

Gov. Will Speak-No More To Negro Audiences

There was a time in North Carolina when the simple announcement that the governor will speak to a Negro audience was sufficient to fill the largest auditoriums available for Negroes. Men rushed home from the farms, factories and begged off from wherever else they were employed. Women left the wash-tub, the kitchen or wherever they were employed. It was no unusual sight to see a mother seated in the audience with a baby in her lap and two or more small children hovering close by in order that she and the children might hear and see the governor. What the governor said or how he said it mattered little. The mere fact that he had condescended to take time out to honor a Negro audience with his presence was sufficient to attract Negroes from all walks of life and label the Negro who was able to get him to do so a leader among his people.

Quite often, at these occasions, there would be seated on the platform both the fair weather and stormy weather friends of this leader of leaders who would vie for a handshake with the governor or his approving nod or smile. Those were the good old days when governors were looked upon by Negroes as being a little lower than angels, and no Negro dared

say or even think otherwise, lest his leader of leaders label him a radical and use his influence to keep his son or daughter from getting a job teaching in the county or city school system. Yes sir, those were the good old days.

Usually, when the governor would speak, it would be at a Negro state college commencement where the president would pull out all stops with his introduction, and at which time he would declare the governor the savior of the Negro race, the uncrowned president of the United States or some other equally ridiculous misnomer. Such an introduction was usually good for another building, especially if the president had previously hinted to the governor that he wished to name the next building erected on the campus after him. Thus, on every Negro state college campus we have building after building bearing the name of a governor of this state.

Well, a rose by any other name would smell just as sweet and a building by the name of a governor will house just as many students or just as much classroom equipment.

We believe about the last attempt made at this time-worn comedy was when the late Dr. F. D. Bluford invited Governor Hodges to speak at A. and T. College. The episode will not soon be forgotten as

one in which the college, president, the governor and faculty members were made to realize that a new Negro had arrived on the scene, and that he represented a new day and new thinking. As soon as the introduction was over and the governor had begun his speech and started pronouncing the word Negro as "nigra" there came repeated hisses from the audience. Sweat rolled from the brows of the president and faculty members and a bewildered look stood on the face of the governor.

Yes sir, thank God those days are gone and may they never return. At their best they were days when hypocrisy, deceit and cowardice reigned supreme among Negro leaders. Those were the days when Negro college presidents were expected to have a big bag of tricks to work on the governor and other state officials to keep their schools going, and Negro school principals were expected to have a small bag of tricks to hold their jobs, keep their teachers living in fear and trembling and work on the Superintendent of Education to get some second-hand equipment and books from the white schools. Yes sir, THE GOVERNOR WILL SPEAK—NO MORE TO NEGRO AUDIENCES.

Free Transportation And The Vote

Last Tuesday, our office was besieged by telephone calls from well and able-bodied persons requesting (some demanding) transportation to the polls in order that they might cast their ballots in the national elections. One woman caller became indignant when she was informed that no transportation had been provided and retorted: "how do you think people are going to vote if you don't take them to the polls?" This editorial is being written for fear that there is a growing tendency among some short-sighted persons that they are doing persons other than candidates a favor to cast their ballots in an election.

It is understandable that on election days, especially in primaries, our office receives a number of telephone requests for transportation to the polls. In the past, when interest in voting among Negroes in Durham was at a very low ebb, it became one of the central concerns of the Durham Committee on Negro Affairs. In trying to overcome the apathy toward participating in elections, the Committee established a system whereby free transportation was provided as an inducement for persons wishing to vote. Our office has often served as the control center for that operation.

But voting is the greatest privilege any person living under a democratic form of government can exercise, and the only person any lower than one who will sell his vote is an able-bodied one who will sit home on election day and refuse to budge unless someone hauls him to and from the polls. The right of the governed to select who shall govern them is so highly treasured that in some countries many have died and are dying to secure and maintain that right. In this country, where the right to vote is, except for some areas in the South, an accepted privilege, no honorable person who is able-bodied should demand free transportation as the price of exercising it.

Probably there should be a law against hauling persons to the polls unless they are

physically handicapped. Too often the person or persons who pay for the hauling controls the voting of the hauled. It might not be a bad idea for students of political science to make a study of the situation to determine if the free exercise of the ballot and the best interest of democracy can be promoted under a system that encourages persons to demand that they be paid to vote in the form of free transportation to the polls.

To sit at home and demand transportation to and from the polls in exchange for a vote is the same as being paid to vote. It is really bribery, and according to such interpretation is in violation of the federal laws. And while we can understand that the idea has been fostered in Durham that free transportation can be had by those wishing to vote, we cannot excuse the attitude which demands a free ride for the vote, especially at a time in our existence when people of Hungary and Poland are dying for the right to vote freely.

