

### The Choice Facing Legionnaires

Those who may still be debating within their souls whether to convict the North Carolina American Legion of discrimination for assigning its Negro units to the tail end of its state convention parade in Durham last Saturday and thereby forcing the Negro units to withdraw from participation may be aided in reaching some decision by the following facts culled from recent WORLD ALMANACS describing the general outlook of the Legion.

"Sept. 11 (1955) — Seaborn P. Collins, national commander of the American Legion, urged members to boycott the Fund for the Republic set up, 1952, by the Ford Foundation. He said the Fund was telling the American people communism was nothing to worry about. Collins considered Robert M. M. Hutchins (former University of Chicago president), fund director, unsuited to direct the project to mold public opinion."

In another place is the following entry which is more revealing of the Legion's attitude toward the world and humanity:

"American Legion Convention Rejects Own Report Clearing UNESCO.

"The 37th national convention of the American Legion in Miami, October 10-13, 1955, elected J. Addington Wagner, 41, a Battle Creek, Michigan lawyer national commander to succeed Seaborn P. Collins of Las Cruces, N. M. Wagner served as a naval officer in World War II and was wounded at Okinawa . . .

"The principal debate centered on the Legion's investigation of UNESCO . . . The convention voted birthday greetings to President Eisenhower, 'our No. 1 Legionnaire'; opposed continued economic aid to India because India 'actually is giving material aid to Communist Russia' . . . endorsed the Bricker amendment to limit treaty-making powers of the Executive; opposed U. S. participation in world government projects; asked U. S. withdrawal from the Korean Armistice Comm. (ission)."

(As a national group, the Legion should be uniquely and first hand familiar with the bloodiness and horror of war since its members are all ex-servicemen, who have participated in every major war of the past half century).

" . . . It defeated a demand that Congress give \$100 a mo. (nth) to every living World War I veteran over 60 . . ."

(The Legion was organized from a group of World War I soldiers in France in 1919, following the Armistice).

"Continued attacks in Legion meetings against UNESCO (United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Org.) over several years led the Legion to appoint a committee to investigate charges that UNESCO was (1) atheistic, (2) communistic or subversive, (3) favorable and tending toward world government.

The committee worked 18 mos. and early in September, 1955, presented a report completely exonerating UNESCO and asserting that all charges rested on misinformation and misinterpretation. It said that accusations made in Los Angeles in 1951 had been found baseless by the Los Angeles Board of Education and by the New York board, that allegations had been circulated by pressure groups and individuals whose aim was to discredit the U. N. The committee was disturbed by an intolerance and implacability of attitude. It warned against namecalling because honest men differed with one another. It told the Legion that communism remains a deadly danger as an idea, but it 'must be met with an idea of greater validity, the idea of the free man deriving his individual rights from God.'

"The convention rejected the report."

Finally, the Legion decided that the lay Commission appointed by the Congress to advise U. S. participation in the UNESCO should be abolished, urged Congress to keep a watch over any UNESCO activities and reaffirmed the Legion position of "opposition to any UNESCO interference in U. S. Schools or 'world government propagandizing' in the U. S., and described UNESCO as disseminating educational materials."

It is difficult to see how any sensitive, fair-minded and honest person can remain a part of an organization which has displayed such obvious neurotic tendencies as those illustrated in the foregoing documentary. With such a retrograde view of the world and humanity, a view point which is all the more illogical because of the circumstances under which the Legion was founded and the experiences which its members have been put through, the Legion imposes a rather sad alternative upon its Negro members, who as a minority must share in the one-world and one-brotherhood concept. It seems to us that they must decide either to withdraw and form an organization of their own or remain with the hope of someday and somehow persuading their brothers to a more tolerant acceptance of things which are not native-born white American products. This is, admittedly, a tough job, but it is no more than Negroes are daily called upon to do. Along with the inevitable humiliation which accompanies the latter choice is the danger that Negro legionnaires may become so engrossed in the details of running their own organizations that they will forget the great goal which separates Legion ideals and those of democracy and, consequently, cease to contend for human dignity. It is therefore imperative that Negro legion members look upon themselves as more than a fun-loving organization and examine their very souls to make certain they can measure up to the task which is theirs.

