

**THE YANCEY RECORD**  
 BURNSVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA  
 ESTABLISHED 1936

EDWARD A. YUZIUK - EDITOR & PUBLISHER  
 CAROLYN R. YUZIUK - ASSOCIATE EDITOR  
 ARCHIE BALLEW - PHOTOGRAPHER & PRESSMAN  
 JERRY McGUIRE - ADVERTISING MANAGER  
 MISS PATSY BRIGGS - OFFICE MANAGER

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY  
 YANCEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT BURNSVILLE, N. C.  
 THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1970 NUMBER FIVE

SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$3.00/YEAR  
 OUT OF COUNTY \$5.00/YEAR

**SENATOR  
 SAM ERVIN  
 SAYS**



WASHINGTON—Confronted with a new national mood and changing priorities, the President's State of the Union Address eloquently presented the challenges of the new decade. The Address, however, did not blueprint proposed solutions to our problems. The Chief Executive said he would propose his remedies in a dozen or more special messages to the Congress later in the session.

There was much common ground between the sentiments of the President and the Nation on what the problems are. With respect to foreign policy, he called for an end to the Vietnam War through a just peace. He announced also that his foreign policy would deal with the realities of a world that has changed much in the last twenty-five yrs. and said the time has come for us to "reduce our involvement and our presence in other nations' affairs." In essence, what the President appeared to be saying was that we have strained our economy and our resources in trying to act as the world's policeman, an opinion which I have expressed many times during the last two decades.

The two other key issues mentioned by the President—*inflation and crime control* -- certainly strike a responsive note in the minds of Americans. I am gratified that the President announced that he would present a balanced budget for fiscal 1971. He correctly blamed deficit Federal spending which has occurred in many prior years as the cause of today's rising prices. In calling for a broad attack on crime, the President was emphasizing anew what most Americans have urged for some time. It should be remembered, however, that neither of these most pressing domestic problems has yet been responsive to simple rhetoric. Any relief in these areas will require the cooperative efforts of our entire governmental structure. Congress and the Executive branch must work together to control Federal spending and inflation. Both of these branches of the Government sorely need the cooperation of the Judicial branch to cope with crime.

The President laudably gave environmental pollution control a priority status in the Administration's catalog of programs. Unquestionably, there is much need to continue the major programs enacted by the Congress in this area in recent years. There was some friction between Congress and the Administration at the last session when Congress raised the budget request for anti-pollution control. It remains to be seen just how the President will seek to implement existing Federal efforts to purify the air we breathe and the water we drink.

While the President advocated new solutions for most of the nation's ills, and should be commended for so doing, his message shed no light on one of the most troublesome problems of this hour -- the crisis of the public schools and what we could and should do to improve that situation. It would have been laudable if the President had urged that we take a realistic approach to this problem also. Indeed, it would be refreshing if the nation embarked upon a new policy which emphasized education as the prime function of the public schools.

**How About A Moratorium?**

How about a moratorium asking the Communists to quit killing, maiming and torturing in Vietnam? Or are the leftists who organize moratoria

under the impression that when Communists kill, maim and torture it doesn't hurt -- or it doesn't make any difference?  
 —Indianapolis (Ind.) Star

**straight talk**

By Tom Anderson



**MR. AGNEW IS CORRECT**

Under the so-called "fairness doctrine" of the FCC, broadcasters are supposed to give "equal time" to the "other side" on controversial questions.

Mr. Agnew says he believes both sides have a right to be heard. But the main reason broadcasting is so one-sided is not because of Frontley and Pinkley, but because of the government itself. Big Brother, through the Federal Communications Commission's "fairness doctrine," has decreed that the "other side" must be given equal time to present its side of controversial subjects. What's controversial? It's what FCC says is. And the FCC is loaded with "Liberals." In the past, anything which was against the New Frontier and Great Society "line" was "controversial." In other words, Socialism is not controversial, but anti-Socialism is. Stations which have an over-balance of anti-Socialist programs are subject not only to giving equal time, but are subject to losing their license.

CBS and NBC are the worst. The comparison between them reminds me of the time the Earl of Sandwich (who invented the sandwich) was challenged by backbencher John Wilkes in the English Parliament. Sandwich was kind of a ladies' man, but he was tough in debate and told Wilkes that he was a no good So-and-So and that he'd surely die on the gallows or of a dread disease. Wilkes replied: "That depends, my lord, whether I embrace your principles or your mistress."

