Buy a copy of The True Believer, and read it if you get an opportunity. It's an analysis of fanaticism. I'll probably live to regret this. The poor old man probably just has a few brittle arteries in his skull, and here I sit tearing him down,

A blast from the past: Lo! History doth repeat itself!

JAN. 17, 1969

The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are full of students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might and the republic is in danger.

Yes, danger from within and from without. We need law and order. Without law and order our nation cannot survive.

Elect us and we shall restore law and order. We will be respected by the nations of the world for law and order. Without law and order, our republic will fall.—Adolph Hitler, 1932.

COMPLIMENTS OF Prof. Paul Shaw.

Screwed

(Continued from page 9)

championed as a bastion of liberalism has shown itself on this question to be approaching senility as "in loco parentis" again rears its hoary head on the campus.

The administrative committee composed of Deans Jones Melton, Diehl and Williford, Drs. Batey and Neal, and Dr. Rhodes, the interim President, worrying that there will be "4, 5, or 6, or maybe a dozen who are insensitive to the aims of the community" and who will "take over and determine the climate" on the campus seemed to be totally oblivious to the fact that they rejected a proposal that came from the majority of men dorm students, and that this rejection is determining the climate of social change on this campus.

Perhaps their action can be understood by fear of Synod censure, such as almost occurred this summer in Tennessee, however, this should not be the case, for our administrators are men of principle and would not compromise their ideals and beliefs in the face of harsh criticism from their peers. Then again this action could have been precipitated by the wedding of the members of the committee to the worship of the "Great White Southern Virgin" and the concepts of *Thou Shalt Not*, and that Southwestern students are not responsible or mature enough to govern their personal relationships.

The moral chastity belt of Southwestern has been removed through the actions of many groups, among them the SRC. However this administrative interference, in what is primarily a student matter, can only be seen as a conservative effort to wriggle back into the stone, stained glass, and steel girdle that has encased Southwestern through the years.

Beer beats out sex, pot, vows experienced senior

JANUARY 7, 1969

I hate to do it to you cats, but this is anti-marijuana. That's right, not Millard Fillmore crap today. I'm crusading. This is not to say I don't advocate some form of addiction. I do: Beer. That's right. B-E-E-R. When I came here, it was a social obligation to drink. Hell, now most freshmen pass out on two Pabst's drunk through a nipple.

SENIORS, you remember. On Saturday night (or preferably before a final exam) Gammons loomed large on the list of musts, and being under age added to the excitement. You used old army I. D.'s, and if you had a date, she could use anybody's. I mean, she would even pass on Eldridge Cleaver's N.C.A.A.P. (or something similar) membership card. Nobody is as brazen with pot.

The people you got to know is something else. When you smoke "grass," nobody over thirty is ever present, and the group never includes people you don't know. ('Cause a stranger might be a fuzz). Beer drinkers, although not as aloof intelligently, are a hell of a lot more democratic. Bus drivers, mayors, and Southwestern professors have quaffed flagger after flagger with me. And such contacts formed lasting relationships. One English prof that I drank under the table promptly flunked me.

Ph. D.s who smoke pot never do it

Men Win Entrance In Girls' Dorms; Administration Sanctifies Parietals

OCTOBER 24, 1969

By Mark Lester

The administration has approved a three week trial period of parientals for Voorhies and Townsend Dorms.

The administration acted upon the Social Regulations Council recommendation that visiting hours be established in Voorhies Hall on Fridays and Saturdays between 1 and 5 p.m. and 8 to 12 p.m., Sunday hours were established between 1

and 5 hours in Townsend Dormitory were established between 8 and 12 on Friday and Saturday nights as requested.

ALSO APPROVED was the women's card system suggested by the SRC. Under the new system, white and yellow cards will remain mandatory. The white card must be turned to the "out" position upon departure and "in" upon return. Yellow cards will be shown when

someone leaves the Memphis area. The penalty for failure to follow these rules will remain as stated in the 1969 Co-ed Handbook.

In commenting on the proposal, the SRC stated, "At the end of three weeks the council will make its recommendations to the Executive Dorm Board on the continuance, revision or discontinuance of the privilege. We feel the women should handle the trial basis to reach an equitable decision as to any per-

manent pariental hour regulations.