### THE RIGHT OF DISSENT

Editor's Note: Last May, 1956, Jack O'Dewid, former editor of the Florence, S. C. Morning News delivered a speech before the Hartsville, S. C. Rotary Club. Since that address, Mr. O'Dewid was forced by local advertisers to leave the Morning News and is currently with the Chicago Sun Times. Because of the profound insights into prevailing spirit of our times in the South, the TIMES is reprinting in two installments Mr. O'Dewid's speech. Herewith begins the first installment in the series. The second will appear next week.

I am not here to discuss segregation vs desegregation, important as that is. Something of even greater importance is what the sentiment concomitant to the Supreme Court's decision is doing to the Southland.

My comments will concern what is happening to our section, our people, our ideals and the freedoms the more ardent pro-segregationists say they are defending.

I, personally, think segregation is morally indefensible. If the honest, the sincere, the just and the public spirited want to debate this great issue on the basis of expediency, then there is room for argument and collective progress.

I am not here as a pro-integrationist. You can say that I am here as an anti-pro-segregationist. I am here to say that the nature of the opposition to the Supreme Court has almost reached the tenor that characterized Southern thinking and acting just before the cadets from the Citadel fired on the ship, the Star of the West.

Last June 17, the 'Morning News' ran an editorial entitled "We Can't Win". It expressed the opinion that eventually the Supreme Court's decision would be law in South Carolina. It said that the South is a minority section and will receive minority consideration. It said the decision to be made was not if we will yield but when. The decision, it said, is to be limited to cost and time. We can't determine the eventual outcome—we can only set the price to be paid.

This, I believe, is true. But whether it is true or not, whether opposition is to be a delaying action or a march toward victory isn't as much at issue as is the nature of the opposition. For the sake of argument, let's assume that the South's opposition gains the victory. If everything fine in the South is to be destroyed in the name of segregation, what has been won? If we must destroy exerting positive leadership in the South in order to preserve a social pattern of no positive value, what has been accomplished?

My hope in this matter is that the argument is not an absolute and that there is still room for debate. The South is not welded into a cry, a cause, a flaming sword that will destroy itself rather than admit of modification.

Which ever way the South goes in the difficult tomorrows facing us can only be determined properly if it is determined by people such as you. The leadership of the South is being placed in new—and untested—hands because the historic leadership of our section has done nothing of positive value in the present crisis.

Because the traditional leadership of our section has allowed itself to become intimidated, the new 'leaders' have led us into strange paths. Paths that are dangerous and paths that—

again—threaten to destroy the freedoms these latter day "leaders" say they are fighting to preserve.

Let's look at the nature of the opposition; the dangers of the opposition; and what should be done. The suggestions for remedial action should be of special interest to you. You know whether or not you have been exerting positive leadership in this grave crisis. If you haven't, the suggested remedies will at least remind you that there is a need for honest leadership.

The nature of the opposition has been absolute. A few hours after the Supreme Court announced its decision on that May 17, the cry went up from South Carolina and the Georgia capitol, and from Southern Senate and Congressional offices in Washington—"We will never consent. We will resist to the end. We will never mix. The Supreme Court cannot force us to desegregate."

The nature of the opposition has centered around the theme of State Rights. States Rights is a good cry. And, as G. B. Shaw says, "A good cry is half the battle." Everyone interested in the preservation of the Constitution is interested in States Rights. The rights of the several states must remain inviolate if the republic is to remain strong and to operate within the framework of the Constitution. But loyalty to the idea of States Rights does not demand a loyalty to the abuses of the cry or to the sins committed in its name. To say that the South is defending segregation because the South is interested in States Rights is to construct a defense and opposition on a framework of lies. The South is defending segregation because the South likes segregation. The defense is not properly made in the name of States Rights.

T. S. Elliot had a line in his play, "Murder in the Cathedral," that would best describe this attitude—"The last temptation is the greatest treason, to do the right deed for the wrong reason." "A battle for States Rights is proper, but segregation isn't a good battle ground for a holy crusade.

Southerners can't expect the idea of states rights to be an acceptable battle cry, or legal defense, when they equate states rights with segregation. Ask the average—or superior—Southerner the meaning of the term "States Rights" and he will give you a pro-segregation answer.

Even the magical cry of States Rights is not enough to convince many of us in the South that law and equality under law can mean one thing in one section of the country and something quite different in another section. Any political device that can serve to make one man less a citizen than another, or give him less opportunity than another is, or should be, considered politically immoral.

With our interpretation of States Rights, we are trying to tell the world our Constitutional Democracy means—All men are equal; but, some are less equal than others.