The Middle East Debacle

Despite the really alarming implications which the crisis in the Middle East now poses to world peace, within that situation lies a real opportunity for the United Nations and the United States to emerge as the real forces in the drive for peace. Already under distrust and suspicion by a majority of the darker-skinned countries of the world because of our past support of the colonial policies England and France, the United States now has a real opportunity to convince the uncommitted nations of the world that it sincerely believes in self-direction for all peoples of the world and is the real guardian of freedom. By taking a firm position in the Middle East crisis, by taking a position on the side of the victims, we can prove to the world that our talk about freedom and democracy is more than mere talk.

In like manner, if the United Nations is able to mobilize an effective police force to put an immediate end to the conflict in the Middle East, it will have come a long way towards insuring the permanence of its existence.

We realize that it is going to be difficult for the world to judge just who is wrong and who is right in that complex affair. But as fraught as the Middle East situation is with complexities, as difficult as it might be to point unswervingly to the villains, the United States must now allow the great moral force for peace which it still maintains to be lost by default in inaction. It must, through the United Nations, find the guilty parties in the present conflict and, through the United Nations, press for their censure. Regardless of the Egyptian provocations, the rightness or wrongness of Colonel Nasser

in nationalizing the Suez Canal, the fact that Israel, Britain and France deliberately risked a third world war to settle the issue themselves cannot go uncensured.

We must, it seems to us, push for condemnation of the British, French and Israeli aggression upon Egypt, just as we rightly did in Korea and the case of recent Soviet interference in Hungary. For how can we continue to hold the respect of the world, much of which has only recently emerged from the shackles of colonial domination, if we condemn only communist imperialism and close our eyes to the imperialistic actions of our allies?

We realize that to expect such forthright and bold action of the United States and the United Nations may be in the main wishful thinking. We seriously doubt that the United States is prepared

at this time to oppose with force or sanction the use of same against her time-honored allies of Britain and France. But, we feel that the time is fast passing when we can continue to talk out of both sides of our mouth like the soap box politicians and still command the respect of the uncommitted and free nations of the world. If we allow

the influence which our country still has in the United Nations and the world to be defaulted by inaction, we will have lost one of the few remaining opportunities to prolong the uneasy peace we now enjoy. And who is ready to be accountable for a war with such fearsome weapons as we have now invented?

FACING THE ISSUE

By DR. A. H. GORDON

"THE PATH TO PEACE"

In order to meet the publisher's "deadline" this column had to be written, of course, before our Presidential Election. It may be that by the time you read this President Eisenhower may have been re-elected or it may be that we have a new President by the name of Stevenson. No matter who is president of the United States, he faces one great challenge and that is the challenge to lead this nation to and along in the path to peace.

At the time this is written the United States is not in the path of peace but is actually fighting on both sides in the hot war now in progress in the Middle East. It may seem paradoxical to say that the United States is not at peace but fighting on both sides. This seeming paradox is true because the United States has actually furnished material aid to both sides prior to the war and without that aid neither would be fighting today. This came about through the practice by the United States, England and France in building up the economic and military strength, directly or indirectly, of both sides. Eisenhower and Dulles were responsible for this policy of trying to keep the peace by preparing the U. S. and helping others to "defend" themselves by the use of military force. All this was done while we were preaching peace from the house top of the United Nations. We have pointed out previously in this column that preparation for war is not the way to achieve peace.

During his strenuous campaign for election Stevenson stated that we might at least move in the direction of the path of peace by outlawing the use of Hydrogen Bombs and by planning to do away with universal military training. Eisenhower rejected this since he believed that, in the last analysis, a nation could only "defend" itself with military might. The

War which started in the Middle East proved what all historians already knew, that preparation for war inevitably leads to war because it is not anywhere on the path to peace.

As the situation now stands at the time of this writing the only way we can get on the path to peace is to grant the United Nations the right to quickly constitute a powerful police force with the aggressors, (England, France, and Israel) excluded from any participation or in contribution to this special police force. Russia, the United States, India, and China should be the chief contributors to this police force. Our "A" and "H" bombs and the atomic powered submarine of the United States should be turned over to or made available to the United Nations police force. The suggestions made by England and France that they be allowed to participate in the United Nations Police force is absurd on the face of it and their requests in that matter should be disdainfully rejected and ignored as they did the Security Council and General Assembly of the U.N. Unless Stevenson is President, after the election on Tuesday, there is not, of course the slightest chance that the UN will be given such a police force. Eisenhower is positively cowardly in dealing with England and France just as he was cowardly in dealing with the Southern rebellion against the desegregation of our public schools.