THE COUNCIL acted upon the proposal following the procedure outlined in a proposed by-law. The by-law in essence states that the council shall study proposals for a week before acting on the. Council President Rick Hollingsworth stated that the purpose of this new system "is to give the committee and the administration time to set options up and try to talk with any groups involved to get all the details."

Women's residence splits over 'Potnoy's Complaint'

OCTOBER 31, 1969

by H. Love

Appropriately referred to as the "Cold Potty Dispute," the latest argument to inflame the residents of the women's dormitories is currently eliciting highly emotional reactions from Southwestern coeds. The dispute was first aired when one resident of second floor Townsend posted a note on the bathroom door declaring her dislike for cold potty seats and asking that her neighbors take care to keep the bathroom windows closed. In answer to this request a second note appeared from an irate coed, who calls herself "Nasal Nanny," stating that she would rather endure a chilled chair for two minutes per pit stop than pay, through the nose, for a pampered posterior.

ONE WARM POTTY supporter, who is also a dorm board member, emphatically states that there are no butts about this issue, although rumors being circulated indicate that the possibility for a compromise has not been eliminated. On being consulted by various coeds, Dean Williford was bowled over by the intense feelings accompanying the dispute. At first she bemoaned the fact that the potties had not been electrically wired for heating (clearly

an example of hindsight), and then, refusing to become involved, announced that, as far as she is concerned, the matter is dropped.

The latest addition to the door of the maiden head announces the institution of the "Whiff Test." Upon entering the room, a girl is to whiff and then act on the windows as the atmosphere deems necessary. Should this solution prove unsuccessful, the dispute will un-

doubtedly be referred to the dormitory governing board. Those girls who are anxious to avoid the lengthy procedures of the dorm board can be consoled by the promise of Mary Lou McCloskey, dorm president, that any movement of the board will be a mere whizz.

Several coeds were asked to remark on the issue at hand. One declared that warm potties are social crotches; another said, coldly, "I

cannot tolerate hot heads." A rather depressed young lass flushed as she stated, "I'm really down in the dumps about this. Why cause such a stink?" One flippant coed made the cheeky remark, "The hole thing's a gas!" An entire group of warm potty supporters attributes the dispute to another hippie movement. This reporter firmly believes that at the bottom of this controversy lies another crack in communication.

The Best of Ma Frickert

OCTOBER 24, 1969

Dear Ma,

The other day, while cutting my English Class, I happened to bump into the prof whose class I was supposed to be in right then. What is the best procedure in a case like this?

Worried

Dear En,

Ol' Carl did at one time have The Ten Commandments tattooed on his left under-arm, but when he turned hippie last year he had the Ten Commandments removed and the Upanishads placed at strategic points on his body. Perhaps if you asked Dr. Walters after class, he might show you.

Dear Wo,

This of course varies from prof to prof. Some you can just cough real loud and make some comment like, "Gee Sir, (cough cough) I did so want to come to your class but I just now got away from the john. I had the runs something terrible." Sometimes if you favor this sick gambit you must carry it to the extreme. Writhing on the ground and feigning convulsions is not out of the ordinary or too much to expect from the serious cutter.

I personally have always favored the hit-em-hard-where-they-least-expect-it ploy. As soon as you realize it's your prof, if you really bump into him, say something nasty like, "Watch where you're going, you senile fossil." Follow this up with a disdainful look and a contemptuous look and a contemptuous remark. "Oh, it's you," does fine. Once you have him down, keep on him. "That certainly was an awful lecture you gave the other day," is a good line to leave on. But in your case, if my knowledge of the English department runs true, you may as well hang it up.

Dear Ma,

I am a freshman and have heard that my Bible Prof, Carl Walters, has the Ten Commandments tattooed on his left underarm. What's the story on this?

Enthusied

Dear Cur,

For a long while the popular theory held that they were the product of the joint authorship of Henry James and F. Scott Fitzgerald. However, current speculation has fostered the idea that the lectures are secretly being recorded and afterwards transcribed into Farris's now novel to be entitled Jamie. It is somewhat autobiographical.

