

ARE WE WINNING?

A fortnight ago, two steps were taken by the U. S. Government in its battle against Communist ideology to, in the minds of some, insure victory. Offices and property of the *Daily Worker* were seized in several states in a raid by Treasury officials because the newspaper had failed to report its income for tax purposes. The offices of the newspaper were padlocked in New York. A few days later, the Supreme Court ruled that any witness in a loyalty case could not invoke the protection of the Fifth Amendment if the court promised immunity from prosecution for anything the witness might say which might be self-incriminating.

In the minds of some, these acts, precipitated by the seizure of property of the Communist newspaper was, is defensible on the grounds that the state

has the right to protect itself against a known enemy. To others, it was justifiable and probably felt long overdue in that any act which might tend to hurt the Communists and their sympathizers is in order. A few questioned the wisdom of the raid by treasury officials and the court's decision.

It seems to us it would have been far better if the Treasury department had acted in regard to collecting tax from the *Daily Worker* as it usually does in such cases, by announcing to the newspaper before hand that it planned such action if the newspaper failed to comply with its requests. The amount of taxes that it could collect from the *Daily Worker* would help enrich the government far less than the impression that the raid has undoubtedly conveyed

to the rest of the world. Quite frankly, the report of the raids puts in mind of the seizure of La Prensa by the late Peron regime in Argentina and those of the early Hitler regime.

The court's decision undoubtedly curtails the guarantees of protection of private opinion by the Constitution. Granted that the state has a right to protect itself, does it have the right to expose its citizens to public infamy, which would surely result were a witness compelled to state that he was a Communist or Communist sympathizer in 1936?

We wonder if we have really gained in the battle against the communist ideology in these two actions, or have we merely tied ourselves more firmly in a straight jacket of conformity?

MRS. MAGGIE JONES AND THE TRUTH

Last month, Mrs. Maggie F. Jones, aged citizen of Asheville, was featured in the morning newspaper of that city, both in a news story and an editorial as a "Daniel Come To Judgment," because of her idiotic prattle on the race question. Like the dodo bird, we had thought that all such Negroes were extinct and had long since gone to their eternal home or wherever all "Uncle Toms and Aunt Dinahs" go when they pass from this earth.

Here are some pertinent excerpts as quoted from Mrs. Jones' article, called by the Asheville Citizen, as a "Glowing Affectionate Tribute To White People Of South":

What price slavery? You know we have just celebrated the birthday of Hon. Abraham Lincoln for being the signer of our freedom, for which all are sincerely grateful; but we had friends long before his time that we should never forget as long as this world stands. They are the Southern aristocratic Christian slave owners. . . . Then, sooner or later, the war for freedom was on. The South lost. The Negro was set free. The white people lost their wealth and I presume they felt just like we did when the little savings we had worked for and put in a bank were lost through bank failure. Not a cent did we get. It made the dream of a home of our own fade away.

What did the master do? Not a drop of our blood was shed because of the freedom, not one was killed; but the master called the slave together, told them they were free and said: "What are you going to do?" "Master, us dunno. Ain't nowhairs for usses ter go."

"Well, do you want to stay here?" he asked. "You are free and slavery will not be again in my day."

"Yaas Sur, usses goin' stay wid you."

Mrs. Jones represents a concrete example of what happens to a human being in America when he becomes brainwashed with the southern philosophy. When she refers to the "Southern aristocratic Christian slave owners," she produces a most paradoxical monster instead of a person to be served. Who, but Mrs. Jones, ever heard of a Christian slaveholder? No man who embraced the doctrine of Christianity can square slave holding with the teachings of Jesus Christ any more than he can segregation.

Now to take the cake, Mrs. Jones says that not one drop of our blood was shed because of the Negro's freedom. If this depraved, old woman ever attended Tuskegee Institute, she certainly never studied American history. In fact, she should have known

if she never attended any school that over 200,000 Negroes fought on the side of the Union Army in the Civil War and that thousands upon thousands of them died to obtain the freedom of their people. For the benefit of the enlightenment of the Asheville Citizen, Mrs. Jones and the white citizens of Asheville who were doubtless enthralled at this old woman's prattle and her "time worn myth that life in the old was heavenly and that the slaves enjoyed an idyllic existence," we quote from Herbert Aptheker in his book, "The Negro In The Civil War":

"On November 12, 1862, Brigadier General Rufus Saxton reported: 'It is admitted upon all hands that the Negroes fought with a coolness and bravery that would have done credit to veteran soldiers. There was no excitement, no flinching, no attempt at cruelty when successful. They seemed like men who were fighting to vindicate their manhood, and they did it well.'

