

The News - Journal

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION
1908

North Carolina PRESS ASSOCIATION

Published Every Thursday at Raeford, N. C. 28376
119 W. Elwood Avenue
Subscription Rates In Advance

Per Year - \$4.00 6 Months - \$2.25 3 Months - \$1.25
PAUL DICKSON Publisher
SAM C. MORRIS General Manager
JIM TAYLOR Editor
MRS. LUCY GRAY PEEBLES Reporter
MRS. PAUL DICKSON Society Editor
Second-Class Postage Paid at Raeford, N. C.
Your Award-Winning Community Newspaper

THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 1968

NON-VIOLENT MURDER

King Both Right, Wrong

A madman not yet identified last Thursday gunned down Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., civil rights leader and apostle of non-violence, as he stood on a motel balcony in Memphis, Tenn. The murder touched off a nationwide reaction ranging from mourning to rioting and stirred in the nation's white citizens emotions ranging from sympathy to hate.

Respect for Dr. King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference was not universal, but was widespread. That he was not respected by many people in the South was abundantly evident in their conversation following the tragedy. The vast majority of Southerners, however, condemned the man who gunned down, and a great many paid tribute to his work and his purpose.

Martin Luther King Jr. was, first of all, a minister, and although certain of his preachments were not, in our opinion, in the best interests of either his people or the country, basically he preached Jesus Christ and brotherly love. To that extent, he was right. He also was right in many of his zealous campaigns for the rights of Negro citizens, particularly at the beginning of his crusade, when he led boycotts, sit-ins, and non-violent marches through the countryside of the Deep South proclaiming "freedom" for his people.

To that extent, Martin Luther King was a good man -- even a great man -- but his effectiveness as a non-violent leader faded as more and more American Negroes were swept up in more impassioned outbursts which led to the so-called "long, hot summers" of recent seasons. And when King's tactics were opposed by the likes of Stokely Carmichael, Rap Brown and other militants, King's control over his marches were gone, and with it, the essence of his right to protest, because the man at the head of the march must be held responsible for the people marching behind him. Once their ranks were interspersed with savages, the ultimate climate of the march was assured, because these people were never marching with noble purpose, but for an opportunity to do evil, and King's instructions to keep the peace went unheard by those criminals who peppered the ranks.

The first amendment to the constitution of the United States gives citizens of the United States the undisputed right to "peaceably assemble" and that right extended to Dr. King and his followers no more or no less than to any other citizen or groups of citizens. The key word in this guaranty, however, is "peaceable." When a gathering led by King or anyone else becomes anything less than peaceable, the constitutional right no longer applies.

As a matter of law, then, King was conspiring to break the law at the very time he was killed in Memphis. He had led one March two days previously, and the march had produced violence, slaying, and looting which law enforcement forces in Memphis were hard put to bring under control. The city of Memphis then asked the courts to enjoin King and his followers from conducting further marches in the city, because it seemed certain that the

explosiveness of the situation guaranteed more violence. The court, therefore, enjoined King and the others from further public demonstration.

King himself had fled -- first afoot and then by car -- when the violence broke out during his first Memphis march. From a far city he announced that the "illegal" injunction would be disregarded, and he later returned to Memphis to plan the second march, which was scheduled to be staged the week following the Friday on which his untimely death subsequently occurred.

There, King was wrong. And while his error was no justification for bodily harm to him, and certainly none for his murder, it substantially compromised the good he might have done.

First of all, there is no such thing as an "illegal" injunction. The fact that it is issued by the court, by order of a judge, establishes it as lawful until such time as it may be set aside by higher judicial authority, or by the judge who rendered it in the first place. The moment it is set aside, of course, it is invalidated, and never exists as an "illegal" instrument.

Great good may have evolved from King's activities for a time, but when a small portion of his race became violent, the day of peaceful marches was gone, for all extents and purposes. It was and is a simple matter for the savages to infiltrate the non-violent marchers, and King had no more control over them than Ghandi had over the "non-violent" Hindus who murdered tens of thousands of Moslems in the wake of the mahatma's marches through Calcutta, Bombay, New Delhi, and other great cities of India.

So, when King declared that he was confident the "illegal" march he was set to conduct in Memphis this week could be kept under control, he deviated from the logic and reason which must prevail in such critical times. Two days previously, when violence erupted in his march (which, incidentally, was in support of striking garbage collectors, mostly Negro), a newspaper story described King's flight by saying he "sprinted down a narrow side street, jumped into an old model car, and sped away." That, while not at all humorous in light of the seriousness of events, indicated precisely how much control King had over the crowd.