Dear Ma,

I have heard the current movements to abolish girls' sign-out cards and to establish parientals in the women's dorms are Communist-backed in order to undermine the moral fiber of wholesome chastity.

Browned Off

Dear Jack,

Actually, these two movements you refer to, plus the attempt to establish open hours in the men's dorms, are backed by two more lethal and nefarious groups, WHORE (Women's Honorary Organization for Re-establishment of Equality) and PIMP (People's Involvement for Moral Prostration).

SEPTEMBER 26, 1969

Dear Ma,

I'm in trouble. Who should I try to stick with the paternity suit?

Stuck

Dear Stuck,

This is one of the most asked questions. However, it is a very touchy one, and there is no one answer for all cases. The court will probably look more kindly on your situation if you name a male as defendant.

Dear Ma,

If Southwestern girls aren't interested in politics and don't . . . what do they do?

John A.

Continued on Page 11

Scarborough edges Hollingsworth in run-off election

MARCH 18, 1969

Independent candidate Bo Scarborough squeezed by Don Hollingsworth in Monday's run-off election for a president of the Student Government Association. Scarborough gained a slim majority of twenty-one votes in the balloting, edging his opponent 360-339. Bob Glasgow, Commissioner of

Elections, pointed out the remarkable number of students who turned out to the polls Monday. In last Friday's voting a total of 705 students cast their ballots for a full slate of candidates, or about 74 percent of the student body. Monday 669 students decided on either Scarborough or Hollingsworth. These totals con-

stitute an unprecedented number of ballots cast in previous elections.

Scarborough, elected by 51.5% of the voters, is a political science major from Bossier City, Louisiana. He served as a representative to the Executive Council of the SGA and Commissioner of Intercollegiate Activities last year. He was chairman of the Dilemma '66 committee

and co-ordinator of Danforth also. In the other campaign requiring a run-off, David Adcock polled 407 votes to Jim McKnight's 273 to gain the position of Commissioner of Publications and Publicity.

David is a sophomore majoring in English literature from Jackson, Mississippi, and is a rookie to student politics.

Campus erupts over Gibbon's Steak House ban

APRIL 14, 1967

A massive Southwestern student demonstration in front of Gibbon's Steak House, 2439 Summer Avenue, both objecting to and supporting a boycott of the restaurant, was sparked this week by the refusal of Steak House Manager Bill Taylor to serve Negro student Lorenzo Childress.

In an effort to support the boycott organized by several students, the Southwestern Senate passed a resolution last Tuesday urging the student body to join in the movement not to patronize Gibbon's.

A *Sou'wester* student opinion poll, taken in convocation Wednesday, showed that a majority of the 614 students responding were in favor of full racial integration, but that the majority would not support the boycott and did not think the Senate should take an official stand on the Childress issue.

Southwestern Women on Men

JAN. 13, 1967

By

Carol Ann Colclough
Lou Anne Crawford

"Brylcreem . . . a little Dab'll Do Ya?" Not quite, boys, but, on the other hand . . .

For the many men of Southwestern who are ignoring their potential for physical appeal because of their adherence to ye olde adage, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," we have news. This is not quite the route to achievement of the status of ideal Greek god. For the benefit of the Southwestern men and, thus, the benefit of the Southwestern women, we have helpfully polled the women's dormitories to ascertain what qualities in a boy make him more attractive to the opposite sex. The question asked the coeds was, bluntly: "What do you think is sexy in a boy?" It should be noted, however, that the opinions expressed in this column are not necessarily attributable to its editors.

First, do not shave your heads, boys, in emulation of Yul Brynner. Most universally approved and

The poll reached 104 more students than voted in the recent SGA presidential race.

Andy Anderson, Sophomore KA, appeared in the convocation and railed against the Senate resolution.

Lorenzo Childress spoke after Anderson, presenting his own viewpoint on "red-neck" attitudes.

Childress, Barre Reed, Robert Orr, and Mike Welch, all Southwestern students, sought service at Gibbon's on April 5. Childress said in an interview that restaurant manager Bill Taylor made it clear that he was refusing service to him because he was a Negro.