"On November 22, 1862, Lieutenant Colonel O. T. Beard wrote: 'On the last expedition the fact was developed that colored men would fight behind barricades; this time they have proved by their heroism, that they will fight in the open field.' On March 14, 1863, Rufus Saxton again reported: '... in every action the Negro troops have behaved with the utmost bravery. Never in a single instance have I learned that they have flinched.'

"Gen. E. S. Dennis wrote on June 7, 1863: 'It is impossible for men to show greater gallantry than the Negro troops.' Similar testimony came from Generals Banks, L. Thomas, J. G. Blunt, S. A. Hurlbut, G. C. Strong, A. H. Terry, W. F. Smith, T. J. Morgan and Colonels J. A. Foster, D. G. Ader and J. A. Taylor. General Ulysses S. Grant said little, but his action is quite eloquent. When in 1864, he was made commanding general of the Union forces and transferred from the West to the decisive Virginia front, he insisted upon taking with him 20,000 Negro soldiers.

"A Confederate soldier after a particular engagement exclaimed: 'I never saw such disregard of danger and certain death as these Negroes displayed.' The Richmond Dispatch of August 2, 1864, following another battle, also stood aghast at their astounding courage. Both the Southern soldier and the Southern editor could account for this only with the ridiculous explanation that the members of the regiments were drunk on both occasions!

"Let us observe in some detail, as example, two instances of the great courage of the Negro fighters. Early in 1863 the Confederate forces determined upon a desperate effort to recapture that tremendously important city,

New Orleans. The key to that city was Ship Island. Ten Federal companies guarded it, three white and seven Negro. In April, 1863, this island was attacked by a Confederate force five times more numerous than the defenders. And Union gunboats sent to the aid of the besieged men actually and, it is believed, purposely shelled the Negro troops instead of the enemy. Nevertheless the Confederates were repulsed. The Federal commander declared, referring to the Negro soldiers: 'They were constantly in the thickest of the fight, and by their unflinching bravery, and admirable handling of their commands . . . reflected great honor upon the flag.'

"A Union army laid siege to a strong Confederate force entrenched in Port Hudson, Louisiana, in May, 1863. Two Negro regiments were ordered to attack. They did—through direct and cross fire. General Banks reported: 'The deeds of heroism performed by these colored men were such as the proudest white men might emulate. Their colors are torn to pieces by shot, and literally bedspattered by blood and brains. The color-sergeant of the First Louisiana, on being mortally wounded, hugged the colors to his breast, when a struggle ensued between the two color corporals on each side of him, as to who should have the honor of bearing the sacred standard, and during this generous contention, one was seriously wounded. One black lieutenant actually mounted the enemy's works three or four times, and in one charge the assaulting party came within fifty paces of them. Indeed, if only ordinarily supported by artillery and reserve, no one can convince us that they would not have opened a passage through the enemy's works.' In his effort to achieve the impossible the Negro troops made 'six distinct charges and fought 'from morning until 3:30 p. m. under the most heinous carnage that man ever had to withstand.'

An equally authoritative source of information on the Negro soldiers of the Civil War may be obtained from a history of the Negro "From Slavery To Freedom," written by Dr. John Hope Franklin, former teacher at North Carolina College and now instructor of history at Howard University. On pages 280 to 290 and especially 286, a very true account of the Negro soldier is given. In addition to that, there are numerous other sources from which Mrs. Jones and the Asheville citizens could have obtained more accurate information on whether or not any Negroes gave their lives in the cause of freedom during the Civil War.

As is most always the case, white people do not want to know anything but derogatory facts about Negroes. As a result most of the accounts

of Negro courage in the defense of their own freedom have been deleted from our histories, or written in such ways as to camouflage their achievements.

Mrs. Jones, either intentionally or unintentionally, has done her race a great disservice in leading the white people in Asheville to believe that she represents the thinking element of her group or its leadership. She needs more sympathy than condemnation. The *Carolina Times*, however, cannot allow her, or any other members of her race in North Carolina, to feel or to be led into thinking that their race has not paid the price of freedom in this country.

ing element of her group or its leadership. She needs more sympathy than condemnation. The *Carolina Times*, however, cannot allow her, or any other members of her race in North Carolina, to feel or to be led into thinking that their race has not paid the price of freedom in this country.

