

The Daily Tar Heel

71 Years of Editorial Freedom

Offices on the second floor of Graham Memorial. Telephone number: Editorial, sports, news — 933-1012. Business, circulation, advertising—933-1163. Address: Box 1080, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Entered as 2nd class matter at the Post Office in Chapel Hill, N. C., pursuant to Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rates: \$4.50 per semester; \$8 per year.

Published daily except Mondays, examination periods and vacations, throughout the academic year by the Publications Board of the University of North Carolina. Printed by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc., 501 West Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.

THE DAILY TAR HEEL is a subscriber to United Press International and utilizes the services of the University News Bureau.

The Civil Rights Movement Starts Over

Whither the local civil rights movement? With most of its leaders in jail and almost all "regulars" pledged not to participate in demonstrations, the movement is in trouble. Judge Raymond Mallard has carefully selected the leaders for jail terms, releasing those who he considered the followers on suspended sentences.

Demonstrations will be confined to marches, and sit-ins and hit-and-runs will be forgotten, if the CCC takes over. Violence could come about if extremists managed to muscle into the new leadership before it can get organized. This would include adherents to the doctrine of ACT, which includes such reasonable people as Adam Clayton Powell, Gloria Richardson and Malcolm X.

So what will happen? As we see it, any of three things: no movement at all, demonstrations led by the Committee of Concerned Citizens or violence. Of the three, the second seems the most likely. The CCC, which has lobbied for the Civil Rights Bill in Washington, picketed, raised money for bail and circulated petitions, is a responsible group, and the need for responsibility at this time leads us to believe they will step into the vacant shoes.

We hope that those who believe that action is the only way to push integration will be watchful for those who are in the movement for their own glory. The fact that all the sit-ins have done almost nothing to further the cause (no restaurant has integrated, the Public Accommodations Law is still distant) should cause the new leadership to sit back and consider future actions. If demonstrations are considered a must, so be it. But don't go any further.

It's Almost Your Turn—Be Patient

The long-awaited referendum on the boycott has started its journey to the polls, and students will finally be given an opportunity to express their views on the subject which has been roaring about us for the past two months. The bill was introduced by Bob Wilson Thursday night in the first session of legislature under the new regime. We have our doubts on the motives behind the introduction of the bill, as we thought it would be done in a bi-partisan manner. We also haven't been able to find too many Student Party legislators who knew about the bill before Wilson assumed the rostrum. But more on that another time. If the bill gets to the polls in its present form, it will consist of two questions:

- 1) If the voter would patronize establishments that serve all students, and
- 2) If the voter follows the boycott, that is, if he refuses to patronize places which do not serve all students.

Radical Education And Georgia Schools

From The Knickerbocker News
In a Georgia community the other

Fred Seely, Hugh Stevens
Co-Editors

- Managing Editor — John Montague
Associate Editor — Mickey Blackwell
Editorial Page Editor — Pete Wales
News Editor — Dennis Sanders
Copy Editor — Nancy McCracken
Sports Editor — Larry Tarleton
Photo Editor — Jim Wallace
Editorial Assistant — Shirley Travis
Staff Artist — Chip Barnard
Reviews — Henry McInnis
- BUSINESS STAFF
- Business Manager — Art Pearce
Adv. Manager — Fred McConnell
Asst. Adv. Manager — Woody Sobol
Asst. Bus. Manager — Sally Rawlings
Sales — Bob Vanderberry, Frank Potter, Dick Baddour
Special Assistant — Becky Biggers

interpret it enough so that we could explain it. But the legislature will work on the wording, and the voter will know what he's doing. So, what are the reasons for having the poll? We must emphasize that the referendum is only a poll. It has no effect other than as a point of information, and will affect no Student Government policy. The legislature has already taken a stand on the issue, so don't expect them to change around if the vote is overwhelming against the boycott. The vote will serve as an indication to those merchants who would like to integrate, but are afraid they will lose business if they do. After all, they are risking a trade from a possible 10,000 plus students in order to be able to serve an additional 57. One example that comes to mind is the Carolina Grill. It won't make any difference to Clarence or Carlton, as their only consideration is the cashbox and as long as it is healthy they will remain as they are. Of course, it is doubtful if either of these establishments would serve Negroes if they were the only people in town. But most of all, it gives each and every student the opportunity to express his views on this matter. This has been long overdue, and we hope that a record vote will be the result of these months of waiting.

● Speaking a strange language called midwestern—believed to be a dialect of American English.

● Being too humorous about his work, such as when he encouraged his students not to become "wall-to-wall idiots."