TAYLOR DISPLAYS GUN

He said Taylor displayed a gun and told them Gibbon's was a private club. The group then determined to picket Gibbon's to inform his customers, especially students of Southwestern, about the restaurant's policy on serving Negroes.

Childress said that it does not make much difference to the pickets if Gibbon's is a private club, since the moral issue of individual rights is still involved even if the restaurant is in fact a private club.

MURRAY MAKES MOTION

Rising Junior Senator Craig Murray introduced the motion to adopt the resolution.

Murray stated that the resolution was not a statement for the student body, but only a recommendation urging the students to boycott Gibbon's.

CONTACTS TAYLOR

Murray said he contacted Gibbon's manager Taylor by phone Tuesday afternoon. According to Murray, Taylor confirmed the incident with Childress on April 5, confirming that he would not serve Negroes and that Gibbon's was a private club.

Murray said that he was most unsure that Gibbon's was a private

club as stated by Taylor.

After further discussion the resolution was carried, 16-3.

Newly elected Senior Class President Dickie Fletcher then introduced a motion providing that a petition be offered for student

Poll Results

1. Are you in favor of full racial integration of public restaurants?
Yes-62% No-27% No opinion-11%

2. Will you support the proposed boycott of Gibbon's Steak House?
Yes-38% No-52% No opinion-10%

3. Do you think the Southwestern Student Senate should take an official stand on this issue?
Yes- 30% No-65% No opinion-5%

Number of students polled: 614

support of the resolution and that the resolution be sent to *The Commercial Appeal*.

Cook asked if a referendum would be more effective than a petition. Both Hollingsworth and SGA President Bill Hubbard said that the students might call for a referendum on the issue if they so desired and that the Senate was only expressing its own opinion on the Gibbon's incident.

The Senate approved Fletcher's proposal with only one opposing vote.

Following the Senate meeting, a group led by Childress, Reed, Welch, and Orr planned to picket before Gibbon's. A *Sou'wester* reporter arrived first and questioned several diners leaving the Steak House as to whether membership cards had been required of them. The only reply was "no."

Good Steak

Several Southwestern students leaving at this time said they were aware of the management's policies, but that "they have good steak."

Burly, conservative Memphian Frank Flanigan and his wife emerged from Gibbon's at this time and immediately complained "Who's taking up for niggers?"

Flanigan yelled "You people are inciting a riot!" at the reporter and three other students standing outside awaiting the pickets.

BACKS TAYLOR

When the pickets finally arrived, Flanigan became quite excited and threatened to call the police, reassuring Taylor, "We'll draw the line. I'm gonna stand right here with you, I'm gonna back you up 100%."

Picket leader Childress led the line of marchers, who quietly filed back and forth on the sidewalk.

"NIGGER-LOVERS"

The Memphis couple repeatedly yelled "Nigger-lovers" and "beatnik-b-s" as manager Taylor smiled. Taylor himself stated "It's just a small clique. They sent 'em down here." He felt that "the majority of Southwestern students are not liberal and Communist indoctrinated."

Taylor, reportedly a member of the John Birch Society, claimed the picketing had produced a 20% increase in business, and that "a lot of Southwestern students have been in here tonight and reassured me about how they feel." He added that most of his student diners were from Memphis State or Christian Brothers, and that a complete boycott by Southwestern would have no effect.

I guess we'll stay down here till we get tired" said picket leader Childress. A police car slowly passed, inspecting the picketers, as Flanigan urged a waitress to "call the cops." Taylor and the waitress went inside, and the Flanigans got into a white Fleetwood Cadillac.

The portly conservative had a statement for the press: "As long as a man has a place of business, it's his privilege to cater to the people he wants; Chinese or black. I'm tired of this nigger s-t."

The pickets, again headed by Childress, returned to Gibbon's lat Wednesday afternoon and remained until nine o'clock, carrying protest signs and singing songs. A crowd of approximately 100 persons, mostly students from Southwestern, looked on as the 30 pickets marched back and forth on the sidewalk. Individuals from the crowd hurled occasional jeers at the marchers.

Three police emergency squad cars were on the scene with at least six officers.