Life Is Like That

By H. ALBERT SMITH

THE WEEPING KING

There comes a time in the life of many men when the prospects of broken relationships, the termination of a joyous fellowship, rejection, betrayal, misunderstanding and repudiation cast their gloomy shadow across their trail, or lay upon their spirits the heavy burden of sorrow. So true is this that these men find themselves lonely in the midst of multitudes and possessed of a sense of isolation although touching elbows with others.

Jesus Lonely

I think that this was eminently true of Jesus; so much so that one of our noted preachers, some years ago, wrote a sermon on "The Loneliness of Jesus," which was published with other sermons he penned.

Revealing Words

Bearing out this thesis, there are some words respecting Jesus, found in the 19th Chapter of St. Luke's Gospel record, the 41st verse. These words read: "And when he had come near, he beheld the city (Jerusalem) and wept." They indicate how alone in spirit Jesus was, as well as revealing a profound sadness.

Not Happy

At the time referred to, Jesus was about to make a dramatic entry into the Holy City, an event we call the triumphant entry. He was riding upon a colt, the foal of an ass, upon which his disciples had set him. But, as the Master rode toward the city, he was far from happy, a state of mind and mood his disciples were too blind to detect.

What He Knew

Let us take note of their frame of mind and his. Jesus knew the passover, then at hand, would be his last on earth. He knew that betrayal, denial, heartache, conspiracy and tragedy awaited him. He knew that he was riding to certain death, the horrible agonies of Calvary which would be the climax of his people's rejection both of himself as their Redeemer and his message of salvation.

Disciples Joyful

But those disciples found no such inhibiting visions before their eyes. Still dreaming of Jesus as a political messiah, they felt certain that now he was about to re-establish The Kingdom of Israel, and with glory transcending that of David and Solomon.

Given Acclaim
They spread their garments on the highway as Jesus rode along. They shouted, "Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord! Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!"

Disapproving Pharisees, in that moving throng, challenged Jesus: "Master, rebuke thy disciples!" Whereupon Jesus replied, "I tell you that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."

Unkingly Behavior

The procession moved on. Jesus rode with kingly majesty, yet with sorrow burdening his heart. The disciples walked with tumultuous joy in their souls and visionary pictures in their imaginations. And, then, just as they neared the city—just as Jerusalem burst upon them in all its glory, the Savior, this king anointed of God, did a very unkingly thing. He wept.

A Paradox

What a paradox, an inconsistency this spectacle presents! A king weeping on his coronation day! A king made sad by the ovation of the multitudes and a demonstration of confidence and loyalty essential to any successful rule! Yet, in the face of such, Jesus wept.

Alexander The Great

History records that Alexander the Great wept in the hour when he was master of the world. But we are told he wept because there were no more worlds to conquer. There was no moral vision, no spiritual insight behind those tears. The grief of that conquering king was the sorrow of disappointed ambition and foiled hopes. It was the hunger of a greedy appetite for conquest and glory that could not be satisfied.

Charlemagne

Montgomery tells us that Charles the Great stood one day by a window looking out upon the blue waters of the Mediterranean Sea. In his presence were several officers of his army. One of them who stood by looked up. He saw tears rolling down the cheeks of the Great Saxon King. But the soldier dared not speak although he wondered why his chief was sad.

A Prediction

Charles looked up. He called the soldier to his side. He pointed (Continued on Page Four)

Acceptance Of The New Order Is The Answer



Spiritual Insight

"PRIDE: A DEADLY SIN"

By REVEREND HAROLD ROLAND
Pastor, Mount Gilead Baptist Church



"Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." Prov. 16:18.

Pride is listed among the seven deadly sins. What is this sin of pride which is such a great spiritual problem for us human beings? Pride is that selfish spirit described by the writer of the Proverbs: "Be not wise in thine own eyes." Thus pride is an overbearing, excessive sense of our own importance. It is the attaching of an undue sense of importance to ourselves. And this excessive sense of importance, self glorification or exaltation may apply to individuals, races or nations. Pride is the self parading of its own so-called virtues or fine points. Humility lets others boast it. Pride boasts itself. Thus, it is clear that excessive pride is an enemy of man's spiritual life, and thus may be rightly classed as one of the seven deadly sins.

