

The Chapel Hill Weekly

"If the matter is important and you are sure of your ground, never fear to be in the minority."

ORVILLE CAMPBELL, Publisher

JAMES SHUMAKER, General Manager

Published every Sunday and Wednesday by the Chapel Hill Publishing Company, Inc.
125 East Rosemary Street, Chapel Hill, N. C.
P. O. Box 271 - Telephone 967-7945

Subscription rates (payable in advance and including N. C. sales tax)—In North Carolina: One year, \$5.15; six months, \$3.09; three months, \$2.06. Elsewhere in the United States: One year, \$6.00; six months, \$4.00; three months, \$3.00. Outside United States: One year, \$10.00.

Another Dab Of Mud On The Business Escutcheon

Chapel Hill merchants have been mis-cast in the role of villain so many times for so long now that you might expect one more dab of mud on the business community's likeness to be dismissed with a philosophical shrug.

To those perennial charges based on the captive clientele myth and other gratuitous slurs that seems to follow as regularly as season follows season, perhaps a shrug is the most sensible reaction. Reason, unfortunately, is seldom a satisfactory rebuttal to unreason.

In the case of the current civil rights trauma, however, the misrepresentation of Chapel Hill's businessmen, as a group, should not be allowed to stand.

There are, indeed, about half a dozen substantial Chapel Hill businesses and about half a dozen joints that still practice segregation. All other businesses in Chapel Hill, well over 150, do not have any discriminatory policies and do not practice discrimination.

More than ninety per cent of our merchants have renounced segregation for themselves. In addition, they deplore the segregation policies of the dozen die-hards. Beyond that, no group, excepting our clergymen, has worked harder than Chapel Hill's businessmen to eliminate public discrimination.

Their methods, it is true, have not been as sensational as downtown marches and picket lines and civil disobedience. The

businessmen have worked quietly, sometimes privately and anonymously. They have worked in small groups and individually, in man-to-man confrontations with the dozen diehards.

They have committed themselves to this work, regardless of the fact that they are no more responsible—morally, professionally or otherwise—for someone else's business policies than are you and I. They are, in fact, deeply committed to the ideal of equal rights and are acting directly in response to that commitment.

The businessmen's aim is the same as that of the clergymen, the Human Relations Committee, the Mayor's Committee on Integration, the Committee for Open Business, and all of the citizens of this community who want to see true equality. If their methods are somewhat less flamboyant, it doesn't necessarily follow that they will be any less effective.

The businessmen's efforts have frequently been met with open attacks, carping criticism and implications of guilt by association (the only association being that they are merchants and so are the die-hards). This, we submit, is totally unfair.

Instead of recrimination, Chapel Hill's businessmen deserve our gratitude and respect. If the rest of the community were as actively dedicated to equal rights, the present problem would probably vanish.

One Or Two Random Thoughts On Rousing Rabble

Americans, especially Southern Americans, have never cottoned to outside agitators, whatever the cause for which they agitated.

Take Citizen Genet as a case in point. No sooner had the French helped do in the English at Yorktown and had a little revolt of their own than M. Genet, as the Revolutionary Government's minister to the U. S., began drumming up support for French ambitions in Europe. His zeal earned him the distinction of being the first diplomat declared persona non grata by the United States. He solved it nicely by resigning his post and becoming a naturalized American citizen.

Not every agitator is so flexible. The late judge Samuel Liebowitz muleheadedly insisted on a fair trial for nine Negro boys tried in Scottsboro, Alabama and took part of his fee in one of the most vicious and concerted personal villifications on record. He became the prototype of the "Jew-Yankee-troublemaker lawyer" one finds in some otherwise legitimate Southern fiction of the immediate past.

We mention these two because they represent something of a lesson on the nature of agitation and the varied response their actions elicit in America.

The outside meddler, however innocuous or sinister his motives, is not and never has been in good odor.

Much of the present race dilemma has been ascribed by White Citizens Councils to needlenosing outsiders coming in and making trouble. This, they would have us believe, is a purely local problem, to be worked out by local folk in a sane, sensible way free from pressure by rabblers who don't understand the situation.

There is something to this, as in any argument that implies the necessity for intimate and specific knowledge of difficulty in its own context. It seemed that people here were hewing to this principle until Roy Harris of Georgia spoke to a White Supremacy rally in Durham this past weekend. There is little question but what Georgia and North Carolina have their points in common, and also that they are distinct and apart in a number of ways. Mr. Harris is unavoidably an outsider, and since he spoke about a local problem, we are left to conclude either that his Durham audience abandoned principle in the name of expediency, or that there never was a principle that stood between local matters and extraneous meddling.