● Giving 37 of his 93 pupils failing grades for the first semester.

● Being in essence a radical in that he sometimes departed from the text and introduced outside subject matter in his teaching. In one instance he went several miles to get books not available in his own city.

Obviously no one wants THAT sort of person teaching our children.



Letters To The Editors

Defense Of Chairman, Mom

Cigar-Smoking Mother Revered

Editors, The Daily Tar Heel,
I can fully share the revulsion Miss (?) Montgomery experienced watching our student leaders. I too was brought up in a sensitive home atmosphere. In fact, among the fondest memories of youth was my lady-like mother standing on the veranda of our Southern plantation arrayed in orange hat and red dress. As she squinted through the smoke rising from a cheroot clamped in the corner of her mouth, she admonished us boys, never, NEVER, to chew gum because it is uncouth. She always hit the children on their heads with her dainty parasol when we transgressed. Ah, she was a true gentlewoman of the old school! What we need today at UNC are more of these cultured ladies like Miss Montgomery and others to keep us ever aware, with their exemplary conduct and letters, of the paramount necessity for manners and decorum. Keep up the good fight, Myrtle Montgomery!

David W. Allen
416 Connor

Schiff Replies On Convention

Editors, The Daily Tar Heel:
In response to questions raised concerning the handling of the Chair at a recent session of the UNC Mock Political Convention, I feel it incumbent upon myself to clarify a few matters. The Democrats were in the majority. No Republican in attendance would deny this fact, the most representative unit vote being a 24 to 18 decision. Hence it is understandable that the Republicans would object to the decision of the Chair to conduct the Convention in the most expeditious manner possible. Strategic factors are not the concern of the Chair. The chairman should not permit the object of a meeting to be defeated by a few factious persons using parliamentary forms with the evident object of obstructing business. Suggested rules of procedure had been decided upon by the Executive Committee previous to my appointment as Convention chairman. These rules were brought before the Convention. Amendments were proposed by Republicans and Democrats alike. The amended rules made no stipulation for the reading of individual planks. The lengthy discussion surrounding the foreign policy planks prompted the chairman to entertain a motion that in the interest of expediency the reading of the planks be eliminated or included in the allowed debate. The platforms of both parties were in the hands of all delegates and the reading seemed to the Chair to be superfluous. The Convention agreed.

As it was, the Convention finished the business at hand within a half hour of the limitation extended to the women delegates. Dis-

There is a serious flaw in Student Government's judicial procedure. That is keeping secret the names of parties in trials. Under the present system, a student may be accused, convicted and suspended from the University for an offense against a student body that doesn't even know he's being tried. Secrecy is always a desperate threat to democracy. The American tradition is one of open courts. The public must be aware of and control the solution to its own problems. When the students do not know, they cannot control. Those who say "keep the names secret" doubt the integrity of the student body to give justice to those brought to trial. They believe that a student, once suspended, stands a better chance of returning to school and becoming a good Carolina citizen if he does not face a certain social stigma. Much can be said for this argument. The advocates of publishing names point out that the truth about the cases is far less dangerous than the rumors which invariably circulate. Founded upon partial fact and colored in word or mouth transition, these rumors cast the offenders in a completely false light. The "so-

cial stigma" under such circumstances is much worse. Students must be "in the know" if this is to be a real Student Government. And a student who is accused of an offense against the student body should be known to that student body, as should his accuser. If any offense is serious enough to warrant suspension of a student from school by other students, it is serious enough to be brought to the attention of everyone. As it stands now, a convicted student is marked as such on his permanent record—records that follow him forever. A mistake now, in school, can cost him a job and a livelihood for his family for many years hence. It would be far better to publish names at the time and forget the permanent record. Then the offender receives a temporary but deserved punishment in ostracization that is more in keeping with his years and experience. Unless, of course, an offender repeats. Then a student has indicated his incapacity for change and should be marked as of doubtful character. These arguments tend to balance each other in their consequences. The fundamental question is whether the students shall know what is happening in this government they supposedly run themselves. Can the students be trusted? Can the student public afford to trust its sovereignty to secrecy from itself?

