

Time Of Change For Negroes, Whites

South Is Scene For Two Revolutions

(ED. NOTE—During a recent visit to the South, United Press International editor Roger Tatarian compared notes with UPI correspondents and editors and others on the status of the civil rights movement. This is a summation of the information he gleaned.)

By ROBERT TATARIAN
UPI Editor

ATLANTA—There are two revolutions under way in the American South today. One is the Negro's battle for civil rights. This is the open revolution that has reached from Selma, Ala., to the halls of Congress.

The other is a white revolution. You have to look harder for it. But it is there and it is just as significant as the other one.

This is the revolution of men adjusting themselves and changing old concepts and old customs that have gone unchallenged for generations. It is a revolution of white men calling a Negro "mister" instead of "boy" or of a White child sticking a tentative toe in a pool where the young Negro is already swimming.

It is a revolution that develops around family dinner tables or between neighbors and communities as they weigh each new thing they are asked to do: To share schools, churches, motels, hotels, jobs and the ballot box with Negroes—to share them equally with no strings attached.

It is as difficult for the southern white to accept these changes as it is for the Negro to be satisfied with the pace of his struggle to close the enormous gulf between himself and the white man.

The southern white is not accepting these changes easily or happily. At best it is with resignation. More often it is with bitterness.

But he has started to accept them, and the American South in this summer of 1965 is not quite the same place it was even a year ago. In some respects it is dramatically different from the South of five or 10 years ago.

The acceptance of change has been greatest among whites in the bigger cities. Some rural areas remain untouched and unchanged in open defiance of new federal civil rights laws. And there are still occasional white juries that invoke a strange double standard in murder trials.

Heroes To A Few

The red necks who burn crosses by night or fire rifles at passing cars still exist. They have not lit their last cross nor fired their last furtive shot. But they are heroes to fewer and fewer besides themselves.

A large layer of the white South—probably a majority—regards them with the same contempt as does the northerner.

The southern apostles of violence have, unwittingly, given a push to the acceptance of change by many whites who may share their feelings about Negroes but not about violence.

The law-respecting and church-going whites in communities scarred by beatings, shootings and bombings have become disturbed and angry to find themselves identified in the outside world with the perpetrators. This has unquestionably helped many to surrender more rapidly to change.

Other powerful but unseen factors are at work. Integration could not have proceeded even as far as it has if the movement had not coincided with a period of great prosperity. Had joblessness among whites been widespread, competition from Negroes could only have led to greater strife.

Law Still Respected

The businessman's desire to prosper—that is, the profit motive—has been a factor of overwhelming importance. Negro organizations recognized this in the beginning with their strikes, sit-ins, boycotts and demonstrations. In many a southern community caught in this turmoil, it has often been the business leaders—key segments of the so-

called power structure—who have been the catalysts in breaking deadlock and introducing change.

But with or without economic motive the average southerner has an innate respect for law and order that is providing the Negro with another ally in his fight for civil rights. This feeling for the law is widespread even among southern whites who prefer segregation as a way of life and make no secret of it.

It is typified by a businessman in an Alabama town of 35,000 who also makes no secret of the fact that he is no hero and prefers anonymity. His place of business was bombed once because his advocacy of law and order put him on the Negro's side.

"Look," he will tell you, "I'm not for integration. I don't like the Civil Rights Act, and I hate a lot of things the Supreme Court is doing. But I am for law and order. Without that we'd be in real trouble. So if it is the law of the land that the Negroes have these rights, then I am for upholding the law."

That this feeling is widespread in the South is shown by the degree of compliance with the Public Accommodations Section (Title 2) of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in its first year of operation.

The headlines have gone mostly to the Lester Maddoxes who have defiantly closed turned them into private clubs rather than serve Negroes.

The Change Comes

But literally hundreds of hotels, motels and restaurants that were closed to Negroes last year are open to them this year. This is particularly true of the bigger establishments and Mississippi as well as elsewhere.

There are defiant holdouts, too particularly in rural areas, and civil rights organizations are trying to pick them off one by one in the courts.

Another major provision of the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Employment Section (Title 7) goes into effect July 2. It will afford the southern Negro great hope of job opportunities; how effective it will be in actually getting him jobs remains to be seen.

Seminars have been held throughout the South on the meaning and application of the new law. In Montgomery, Ala., the home of Gov. George Wallace, the Alabama Journal has been running a series of articles on the law and its provisions.

"It's likely," the opening article said, "that half the people of Montgomery think the Civil Rights Act is an unjust law."

"From past performance, the city as a whole will obey it anyway."

Glimpses of much that has changed in the South, and much that has not, can be seen in any city.

In Biloxi, Miss., a businessman is advertising for boys from 15 to 18 to do summer work. His ad stipulates "white, please."

—In Atlanta, which many deep southerners relegate to the North, white and Negro women lunch at adjoining tables in the city's most fashionable department stores. Four years ago when the stores decided on integration many white women turned in their credit cards and vowed never to return. They have. But "white only" signs have not disappeared completely even in Atlanta. And neither has the Ku Klux Klan.

STUDENT OPINION

Students Accept Title Of 'Protest Generation'

By BEV COLEMAN

First it was the "lost generation" then the "beat generation": College students today have been called members of the "protest generation." A sampling of opinion from University students indicates that they are willing to accept this title.

