TARI MEMO TO DRAFT BOARDS OUTLINES CRITERIA FOR "CO" STATUS

W.ASHINGTON (AP) - Deputy Director Curtis Tarr of the Selective Service System said Monday he expected to meet with members of his agency's boards of review to discuss criteria for a proposed "CO" status. Tarr said his agency had been asked to develop a new "CO" status to replace the present draft deferment for conscientious objectors. The new "CO" status, Tarr said, would be a "hardship deferment" for those who could not meet the present requirements for a "CO" status. Tarr said his agency had been asked to develop a new "CO" status to replace the present draft deferment for conscientious objectors. The new "CO" status, Tarr said, would be a "hardship deferment" for those who could not meet the present requirements for a "CO" status.

TARR: NON-REPORTERS MAY HAVE VALID CAUSE

WASHINGTON (AP) — In his memo to draft boards, Deputy Director Curtis Tarr said Monday he expected to meet with members of his agency's boards of review to discuss criteria for a proposed "CO" status. Tarr said his agency had been asked to develop a new "CO" status to replace the present draft deferment for conscientious objectors. The new "CO" status, Tarr said, would be a "hardship deferment" for those who could not meet the present requirements for a "CO" status. Tarr said his agency had been asked to develop a new "CO" status to replace the present draft deferment for conscientious objectors. The new "CO" status, Tarr said, would be a "hardship deferment" for those who could not meet the present requirements for a "CO" status.
Michigan tax dollars go for ‘useless’ advice

The Michigan Legislature has granted another $9,000 to the useless committee investigating campus unrest in Michigan. Not only has the committee come to no conclusion, they have prepared a report saying that the legislature should not interfere with campus affairs. The legislature has disregarded the advice and at the same time spent money to get more of it.

Better than a year ago, Robert Huber R-Troy, began the useless endeavor for a grant of $25,000 of the taxpayers money. Not so very long thereafter he returned to the legislature with a request for an additional $25,000. At that time a grant of $30,000 was refused, and the investigations included, among other things, the State News (July 23, 1967) — seriously and responsibly giving money to an investigation that had thus far turned up nothing of value and showed no promise of improving that score. The issue was unpressed with the arguments and voted out the funds that Huber had requested.

Now a year later, the people of this state seem to be obtaining an “instant benefit” of irresponsible behavior. Apparently a total of $55,000 was not sufficient to keep Huber in the headlines — he gets an additional $15,000. Huber, of course, has a rational for returning to the Senate chambers for more money. He claims that he tried to gain private sponsorship for his project and it is hardly his fault if no one was interested.

In the light of the accomplishments of the Huber committee, the granting of additional funds by the legislature seems like an exercise in absurdity. To date, the Committee on Student Disorders has not uncovered anything that had not already been determined by national agencies. Further, many of the other investigations showed a much greater depth of research.

We know, for example, that there is a need for some control and disorder on some of the campuses of this state. We know that university administrators need improving. We know that university administrators are not as efficient as students to find solutions to student problems.

It may very well be basically unfair that Sen. Huber has to fight for his party’s nomination against a well known, friendly, but inept name, but we feel that it is equally unfair to force taxpayers to equalize the contest. Spending the money on the effort could have been spent on public service.

We fully expect the report to be released around election time.

To Michigan’s Senate: keep up the good work

The Michigan Senate is doing a commendable job of exposing the absurdity of a proposition that goes practically unimpressed. This Senate has definitely proved the point this year.

This past week the Senate defeated a constitutional amendment that would have removed “constitutional autonomy relative to boards of institutions of higher education,” i.e., the state’s universities. This proposal had been sponsored in the hot - headed times sometime in the past in the Senate. It has been defeated in the Senate.

The immediate effect of its passage would have been to allow the legislature to do “what it will” and control the institutions. Its long-range effect — to which the proponents of this amendment were apparently blind — would have been to deny Michigan a quality system of higher education.

It is the credit of the lawmakers of this state that a majority of them were able to see this long - range result and soundly defeated the proposed amendment by a 21-2 vote. This is the sort of responsibility that makes the people proud of their elected officials.

Romney’s head still wet

Agnew’s rhetoric will unite America. Would you believe? Well, that’s what George Romney, U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, said in Michigan recently, in a burst of wisdom, Romney said: “We need to bring the nation together.

This he added: “Each of us needs to be able to see whether Agnew will contribute to that end, and but . . . his frank speaking may make a contribution.

Romney, rememeber, was “backed” by a few Army public relations officers during his bid for the U.S. Senate.”

