

Not Conducive To Interracial Goodwill

Mayor E. J. Evans' abortive attempt to justify his action of not voting for R. N. Harris for the Durham City Board of Education, at a meeting of the City Council on last Monday night, is about the poorest show of statesmanship we have seen in a public official in many years. Every word smacks of cowardice and is evidence that the man, instead of speaking from a conviction, was struggling to beat back his conscience that was leaping at him in full fury. Had the mayor merely voted against Mr. Harris and let it go at that, Negro citizens would have at least felt that his action stemmed from intellectual honesty rather than the lack of courage to meet a situation head on. Thinking Negro citizens will always respect a person who has the courage of his conviction even though it may not be in support of their cause. They will never forget one who apparently would rather hold public office than to be right.

Mr. Evans' play to the grandstand, which he apparently feels is packed with anti-Negroians whom he would like to garner into his political camp, should elect him to the office of mayor of Durham for life. His statement of last Monday night will certainly be interpreted in certain anti-Negro circles of the city as coming from "a Daniel come to judgment." When it finally gets around to the right spot that he is basically and fundamentally for the status quo on the race question and that he has now entirely lost his Negro constituency, he should rise to the top of the political maggot heap where no man or group of men will be able to dethrone him. Governor Hodges, Senator Ervin of this state and Senator Eastland of Mississippi all know the art of climbing to political ill fame by lambasting the Negro.

More than 10 years ago, the late Dr. James E. Shepard arose from his sick bed to appeal to the City Council to appoint a Negro to the Durham City Board of Education. At that time the late Mayor W. F. Carr stated that

Dr. Shepard had certainly made an eloquent plea for Negro representation. The Council turned a deaf ear to the plea. We think it was in 1953 that Negroes again appeared before the Council to plead for representation only to be turned down a second time. Last Monday night was, therefore, the third futile attempt that has been made to secure just token representation for one-third of the city's citizenship and 40 per cent of the school population.

In Charlotte, Greensboro, Raleigh, Rocky Mount, Southern Pines and Tabor City Negroes are already serving on city boards of education. Even as far South as Atlanta, Georgia, they have representation. We would like to know whether the trouble is in the Negroes of Durham or the members of its City Council?

Said the mayor last Monday night, "I feel that within the area of conflict whoever is chosen from the Negro group would be the target of both groups, white and Negro." Now Negro citizens of Durham do not appreciate this play at paternalism from Mayor Evans. In fact many of them look on such with the uttermost contempt. Whoever the race offers for the City Council, the Board of Education or any other public office will be passed on by Negro leaders here in advance and will need no paternalistic protection by the mayor or any other person from the usual attacks that come to any one holding public office.

As we see it, the City Council, along with the mayor, sank to a new low in statesmanship last Monday night and plainly showed that it is studded with too many little men who are not only unfair to the Negro citizens here but are afraid to do what their consciences must tell them they should do; and that is provide Negro representation on the City Board of Education. The action of the Council is not conducive to the interracial goodwill.

Democrats Fail Again

Senate action which destroyed, for all practical purposes, the President's civil rights legislation last week should make it crystal clear to Negroes that to trust their political future to the hands of the Democratic party is like taking a walk down a dead end street. The blame for the destruction of the bill must rest squarely on the shoulders of the Democrats. The President would do the cause of liberty and freedom a great service by affixing his veto to the measure which has now been wrecked beyond effective use.

Although the attack upon the bill in its original form was led, as was expected, by southerners, in the end it was the so-called liberal Democrats from the northern and western states who joined forces with the South to wrench all effectiveness from the bill. At the beginning of the long summer battle, the South could count no more than 28 Democratic votes, all southerners, to oppose the measure. During the course of the lengthy arguments, the South decided to shift its tactics from assailing the measure frontally to disarming it by subtlety, a tactic which southerners have long since mastered in preserving the status quo at the cost of democracy. Southerners first decided to ruin the part of the bill (part IV) which would implement the 15th amendment. They did this by ridding it of all its enforcement provisions, persuading the Senate that to enforce this amendment would be granting dictatorial powers to the federal government.