Rights Bill Faring Better Than Expected For LBJ

By ROWLAND EVANS And ROBERT NOVAK
WASHINGTON — Contrary to all the gloomy speculation about the civil rights filibuster in the Senate, the battle is going far better for President Johnson today than seemed possible when it started. The reason for this unusually optimistic forecast won't be found in the Senate debate. It lies in the elaborate and unprecedented system of check and cross-check between Senate and House Republicans that now controls the principal actors in the congressional drama. For example, consider the well-publicized move of Sen. Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, the Republican leader, to water down the Fair Employment section of the bill (FEPC). Some amendment is essential to win over enough Republicans so that if cloture (the forcible ending of debate) becomes necessary, a two-thirds majority of the Senate will vote for it. Behind the scenes, Dirksen is shrewdly exploiting the system of check and cross-check to hedge in those who want a very tough FEPC and those who don't want any at all. To the businessmen who have swarmed into this office the past few weeks to lobby against the FEPC section, he patiently explains that this particular provision was written not by wild-eyed Democrats in the administration but by moderate Republicans in the House, led by self-effacing Rep. William McCulloch of Ohio. Thus EVERY CHANGE that Senator Dirksen would like to make, under pressure from conservative Republicans, he cross-checks with McCulloch, the ranking Republican on the House Judiciary Committee. McCulloch in turn checks with Rep. Charles Goodell, the New York Republican who helped draft the original language of the FEPC section in the House Labor Committee. Changes that would gut the section are rejected by McCulloch and Co., and their veto gives Dirksen just the leverage he needs to withstand the conservatives. The important restraints on Dirksen, in other words, do not come only from the White House or the liberal Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, but from a handful of moderate Republicans in the House. None of these vital restraints would be operating today if the bill as it passed the House had not been truly bipartisan. The origin of this bipartisanship goes back to last fall when President Kennedy, confronted with a runaway liberal coalition in the House Judiciary Committee, appealed to McCulloch and Rep. Charles Halleck, the Republican leader, for help. Halleck and McCulloch delivered. As a result, these middle-of-the-road Republicans, who have never been civil rights zealots, have almost as much at stake in the Senate version of the bill as the all-out civil rights partisans. Perhaps never before in Senate history has a handful of minority-party congressmen in the House held such a whiphand over the Senate. A YEAR AGO Dirksen might have been far less willing to cooperate with his House col-

leagues. It was only last summer that Dirksen extracted the heart from a Republican statement of principles on civil rights that Sen. Jacob Javits, the New York liberal, tried to push through the conference of all-Republican senators. But today, as the Negro revolution moves on an ever-ascending scale from one crisis to another, Dirksen knows that a strong bill is essential. And there is only a handful of senators in either party, north of the Mason-Dixon line, who haven't been driven by the force of events to the same conclusion. As a result, practically every objective in Javits' statement of principles last summer is found in the House-passed civil rights bill. Accordingly, the long and windy talk in the Senate is a charade that should not be confused with reality. The first major break may come late this week when Dirksen, McCulloch, Halleck, Goodell, Javits, and Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, the Democratic master strategist in the Senate, agree on the FEPC provision. Once this agreement is reached, Senate managers of the bill will be able to move with the assurance of help from Dirksen, whose support has always been absolutely indispensable for final action.

Review

By RON SPAINHOUR
Tonight's free flick, "The Innocents," is one of the more successful horror films. Hitchcock could take some lessons from its talented British director—Jack Clayton. The film, based on Henry James' "Turn of the Screw," involves two children whose uncle (Michael Redgrave) employs an English minister's daughter (Deborah Kerr) as their governess. William Archibald and Truman Capote's adaptation of the James novel has added some Freudian overtones. Is the governess mad or just seeking to get the attention of the children's uncle? Or are the children haunted by the evil spirit of their former governess who appears as one of the apparitions? Are the ghosts real or part of the children's imaginations? Director Clayton, who directed the superb "Room at the Top," has almost succeeded in making a high-brow "scare show." He has everthing working for him but the story and the length of his scenes. His climax is shattering and tragic, but he takes too long to get there. As a result, the film becomes monotonous. However, Clayton's ability, the quality of the photography, and the acting make the film a "must." Clayton has been most successful in his use of black and white photography, lighting, and the settings to create an eerie atmosphere. He has allowed the English countryside, a lake, a garden, the Georgian mansion, its stairway, corridors, a curtain blowing in the wind and mist on the windows to act for him. "The Innocents" will probably never be as popular as some of Hitchcock's films, even though it's a lot better.

Whicker Craves Recognition

Editors, The Daily Tar Heel:
Although I was not a participant, I am certain that the thirty-five boys who did participate in the Delta Upsilon skit in the Valkyrie Sing entitled "Coffee Break" would like a little recognition of the fact that they won the men's skit division. These boys worked long and hard on the skit and put on a good show. They were the only group that was not announced as being a winner in a recent article on the Valkyrie Sing in The Daily Tar Heel. I feel that The Daily Tar Heel owes them this recognition.

Lester Whicker
Delta Upsilon