

The News - Journal

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER
PUBLISHED BY THE
SUSTAINING
MEMBER - 1972

North Carolina
PRESS
ASSOCIATION

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

Per Year - \$5.00 6 Months - \$2.75 3 Months - \$1.50

PAUL DICKSON Publisher-Editor

SAM C. MORRIS General Manager

ELAINE SYMANSKI Reporter

MRS. PAUL DICKSON Society Editor

Second Class Postage Paid at Raeford, N.C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 1972

Opinion and commentary

by Paul Dickson

The year of the politician

Last year was the year of the dog in China, or maybe it was the year of the rat. No maybe about it, this year is the year of the politician in the good old USA. The political animal is busy from the precinct to the Presidency, or from the outhouse to the White House, to coin phrases the way candidates pay people to do.

They are with us morning, noon and night, in our magazines, newspapers, radios. Just cut on the tube at any hour and there one is, talking just to you.

There are many interpretations of what the President is doing, with the cartoonists having a fine time showing him as a traveling circus act with the line, "And now, ladies and gentleman, by helicopter direct to the Capitol steps and straight from a week at the Kremlin, here in person is... "himself, of course. And his actions are labeled strictly according to the personal motives and desires of the labelers. His performance is the "greatest act of statesmanship of the century" by a senator who intends to have him firmly by the coattails for a ride back to Washington come November, or it is "blatant politics," or "using the country's foreign policy for political gain" by another who hopes to dislodge this same senator in the fall.

There are those who think that Richard Nixon has been qualified by experience in the political arena at many levels, and strengthened by adversity and the bitterness of many defeats to degrees not seen in a president since Abraham Lincoln, and many who think these things also think he is trying to be and being a great United States President. Because Nixon doesn't come across with the warmth of an Eisenhower or the magnetism of a Kennedy, the average person seems to find it harder to give him credit for motives which must be at least as lofty as any ever possessed by either of these others.

But in this year of the politician many things are strange, and the one sure thing is to judge nothing by its name, unless you want to win a few by judging that something is the opposite of what it is called.

Take Democrat John Connally for example, former Democratic governor of the great and sovereign state of Texas. What is he, really? He is still a registered Democrat, and undoubtedly is still able to point with pride to a record of always having voted the straight Democratic ticket. Still, Democrat Connally would have to admit he has been seen in some strange places lately for a good Democrat, as secretary of the treasury in a Republican administration, for one, and getting strong publicity for being on the Republican ticket for another.

"Party loyalty" is a phrase wont to turn up in these years of the politicians, and it is an expression that bears a little looking into. For one thing it is never used by anyone who doesn't have something to gain for himself or a friend. Now this is sometimes hard to see very clearly, and particularly so here in the old "solid South" we used to hear about, because there are more Democrats here and in the nation as a whole than there are Republicans, so the Republicans get there by people not having "party loyalty," and when the Democrats manage to stall them off, it's because they can convince enough people in November that they ought to have "party loyalty."

Of course, the poor voter has a hard time defining, or getting anyone to define, just what the Democrat Party, for example, stands for, what with George McGovern and Hubert Humphrey giving it pretty good explanations but not quite the same as, say, Democrat George Wallace, or Democrat Connally, for that matter.

Now as more North Carolina Democrats favored George Wallace than anyone else for the U. S. presidency on May 6, and as it appears more and more that Senator McGovern, who explains the Democratic Party a little differently, is more likely to be the Democratic nominee, Democratic Nominee for Governor Skipper Bowles and Democratic Nominee for U. S. Senate Nick Galifianakis are going to have to be somewhat adroit in their talk of party loyalty this fall.

Party loyalty is going to have to be asked for on the state level, or else either Bowles or Galifianakis or both could be toppled handily by Republicans Jim Holshouser or Jesse Helms. On the other hand, though, if McGovern happens to be the national Democratic nominee, it may not work too well for the state nominees to try to get the Wallace folks to have enough "party loyalty" to vote for him.

So while the Year of the Politician may be somewhat harder to define, and while it definitely has many more crooks, angles and switches than the year of the rat, it may be much more interesting if we can just stick it out to the bitter end.

But then, we always do, don't we?