Seniors Petition Faculty; Question 'Value' Of Comps

By Tom Bayley
MARCH 21, 1969

Springtime at Southwestern will bring thoughts of flowers, good weather, baseball, track the "uniqueness" of comp catharsis, and a gathering cloud of discontent among the senior class if present conditions prevail.

Currently there is a controversy encompassing the Southwestern campus on the subject of comps. The present situation stems from

the combining of the European system of a comprehensive exam, taken after four years of college in which no yearly tests are taken, and the American system of course grades and semester or yearly grades. It was hoped that this was combining the "best of both."

THE '69 GRADUATING CLASS does not seem to think so. In their petition to the faculty, they cite the fallibility of a comp to "pull together" four years of courses, the

fact that graduate schools do not require or even consider comps, and the fact that comps negate the three term system, where the third term is supposedly dedicated to independent or directed inquiry.

JOE HEBERT expressed the opinion that comps were inappropriate. They were introduced for honor students in the Thirties and eventually spread to include the entire student body. He proposed that senior seminars be used instead

of comps to pull everything together.

"The system is no good as it is and since it is too late to change the system it should be abolished. If faculty members agree, they should join in boycotting the comps. If enough students and faculty boycott, then they (the administration) will have to give degrees. The students have not been allowed to work through the present structure to change comps, so they must work from outside."

PROFESSOR PAUL SHAW believes that the faculty's recognition of the legality of the student's plea will be easier to any settlement that may be reached. Shaw also believes that if Southwestern keeps comps, then they should change completely to the European comprehensive system. "This would place more responsibility upon the student."

He also believes there are other combinations of the two systems which might be more feasible. "The faculty and students must get together. If the faculty does not want to listen seriously to the students, it seems that the students should either take the comps or boycott them as a last measure. The boycott is their bargaining position. Students should have an equal voice in discussions of comps."

DR. FREDERIC STAUFFER believes that there are valid reasons for questioning the comp system. "I don't like the combination of the English and American systems. Comps may serve some purpose but

they are not worth the trouble. A new system of comps may be better, but the American system is enough 'Pulling together' occurs naturally."

Then asked about the possibilities of a boycott he answered, "They (comps) are required, as of now, and I would be forced to fail a student who boycotted the physics comp."

DR. HAROLD LYONS of the chemistry department, sees comps as a great help preparing the student to take entrance exams at grad school. Students who have graduated from Southwestern have expressed the opinion that the comps were beneficial in their studies there. Dr. Lyons does not believe that the students have valid reasons for changing the present system. "Taking courses for four years will not pull everything that they need together. A comp reinforces their knowledge. The results speak for themselves." Dr. Lyons also believes that comps make Southwestern unique.

IN THE SAME VEIN Dr. John Henry Davis of the history department maintains that courses are too scattered and that the student needs to pull his knowledge together with a comprehensive exam in his major. "Students tend to forget the individual course finals." He also believes that the comp will help the student "in the long-run." Dr. Davis does not believe that switching to the English system would be better because we are too used to our American system of grades and courses.

The Best of Ma Frickert

Continued from Page 10

Dear John,

My sources report that some do.

Dear Ma,

Lately it's been getting harder and harder for me to remove my head from my rectum in the morning.

Ed E. White

Dear E.

By the way you have stated your message I can't tell whether you seek advice or are just bragging. This column can't be used to afford every budding egotist a medium for glorifying himself, so I will assume that you merely wish advice. Though the question is a little out of my line, I would suggest that you try in the evenings instead of the mornings when even the best of us are not quite up to par.

Dear Ma,
What happened to all the rats in the refectory?

R.D.

Dear R.,
Approximately half the former rat population succumbed to last spring's food poisoning epidemic.

The rats were further decimated during the fall food shortage when good quality horsemeat was simply not to be had, and they provided an adequate substitute. However, have hope—they are not quite extinct yet. If the quality of food would somehow miraculously improve, they could rally yet.

Dear Ma,
On campus over there who is the leading dop supplier?

