

THE YANCEY RECORD
 BURNSVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

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 19, 1970 NUMBER TWELVE

SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$3.00/YEAR
 OUT OF COUNTY \$5.00/YEAR

**SENATOR
 SAM ERVIN
 SAYS**



WASHINGTON - Senate debate on the extension of the controversial Voting Rights Act of 1965 moved in a new direction last week. By a 64 to 17 vote, Majority Leader Mansfield won approval of a constitutionally questionable amendment allowing 18-year-olds the right to vote. The amendment is subject to a Senate - House conference where House opposition to the 18-year-old vote is said to be strong.

I voted against the statutory change allowing 18-year-olds to vote for two reasons.

First, it seems to me that if the Constitution has any vitality, this provision is plainly unconstitutional. The Senate has pending in Committee S. J. Res. 147, which would submit to the States a constitutional amendment setting the voting age at 18 years throughout the Nation. If we are to deal with this issue, S. J. Res. 147 has the virtue of following the prescribed method for changing our basic constitutional law. On the other hand, the Mansfield amendment, by taking the statutory approach, runs counter to four express provisions of the Constitution. These are: Article I, section 2, Article II, section 1, and the Tenth and Seventeenth Amendments to the Constitution, which spell out in unequivocal language that the States have the power to prescribe qualifications for voting, subject only to the condition that race or sex cannot be used to deny any individual the right to vote.

Second, I think it is unwise to deal with the 18-year-old voting amendment in summary fashion. A change of this magnitude deserves considerable study, and the Mansfield amendment was not even referred to the Judiciary committee for review prior to its consideration.

In saying these things, I recognize that there are compelling arguments that 18-year-olds ought to be permitted to vote, because many of our 18-year-olds possess greater educational opportunities than existed two centuries ago. It is said, too, that if a young man can be compelled to enter the service of his country prior to his 21st birthday, he ought to be permitted to vote, and decide who shall represent him in the government of the community, State and Nation. But there is more to the matter than this.

Any legal age requirement contains a debatable arbitrariness over the standard of maturity. The fact is that much of our present laws governing property, business, and contracts is founded upon the English common law precept that 21 years is the legal age for adult judgments. True, four States of the Union -- Georgia, Kentucky, Alaska, and Hawaii -- permit voting before 21 years. Still, 46 states have set 21 years as their voting age, and this fact alone ought to give Congress pause before it arbitrarily writes a new voting requirement for the entire nation.

The issue now goes to the House, where it is to be hoped that constitutional reverence will prevail. If not, the Courts may have to say whether there is any meaning left to four provisions of the Constitution which delegated to the States the power to determine voting qualifications.

Americans Waking Up!

What price patriotism? Americans appear to be boycotting a certain foreign airline whose country harbors some of our military deserters and whose premier favors our enemy. It's another indication that people are registering their indignation and disgust at such situations

by refusing to patronize people or places that are anti-American. Wouldn't we be fools to continue proffering money and friendship (in typical altruistic American fashion!) to those who aid the very forces committed to our eventual downfall?

straight talk

By Tom Anderson
MISFORTUNE VS CALAMITY



Recently a reader wrote me: "The things you write are true, I'm sure—but what I don't understand is why the big news magazines and newspapers don't report those things." There are several answers: like Big Businessmen, many big news media are afraid of and subservient to Big Government. They are also afraid of some of their advertisers—who abhor "controversy."

Leftist *Look* magazine editors and photographers, *Look* claims, spent almost a year, on a man-hour's basis, studying the accomplishments of 50 years of Communism in Russia. The editors forgot to tell—or perhaps they didn't find out—that all editors, foreign and domestic, even including *Look* editors—are forbidden to photograph a vast group of objects, installations and activities in Russia. Bureaucratic harassment, intimidation and reprisals are relentlessly inflicted on all who seek truth in Russia. About 2/3 of the USSR is off-limits to all non-communist foreigners and, we presume, to *Look* magazine. (And *Look* magazine is off-limits to our household.)

Years ago, *Look* magazine did a piece on me. They assigned a photographer to get 100 pictures of me on the rostrum, speaking. He

got 102. You can imagine which one they used. When my teen-age daughter saw the one they printed, she cried.