Browsing in the files of The News-Journal

25 years ago

Thursday, June 5, 1947
Incoming Mayor W.L. Poole and commissioner Milton Campbell, John K. McNeill, Clarence Lytch, Alfred Cole and A.V. Sanders took their oaths of office and became the administrators of the town of Raeford last Monday night.

Maj. Gen. S. LeRoy Irwin, commanding general, Fort Bragg, officially announced today that due to

economy measures in line with peacetime operations several hundred civilian employees at Fort Bragg would be dismissed June 30, 1947.

The Raeford baseball club of the Peach Belt league won two more games in the last week to bring their score of victories up to five with only one game lost.

From Poole's Medley:
Back in those days taxes and the preachers were the only two causes that untied the little money bags.



Passing Thoughts

By Elaine Symanski

A Weed Is A Weed

If weeds could only be flowers. Or even if flowers could be weeds-- it wouldn't really matter, since either way would be an improvement over the present condition of my garden.

I use the term "garden" rather loosely, for what I really have is a small plot of sandy soil on either side of my concrete patio, which is closed off by a tall wooden fence. When I think of the acres and acres of land some homeowners have to contend with, I feel fortunate, indeed, of my station in life as an apartment dweller.

So you would think with so little land to worry about, it would be in top-notch condition, just like one of those darling little yards featured in the gardening magazines around this time of year, right? Wrong. It seems that completely untended lands in the woods come off in better shape than my carefully cared for plot of soil.

It's not that I haven't tried-- I guess I just don't have a "green thumb." All of

my weeding, hoeing, fertilizing and cultivating don't do a darned bit of good for the flower seeds I carefully planted, just as the directions on the package told me to. But you should see the weeds-- they're the healthiest ones in town, I'm sure.

I've often wondered what makes a flower a flower and a weed a weed. Some of my tallest and healthiest weeds have sprouted blooms, but they are still unmistakably and undeniably weeds. The fact that they thrive so well on neglect and even punishment must surely be the deciding factor. They're totally unshaken by cruel treatment such as cutting and pulling-- it only seems to make their return even more glorious.

Somewhere I read that if you talk to your flowers and plants in kind, gentle tones it will encourage them to grow. Using reverse psychology, I have uttered some choice words at my weeds that I couldn't print here, in the hopes that I would hurt their feelings and they would cease to inhabit my garden. But even that effort was to no avail, so now I am not on speaking terms with them at all.

I've even toyed with the possibility of letting the weeds run rampant and telling everyone I'm conducting experiments on them so I don't want to get rid of them. But if I tried that, true to their nasty nature, the weeds would probably die on me.

So I guess I'm stuck with them. Some day, if I'm fortunate, all of the flower seedlings will burst forth with unprecedented force and run the weeds right out of town.

Or if I get tired of waiting for that unlikely day to arrive, I just may chuck the whole idea of growing anything and plant some plastic flowers in a huge green styrofoam block. At least that way I'd be sure of one thing-- there are no plastic weeds that could invade-- not yet, at least.

Puppy Creek Philosopher

Dear editor:

If a man hasn't got something to protest about these days he's so far out of style he's probably still carrying a pocket watch, wearing high-top shoes and carrying cold patches to fix flats with, so it was only natural that an 11-year-old girl should show up before a Senate committee in Washington protesting Saturday morning commercials on kids' T.V. shows.

According to her, the commercials are so bad, or so good, however you want to put it, that kids immediately rush out and demand that their parents buy the stuff, and parents, naturally not wanting to lose the everlasting love and affection of their children, comply.

Then when the kids, after a few years of eating all that cereal and having attained the mature age of 10 or 11, discover they don't feel any better or turn out more popular or prettier or stronger than kids who've been eating oatmeal all along, they begin to doubt the commercials, then begin doubting the adults who sponsor them.

"They find out that not all adults tell the truth," the young girl told the Senators. "They start disbelieving some things they say, and I feel this is dangerous."

Come on, honey, you're on the right track, not the wrong track.
Dangerous? Quite the contrary, it's safe and wise. Of all the things a child needs to learn, and what better place is there to have it down on you than before a bunch of Senators, one of the most important is that you'd better not believe everything everybody says.

You'll find that while most grown-ups today weren't taken in by T.V. commercials when they were youngsters, it was mostly because there weren't any T.V. commercials then to be taken in by, but you'd be surprised how many of them ordered secret devices to throw their voice or rings with a secret compartment, as advertised on cereal boxes and comic books.