Ahead

Dear Ahead,
Don't try to put anything over on

ole Ma. I knew right off that this letter was a plant by the Memphis vice squad. The slight irregularities in syntax and spelling tipped me off. Note the misplacement of the phrase 'on campus'; besides, everyone here knows that it's Eliza Fitzhue, my roommate.

Dear Ma,
Do comps actually serve any significant purpose?

Rad E. Cal

Dear RAad.
It sounds to me as though you are bordering on revolutionary liberalism. Pull yourself together, boy. Of course comps serve a significant purpose—every student must pass comps before he can graduate. Also comps will provide excellent groundwork material for Philosophy 531, the Philosophy Department's new course on Paradoxical Absurdities.

The Men on Women

FEB. 10, 1967

By Lou Anne Crawford
and Carol Anne Colclough

Since our last column generated so much interest and lively commentary, and, moreover, such resounding action on the part of our male readers, who now have the woodsy-huntsy appearance and drape their ties around their necks at the slightest provocation (but—alas, still do not look like Paul Newman); this week we are thoughtfully presenting helpful hints to improve the female portion of the campus population.

The question presented to the

Southwestern men in an all-inclusive poll was: "What do you find attractive (sexy in a girl)?"

The answers were numerous, varied, and frequently off-color; but there was general agreement on long hair, short skirts, and shapely legs. Also receiving wide acclaim were eyes, the expressions thereof, and a natural appearance (i.e. not too much make-up). Specific physical features praised were:

Adrian Taylor and Mike Stone: Hair casually flipped over one eye.

Brady Anderson: A small waist (provided the north and south aren't so small).

Currie Johnston and Fred Kuhl: Long eyelashes.

Joe Alford: High cheek bones and the sallow look.

David Griffin: The backs of knees.

Neil Arnold: A sexy looking neck.

Bo Scarborough: "I like a girl who has a good body but does a fair job of covering it up."

Willie Edington: "Pretty hands with shiny fingernails."

Mike Whitaker: A good facial expression. ("Some girls are just hungry looking.")

Jim Durham: A slinky walk.

Charlie Sneed: Sun tans.

David Capes: Dietrichs, Hermanns, and Helens.

Barry Hilliard: Sensuous lips.

Girls, in case you have not yet purchased your spring wardrobe, there are certain items which you will not want to omit, if you wish to increase your sex appeal. Here's the fashion scoop according to several imminent critics:

All: Sweaters are *in*, especially V-neck—the contour of which are unspoiled by underlying blouses. (Dickey Fletcher.)

Charlie Sneed: Pants suits.

Garry Sharp: Plain gold chains. Clint Harelson: Low-cut black dresses with pearls.

Don Dillport: Two-piece bathing suits.

John Boswell: Pierced earrings and tassels in the right places.

Jim Durham: Poor-boy ribbed sweaters.

Jimmy Whittington: Tight skirts.

Sandy Sanders: Bikini underwear.

Brady Anderson: Plain ol' weejuns.

Southwestern men also considerably provided us with words for the wary, things to avoid if you wish to appear appealing.

Howard Cleveland: Dresses belled at the hip.

Butch Shirkey: Stiff hair plastered with hair spray.

Currie Johnson: Knobby Knees.

Jim Durham: Spare tires.

Steve Turner: A bad laugh.

Brady Anderson: "There's nothing worse than an unplucked eyebrow."

David Payne: A constant giggle.

There were multitudinous comments from those interviewed that, after much diligent thought, we feel cannot be placed in any particular category, but are nonetheless pertinent. Among them:

Pat Black: "What makes a girl sexy is something you can't quite put your finger on. (Heh, heh.)"

Tommy Strohm: It takes a clean shaven face.

Joe Alford: "I like a girl who smokes Camels and drinks straight scotch."

Dickey Fletcher: "Posterior perfect non gargantuous."

Herbert Hill: "What makes a Southwestern girl sexy?—About two six packs."

Which seems to pretty well sum up the situation.

CAMBODIA

Mark Lester

Charlie McElroy

MAY 8, 1970

By Charlie McElroy

Somehow, the killing must end. Each day mass slaughter continues in Viet Nam in the longest war in U.S. history. The bloodshed spread last week into Cambodia, as United States troops invaded the country in the interests of "peace."