The Holy writer, therefore, rightly warns us that pride is a deadly enemy of man's spir-

itual life. Pride, as self-exaltation or glorification, is a deadly sin. Excessive pride is an enemy of man's spiritual life. We all know that there is an essential pride which gives dignity and worth to the human personality. A man without this essential pride can be dangerous. But we are talking about excessive pride, which is rank and dangerous selfishness. This destructive pride may be a soul sickness. It may be the soul sickness of Germany under Hitler. Or it may be the dangerous soul-sickness of race supremacy. Thus, this form of pride is rightly classed among the seven deadly sins. It is the characteristic of "HIM THAT HATH A PROUD LOOK AND A HIGH HEART..."

Pride puffs us up and makes us feel ourselves to be better than others. Thus, the excessively proud look with scorn and contempt upon others. In pride the learned looks with contempt upon the unlearned. The

well-to-do may be contemptible toward the so-called poor. The blue blood may look with scorn upon those who may have ordinary red blood. Those who live on the boulevard may look with contempt upon those on the other side of the railroad track. Then, above all, pride with its self-glorification, has given the world the dangerous doctrine of race supremacy. Who can deny that pride is a deadly sin? Who can deny that pride is threatening the peace and harmony of men everywhere?

Pride sets up false standards of value. It overlooks the worth and dignity of others. Pride is blind to the good in others. Why? Pride is so busy looking at itself it cannot see the nobility in others. How much nobility of soul pride has crushed and hampered in this land of ours? Many men and resources are wasted at the shrine of pride. Truly, pride must be classed as one of the deadly sins among men.

Pres. Eisenhower's Statements On Segregation Said Revealing

Alfred Baker Lewis
President Eisenhower at a recent press conference (March 13th), answering a question on his attitude toward enforcing desegregation in the public schools, said that progress must be gradual and we must be patient in enforcing desegregation, because the Southern states had not been acting in defiance of law when they had segregated schools heretofore, but had followed the now discarded Supreme Court ruling that separate but equal schools were Constitutional.

This remark illustrates clearly two facts of present day politics; first, the way in which the Republicans play ball with the reactionary Southern Democrats; and second, the deep ignorance of our President on social and economic issues. For the excuse given by President Eisenhower for the segregated schools in the South, namely that they were separate but equal according to law, is just not true, as nearly everyone but the President knows.

The separate but equal doctrine was laid down by the Supreme Court in 1896. Forty-five years after that here was the situation: The Southern states in 1940 spent on an average only 43 percent as much per pupil for the education of Negro children as they did for the education of white children. (Actually the amount spent per child of school age was still less for a somewhat smaller proportion of Negro children were at school.) Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina spent only one-third or less per Negro pupil compared with

what they spent for each white pupil. In addition, Mississippi spent only 17 percent as much.

By 1952 there had been a very substantial improvement, but the Negro children were not getting what the white children were getting in the South, but 70 percent as much instead of only 43 percent as much. Alabama had gone up in expenditures per Negro pupil compared with whites from 33 percent as much to 80 percent, Georgia from 31 percent to 68 percent, and South Carolina from 30 percent to 60 percent. Even laggard Mississippi had gone up from 17 percent to 30 percent. Even then, despite President Eisenhower, the Southern states on an average (there were individual exceptions like Oklahoma) were still not obeying the law under the separate but equal doctrine.

For President Eisenhower to say in the face of facts, which were known in a general way, though not of course in precise figures, to nearly everyone who thought about the matter at all, that the South has been obeying the old separate but equal doctrine, is just plain nonsense. Either he was abysmally ignorant, or else he was making a specious plea for the South in the hope that he can repeat this year his feat of the 1952 election, by winning several Southern states.

It is worth remarking that the marked improvement in the education of Negro children between 1940 and 1952 was not due to just goodheartedness of the Southern whites. They acted under pressure. During that

Cole Attack Points Up CR Bill

The vicious, unprovoked attack on Nat "King" Cole, in his native Alabama, last week, points up the urgency of the long-awaited Administration civil rights bill, which reached Congress only a few days prior to the attack, together with strong letters of transmittal from Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., one to the Vice-President as Chairman of the Senate, and one to the Speaker of the House.