Now & Then

by Bill Prouty

One night while televiewing a late movie I dozed off (is there anybody who hasn't done this on occasion?) and the next thing I knew I was sitting straight up in my chair, startled into fitful consciousness by a cacophony of blatant noises and brilliant flashing lights.

Shown on the screen was a caricatured and animated line drawing representing a man who was obviously in excruciating pain. And for good reason, because at regular intervals a heavy mallet was crashing down upon his unprotected skull, cadenced to the strident exhortations of a shrill pitchman.

As the pitchman continued his spiel at about twice the decibels of the regular program, extolling the "double-the-strength" virtues of the incomparable So-and-So, the pounding mallet slowly faded out of the picture and flowing dotted lines (obviously representing pain) began pouring from the head of the vastly relieved figure, whose now upturned mouth and sparkling eyes spoke eloquently of So-and-So's unique healing powers!

I was so disgusted with the

pitch that I snapped off the television and picked up the evening paper and read a while before going to bed, all the time vowing that I'd never, but never, ever use So-and-So headache medicine even if my head was beating like a bongo drum at a voodoo rally!

Is, then, loud and exaggerated advertising more effective than calm, truthful, and necessarily less obtrusive advertising? Is it true that the Big Exaggeration, if repeated often enough and loud enough, will be generally accepted, even by people traditionally accustomed to freedom of choice?

In other words, can calm, cool, essentially truthful appeal compete successfully with gaudy fevered, exhortation in television? I sincerely believe it can, thereby bringing great relief to the serious televiewer and to the advertiser alike. Take one example of the soft candid approach, for instance: There's a well-known foreign small automobile whose advertisers tell their televiewers that their product looks like a beetle, is definitely not pretty, never changes its lines, BUT that it is as durable and as economically operated a passenger

automobile as can be found, and has the highest trade-in valuation of any car on the market.

This is told the TV fan in a soft, unembellished manner, and, frankly, comes as a great relief on many programs.

Does this sensible, though quite unusual, approach sell? When driving to work tomorrow morning, just look around you in traffic and you'll see that it does, or that it has, since you may well be driving one of the little "beetles" yourself!

But even if we have to live with the clangor of the So-and-So pitch, and the cool candid approach is yet a far way off, the former is to me preferable to the ad-less state-supervised programming dealt to captive audiences in many countries about the world.

Advertising (in whatever form) is absolutely essential to our envied capitalistic society. And besides, a shoot-'em-up Western once in a while, even with raucous ads, may be better than no ads at all and nothing but serious music, philosophy, politics and propaganda. What do you think?

Letters To The Editor

More On Sir Clarence, Civil Rights

Dear Sir:

There has come to my attention this morning what purports to be an editorial from your paper titled "The Tragic Spring of Clarence Stone." It would appear from that editorial that your paper is emulating, or attempting to follow, the liberal leadership of several of the big dailies in North Carolina in castigating Senate President Clarence Stone and other members of the North Carolina Legislature who voted for the bill passed by the recent Session of the General Assembly the apparent purpose of which was to slow down the indoctrination of North Carolina youth in State Educational institutions with Communist propaganda. Evidently, you and many of your brother newspapermen do not agree with that philosophy. If you do not agree, at least you could so announce to the State of North Carolina and the world at large with editorials propounding your philosophy, if it be favorable to Communism, Socialism, or whatever it be, without using your editorial page to try to undermine, destroy the character of, and stultify one of the outstanding citizens of North Carolina; a man who has spent a good part of his life in the political arena of North Carolina fighting for legislation designed

to advance the best welfare of North Carolina and its citizens.

Long after you and those like you have passed from the scene, the work of men like Clarence Stone will stand out in the history of this State as the foundation upon which North Carolina grew to be one of the leading states in the nation in every phase of good government.

Contrary to your editorial viewpoint, I say it was the love for the University of North Carolina, the other educational institutions of the State, the citizens generally, and our young people especially, which prompted Clarence Stone and his friends to support the bill in question.

I supported the bill which you referred to in your editorial, and will continue to do so as long as I am a member of the General Assembly of North Carolina, and after that, will support the philosophy as set out in that bill so long as I live. From the public forum response, and from the response of people verbally throughout the State, I think the majority of the people of North Carolina are with President Stone and the members of the General Assembly in this matter, and nothing you and the other editors of the papers in North Carolina can do or say will alter the fact.

It has been my observation over the years that the poisoned pens of editors of newspapers and periodicals do not affect the right thinking of the majority of the people in North Carolina.