The civil disobedience he preached and practiced were not in the best interests of his nation, or even his people, because we are persuaded that whatever helps or hurts the Negro -- and all poor and underprivileged Americans -- also helps or hurts the nation. Not even civilized human beings can be taught to break one law and obey another. The rioters and looters are not civilized, and, thank God, amount to only a minute percentage of their race.

It is, indeed, a shame that the Negro race must bear the shame of the few of them who have denounced the responsibility of citizenship, just as it is a shame the white South must bear the shame of the death of Dr. Martin Luther King. Perhaps King's martyrdom will lend longer life to the good things he taught than to the evil that exploded with his death.

'Guess who might be coming to dinner?'



By Jim Taylor

The New Morality



Hark, the death knell: the nation is dying. The land and the people are wasting away.

Not great poetry, perhaps, but the above couplet expresses in 10 metric feet the tragedy that is befalling America.

It has been said before, probably by every generation successive to the Pilgrim fathers. Pessimists throughout our history have sighed in agreement, and optimists have proven them liars.

Not so at this hour. America, the land of the free and the home of the brave, actually is no more, as of this day. Bravery is reserved for the soldier in uniform, the savage in the street, and the lunatic who stands ready to touch off civil war by taking the law into his own hands.

They continue perhaps 6 per cent of the total population in the nation. The other 94 per cent -- including plain, law-abiding me and thee -- have lost that physical and moral courage that provided us victory over every foe.

It is ironic, but not unpropheesied, that we shall perhaps fall victim to our own compassion, and in the end, may be beaten by ourselves.

The commonplace criticism one hears this day and time is that the leadership of the nation has gone to hell.

That, like so many other shortcomings characteristic of this day and time, is a falsehood. What happened to the leadership happened first to the people. And it began happening a generation ago.

Today, there is a psychological, sociological and philosophical justification for every sort of insane behavior in the world, including murder, arson, and grand theft.

Some people say the breakdown of law and order began with the Brown decision, handed down by the United States Supreme Court in 1954. That

decision, you may or may not remember, was the one which declared that separate school systems are inherently unequal.

At the time the Supreme Court made the decision, there was no precedent for the action. The matter of segregated schools had been brought before the court on several occasions, and in each instance, the court held that the "separate but equal" doctrine was constitutional.

In the Brown decision, the court pointed out that the action was justified on "psychological and sociological" grounds, which has caused many authorities on constitutional law to differ in opinion with the court.

Nonetheless, the Brown decision has not been reversed. And while it merely forbade segregation, it did not force integration. That was given to us in the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Whether the Supreme Court decision in that and other matters concerning civil rights is responsible for a growing disregard for law and order is, at best, an academic argument. It did not, by any stretch of the imagination, account for the moral degeneration which followed in its wake.

White people, particularly Southern whites, are fond of pointing to the rioting Negroes as the primary exponent of lawlessness. That, too, is not altogether true.

What about the white South? By and large, we said soon after the Brown decision that it stood as the law of the land, and we would obey the law. In most cases, we have. Insofar as the spirit of the law is concerned, we have not.

Perhaps we have lived up to our legal obligations, when that responsibility was trust upon us, but we have disregarded our moral responsibility in the matter.

For in obeying the law -- vis a vis the Brown decision -- we have by every legal means possible, evaded compliance with the spirit of the law.

Even today, we comply only so far as we are forced to comply. If we have devoted as

much energy, money and effort to solving the problems inherent in changing our school system, during the past 14 years we might have wiped out the problems.

But that is not the theme of this article, except as it reflects a certain moral irresponsibility.

The breakdown of our society actually began in the home, perhaps while Daddy was away at World War II and Mommy was working in a defense plant.

When the war was over, too many of us failed, in our rehabilitation, to pick up the responsibilities of parenthood.

Along came television, which may very well provide the means by which man may observe the destruction of the human race.

I mean the bodily destruction of civilization.

It already has affected the mind, perhaps irreparably. It brought the abolition of the family unit, and the neighborhood concept, which always have been the most cohesive agents in a democratic society.

You don't believe it? How many real "neighbors" have you? I mean in terms that people were neighbors as lately as the 1940s?