Luke Blanchard, medicine, Ahoskie

"Yes, I accept it with pride. I think this may be the first time students have been an important force. It is shaping the modern social evolutions that we have today somewhat as a group, a unity."

Ed Causey, sociology, senior, Lakeview

"I guess I'll have to accept it because I am a part of it, and if the whole is called that, then a part must be also."

Norwood Pratt, RTVMP, senior, Chapel Hill

"Yes, there is a sense in which our's is a protest generation, but that's not the final phrase with which to name it. I hope, at least, that we will earn the title of the free generation. We have freedoms, economic and social, that no other generation has enjoyed before us. I hope that we will find the character and the vision to achieve and make use of the intellectual freedom and political responsibility these make possible."

Rose Thompson, languages, sophomore, Bethesda, Md.

"Yes, I accept the title of the protest generation. I believe that almost every college student, if he thinks at all, is caught up in the tide of the many current crisis in the world today. We are forced actually to take a stand on various current issues, such as the racial issue, the Viet Nam situation, the Dominican crisis, etc. The fact that this cliché protest generation is being hurled at college students indicates that the world is focusing their attention and hopes on the future generation."

Joel Adams, music, junior, Chapel Hill

"If this generation can be called a protest generation, then all the other generations before us can also be called protest generations. There have been things all along that people have protested. I think that if this name is tagged to our generation, it's because the protests are more open. Communications have made these protests spread more rapidly, and in doing that more people hear about them and see them. Maybe that is why people think this is a protest generation."

Academic Freedom: A String Attached

(ED. NOTE—Yardley, a former Daily Tar Heel editor, is now an editorial writer for the Greensboro Daily News.)

By JONATHAN YARDLEY
Greensboro Daily News

The Charlotte News kissed off the 1965 General Assembly with a three-part editorial series by Bob Smith, associate editor, entitled "What's Wrong at UNC?" Smith, who went to Raleigh to talk with some of the legislators about the University of North Carolina's fall from grace, returned to paint a picture of legislative petulance, suspicion and anti-intellectualism.

Not that Smith intended it to be that way. Perhaps because so many editorials and news analyses have questioned the legislators' common sense and devotion to the University, Smith gave them every benefit of the doubt: "The men I talked with are neither benighted nor superstitious. I am persuaded that each one of them has the best interest of the university at heart." To be sure, some he quotes—notably House Speaker Pat Taylor—indicated a sure sense of the basic issues dividing the Legislature and the university; too often, however, the legislators only displayed singular misunderstanding of what a university is.

Just An Excuse?

One legislator said: "It's amazing to me that anyone in America could make an anti-speaker ban speech without prefacing it by saying that they oppose communism." Another: "The feeling is that this academic freedom thing is being used as an excuse for not saying where the university stands." And this from the Lieutenant Governor: "If the trustees of the university and the various colleges would issue a statement which would say 'We are opposed to communism and to the communist philosophy, and in the light of our opposition we will set up rules and regulations for dealing with this problem if permitted to do so by the General Assembly'—the General Assembly might be more favorably disposed to grant them this authority."

In other words, the University can have all the academic freedom it wants—if. The bargain has a string attached. Academic freedom for the university and all the smaller state-supported colleges hinges on their willingness to subscribe to anti-communism. Communists will be welcome to speak at Chapel Hill and Greenville so long as college authorities inform them that, in fact, they and their views are not in the least welcome or appreciated.

"Poor Discipline"

Smith gets to the heart of the matter: "The educators have directed all their con-

cern to the freedom to teach. The legislators have looked to the substance of that teaching. Rightly or wrongly, they have been disturbed by examples of what they consider poor discipline, irresponsibility, and lack of commitment to national ideals. They want to know where the University stands on these points."

If the legislators really had looked at "the substance of that teaching," there would not likely be much to worry about. It would be heartening to find legislators sitting in on UNC classes to get a first-hand impression of the quality of teaching there—to see, perhaps, whether professors were presenting balanced accounts of Reconstruction or Thomas Wolfe's place in American literature. But that, of course, is not what the Legislature means by "substance." It wants to know: Is communism being preached at Chapel Hill? Is free love being advocated to sophomores at UNC-G? Is nonviolent resistance espoused at Raleigh?

No Strange Ideas

In short, the Legislature wants to know whether political beliefs contrary to those prevalent in the Statehouse are winning free expression at state-supported colleges and universities. It wants to censor the instructor in order to "protect" the student. It wants to safeguard the young and (for the sake of political discourse) "innocent" from strange ideas by denying them the right to hear, discuss and ponder them.

The brunt of Smith's excellent series is that the Legislature expects the University—specifically, Chapel Hill, for that is the target of its lance—to bend to its will. As seen from the Statehouse, this is not a two-way proposition. There is only the slightest indication that legislators recognize that they fail to understand the University's problems; mostly, they moan about the inability of the University to understand the legislative process (a heart-rending cry that surely must puzzle history and political science teachers).

A Real Danger

The University is directing all its concern to the freedom to teach for a painfully simple reason: That freedom is in danger. Over and over, in statements from Raleigh and the hustings, legislators underscore the danger. They are hell-bent to exercise total control over the university, control that, if established, will cost the University its accreditation and, ultimately, its good name.

But in politics lasting institutions rate second to passing furies. The men who were in Raleigh in 1965 want to return in 1967, and if the state's colleges and universities suffer as a result, well, that's politics.