And the nature of this opposition is less a matter of states rights than an attempted return toward state sovereignty. It was established in the 1860's that the states did not have negative powers. Calhoun's beautiful theories of legal rejection through non-concurrence were demonstrated to be unacceptable to the nation.

They are no less unacceptable today. (To be continued)

### "HIS DAY IS COMING TO AND END - THE COURTS HAVE SPOKEN"



### Spiritual Insight

"HE FORGIVES OUR SINS"

By REVEREND HAROLD ROLAND  
Pastor, Mount Gilead Baptist Church

"My son, your sins are forgiven." . . . Mark 2:5.

Man needs the assurance of the forgiveness of sins. Man, so prone to sin, needs to know that God forgives sins. To us we need to be aware of the great spiritual fact of the forgiveness of our sins. We know that we sin. We need also to know and be assured of the fact that God will forgive our sins. Our sins can become an awful, inward and painful burden to us. We can become very burdened by an inner sense of guilt. Yes, sin leaves an inner uneasiness in the mind and the soul of man.

The after effects of our sins can become very painful and burdensome; this is what we call guilt feelings. Why would you struggle on with that painful, uneasy feeling of guilt which follows our sins? Every sin leaves its mark in the body, the mind or the soul. What shall I do? Confess your sins and God is ready to forgive your sins. God in Christ is ever ready to

say to you as he did to the man bearing the burden of guilt and sin a long time ago . . . "YOUR SINS ARE FORGIVEN. . ."

God's forgiveness for our sins means healing in our souls. Forgiveness is soul healing. Forgiveness brings relief from the burdens of our sins. Forgiveness brings quietness to the disturbed and burdened souls of men. Why go on with the soul sickness of sin when you can be healed? Your soul sickness may lead to the sickness of your body. And the soul sickness of sin leads to the sickness of the mind. Many of our body and mind sicknesses are due to the sins we have not confessed. All we have to do is confess our sins and God will heal our souls.

God's forgiveness of sins brings peace to our souls. Many a strife-ridden and turbulent soul is due to some hidden and unforgiven sin we have committed. Be honest and face your sins. Confess your sins before

God and man and you will find the rich fruits of inward peace. And inward or soul peace is the only true peace. We seek in vain for real peace until we make peace with God and man. When we face and confess our sins then we are ready to receive the wonderful, matchless peace of God. Confess your sins and God will give you his peace. Is not this the heart of . . . "The peace of God which passeth all human understanding?"

The joy of salvation is that the mighty burden of guilt and sin has been taken away. When our sins are forgiven by God we can say with the poet . . . "O happy day that fixed my choice on Thee my Savior and my God. . . ." What a joyous blessing to know that God is ever ready to forgive all of our sins. Let us be honest and confess our sins that we may find the rich spiritual fruits of God's forgiveness.

By Robert Spivack

### Watch on the Potomac

THE UNTIMID TEXAN WASHINGTON

Ralph W. Yarborough, the new Senator from Texas, is getting the "let's look him over" treatment from friend and foe alike as he settles down to his new role as a legislator. As his colleagues, Sens. Kefauver, Douglas, and Humphrey well know, being a liberal anywhere is tough enough these days. But being a "liberal" in oil-rich Texas is probably as tough an assignment as any man can impose upon himself.

In his first eight weeks in the Capitol, Yarborough has acquitted himself on several scores but still has to prove himself on others.

You get some idea of the problems facing a man like Yarborough in examining a speech he made here recently before the Woman's National Democratic Club. It might have made headlines but for some reason many Capitol correspondents did not know about it until several days after delivery.

"Coming, as I do, from five years of continual political warfare in Texas where every force of greed and avarice in that state were aligned against us . . . I have been stunned almost to silence by the kindness and generosity of the treatment accorded us in Washington," Yarborough said, speaking for himself and his family.

His remarks were interspersed with comments that indicate

he spoke with considerable feeling.

Yarborough's topic was "The Democratic Future". The text, we understand, is now being studied carefully by his fellow-Texans, Senate Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson and Speaker Sam Rayburn. There are many who think his remarks were aimed primarily at them.

"When the Democratic Party quits tiptoeing down timidity street, and, boldly, as Roosevelt, proclaims its faith and belief in men over money and machines, then will America again place her faith in the Party of Jefferson and Jackson and of Wilson, of Roosevelt and Truman.