Up until last Thursday, there was still some hope that Negroes would be extended a significant grant of the ancient constitutional guarantees. At that time, section three, the section which would insure the right to vote, was still an effective instrument. It was on this last remaining vestige of effectiveness in the measure that southerners began moving, well in advance of last Thursday's showdown. Senators from Dixie had painted a

picture which showed the section to pose as a sinister threat to the right of trial by jury, and as matters turned out, persuaded eleven of their northern and western brother party members to join them in voting to attach the crippling jury trial amendment. When the vote was taken, some 39 Democrats had cast their votes on the side of the South, and only nine voted with Republicans to save the measure.

Northern and western Democrats who describe their action in joining with the South in the showdown vote as a compromise are fooling no one, except possibly themselves. For every Negro, North or South, knows full well that the remanding to a southern jury a case involving denial of constitutional rights of Negroes by southerners will result, not in justice, but in frustration of the law. Even the addition to the jury trial amendment which seeks to guarantee the selection of Negroes to federal juries is not of much help. Most Negroes in the South are economically captive to whites. Even if there were one on such a jury whose decision would not be determined by his white employer, he could hardly do more than hang a jury, resulting in the eventual freeing of the defendant. Thus, in reality, the so-called compromise was no compromise but a resounding victory for the South.

If northern and western Democrats cannot see that the result of their action in playing ball with the South is to nullify the promises of the U. S. Constitution to Negroes, then they are not intelligent enough to deserve the vote of Negroes. If they do see it and went along simply for the sake of party unity, then that party is certainly not the one for which Negroes should vote. However the situation may be viewed, the fact remains that out of 48 Democrats in the Senate, only nine were in the corner of justice and fair play when the test came. It is certainly time that Negroes ditched such a party.

Eisenhower Bill Would Have No Compromise With Fair Play

EDITOR'S NOTE: The possibility of enactment of civil rights legislation by the current Congress appears dim at this writing. The bill now faces a possible Presidential veto because it has been so transformed from its original character by crippling amendments. But because so much propaganda has been generated over the bill, largely by southern opponents who sought to make it appear an instrument of dictatorship, the TIMES is presenting this frank, down-to-earth explanation of the measure as it appeared in its original form by Val Washington, a veteran observer of the national political scene and a high echelon member of the administration's policy making advisory staff. The discussion will be printed in two installments.

A number of people, including several members of Congress, have asked my opinion of the Eisenhower Civil Rights Bill. At the outset let me say there can be no compromise with right. In a democracy all of us, as citizens, should share and share alike or the term is meaningless.

An attempt is being made to penalize Negroes for historical facts of the past that were not of their own making. Our forebearers were brought here as slaves in 1619 and held in servitude until 1863. After the Emancipation Proclamation they were set free, ignorant and without organized friends. For over 90 years they have been treated as inferiors, their children in most cases sent to inferior schools and until recently allowed only four or five months schooling a year, then rushed to the fields to pick cotton, while the white children remained in school the full term of 9 months. Negroes have been given what was left (in the way of work) economically. Yet in spite of all these injustices the South would continue to penalize them because their constitutional rights were finally recognized by the Supreme Court and because the Eisenhower Administration decided to do something about rectifying these inequities.

There are more good people than bad. There are more fair-minded people who would not want Negroes to continue playing at democracy with a stacked deck than those who would. There are more law abiding citizens by far than lawless people. It is these good citizens who must be looked to for the preservation of justice.

First, what is there to compromise in this mild Eisenhower Civil Rights Bill? It calls for a Commission of 6 members—three Republicans and three Democrats—to investigate allegations under oath that certain citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their color, race, religion or national origin. The Commission is limited to a two year life and within 60 days after the submission of its final report and recommendations shall cease to exist.

Most certainly if the Southern Senators who oppose this bill did not intend to continue taking advantage of minorities, they would not object to investigation by a bipartisan commission.

To prove this point Senator Olin D. Johnston, Democrat of South Carolina, on July 9 offered an amendment to the Civil Rights Bill which would "provide for homeward shipment of deceased members

and employees of the President's Civil Rights Commission at Federal expense. I just want the boys taken care of in case something happens to them. I hope nothing does. But if they try to act too fast, they might cause a lot of bloodshed, some of it their own."

Secondly, the bill calls for an additional Assistant Attorney General, appointed by the President, who shall assist the Attorney General in the performance of his duties. His duties would be to bring any persons to justice who are engaged in any acts or practices which would give to a cause for feeling that they were going to interfere in the voting rights of any person.