In preparing yourself to vote intelligently in a democracy, kids, the first step is to watch those T.V. commercials pretty closely, whether they're for posttoasties or politicians.

Yours faithfully,
J.A.

CLIFF BLUE... People & Issues



POLLS CAN BE TREACHEROUS - Opinion polls for candidates can be treacherous for the leaders as appears to have been the case in three state-wide races in North Carolina this year.

Polls are reported to have showed Pat Taylor, Everett Jordan and Jim Gardner leading in their races. With this in mind, each to an extent conducted their campaign somewhat similar to the Tom Dewey campaign for president in 1948 when the polls showed him leading Harry Truman. Dewey didn't want to "rock the boat" and conducted a very calm and placid campaign. He thought he had the election won but when he awakened on Wednesday morning he learned to his sorrow that Truman and not Dewey had been elected president!

Pat Taylor started his campaign for governor with the polls showing him with a big lead. Evidently he and his managers didn't want to "rock the boat" of what appeared to be a smoothly running campaign, but on May 6 to his great surprise and astonishment he found that in his placid campaign that Skipper Bowles had moved by him into the lead.

The same thing can be said about Everett Jordan. He realized that Congressman Galifianakis was a vigorous campaigner but the polls showed him with a substantial lead. He did not want to "rock the boat," and to his surprise on May 6 found Nick sailing ahead.

It was the same with Jim Gardner. He and his advisors felt that he was way out among the Republicans. His big victory over Jack Sticklely in 1968 led him to believe that he need do but very little campaigning to win the nomination. To his great surprise on May 6 he led Holshouser by a very small margin. Holshouser was on the move and Gardner couldn't stop him.

Chances are that with different approaches to the respective campaigns of Taylor, Jordan and Gardner that each might have won. However, on May 6 when they realized that they were trailing instead of leading, it appears to have been impossible to chart new and acceptable campaigns capable of overtaking tides which were rolling high and fast.

DEMOCRATS - The outlook for the Democratic nominee for president now is that he will hardly receive a great deal of warmth by the major nominees of the party in North Carolina this summer and fall.

Four years ago Bob Scott had little to do or say about Hubert Humphrey, the 1968 Democratic nominee, and right now it appears that the nominee for governor may find it expedient to be just as cool towards the Democratic presidential nominee as Scott was four years ago. Self preservation is the first rule in politics as well as in nature.

PATTON - A night last week Gala and I attended the showing of "Patton" starring George C. Scott at a Southern Pines theatre.

General Patton of World War II fame was evidently a pretty courageous general but as a man and a gentleman as portrayed by Scott he cannot be placed in the category of soldiers like George Washington, Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson.

Washington, Lee and Jackson were outstanding generals and leaders, not only because of their courage and ability as warriors but because their soldiers loved and had great respect and admiration for them. Patton won battles because of his cold-blooded courage and also the rear and often - times dislike of his soldiers. They were afraid of him. In the picture he was portrayed as an arrogant and vain man who wanted to go down in history as the great general of World War II. He was quite jealous of General Montgomery and was ready to fight the Russians even before World War II was over.

For slapping a soldier in a hospital ward and using vile and profane language he was severely reprimanded by order of General Eisenhower and ordered to apologize to his troops, and relieved of his command for awhile.

War is not a play game and to win you have to use facilities and leaders available. Without a General Washington, a General Lee or a General Stonewall Jackson, when survival becomes the key word no doubt but that sometimes a nation must turn to vile, profane, yes and courageous men like General Patton.

Just One Thing After Another

By Carl Goerch

We have said this before - the study of words is a most interesting one and has caught my fancy all my life.

For example, what's the difference between admittance and admission, referring to entrance?

"No admittance" means "entrance forbidden." Admission refers to entrance into a society or into certain privileges.

What's the difference between "on behalf" and "in behalf"?

"On behalf" means in the name of. "In behalf" means in the interest of.

"On behalf of the school, we thank you for your presence here tonight."

"I make this appeal in behalf of the prisoner."

All of us use many words that are entirely unnecessary. Here are a few typical examples - the words in italics are the ones that should be omitted:

We'll try to cooperate **TOGETHER** in this matter.