Life magazine recently gave killer Kossygin, head of the criminal Communist Soviet "Republic," an extensive interview in which he spread more lies, threats, distortions, condemnations and propaganda against us. Whereupon our own Dauntless Leader Johnson let it be known that he would submit to an interview by the Soviet press. The Russians were not interested.

Even Yugoslavia's most important literary magazine stated that the Soviet Union used concentration camps and practiced genocide long before Adolph Hitler did. Wonder why *Life*, Hollywood, *Look* or Pew Smearson never did a story on that?

Perhaps *Look* is pinker than *Life*, but the real difference between *Life* and *Look* is the difference between a misfortune and a calamity. When asked the difference between a misfortune and a calamity, Disraeli replied: "Well, if Gladstone fell into the Thames, that would be a misfortune; and if anybody pulled him out, that, I suppose, would be a calamity."—American Way Features

The Manion Forum

By Marilyn Manion

PSST . . . THE GAP ISN'T REALLY THERE



When man first orbited the moon, more than one wag observed that we were all quite possibly being taken in by a conspiracy of practical jokers. The idea was absurd, of course—imagine staging a whole moon shot from a television studio! Yet, some remembered a radio announcer named Orson Welles, and an "invasion from Mars" that threw whole sections of the nation into panic. A giant hoax is possible.

Back to earth for a moment—but don't forget the possibilities. Would you believe, for a starter, that the scourge of our age—the Generation Gap—may have been dreamed up and foisted upon the American public? That all of those long-haired girls in mini-skirts and maxi-coats haven't the slightest notion of running away from home and/or overturning society? That those bearded bell-bottomed boys wearing rimless eyeglasses may never have even tried marijuana, much less any hard drugs?

Take politics. The average idea of "youthful" opinions is that they are ultra, ultra liberal. Look at the protest marches. The SDS. Ad nauseum. But then look at an interesting fact about the 1968 election: a disproportionately large number of northern votes for Wallace came from voters under thirty.

Or have a look at that shocking subject of drugs: ". . . the great majority of youngsters, almost 90 percent have had no experience with marijuana, not even to the degree of having tried it once. . . ."

The statistics and the quote are from Joseph

Adelson's provocative article, "What Generation Gap?" which appeared in the January 18 New York Times Magazine. Here are some of the points he makes, and a few of our reactions to them:

1. Most of the attention is focused on college youths, while the majority of young Americans do not attend college. (Adelson doesn't say it, but we will: this confirms the suspicion that students are being brainwashed in the classroom.) Narrowing it down a bit further, most of the youngsters you see and hear about belong to a tiny minority of those who do attend college—and therefore a microscopic minority of American youth in general.

2. The majority of young people—including college students—are not in rebellion against their parents. After an exhaustive study of college students, pollster Samuel Lubell noted that he found "both much less authority and much less rebellion than popularly imagined." In another study of collegians, it was found that 80 percent of them considered their relationships with their parents to be "close and friendly." Bet you haven't seen them on any TV documentaries of late.

3. Studies show that most of the student radicals are "children of radical or liberal-left parents." When you add this to the knowledge that their professors are likely to be liberal too, you might be tempted to conclude that they are not rebelling at all, but following. Ho, hum. Another generation of sheep?—American Way Features

Letters To The Editor

Dear Editor:

I was pleased to note the article in your paper last week honoring the fire fighters who had served for many years.

I saw that one of them was my good friend, Julius Patton, and thought that the picture of him was particularly good.

Yours very truly

James Parker Dees, Presiding Bishop, The Anglican Orthodox Church, Statesville, N.C.

Dear Editor:

I enjoy your paper very much as it brings news of my

friends and my old Home Town to me. I like especially the notes about the Country Store and the pretty words above the Death and Funeral notices. It brings good and bad news alike that I would not know any other way of receiving if it were not for your newspaper.

Please keep it coming!

Mrs. Cleo Fox
 Winston-Salem

Dear Editor:

Thank you sincerely for doing such a splendid job of the

obituary on my mother, Mrs. Minnie L. Ray, in the February 19 issue of The Yancey Record. . . .

I especially like Tom Anderson's column. It is time we told the public the proper attitude in such matters.

Marion Manion's column is also excellent.

I have studied journalism myself and find The Yancey Record to reflect very good taste and above all, proper in its Public Relations department

Sincerely
 Ora Ray Martin
 Rockville, Md.