More disturbing than the actual invasion, I think, is the fact that Mr. Nixon took the action without the consent of Congress, and even against the advice of key congressional leaders. He moved after his advisors had assured Americans that such action was not in the offing in the foreseeable future (one day later).

After the invasion, Mr. Nixon made public the results of a poll which he had taken, supposedly at random, and claimed a 6-1 ratio favoring his Cambodian policy. It was later revealed by GOP leaders that top Republicans in Washington had been ordered to respond favorably to the poll, and to write five political friends in their home states instructing them to do the same. This process was to be continued on a chain letter basis in order to assure a favorable response.

Was our President acting responsibly in approving such action?

It is interesting to note that during Mr. Nixon's speech in which he announced the invasion, there was a marked change in his terminology. Instead of speaking of "achieving a just peace"

as he had in the past, the President spoke rather of "winning a just peace." He also spoke of the humiliating defeat the U. S. might suffer if such action was not taken.

Are we now secretly trying to win in Viet Nam and Indo-China? If so, it would seem that the President enjoys the role of imperialist aggressor which was cast upon him, and has no intention of altering it.

It seems that President Nixon is not satisfied merely to broaden the scope of U. S. imperialism abroad, but must also step up political repression at home. Witness the Black Panthers, and the Chicago Seven, and the blacks, chicanos, "hippies," etc., etc. Witness the merciless massacre of four students from Kent State as National Guardsmen fired into a crowd. Four dead and three critical.

The killing goes on, in the field and in the streets. It seems that Mr. Nixon is doing his best to insure that it continues to do so.

Yes, the killing must stop. Not by staying in Viet Nam. No, Mr. Nixon, not even by eradicating a few effete snobs. But somehow it must end.

It has been one week since President Nixon announced his decision concerning the Indo-China War in relation to Cambodia. It has apparently been the impulse of those persons who stand in opposition to the war to view this escalation of American involvement as the planting of a seed. A seed which will blossom into another black flower similar to Viet Nam.

But on reflection, one can see in the recent escalation a paradox. It is the paradox of ending the war by escalating it. It has been tried before, indeed within the same conflict, and it has proved a total failure.

But with the paradoxical escalation in Cambodia there are two basic differences which separate it from earlier American attempts at settlement via escalation. The first difference is the temperament of the American people. America has decided to end the war as soon as possible. The method now is the only factor in question. This was not the situation at the time of President Johnson's decision to send substantial numbers of troops into Viet Nam. There was no pressing urgency to end the war at that time, such as exists now.

This temperament of the American people has its most profound effect on the person of Richard Nixon. Nixon is many things, but most of all he is a politician, and as a politician he realizes that he must make some progress toward ending the war before his bid for re-election. This was most vividly demonstrated in the President's mention of perhaps becoming a one-term president—something that worries him—something that he has no intention of letting happen.

The second great difference between the Cambodian escalation and its predecessors lies in its basic nature. Previous escalations have always meant more men, more airplanes, more money. But it is significant that while the Cambodian escalation has meant more danger to American lives, it has not meant the need for additional troops. To the contrary, 50,000 American troops will be withdrawn by May of next year.

These facts can simply not be overlooked. There are, of course, many variables to the situation—the length of the invasion, the character of President Nixon, the extent of retaliation by the military.

But I think it is unwise to make the assumption, after only one week, that we have planted the "black seed." We have indeed plowed new ground and planted new seeds. But what shall grow is yet to be seen.

Nuclear treaty scored by YR's

OCT. 4, 1963

CHICAGO (CPS)—The nuclear test ban treaty was labeled "grossly objectionable" by the Executive Committee of the National Federation of Young Republicans last Saturday.

The group also noted with "unabashed amazement" the "continuing dangerous leftist trend" of the Young Democrats.

The treaty was attacked on the grounds that:

1) It is a "dangerous step toward the Soviet version of 'general and complete disarmament'";

2) The Senate was forced into a "shot gun marriage" because the treaty already has been signed by some 80 nations;

3) The test ban would give the Soviet Union a "distinct advantage in catching up with the U. S. in low-yield tactical weapons," while restricting U. S. development of high-yield weapons.