Your libelous editorial should be aired in the courts of North Carolina, but President Stone probably would not give your editorial the dignity that an action against you and your paper might convey.

Yours truly,
Gariand S. Garriss

Mr. Garriss, a resident of Troy, is a State Senator from North Carolina's 16th District.

Dear Sir:

Examine with me a few thoughts, ideas, questions and facts regarding our race problems and the social revolution that is associated with them. Examine with logic and careful open-minded consideration.

We, in this country during the past several years have become very minority conscious and have become very sensitive to the rights of all those that are discriminated against. I am not offering a criticism, I am simply

stating a fact. We are afraid of offending our Jewish neighbors over school prayers and we find that the Supreme Court is brought in, changing old and formally accepted practices. Perhaps this is good, perhaps it is bad but it is a fact to be dealt with. We are afraid of offending our Negro neighbors and we are about to enact rules to change this. We are entertaining the idea of adopting rules to govern shopkeepers in their selection of customers.

The above are stated facts. Examine now the logic of these facts as related to their overall purpose and their ultimate effect. Also think about the justice involved to both sides of the question.

Would you, in fairness, say that the ardent segregationists are a minority in this country today? They are in fact? Would you agree that the ardent segregationist shopkeepers are a minority in this country today? They are in fact just that. How is it then that we, the majority, are able to override their desires with desires of our own, just because we think ourselves to be right? Would this not be offending a minority group? If we override one minority group because we are sensitive to the desires of another minority group what have we, in effect, accomplished? Where have we come? We have only exchanged minority groups. What is the logic in that?

If we suppress the shopkeeper in order to avoid the suppression of the Negro we have effected no major social change at all. We only have one more stupid law on the books, and a little less freedom for everybody. Each and every single time a law is passed a certain measure of freedom is lost to us all.

It seems to me that we are refining the great moral purge of the 1920's that led to prohibition with just one exception: Freedom cannot be bootlegged and once it is lost it will be gone forever. We have worked our way along this far and have evolved as a semi-socialist state already and we seem to be charting our course in that direction with ever-increasing vigor. If we work hard enough in that direction we will find ourselves waking up one morning with all of our freedoms lost and we will find ourselves joining the Union of Socialist Republic in the suppression of all human freedoms.

All freedom or groups who favor this encroachment of our basic overall freedom, in their own personal interests, are desiring freedom at the cost of freedom. Such is the stupid logic of lawmakers who favor laws for everything.

These are moral, ethical and social questions, not legal ones, and the only solution will be found in a moral and social reawakening by us all. These are not questions to be answered by Democrats, Republicans, Jews, Negroes or Gentiles but by all

mankind working together in the greater interest of mankind.

William L. Simpson

Dear Sir:

Once more we have the spectacle in Chapel Hill of community leaders abdicating their potential role as mediators in the current racial crisis. After a temporary gesture of willingness to help erase injustice in this city, the business leaders stayed away en masse Sunday from a crucial meeting of the Mayor's Committee on Human Relations.

How can these men accuse civil rights leaders of "irresponsible behavior" when they themselves are guilty of the height of irresponsibility in avoiding the most important issue facing our community? Leaders are expected to lead; they are expected to seek solutions to public problems; and they are expected to keep their promises. Instead, our business leaders have tried to run away from community problems and have even failed to keep an important appointment with the Mayor's Committee. By such standards, the behavior of the Committee for Open Business has been exemplary in recognizing a community ill and in trying forthrightly to combat that ill.

Obviously, the only dependable way to eradicate the evils of segregation in Chapel Hill is for the Aldermen to pass an open public accommodations law. The Aldermen, too have been slow to exercise leadership. But they have been elected by the public to solve our community problems. Certainly, they can see now that no one else—not even our business leaders—can be looked to for the solution.

Sincerely yours,
M. Richard Cramer

Dear Sir:

I should like to state, with enormous enthusiasm and pride in a fellow Chapel Hillian, that Patricia Hunter's letter in your issue of last Sunday is without any doubt the most moving and eloquent plea for integration that I have been confronted with during my twenty-two years as a Southerner. It teaches all of us an enormous lesson... a lesson which the leaders in the movement seem to have forgotten. Not only is the letter eloquent, but its very lyricism makes it hold its own with any contemporary prose-poetry.

Some way should be found to have it published and widely distributed, not only as a plea, but as a tract of our times. It should not die in a letters column. It should, somehow, become part of our literary heritage.

