

ESTABLISHED 1936

EDWARD A. YUZIUK - EDITOR & PUBLISHER CAROLYN R. YUZIUK - ASSOCIATE EDITOR ARCHIE BALLEW - PHOTOGRAPHER & PRESSMAN MISS PATSY BRIGGS - OFFICE MANAGER

> PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY YANCEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT BURNSVILLE, N. C.

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1970 NUMBER ELEVEN

SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$3,00/YEAR OUT OF COUNTY \$5.00/YEAR

SENATOR SAM ERVIN & SAYS &



WASHINGTON - Senate debate on the proposed five-year extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 has again focused attention on how a so-called civil rights law can ignore constitutional principles if such a law affects only Southern States.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, which has since been up held in a split decision of the Supreme Court, is an iniqui tous piece of legislation designed to usurp the undoubted constitutional powers of seven Southern States to prescribe voting qualifications. Last year the Administration proposed to extend the Act for a period of five years, but to make it applicable to all of the States by deleting the so-called "trigger" formula from the Act. That formula brought states and counties under the Act, if a state or county had a literacy test in effect on November 1, 1964 and if less that 50 percent of the voting age residents were registered or voted in the 1964 Presidential election.

Under the automatic "trigger" formula of the 1969 Act, five Southern States and certain counties in two other Southem States became subject to punitive action by the Federal Government. Federal voting examiners could move in automatically to supervise voter registration in these areas.

Not only was the 1965 Act Southern-oriented, but it violated the constitutional powers given the States to prescribe voter qualifications in a tyramical fashion which no Court would sanction for the punishment of a common criminal. In essence, what Congress did in writing the 1965 Voting Right Act, and what the Supreme Court subsequently approved in the case of South Carolina vs. Katzenbach, was to enact a bill of attainder to condemn certain State officials and the peoples of their States without giving them a judicial trial Moreover, this Act actually took away the rights given to the States in four separate provisions of the Constitution.

On December 11th, the House passed the Administration proposal to extend the 1965 Voting Rights Act for a period of five years. The bill as it came to the Senate did have the virtue of uniform application to all of the States.

In the Senate, however, Senators Hart and Scott offered a substitute bill which sought to leave the 1965 Act provision applicable only against seven Southern States and extend the existing law for another five years.

I shall offer an amendment to provide that if the 1965 Act is extended for another five years that the statistical base be changed to the 1968 Presidential election. It seems to me that it is basically unfair to say that no matter what positive actions the States and voters take to register between 1964 and 1968, the seven Southern States cannot be exempt from the automatic power of the Federal Government to supervise voter registration within their borders. I hope my amendment will prevail.

One of the unfortunate things about the present day is that people and public officials are willing to ignore the Consti tution to accomplish what they seek. It would be well indeed for the Nation to heed W shington's sage advice concern in g dissatisfaction with the Constitution when he said in his farewell address:

"Let there be no change by usurpation, or even though a change may seem good in one instance, usurpation is the customary weapon by which free government is destroyed."

straight

By Tom Anderson

IS THE "FREE PRESS" REALLY FREE?

No nation can long remain above the level of its press. The low estate of our Fourth Estate is one of our most serious problems. Far more important than cleaning up our slums or roadsides is cleaning up our press, preachers, schools, networks and government.

The right to publish carries the implicit responsibility to tell the full story like it is. Many publishers are afraid to. Afraid of government, afraid of advertisers, afraid of readers, afraid of losing money.

One of the most-used cliches is the term "free press." The press is certainly free to distort, suppress, exaggerate, smear and lie. But is it free to tell the truth? Undoubtedly a free press is necessary to true liberty. As the Bible says: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." But the American people are not getting the truth.