The censure of the Young Democrats was based on their stands:

- 1) Calling for the recognition of Red China;
- 2) Asking for the abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee;
- 3) Demanding the repeal of the Internal Security Act and 4) Recommending the resumption of ties with Cuba.

"Responsibility and sanity have departed the opposition," the Republicans declared.

They continued that YD policy could be stated: "We'd rather be red than dead; we should give up, lie down, and roll over."

cost of the cups, at about twenty cents each, is not insurmountable, but the cost of the styrofoam replacements is difficult to absorb, and that's certainly no incentive for Larry to keep buying more. When confronted, people sometimes respond with, "They know I'm not stealing it; I'm going to bring it back as soon as I finish." To this we must realize: 1) actually, they don't bring it back; glasses and silverware turn up all over campus; the glasses get broken; and the coffee cups end up in bookshelves and aquariums. 2) No one walks out of a restaurant with the plates and glasses in their pockets; what's the difference? 3) Even if it is returned *eventually*, every day or week or month a cup sits in someone's room means it's being taken out of circulation for the rest of us.

The refectory has lost a lot of money this year due to a couple of student practices: walking out the door with a coffee cup in hand and treating off-campus guests to free meals. The time-honored tradition of helping oneself to cups, glasses, bowls, and silverware continues to drain the food service's stock as fast as they can put them out. In the past three weeks Director Larry Smith has put out 360 coffee cups. He estimates he has about 70 left. The

pocketing two or three packets at a time.

The other problem can be a little easier to stop and is much more expensive. This is the first year in a while we have had much trouble with non-students eating free meals. It is difficult for the food service people to keep up with it since the directors don't really know everyone's face. It's really up to the girl counting the line and each one of us to keep an eye out for them. There are three recognizable types: 1) Friend of a student: There are a couple of individuals who have been eating in the refectory so much even the students think they're students. 2) Groups of three or four who, when confronted, either pay or say they are students. There's one bunch that drives up from the art academy, about six of them, for a free lunch once a week. 3) Total strangers who just quietly get in line and no one says anything

to them. It doesn't take much to get rid of them. I once confronted a man who looked to be about thirty-five, just obviously "off-the-street," and he responded with a quickly contrived lie; but I haven't seen him since, and probably won't.

Does this seem unnecessary or busybodying? Larry figures he's lost about \$1200 this year in free food. Don't consider it an insult to confront someone you don't recognize; if he's a student he should appreciate your concern; after all, it's his tuition too.

The other problem area is the gym. Coach Thornton has instituted a couple of policies which ought to save everybody a lot of trouble. One is the red tag on the shoe; starting March first, no tag, no play. It may seem a bother to keep up with that little tag, but it will give the students gym space and tennis courts that have in the past been frequently

taken by off-campus people. Alumni should be accompanied by a student.

Another new system is the pins for all the varsity sports. By itself it has been working fine and the loss of gym clothes has been cut to almost nil. But there is only one Robert, and the system can be beaten; \$300-\$400 has been lost this year in the form of disappearing towels, and at one point they were losing two basketballs a week. No one, or, that is, very few people are trying to steal from the place; but if you need something Robert will usually give it to you, and it only takes a little bit of conscientiousness on our part to see that he gets it back. It is an Honor code offense, even though a small one, to take a towel or pair of socks back to your room.

These things, as trivial as they may seem at the time, are infractions of the Honor code. The losses add up.

By Taylor Phillips

Everyone on this campus is directly affected by Southwestern's Honor system in a variety of ways: pledging tests, take-home exams, the absence of meal tickets, or the habit of leaving our mailboxes open. Yet there are two areas which are also under the protection of the Honor code and are continually abused: the refectory and the gym.

The refectory has lost a lot of money this year due to a couple of student practices: walking out the door with a coffee cup in hand and treating off-campus guests to free meals. The time-honored tradition of helping oneself to cups, glasses, bowls, and silverware continues to drain the food service's stock as fast as they can put them out. In the past three weeks Director Larry Smith has put out 360 coffee cups. He estimates he has about 70 left. The

Something Current—Honor Code Violations Rampant