Our Southern friends could not be opposed to this unless they intend to continue depriving Negroes of their voting rights and do not want interference from the Federal Government which is the Negroes' only real hope for justice.

Thirdly, the bill attempts to strengthen the Civil Rights statutes now on the books without changing the old Civil Rights laws. Thus it would solve the problem where subterfuge and subtleties are resorted to in order to deprive an individual of his rights. It attempts to do this by first providing that the Attorney General may institute for the United States a civil action for preventive relief whenever a person has committed any acts or practices which would give rise to a cause of action under the existing law. It also confers jurisdiction upon the U. S. District Court to proceed and further provide that such jurisdiction should be entertained without regard to whether the party aggrieved had exhausted any local judicial remedies. This is asked for because it has been impossible for Negroes to get a fair trial in the local courts.

This section also provides a civil remedy for damages to the damaged person as a result of conspiracy to deprive one of certain civil rights. This is nothing more than enabling legislation to help enforcement of the law as now written; establishes liabilities for damages against any person who conspires to intimidate or injure parties, witnesses, or jurors involved in any court matter or who conspires to obstruct the due process of justice in any state court made with the intent to deny to any citizen the equal protection of the law; established liability for damages against any person who conspires to deprive another to vote in elections affecting Federal officers.

(Continued next week)

THE SOUTHERN SENATORS DID IT AGAIN



Spiritual Insight "THE UPPER ROOM"

By REVEREND HAROLD ROLAND
Pastor, Mount Gilead Baptist Church



"They went to the upper room where they were staying..." Acts 1:13.

The upper room has become a spiritual symbol of far-reaching importance. It is originally the place where the Apostles and followers of Jesus stayed, after Jesus had ascended into heaven, to await the heavenly gift of the spirit. It has become a place of fellowship, prayer, meditation and unity. It has become a symbol of cleansing and preparation for the coming of the Holy Spirit. It has become a symbol of spiritual clearance for the Divine invasion through the spirit. It is a symbol of trustful obedience. It is a symbol of our deep need to pause and wait for God to come in power to strengthen and consecrate us for his work. "They went to the upper room where they were staying..."

We all need a place of quiet communion with God. The saints, in a measure, have lost the habit of stealing away from the world for enrichment through quiet communion with God and one an-

other. We are now so busy trying to get ahead or keep up until we do not have time for the spiritual quietness of an upper room. We are lost in the grind. We keep our noses to the grinding stone so we have no time left for the meditative communion of the upper room. We all need each day to steal away from the grind to some quiet place for communion with God—that the soul may be bathed and refreshed in the presence of the Eternal.

The upper room gives spiritual depths to life. What richness and strength came to those who waited in the upper room. Life took on a new look and a new meaning for the little band who waited in the upper room. It will do the same thing for you and for me. This is one of the crying needs of our times. There are so many empty, meaningless lives about us. Our emptiness leaves us in a state of fury, confusion and bewilderment. Life apart from the upper room is a lot of sound and fury. Someone had a great insight into the spiritual

needs of our times when he said, "The cocktail party has become a symbol of fellowship for so many in our times." This is a sad and tragic commentary of our times that we are spiritual DPs—cut off from God—we have indeed become spiritually Displaced Persons.

The upper room means a rich spiritual fellowship with God and man. Fellowship—a sense of belonging to a meaningful and satisfying society—is an inner need of all so-called normal human beings. In human fellowship we feed and nurture the souls of others and they in turn feed and nurture our hungry and thirsty souls. The soul needs communion with God. Without this Divine contact of fellowship the soul perishes and dies.

Let us find some quiet place for daily communion, prayer, meditation and a deep inner peace that life may become rich, beautiful and livable for us. The saints of old found it. You too need to find it during the mad rush of these times.

By Robert Spivack

Watch on the Potomac



How Bad Are Our Roads
The American Automobile Assn. has come up with a generally favorable progress report on the status of the huge federal roadbuilding program authorized by Congress in 1956. But its report also warns of possible trouble ahead which may delay completion of the program on schedule.

What bothers the AAA is that several state legislatures have failed to provide for adequate highway revenues and pass other needed bills. This worries highway officials in Washington, the AAA says, because "state cooperation is the key to the vast program..."