Is it not frightening that here in Chapel Hill, Miss Hunter felt compelled to introduce her "fictional" Mrs. Aileen Landis in this manner: Mrs. Landis (whose name has been changed for her protection)... Have we really come to this in our good town?

Kai Jurgensen



The Davie Poplar On The University Campus

Has Success Spoiled Sir Clarence's Gag Law?

THE GREENSBORO DAILY NEWS

If the views of Senate president Clarence Stone of Stoneville are accurately reported in a recent interview in the Winston-Salem Journal, it may be that he has now had second thoughts about the ban on Communist speakers that the Senate helped write into law under his gavel.

In the first place, Senator Stone apparently dislikes being "blamed" for the passage of the bill. Some newspaper reports from the scene indicated that while there were clear calls for a division by standing vote on the day the bill was hurriedly passed, Senator Stone conveniently failed to hear them. "If there was a call for division, I didn't hear it," he nonetheless told Bill Connelly of the Winston-Salem Journal, "and I hear pretty well."

It would be impudent to suggest that Senator Stone has so quickly forgotten the details of the bill's passage. Even so, his denials do not remove certain questions:

Why was the bill introduced on a busy afternoon late in the session when a number of Senate opponents were in conference committee?

Is it true, or not, that Senator Stone

violated the impartiality of the chair by calling the bill "a good one"?

Is it true, or not, that Senator Stone knew of the bill's existence and knew when it would be introduced?

Even more interesting however is Senator Stone's statement that "if they (the opponents of the bill) want to repeal it, that's all right with me, but I don't think they can." Does this mean that the senator's feeling in favor of the bill has become lukewarm, or that he has had second thoughts about its wisdom? If its repeal means so little as it seems to Senator Stone, it would mean a great deal to the state college administrators who have been entangled in endless embarrassments by it.

Repeal would be a welcome testimony, too, to North Carolina's belief in freedom of speech. And it would certainly be a courtesy to college administrators, University of North Carolina trustees, and the Board of Higher Education.

All these groups are most intimately involved in state-supported higher education. It is their integrity and judgment that the ill-conceived law has impugned. If Senator Stone is as indifferent to its repeal as he seems, perhaps he will join in not opposing that repeal.

Knowing not whereof we speak, ofttimes we've made fun of the women. Today, however, we speak of men as authority on the subject and as one. We've intimated in the past that women are unique individuals; today we'll show you men are just as queer.

Of course, some men are gentlemen; but a gentleman is a man you don't know very well.

Some are conceited and wrapped in themselves; therefore they make sorry looking bundles.

Some are like the railroad station agent the colored farmer found, according to the late Judge W. C. Harris, when he went to make a shipment. The station was more often used as a flag stop than anything else, and the agent handed the farmer the papers and ordered, "Sit down over there and fill 'em out yourself. I'm busy."

The colored fellow, unable to read and write, summed up the situation with: "I was alius told the littler station, the bigger the agent."

He was the type which inspired the Moravian Falls Fool Killer to observe: "Don't be deceived by appearances. Some of the loudest crows you hear at 4 o'clock in the morning come from scrub roosters."

There are other types. Take the man with his nose to the grindstone. He doesn't have it always in someone else's business. As James Robinson wrote in the July 10, 1897, Durham Sun: "When a man has learned his own faults and can see their enormity through the same glass by which he measures another's half the bottle of life is won."

But no two men are alike, I've pointed out in a bit of doggerel: He aimlessly roams the streets And nothing is fit to eat; The ole boy looks let down— His wife is out of town!

He's flirty, gay 'n hearty, An' ready for a party; Today he has no frown— His wife is out of town!

"Talk about wimmen being queer," The Fool Killer said in May 1913. "They are sorter, but the men are purty tolerable queer, too, when you come to think about it."

"Now you take the man at his own home. If he had to climb up on a high stool in front of a table with no cloth on it and eat his meals that way, wouldn't he raise Cain in a hurry? You bet! But the old fool will go to a cheap restaurant, crawl up on a greasy stool between two dirty tramps and gobble down a hunk of raw mule and a bowl of soup made out of dishrags and rainwater and swear he enjoys it all."

"Let a man's wife at home offer him a piece of chicken which she or one of the children had taken a bite of, and he will holler his head off. But he will get out in a crowd and borrow a chair to backer from the first stranger he meets, and that's all right."

"At home he won't drink milk from out of a glass from which one of the family has been drinking, but just call him back into the stall of a livery stable and pull out a bottle and he will stick the neck of the bottle six inches down his throat in order to get a swig."

"Verily, man is a queer duck."

BILLY ARTHUR