We don't have corn shuckings, log rollings, barn raisings, wheat threshings, wood choppings, hog killings, or more in the social line, ice cream suppers and community Christmas trees.

If you visit a "neighbor" these days, he's watching television. If you like "Bonanza," you've got it made.

Otherwise, you just about have to telephone your neighbor the next day to find out how he's getting along.

Families have lost the togetherness that once was characteristic of the American home.

Half the mothers in Raeford, I'll wager, prepare breakfast two or three times each day -- once before the old man goes to work, once when the children get ready for school, and again when she eats, if she can afford the calories.

See TAYLOR COLUMN, Page 7

CLIFF BLUE ... People & Issues



HISTORY - MAKING EVENTS
--Two history-making events have taken place in the United States since last week's "People & Issues" column was typed on Saturday night, March 30. Nine months from now when the 1968 highlights are recorded, President Johnson's announcement that he would not seek reelection and the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. will likely lead the list.

JOHNSON--We feel that President Johnson's decision not to seek reelection was one of his "finest hours" in the White House--for himself and for the country.

We do not feel that the president made his final decision against running until Sunday afternoon or evening. Had he decided finally not to run before, why would he have had so many people out working for his renomination? We feel that his low-ebb popularity as reported by the Gallup poll on Sunday, March 31, was the final straw that led him to his decision not to run. We say this because the president has long been reported to be an avid follower of the opinion polls.

People who know President Johnson personally say that he has a tremendous yearning to have a big place in history. We feel that by stepping aside and devoting his remaining days to a peaceful settlement of Vietnam that Johnson can have as great a place in history than had he run and served another four-year term.

And we all must admit that his reelection, had he decided to run, would be far from certain. Present indications are that he would not have had a 50-50 chance to win, although the political tides ebb and flow as do the tides in the sea.

DR. KING--Forten years, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had been the leader of the integration and desegregation movement in America. In behalf of his race, he did much to break down the racial barriers in public institutions and accommodations in America. Regardless of whether a person agreed or disagreed with the tactics of Dr. King--people believing in "law and order" of all races will condemn without reservation the cold-blooded and cowardly shot which took his life.

BOBBY KENNEDY--We will

not underestimate Bobby Kennedy. A man who can cross over from his home state into another state and within a few weeks be elected United States Senator over a veteran senator is not to be taken lightly.

But here in North Carolina, we are not running across Kennedy support. One Democrat has heard to remark: "I will never vote for Bobby Kennedy--no, not even if he cuts his hair!"

But with the Kennedy millions, don't underestimate him!

MONEY IN POLITICS--It takes a lot of money to conduct campaigns now, and unless a man has an issue, it's hard to get far without a pretty good size pocketbook.

Most of the delegates to the Democratic and Republican national conventions will be chosen not through primaries but through caucuses. The average citizen seldom takes part in the precinct, county, district, state or national conventions.

The grass roots beginning in the "making of a president" is at the precinct level. Usually, not more than a dozen, generally not more than half that number, attend precinct conventions.

Through the convention method of selecting delegates, it is altogether possible for a minority with not more than 10 per cent of public support to name the delegates while respectable, tax-paying citizens stay at home glued to television or some other form of relaxation.

A well-organized minority can overcome a dormant majority; and this has been done many times in the past.

DELEGATION--We see nothing particularly wrong with the Tarheel delegates to the national convention in Chicago endorsing Governor Moore or former Governor Terry Sanford as the state's favorite son for president. We would prefer Dan or Terry to Bobby, Hubert or Eugene.

While we are not going to hold our breath while Dan or Terry builds an organization to seek the presidency of the vice president's office, we suspect that Terry if nominated for either would have a pretty strong national pull because of his educational leadership and his support of the national Democratic ticket in 1964.

SENATOR SAM ERVIN SAYS



WASHINGTON--The Senate has taken a step toward dealing decisively with the growing threat to our monetary system. On April 2, it passed an amendment to the House-passed Tax Adjustment Act of 1968.

As amended by the Senate under the Williams-Smathers substitute, the bill to extend excise taxes on telephone service and automobile sales incorporates a 10 per cent surcharge on individual and corporate incomes and provides for substantial reductions in the fiscal 1969 budget submitted by the president in January. I voted for the measure as amended, because I think that it is imperative that the federal government set its financial house in order.