What does freedom of speech and freedom of the press mean? Certainly they do not and should not mean freedom to say or print anything. Surely, "freedom" does not mean the right to libel, to lie, distort and withhold news, the right to undermine public morality with obscenities. John Swainton, long time editor of

the extremist New York Times, in a speech at a banquet following his retirement reportedly said: "There is no such thing as a free press. You know it and I know it. There's not one of you who would dare write his honest opinions. The business of a journalist is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of Mammon and to sell himself, his country, his race for his daily bread. We are tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are jumping jacks; they pull the strings, we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are the property of these men. We are intellectual prostitutes."

I think Swainton was too harsh on the press at large, but very accurate as far as the New York Times is concerned. Free press? There is really no such thing in any nation. The press everywhere is influenced or dominated by advertisers or government—and always has been.

Tailoring the news to suit the government or to suit the Chamber of Commerce or to suit the reader is a form of censorship. Having a little managed news is like having a little pregnancy.—American Way Features

The Manion Forum

By Marilyn Manion

COMMUNISM IS ONLY NINETY MILES AWAY



We see by the papers that a number of U.S. youngsters have gone to Cuba this year to help harvest the sugar cane crop. From what we see on the friendly TV morning news interviews, these "international harvesters" have much more in mind than the advance of agriculture. (How can anyone be so militant at 7 A.M.?) They are adamant supporters of Castro and of what they call "socialism." We'd call it Communism.

If nothing else, the cane-cutting kids have reminded us once more that a Communist regime does still exist in nearby Cuba-and that it is pretty close to home. Does that proximity mean anything to us in terms of actual danger? Is Cuba just an annoying thorn in our side, or must we reckon with a real threat? A guest on the Manion Forum radio program offered some insights into these questions. He is Mr. Ernest Blanco, who used to teach engineering at the University of Villanova in Havana. He is now a professor of engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York. Dean Clarence Manion asked Mr. Blanco what he thought of American students; here is what he said to that, and what he offered on the subject of Cuba and the U. S. as well:

"From my observation, having taught here nine years, the American students today are just as good as ever in the past. It is their mentors who are responsible for the student unrest. The teachers are the ones who are different."

DEAN MANION: In view of your experience in Cuba and here, do you see any connection between Havana and the riots on the campus? I notice that Mark Rudd and George Mason Murray and other representatives of the Black Panthers and SDS shuttle back and forth. Is that just a coincidence?

PROFESSOR BLANCO: Certainly not! These people have a common ideological objective. Their ultimate objective is to destroy the United States.

All of these groups go to Havana because of the common ideological ties that they find between their groups here in this country and the groups in Havana. They are all working for the ultimate objective of destroying the United States. All of this would be impossible to accomplish if there was not a pre-conditioning of Americans to accept their ideas. In other words, there is already a transmission belt into the United States, provided by the Marxist tendencies in university faculties and very much so in the communications media.

DEAN MANION: What is the interest of Havana in stirring up all this trouble through the students? Is it to provide a soil for the implantation of what they send over here from

PROFESSOR BLANCO: Exactly. Havana is the most important center for the expanding of Marxist ideology throughout the whole American continent. They are also very busy in the expanding of Marxist ideas and Marxist revolution through Latin America and Africa. That is why they have established the Tri-Continental Organization.

This Tri-Continental Organization was founded by Castro as a way of providing a vehicle for the subversion of the United States and all the non-committed countries. Castro fancies himself the leader of the Third World. By this he means the countries that have not gone openly Communist, yet. Therefore, this organization was set up to coordinate all the subversive and guerrilla activities in these countries. They are so brazen as to have an office in New York City, where they distribute propaganda throughout the United States, and to colleges.

Which all goes to show that you don't have to get your hands dirty in the cane fields in in order to reap Mr. Castro's harvest.-American Way Features

Junk Viewed As Economic Resource

Junk is junk to us, but not to the Institute of Scrap Iron, which looks on the skeletons of jalopies and the carcasses of refrigerators with an acquisi tive eye.

"Obsolete metallics," says the Institute, "shouldn't be viewed as waste or junk but as an economic resource - mines above ground."

We'll go along provided the

institute will encourage people to start mining this huge load of metal. Until then, it will remain junk to non-me tallic-minded viewers.

- Miami Herald