The situation existing today is a revelation of the grave mistake the United States has made in creating NATO and in giving England and France military and economic aid for the so-called defense of western Europe. Had it not been for the blunder of the United States in this matter, England and France would be too weak to try to steal the Suez Canal from Egypt.

Dr. A. H. Gordon



"Eternal Vigilance Is The Only Answer To Their Persistence"



Spiritual Insight

"HELP FOR TROUBLED FAMILIES"

By REVEREND HAROLD ROLAND
Pastor, Mount Gilead Baptist Church

"It will be easier for you...they will bear the burdens with you." Ex. 18:22

Distress, trouble and conflict will arise in our families at times. Our burdens become seemingly unbearable. A burden shared is a burden made lighter. Thus, amid our troubles and burdens in family life we need to know that there are persons and agencies that will help us with our burdens. In the vital intimate and delicate relations of the home and family life, the going can get rough at times. Yes, we come to trying times in family relations; misunderstandings and distresses threaten our marriage and our home. Sickness can tax the resources of the family to the utmost.

Amid the pressures which threaten the family and the home we need to know that there is a ready and helping hand for distressed families. We need the help of some who loves, cares and understands, and also someone who can give us insight and light as we stand anxiously in our distressed and burdened conditions.

We have an agency with a fine group of persons, whose business is to offer a helping hand to distressed families—The Family Service Agency. It is yours! It is ready to serve you. The people who operate this agency have the loving understanding touch needed in time of family distress. Why try to carry that heavy burden alone? These people of the family service are concerned about helping you. The text beautifully expresses the aim of family service. "It will be easier for...they will bear the burdens with you..."

We all need help at times. We all have burdens that we cannot bear alone. Life, at times, becomes temporarily unmanageable for all of us; and at times we all stand in need of a helping hand. In times of family trouble the family service has a well trained group of people to help you. Call and they will answer. If you have come to distressed and troubled days, why not let the family service help you.

Here are some ways in which the family service can help you: when husbands and wives are worried about their marriages failing; offer help to unhappy older people; offer understanding helpfulness to unwed mothers; when there is undue anxiety about your job; when there is mental sickness in the home; offer aid in planning for the care of children when the mother is incapacitated; offer budget counseling for the family finances; offer a trained homemaker service for needy older people or children.

The family service is ever ready to extend a helping hand through trained counselors to help distressed members of the family think through, and solve their problems.

Remember, my friends, that the Family Service Agency of our community is ready to help you. They are ready to extend to you a loving helping hand, call them. The primary aim or purpose of the Family Service is to make a stronger, happier, community by extending a helping hand to distressed and troubled families. They are ready to extend a helping hand to you. (Please call 5-4261 or 4-3871.)

Capital Close Up . . .

By CONSTANCE DANIEL

Who Go to What Schools and Why

Professional segregationists like Georgia's Congressman James C. Davis, and Senator Eastland of Sunflower County, Mississippi, have attempted, late, to make a case against school integration by such devices as demanding information on the public schools attended by the children of public officials living in the National Capital, or, in the case of Mr. Eastland, by spectacularly withdrawing his own offspring from a private school where a Negro child was enrolled.

Eastland Stunt Backfires

The Eastland stunt backfired in a big way, when it was revealed that the small son of Capital newsworthy, Dr. and Mrs. Edward C. Mazique, active and well-known civic and interracial workers, had been recommended to the school by white parents of other Sidwell Friends' School children—parents from the Deep South—who welcomed this opportunity for normal interracial contact.

Selective Education

Enlightened Americans generally regard the support of free public schools as their duty and privilege. So long as they discharge this duty, the selection of a particular school for the education of their own children, is also their privilege. The reasons for such choice may be multitudinous.

For instance. Our paternal grandmother, the child of free Negro parents in North Carolina, went to a white school mistress in a garret in Wilmington, with her forbidden books tucked under her small apron, and another child standing guard at the attic door, since the law in that State, "before the War," forbade teaching Negroes to read or write. The family migrated West and then North, to free territory, and the next generation was educated in the public schools of Massachusetts.

Our maternal grandmother attended a convent school to avoid inferior segregated schools in Providence, Rhode Island. Our Newport, Rhode Island grandfather, less fortunate, had no formal education, but acquired culture by contact, and made money.

Why the Private Schools?

The taxes of this self-taught citizen helped to support both white and segregated schools in Providence. He worked hard to get rid of the segregated schools and in the meantime sent all but two of his offspring to private schools in Massachusetts. The last two children were sent to public schools in Massachusetts, where by this time the family had established a second residence for this purpose. They entered the Providence public schools only when segregation was ended. Our mother's high school diploma bears an 1871 date, and she entered the first class that admitted Negroes. The reasons for these choices are self-evident.