We now face a serious danger of inflation which will rob every American of his earnings and savings if we continue to engage in deficit financing of the magnitude of \$20 to \$30 billion annually. Moreover, the value of the dollar is at stake in the efforts we make to eliminate deficit spending by the Federal government.

No one that I know welcomes additional taxes. Nonetheless, the nation has reached a point in its fiscal affairs that it must choose between unpleasant alternatives. If Congress does nothing to provide additional revenues and is unwilling to make substantial reductions in spending, we face crippling inflation and a new attack upon the dollar. In that event the entire monetary system of the free world would be imperiled.

During my service in the Senate, I have warned against the dangers of fiscal irresponsibility many times. I have advocated consistently that we balance the federal budget as we went along. I have voted against a number of major programs that I deemed to be unwise expenditures of Federal funds. Had my views prevailed, federal expenditures would have been reduced during my Senate service by more than \$70 billion.

When the tax measure was first proposed last year, I took the position that I would not vote for any kind of increase in taxes unless there was a corresponding reduction in expenditures. The net effect of the Senate-passed tax bill would be to reduce expenditures by several billion dollars more than the revenues derived from the surtax. This would make necessary fiscal adjustments. The facts are these. We are in the midst of fiscal 1968 that

could produce a deficit of some \$20 billion or more. The 1969 budget projects an even greater deficit of \$24 billion or more unless we reduce spending or increase taxes as this bill provides.

So the Senate has faced facts and added the surtax and spending reductions to the House-passed excise tax bill. The surtax will apply to 1968 and 1969 income. The spending reductions represent a \$6 billion reduction in proposed spending and a \$10 billion reduction in obligatory authority for fiscal 1969. The net effect would be a spending reduction of approximately \$16 billion in the foreseeable future.

The measure also forbids the sale of American gold to any nation delinquent in its debt payments to the United States, imposes a limitation on the hiring of new Federal employees to fill certain vacancies, and impose quotas to protect the American textile industry against foreign imports.

The outcome of these amendments is uncertain, for the House must concur in them. Still the measure as amended seeks to restore fiscal responsibility where it is needed more -- the federal government.

Letter to the Editor

To the Editor:

We join the world in mourning the death of our dear brother in Christ, Dr. Martin Luther King. We pray that Americans everywhere, regardless of race, creed, color or belief, will dedicate themselves to the establishment of a world based on his dream of peoples everywhere walking hand in hand in peace, harmony and brotherly love.

May we here in Hoke County let his death give impetus to our part in bringing about the fulfillment of that dream, and thereby a greater America.

The Sunday School Class
St. Peter Baptist Church
Raeford, N. C.

Salt from the world's oceans would form a layer 500 feet thick -- about the height of a 40-story building -- over the earth's land surface.

Philosopher Has Idea To Help Columnists Compete With TV



Dear editor:

There have been so many surprises in politics lately, topped by President Johnson's decision not to run again, that there simply can't be anymore left, outside maybe of Bobby Kennedy's showing up with a crew cut and DeGaulle's offering to pay France's World War I debts.

The worst thing about these surprises though is what it does to newspaper columnists. I got hold of a bunch of old newspapers last night and began reading them in the light of what has happened a few weeks after they were published, and they're confusing.

For example when Rockefeller thwarted the experts and said he wasn't running, the columnists were caught flat-footed. "Political analysis had

thought he certainly was going to run," one of them wrote, not mentioning he was one of the analysts.

Another one wrote only two weeks ago: "Anybody who knows Lyndon Johnson knows he's not going to give up four more years of power."

When Eugene McCarthy first announced he was running, another columnist said bemusedly "he is like Emmett Kelly, the clown, trying to sweep up his own spotlight."

And so it went, proving that this is where television has an advantage over newspapers for experts. An expert can be 100 per cent wrong and almost swallow his foot on T.V., but when the program changes, his words fade with the picture and it's hard to pin anything on him. But with a newspaper it's

different. There the words are, in black and white, and you can clip them out and carry them around and examine them after events have shown the expert didn't know anymore about what was going on inside the mind of the President for example than he did next week's weather.

Consequently I have worked out a solution. Newspapers carrying columns by political experts ought to be printed in disappearing ink. Twenty-four hours after their profound and analytical opinions have appeared, the ink ought to fade like a television picture with a burned-out tube.

This of course does not apply to The News-Journal, not as long as I'm in it.

Yours faithfully,
J.A.