Being able to switch channels and get Frank McGee or Howard K. Smith instead of Walter Cronkite is like getting shipwrecked on a desert island with your own wife.

Last year the FBI and other investigators, doing work for the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee chaired by Rep. Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, delved into the production of CBS's "documentary" mislabeled "Hunger in America." Investigators discovered that

much of the film was deliberate distortion. In one dramatic scene in the movie, a CBS commentator solemnly stated that a baby he was looking at had just died of starvation. But the doctor who had pronounced the baby dead told House Investigators that the baby was not even undernourished and had died from other causes.

Agnew has done well. But that's not enough. We should demand a congressional investigation of the news media—print and air—of this country, because sinister monopolists and government, are destroying our right-to-the-truth. They own the shoe store and are buying all the shoes to fit themselves: The guts of the issue is that the networks have too much power. They have a government-sanctioned monopolistic stranglehold on the people's airwaves. The answer to that is simple: kill the networks. Return television news production and programming to the independent stations. Thus, the diversity of opinion and the competition of the free market would take over. Let's beseech Congress to pass an airwaves *anti-monopoly law* to prohibit any corporation, individual or group from owning more than one station and also to prohibit any station from affiliating with any group of stations, newspaper or wire service, and to prohibit joint ownership of newspapers and radio or TV stations.

Anti-monopoly statutes should bar joint ownership of radio or TV or newspapers in the same city. Newspaper monopolies should also be broken up.

In a skin doctor's office, a woman waiting for her ultra-violet treatment kept staring at the peculiar marking on the face of another woman.

"You been x-rayed?" she asked.  
 "No'm, I been ultra-violated!"

The American people have been ultra-violated by the networks.—American Way Features



**BILL KENNEDY:**

**LET THE FED'S STATES PAY THE TAB**

If the feds are going to dictate the detailed operation of local school systems, it is nothing less than fair for all 50 of the consenting states to pay the bill.

There is absolutely no doubt now that the high and mighty Supreme Court of this "Land"—the self same court that ignored the unconstitutional law permitting the Justice and HEW Departments to persecute the citizens of selected states with regulations that do not apply to people in the majority of the states, and who in fact aided and abetted the persecution with its own rulings—this high court will never permit the browbeaten states to help their downtrodden people with appropriations of extra local funds.

In short, the Supreme Court of the United States of America—the 1960's version face-lifted—will never allow Mississippi, Alabama nor Georgia (nor any of the select states where the people no longer are free to guide the education of their children) to appropriate funds for private schools. Every lawmaker, be he a first-term state legislator from the sticks or a national politician, or demagogue, should be able to see that verse boldly inscribed in the handwriting on the wall. (If there is one who doesn't see it, please pass this on to him so he can take it from a scribbler who sees it plain as day.)

If there are any lawmakers and executives in any of these states worth the salt in their daily expense allowance, there is one thing left that they surely can do; that is to repeal every state law that earmarks any taxes whatsoever for "public" education.

Since the Federal Government insists on directing the educational processes in every detail in these states . . . then let the federal government pay for said education.

This will accomplish two just results: 1) it will give some tax relief to local citizens (all

colors, please) so that they may more nearly afford the private schools they see as the only acceptable solution; and 2) it will let the majority of the people and states, who sat quietly by to let six states be violated, share heavily in the expense of keeping federal schools open in the states where privacy was violated. They deserve every dollar it costs them, as they continue to sit by and await their turn.

The vast majority of whites and blacks, separately and in unison, given an honest freedom of choice have plainly indicated that they prefer to have their children attend schools where most of the students and teachers are of their own race. This can be confirmed by anyone who wants to take the trouble to seek the truth, and is further indicated by the demands of blacks in integrated schools who now want separate dorms and studies departments. Beyond all that, it is a common sense choice. And those who do not see it that way are free to "mix" at will.

This experiment in manipulation of the lives of people by an all-powerful federal authority is a shame and disgrace resting on the collective heads of an entire society in a so-called free nation. There has been much talk lately about the "sins of society;" this is one case where there is little doubt that our society as a whole is guilty, for only the society can do something about it.

When the time comes when this same edict of absolute balance in race mixing is applied to the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area, and to city school systems in New York, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland and elsewhere, there are sure to be revolts by both black and white races. But it will be too late, more likely; the federal police force will already have set its pattern in the Deep South.—American Way Features