To those who are travelling over the big highways this summer some of the difficulties are "apparent. Cars around the big cities proceed at a snail's pace, bumper-to-bumper, if you should happen to be driving through around 5 p.m. or in the early morning.

The need for big city bypasses has long been with us. Their absence is a constant source of irritation to motorists travelling by car on vacations that are limited in time. The AAA reports some other headaches. Many are strictly financial.

There is great pressure on Congress and the Administration to increase the mileage of the 41,000-mile interstate

highway and defense system, since the federal government pays 90 per cent of the cost. It's not surprising that the states want the most highway for the least outlay of their own funds.

But the states are asking for too much, the AAA argues. They want 12,000 miles more of federal highway than now planned. This could upset present financial plans. It might delay the program.

The price tag authorized by Congress was \$23,500,000,000. Our "creeping inflation" might send his figure higher, the AAA warns, because road construction costs are going up. This probably will be a \$30 billion program before the job is done.

The Modern Rockefeller's So much has been written about old John D. Rockefeller and his well-publicized charities that we are sometimes inclined to forget that the present-day Rockefeller's bear little resemblance to the old tycoon.

One of the brightest and most enlightened members of the family is young David Rockefeller, an heir to Standard Oil's millions. The first time I ever heard of him was during the days when Florela LaGuardia was Mayor of New York. Old "Butch" could always detect a promising young man and one day he put young David on his staff as a personal assistant.

But now young David has grown up and he is vice chairman of the board of directors of the Chase Manhattan Bank in New York. Unlike some of his Wall Street associates, he is full of ideas. His latest is a proposal that all those hundreds of millions in oil profits that are taken out of the Middle East be plowed back into the region to help raise living standards there.

Some system might be worked out, David Rockefeller told a group of Arkansas bankers, to use the massive oil earnings "to promote the economic development of an area that is of crucial importance to our future security and prosperity."

What does he suggest? First, oil money could be used to develop the waters of the Nile for use in modern agriculture that would help not only Egypt but also Ethiopia and the Sudan.

Second, oil profits could develop hydroelectric power on the Jordan River, with the benefits that would flow to the neighboring lands from such a project.

Third, the oil men could pay for widening and deepening the Suez canal so that it would accommodate the huge tankers (100,000 tons and more) that now must sail around the southern tip of Africa.

The Carolina Times

L. E. AUSTIN, Publisher

M. E. JOHNSON, Controller

WINSTON-SALEM OFFICE — 304 N. CHURCH ST. — PHONE 5-0869
MRS. DOROTHY M. ROBINSON, MANAGER

MAIN OFFICE — 436 EAST PETTIGREW 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.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year Ten Cents Single Copy
Six Months \$4.00 — Foreign Countries.

\$2.00
\$2.00

Life IS Like That

By H. ALBERT SMITH
BUT FOR ME

There is one fundamental weakness that seems to afflict the average man and that is to blame somebody other than himself for the failures he makes in life, or has made of his own life. And, if he doesn't blame some person or persons, he will solemnly swear that he has been the victim of an unkind and unfriendly fate all of his life; a man who, however hard he tried to succeed, never could because every time the door of favorable opportunity had opened for him it had been slammed in his face by the hand of hard luck.

Placing Blame
The first recorded instance of placing blame for an unfortunate circumstance that had overtaken him involves a man called Adam. He violated a law which had been placed upon him. He had been told what the penalty of violation would be. He blamed his wife for the resultant mess this violation made of his life, which seems to me to have been both a cowardly and unkind thing to do, not to mention its uselessness as

a means to escape his unhappy plight.

A character seen in more favorable light belongs to our own times. He is described by F. V. Smith in the Saturday Review as a down-and-outer. As he watched a successful man whirl by in a Cadillac, he exclaimed: "There but for me go I." I like this order better: "There go I but for me."

Now, here was a man who had the courage to place the blame where it belonged. He was a failure. But for this he did not blame anybody but himself. He was indeed a self-made man, self-made in reverse. Hard luck had slammed shut no opened doors before he could cross threshold to success. The doors had been slammed shut by himself. He had hamstrung his own chances to be a man of means and an asset to society. That is what he meant as he gazed wistfully at his Cadillac-riding brother and exclaimed: "There go I but for me."

Differant Meanings
Now, let it be understood at (Please turn to page 7)