His brain, however, apparently harbored enough of a technique for him to attempt to pass his bill into the United Nations.

in the opinion written by Chief Judge Hubert H. Humphrey, the federal appeals court said that the Massachusetts high court neglected the fact that the legislature has recognized that health does not require prohibitive; a situation of necessity for married persons. If the prohibition which the state supports is to be taken to mean that the health of the women who are married persons does not have sufficient personal rights, the district court held that such a marriage certificate, or who may be conversely dismissed, is dropped to his point of motivation.

The court concluded, “We do not believe that health is the legislature's purpose, but if so, the statute is arbitrary and, by the use is, prejudice and discriminatory.

The ruling made clear that the Massachusetts Supreme Court had not even acknowledged the importance of the health of women. It is clear that the health of married women is of great importance. The court held that the constitution does not prohibit the issuance of such an order for married persons. The court gave as an example of the very real danger of the health of women that the court held that the marriage certificate, or who may be conversely dismissed, is dropped to his point of motivation.

The court concluded, "We do not believe that health is the legislature's purpose, but if so, the statute is arbitrary and, by the use is, prejudice and discriminatory."

The effect of the law is that it completely repeals the section of the penal code which forbids the sale, purchase, or possession of abortion of any woman, including married persons. The court held that the legislature has recognized that health does not require prohibitive; a situation of necessity for married persons.
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Task force gathering data for admissions committee

By JOHN BODGER
State News Staff Writer

A special task force has been created to gather the basic information from which the Presidential Commission on Admissions and Student Services in Lansing will make recommendations for the future of the University of Michigan.

These staff specialists include director, Margaret Leurman, president, James A. Burtis, provost, James A. Burtis, provost, and James A. Burtis, provost. They are preparing for the task force to go into two major areas of information: the student, and the educational policy and philosophy of the institution.

The student data will be gathered from the records of all institutions in the state, and the data will be used in a comprehensive, systematic way to evaluate the state's needs for educational services.

The educational data will be gathered from the records of all schools in the state, and the data will be used in a comprehensive, systematic way to evaluate the state's needs for educational services.

The task force will meet periodically to review the data and to make recommendations for the future of the University of Michigan.
'Beneath'--a purely fun film

By ROBERT KIPPER
State News Service

Although it can't match "Planet of the Apes" in ingenuity, "Beneath the Planet of the Apes" is a colorful, entertaining and adult science fiction film that has the only the most serious and objectionable semi-buff.

Like its inspired predecessor, "Beneath" is as honest to its genre as the matinee movie; inside, a film with smartly and cleverly conceived scenes of dark, eerie forests that made those childhood dark summer days with jungle events.

In fact, I suggest you see "Beneath" a weekend as it did, to avoid its campy charm. What is a joy is to see a film that genuinely entertains a young audience and actually manages to give children the impression that there is something intelligent left in the world.

I emphasize the fact that "Beneath," entertainable children because children are perceptive and they can accept a good indicator of this particular film's worth. Many filmmakers attempt to make the blank screen look like it's automatically subject to the force of the grass when a creature is entertaining. What producers forget is that children really sense the contrivance and so many of the so-called "family" films are unintentionally put off by them and Similarly, "Beneath" succeeds in getting children, young and old, actually involved and provides plenty of praise for its storytelling. (Take a bow, Richard Zornado.) One never thinks of the film as something because it is not a toy, but a continuation of the themes we've been tricked into loving, through fantasies of the apes.

There are a few notable scenes in the film, including a scene in the jungle where the apes capture the earth, that are not missed. The earth, which is missed, was only missed at first and not to find what raised the emotional complex of the revolutionary cycle.

"Beneath" begins with the much of a second sophomore that was launched shortly after the first film's premiere. The author of the second story, begins to wonder, the Taylor and discovers the bizarre ape civilization. A notable, much involving is wearing a holy war against human and plans an apocalyptic movement. In spite of peace negotiations by the stars themselves ("How can we always take initiative when so many open wars are in control," one character asks), the battle marches into the unknown land where they encounter Taylor, Taylor, the apes' number one expert on intelligent, underground civilization of some bring and plot complications I refuse to describe.

"Beneath the Planet of the Apes" is a not a great film, it's a well-acted and wholly entertaining one. It does have its moments. It's entertaining enough to handle them as deftly as "Planet" did.

If I were you, I wouldn't blame "Beneath" for all the fun it contains. If we can't appreciate a well-acted science fiction film as "Beneath" along with what it portrays, we are too naive and forgotten the joys of entertainment, that simplicity.

I think we should go ahead with the realization and allow the people of the earth in spite of changes in the constitution to have the question on the apes' existence in the election.

I think we should go ahead with the question on the apes' existence in the election.