Many Negroes, Today, Choose Private Schools

Many Negroes, today, are sending their children to private schools—often at considerable sacrifice—because they want them to have the stimulus of the intellectual competition afforded, and a cultural environment found in very few public schools—segregated white, segregated black, or integrated. Wilbraham, Phillips, Exeter, Groton, Northfield and many other schools whose names have become synonymous with the best in selective education for generations, are among their choices, just as Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Bowdoin, Radcliffe, Vassar, Williams or wherever may be chosen in preference to any other seat of higher education, public or private.

Some parents, Negro as well as white, select private schools of their religious faith. In two families that we know rather well, several years of public schooling are followed by private schooling, so that the children will benefit by both experiences.

"This, as we see it, is their business—a luxury, perhaps, or a necessity, according to the point of view.

Free Choice for All

By the same token, it is as impertinent as undemocratic to inquire into the personal educational choice or preference of any American family, or to attempt to attribute motives as to why such choice was made, whether the family is that of the President of the United States, the Vice-President, a senator, governor, mayor, city commissioner, or plain John Q. Public, of Main Street.

And About Supporting Public Schools

In 1811, Paul Cuffe, a Negro navigator and ship owner of Westport, Massachusetts, near New Bedford, was exploring the West African Coast, starting colonization on his own—and (Continued on Page Seven)

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

No matter who wins this Tuesday's election, Congress and the American people need to face the fact that the Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution has fallen far short of clearing up the muddle that would result from the death of a President-Elect before he took the oath of office.

It is clear enough that if the President-Elect should die between the meeting of the Electoral College and the date of the inauguration—that is, between next December 17 and January 20—the vice President would become President. The Twentieth Amendment makes that mandatory. But what if the winning candidate should die between November 6 and December 17?

The uncertainty and the danger on that score do not arise from legal ambiguity, but from political factors. The law is clear enough. The Presidential electors would meet in state groups on December 17. Those of the minority party would vote for their surviving candidate. Those of the majority party, whose candidate had died, would have legal power to vote for anybody they wished to. If they concentrated on one man, he would become the next President. If they scattered their votes, the House of Representatives would do the electing.

When the resolution to submit the Twentieth Amendment came before the House of Representatives of the 72nd Congress, the House Report sloughed off this aspect of it as unimportant. "The problem in such a case," the report stated, "would be a political one," which the party would take care of by designating the person for whom the electors should vote.

To guard against the scattering of votes, or a vacancy before the general election, both the Republican and Democratic National Committees are authorized by their party conventions to fill any vacancy in their tickets. That clears up the matter as far as the party wheelhorses are concerned, but where does it

leave the country?

There may not be much difference between a national convention and a national committee. But there is a vast difference between nominating a candidate at the outset of a campaign, to bid for the votes of 80,000,000 men and women, and handpicking one after the election, with absolute certainty that he will become President whether the people like it or not. Professional politicians commonly join in presenting better candidates than they really want, in order to win, would they do the same if they, and not the people, had the final say-so, as they would have if death enabled them to choose a substitute for their nominee after he had carried the day?

This aspect of the Presidential succession is of growing import. A century and a half ago, candidates for President made campaign speeches. Had one done so, it would have shocked the country. Today, the combination of long campaigns with television, barnstorming and handshaking has imposed a strain upon candidates which might make the healthiest of them drop dead in the moment of victory or defeat. The first time that happens, it will put a strain upon the American Government never before encountered by it.

Congress has implied power, if we may judge the Constitution by the views of its framers, to order a special election to choose a President when one dies in office and his place is taken by the Vice President. There is no similar power in the case of a presidential candidate who dies before he takes office. Yet the need is greater because the existing machinery, or lack of it, takes the choice farther from the people and deeper into the realms of chance and mischance. The danger is lasting, and calls for action. No nation ever damaged itself through foresight or saved itself by hindsight.

Irving Brant
Washington, D. C.

The Carolina Times
 MAIN OFFICE — 436 EAST FETTER STREET
 Phones 5-0671 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 W. A. HENNESSEE, Business Mgr.
 CLATHAN ROSS, Editor JESSE GRAY, Advertising Mgr.
 M. E. JOHNSON, Controller
 WINSTON-SALEM OFFICE — 304 N. CHURCH ST. — PHONE 5-0869
 MRS. VELMA HOPKINS, Manager
 SUBSCRIPTION RATES
 One Year Ten Cents Single Copy
 Six Months \$4.00 — Foreign Countries.
 National Advertising Representatives
 INTERSTATE UNITED REPRESENTATIVES, Inc.
 545 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK 17, NEW YORK
 PHONE MURRAY HILL — 2-5452