In the Senate, the letter was read by the Clerk of the Senate, and referred. In the House, the letter was read and action immediately taken by Congressman Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania and Kenneth B. Keating of New York, both Republicans. The two Congressmen introduced the Administration's proposed legislation in identical bills—HR 10340 and HR 10349.

The air, heretofore, filled with the usual accusations as to why this legislation was introduced now. Mrs. Agnes Meyer, wife of Board Chairman Eugene Meyer of the Washington Post, called for a bi-racial White House Conference such as Congressman Adam Clayton Powell and other Democrats have been demanding for some time.

Said Mrs. Meyer: "A White House Conference should be called at once, of the most reputable white and Negro leaders who could be counted upon to seek pragmatic and rational approaches to justice." This column maintains, as it has throughout, that any selection by the White House, itself, of "leaders who could be counted upon" would bring down, forthwith, a bedlam of indiscriminate charges of "polticking," such as those leveled at White House Education Conference

selections, and those already launched against critically-needed CR legislation. The Congress, operating as a body responsible to the electorate, should act promptly on all CR legislation brought before it, from whatever source. If partisan bias is allowed to control its action, that will be evident. It cannot eat its cake and have it, too.

Liberian Envoy, Acclaimed

Ambassador George A. Padmore, new Liberian envoy to the United States, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower at the White House on April 7. His advent, here was hailed as a new look in American-Liberian rapprochement. While his predecessor former Ambassador to the United States Clarence Simpson, now in London, certainly upheld the dignity of his country, an unfortunate tendency to be pompous irked many, here, in and out of diplomatic circles, where "strutting" has long been passe. At the time of his assignment to London, we learned "on good authority" that his successor would be dynamic and friendly, with an out-going personality better suited to the American scene.

Ambassador's Wife

The new Ambassador, who has been Liberia's Assistant Secretary of State for the past six years, is just past 41, and the youngest envoy ever sent here by his country. Not only does he measure up to advance reports, but his attractive wife, Mrs. Mai Wiles Padmore, mother of five Padmore boys aged two to sixteen, also reflects Liberia's "new look." She resigned her post as the first woman Executive Secretary to the President of Liberia—a position to which she worked up from that of

clerk—and was for many years principal assistant to the general manager of the Firestone Rubber Plantation, in addition to managing the extensive Padmore rubber holdings.

Mrs. Padmore is the daughter of Richard S. Wiles, Speaker of the House in the Liberian Legislature from 1934 to 1943, and a niece of the late Liberian Chief Justice Grimes. She is a graduate of the College of West Africa and of the Monrovia Community Commercial School. Howard Chaplain Named Bay State Archdeacon

The Rev. John M. Burgess, Episcopal chaplain at Howard University since 1946, and a canon at the Washington Cathedral for the past five years, last week was named Archdeacon of the Diocese of Massachusetts. Announcement of the appointment has kept the churchman's lines busy, ever since, with messages from well-wishers.

Canon Burgess, a native of Grand Rapids, Mich., will hold the title of "Venerable" which accompanies the rank of archdeacon, one step below that of bishop. On taking office, June 15, he will direct the affairs of 13 missions in the Boston area, and the charitable activities of the Episcopal City Mission.

Before coming to Washington, Canon Burgess was in charge of parishes at his home in Grand Rapids and in Cincinnati. He is a 1930 alumnus of the University of Michigan, and in going to Boston will be returning to the familiar scenes of his religious training at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, where he was graduated in 1934.

During his ten years in the National Capital he has been active in the work of the Wash- (Continued on Page Seven)

SATURDAY

The Carolina Times

APRIL 21, 1956

L. E. AUSTIN
CLATHAN M. ROSS
H. ALBERT SMITH

Publisher
Editor
Managing Editor

M. E. JOHNSON
W. A. HENNESSEE

Business Manager
Advertising Manager

Published Every Saturday by the UNITED PUBLISHERS, Inc. at 435 E. Pettigrew St.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Durham, North Carolina under the Act of March 3, 1879.

National Advertising Representative: Interstate United Newspapers.

No guarantee of publication of unsolicited material. Letters to the editor for publication must be signed and confined to 500 words. Subscription Rates: 10c per copy; Six months, \$2.00; One Year, \$3.00 (Foreign Countries, \$4.00 per year.)