"I fervently pray for that day," Yarborough said. "I want my children and their children to live in the same pure air that was on this earth in the days of man's first creation."

THE YARDSTICKS OF A TEXAS LIBERAL — Yarborough then did what few Democratic senators do these days. He listed the "issues" which, in his judgment, indict the Eisenhower administration as the "cult of the dollar worshipers".

First, he spoke of huge tax write-offs to the giant utilities. They total, he said, \$788 million or "ten dollars a person from every wage earner in America. . . ." Next, he mentioned the high interest and "hard money" policy. This lifts

between \$10 billion and \$15 bil-

lion from the taxpayers annually.

Other items included the "discount rate" in homebuilding, which rockets the cost of many mortgages to 15 per cent interest per year. The "farm decline," he continued, has driven 300,000 farm families toward the cities since the Republicans took over.

Finally he praised Sen. Kefauver, who is particularly unpopular with the Johnson-Rayburn combine and he had nice things also to say about Adlai Stevenson.

To any Northern Liberal, though, there were two obvious gaps in Yarborough's political manifesto. There was not a word on civil rights. Nor was there any mention of the new efforts to put across a Natural Gas bill.

Political realities being what they are in Dixie it is probably asking too much for any Texas officeholder to speak up on these issues. Yarborough's talk would probably have had greater impact if he had, at least, acknowledged that the problems exist.

Sen. Douglas said recently that no one expects a man in political life to "commit suicide". But there are others who will await with interest some comments from Yarborough, they will want to hear what suggestions an intelligent Southern "moderate" has for solving these perplexing problems.

### City Council Mentality Demands Superior Humanity

It is to be wondered how anyone can maintain a faith in the ultimate triumph of democracy, freedom, justice and human decency in the South in the face of such long and adamant opposition by this section to the laws of the country which would proclaim freedom and equal treatment for all its citizens. This opposition was displayed in classic form to us in Durham by Monday night's drama at the City Council chamber.

For the past two years since segregation in public facilities has been declared illegal and the injunction upon exercise of governmental powers imposed by the ruling made abundantly clear in a number of decisions by several branches of federal court, the Durham City Council has chosen to ignore the mandate of the court and continues to pursue its traditional course of segregation. In two years time, it has not even given the glimmer of a hint that it would even try gradually to bring its policies in line with those of the national government.

Monday night, it was told by one of its own, the City Attorney, that it can no longer segregate legally in the use of public facilities. In spite of the abundant testimony of federal courts and now that of one of its own, the Council, according to the report of daily newspaper, "made no move to indicate it will soon abandon" segregation. In effect, the ac-

tion or inaction of the Council says to all who would hear:

"We know that we can't segregate legally. We have heard the voice of the federal and Supreme Courts, and now we hear the voice of our own lawyer. But we will continue to disobey, to remain outside of the law until we are forced to comply."

Most people who are interested in the extension of democracy to all the people have long since read the mind of southern officialdom. Negroes who are tired of bearing the enslavement of segregation know that to win full freedom for themselves they must take the initiative, since their elected officials have proven all too long and too well that they intend to default on this issue. But when they do take the initiative, they are persecuted; their organizations, like the NAACP, are harmstrung with a bunch of police restrictions, they are denied credit, jobs, their places of business are boycotted, they are dismissed from their jobs, their homes and churches are bombed, and often they are subjected to physical violence. Lately, in Durham, they have been accused of acting in "bad faith."

It requires superior humanity to deal with the kind of thinking that is in evidence in Durham's City Council.

### INVITING THE UNDERTAKER-



**CAROLINA TIMES**  
 MAIN OFFICE — 436 EAST PETTIGREW STREET  
 Phones 5-0871 and 2-2913 — Durham, North Carolina  
 Published At Durham, North Carolina Every Saturday By  
 THE UNITED PUBLISHERS, Inc.  
 Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Durham, North Carolina under the Act of March 3, 1879.  
 L. E. AUSTIN, Publisher  
 CLATHAN ROSS, Editor  
 M. E. JOHNSON, Controller  
 WINSTON-SALEM OFFICE — 304 N. CHURCH ST. — PHONE 5-0869  
 MRS. DOROTHY M. ROBINSON, Manager  
 SUBSCRIPTION RATES  
 One Year Ten Cents Single Copy  
 \$3.00 \$2.00 Six Months \$4.00 — Foreign Countries.