I have no one **ELSE** but you to help me solve this problem.

I'm glad that's over **WITH** so we can turn our attention to other things.

Do you plan **ON** going to church today or are you going to stay in bed?

"A penny saved is a penny earned" is a well-known **OLD** adage.

Add **UP** this column of figures and see if **MY** answer is correct.

FROM whence came ye?

Those hats are **BOTH** alike.

Whenever I go to the old homeplace, I **ALWAYS** think of Mother.

What's the difference between depot

and station? A depot is a place where goods or stores of any kind are kept; a station is the place where people get on or off a train.

Clipper, gerrymander, creek and schooner are among the words that are purely American.

"I know a man of the name of Brown" sounds rather awkward but it's correct. "By the name" suggests an assumed name.

Which is correct, "Welsh rabbit" or "Welsh rarebit"?

Most people are under the impression that "rarebit" is the correct form, but that isn't so. Here's how the thing originated:

A friend called on a Welshman and the two of them decided to go rabbit hunting. They told the lady of the house not to bother about preparing dinner; that they'd bring home enough rabbits for a good meal.

They hunted for hours, but they didn't find a single rabbit, so finally they returned home in disgust -- empty-handed and hungry. The woman told them not to worry, that she'd fix something to eat.

All she could find in the house was some cheese. She melted some of this and mixed it with other items of food, preparing a dish which the two men found very appetizing. The dish became popular and was known thereafter as Welsh rabbit, and it has kept that name throughout all these years.

SENATOR SAM ERVIN SAYS

WASHINGTON - Tax reform in this Presidential election year has become a major campaign issue. The Nixon Administration has for some time been making suggestions that there ought to be some shift in the tax burden.

Last December, the President promised to try to "ease the crushing burden of property taxes" when he addressed an attentive audience of delegates to the White House Conference on Aging. Several days ago, a tax memorandum became news. It was disclosed that Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Treasury Secretary for Tax Policy, had suggested to the White House that Federal tax laws undergo a major overhaul to eliminate most personal deductions including those for mortgage interest payments on homes and those for medical expenses to permit lower overall tax rates.

In the wake of these "tax reforms" comes the Mills proposal advocated by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills and Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Congressman Mills, who has been campaigning for the Democratic Presidential nomination, has introduced a bill, referred to his tax-writing committee in the House, which would abolish virtually all tax deductions and credits in three stages by January 1, 1976. What is odd about the timing of the measure is that Chairman Mills,

usually a cautious man, wants his bill enacted before Congress recesses for the Democratic National Convention. The House Ways and Means Chairman is also quoted as saying that while he favors certain tax preferences, Congress ought to go ahead and terminate such preferences under his bill and then review them before the effective date of their abolition to see whether they should be continued.

I certainly have no quarrel with the idea that Congress ought to constantly examine our tax structure to remove any inequities which unfairly burden any segment of our society. But it seems to me that three weeks is hardly time enough to give proper consideration to any tax review of this magnitude, and particularly when the urgency of its passage seems to hinge on action before a political convention.

The middle class is bearing the major burden of taxes today. It should be recognized before we get very far along in the consideration of the Mills - Mansfield bill that it would at the outset terminate a lot of personal deductions that affect the long-range plans of millions of hard-working, tax-paying Americans. It is one thing to talk about abolishing tax "loopholes," and quite another matter to get to the specifics of a bill to terminate personal income tax deductions for charitable contributions, dependent

care, medical expenses, personal and property taxes, interest on home mortgage payments, moving expenses, casualty losses, and many other expenses that are embedded in daily living costs. All of the foregoing personal deductions would be wiped out should the Mills bill be enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. It would then be up to the taxpayers to lobby for the reinstatement of any of these tax deductions. This could throw the whole reform process out of kilter again.

In a day when the government is spending far more than it takes in, it is more than likely that "tax reform" will end up as a "tax increase" for millions of our people. This prospect is not calculated to win votes and it is downplayed in political oratory. What is of concern or ought to be to the people is that for years the government has seldom balanced its budgets and the leadership of the country has ignored the fact that most taxpayers are unwilling to pay for a lot of the Federal programs that we now have or many of the new ones which are in prospect.

When Americans start examining what is proposed as "tax reform," they may get some new ideas about a measure which would take away their right to determine how at least a portion of their