

THE YANCEY RECORD
 BURNSVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

ESTABLISHED 1936

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

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY
 YANCEY PUBLISHING COMPANY

SECOND CLASS POSTAGE PAID AT BURNSVILLE, N.C.
 THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1970 NUMBER TWENTY-SEVEN

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

**SENATOR
 SAM ERVIN
 SAYS**



WASHINGTON -- The President has signed into law the provision of the Voting Rights Act which provides for the lowering of the voting age to 18 years.

In doing so, the President again expressed doubts about the constitutionality of this provision as he did when the bill was before the Congress, but said that he would sign it into law and let the courts rule on this question. This is also the approach adopted by many members of Congress who voted for the bill when it won Senate and House approval. This is regrettable, because this casts the courts in the role of being the only branch of the government which seeks to determine whether a provision of law meets constitutional tests.

Actually, every member of Congress as well as the President takes an oath at the time he takes office to "support and defend the Constitution", and it is not sufficient to say that this is a matter for the courts.

As I have stated in this column previously, I voted against the statutory change allowing 18 year olds to vote for two reasons.

First, this provision is plainly unconstitutional, if the Constitution has any vitality. By taking the statutory approach this measure 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 and sex cannot be used to deny any individual the right to vote.

Second, I think it was unwise to deal with the 18 year old voting provision in summary fashion. Congress actually gave this provision only limited attention during the major arguments that were made concerning the extension of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which was scheduled to expire in August of this year. The 18 year old provision was never reviewed by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and it is to be remembered that when the House first considered the Voting Rights Act amendments, this provision was not included in that measure. When the bill was debated in the House again on June 17th, there was little time for individual members to express their views on this issue.

In saying these things, I recognize that there are compelling arguments that 18 year olds be permitted to vote. Nonetheless, any change of this nature ought to be a matter for consideration by the state legislatures or by constitutional amendment, if federal action is deemed appropriate.

The Judicial Branch of the Federal Government has now been chosen to decide this issue. It is to be hoped that it will support and defend the Constitution and put aside "political expediency" which seems to have been the deciding factor in respect to this bill up to now.

Break Stranglehold

Congress should never vote to give a labor union or any other group power to have a man fired from a government job simply because he chooses not to join. But that dangerous kind of injustice is in the "postal reform" bill.

The right to work with free

decision on union membership, keeping the matter voluntary, needs to be preserved. The House should kill the scheme to give union bosses stranglehold over government employees -- and thus over service of government to the people.

Chattanooga News-Free Press

straight talk

By Tom Anderson



LT. GEN. EAKER TALKS ABOUT MY LAI

Now that the schizophrenic screams from the Left about My Lai have become less deafening, it might be profitable to take a sane-look at the real issue. Here is what Lieutenant General Ira C. Eaker (USAF Ret.), who knows something about the subject, has to say.

"The attack on My Lai often is called a massacre by press and commentators. This leads to a natural and needed query. When does a military operation become a massacre?"

"Strangely, those who are now so certain a massacre occurred in My Lai did not call the bombing of Dresden a massacre although more than 100,000 noncombatants, including thousands of women and children, died there. Nor did they so label the low-level attack on Tokyo with fire bombs where 90,000 Japanese noncombatants were killed in a single night.

"They gave scant space to the Tet atrocities at Hue and seldom express any sympathy for U. S. dead or wounded in the Vietnamese war. They have not reminded our people that more than 500 U. S. soldiers have been killed by the Viet Cong in the vicinity of the My Lai hamlet and the adjacent Song My village.

"When I was in Vietnam in 1967, visiting more than 50 U. S. and South Vietnamese units at 25 bases, while flying several thousand miles from the Delta to the DMZ, I learned of many atrocities committed by the VC about which I had read little in the U. S. press. These are two typical examples. Many similar experiences were reported at every base where I landed.

"A U. S. patrol nearing a village observed a woman approaching who appeared to be pregnant. When she neared our troops she began pulling hand grenades from a belt under her shirtwaist and throwing with skilled precision, killing or wounding most of a U. S. platoon.

"A U. S. captain was leading a patrol into a hamlet when eager children greeted him. A boy of 10 or 11 asked for chewing gum. When the

captain put his hand in his pocket, the youngster plunged a rusty knife into his abdomen, inflicting a mortal wound.

"Upon my return to Saigon, I asked at headquarters why we in the United States had not been told of the Red atrocities about which I had heard so much from troops in the field. The staff officer replied: 'We give the correspondents this information, but apparently it is now old hat and no longer news or it does not jibe with the editorial policy of the anti-war press back home.'

"Upon my return to the United States, I asked one of the Joint Chiefs of Staff why the Pentagon did not release more Red atrocity stories. He said it was against Administration policy, since this might build up a psychology in this country which would pressure our leadership to use more force than it wished to employ in this limited conflict.

"It seems to me unfair and un-American to convict U. S. soldiers of atrocities under the stress of combat without trial and in fact without hearing any of the evidence from their side.

"There will be additional lurid atrocity revelations. When a broadcasting network offers \$7,000 for reports of U. S. atrocities (Red atrocity reports are not wanted) and when a national magazine pays thousands of dollars for pictures of alleged U. S. atrocities, many neurotic disgruntled soldiers will find their memories revived and imaginations stimulated.

"I never knew a U. S. citizen, in uniform or out, who advocated or applauded the killing of noncombatants. But I have known many leaders, including Presidents, members of Congress, reporters, editors and even clergymen, who sanctioned it when unavoidably incident to the accomplishment of a military mission required to force a cruel enemy to surrender or to deny him the weapons and resources to carry out his designs for ruthless conquest."—American Way Features

VIEWPOINT

NETWORK LIBERALS KEEP IT THAT WAY

By Jesse Helms

A few years back, the top executive of the news department of one of the major television networks stopped by for a brief visit. He was new on the job, and he discussed with considerable frankness his dismay at conditions he discovered when he took over. He expressed a confident dedication to "changing things."

His whole network news operation, he said, was infested with what he called "ultra-liberals." In fact, just the week before, he had removed several network employees on the West Coast whom he had found to be card-carrying communists back in the days when communists carried cards. At one point, he declared: "I just told the Boss (meaning the network president) that it was them or me."

Not surprisingly, he didn't last long. He was kicked upstairs, and today holds a perfunctory title with the network. Such duties as he may perform seem obscure. It should be added that prior to his going into television, he was a top reporter for *The New York Times*, and a widely-respected one. But that was in the "old days" of *The New York Times*.

Then, just recently, a talented young journalism graduate of a major university was in town—and he, too, came by for a visit. He has a good job in New York—but he confessed that he found it necessary, as he put it, "to play a constant game" in order to maintain his chances for advancement. "I quickly learned," he said, "that the news business belongs to the liberals. If you're going to make it," he said, "you have to make it their way."

Putting all the pieces together raises an interesting question: How did the news busi-

ness get into such a rut? And another: Why don't the stockholders of the networks, the large newspapers of the country and the other media do something about it?

Recently, students at Campbell College heard an address by a reporter for *The New York Times*, a relatively young native of North Carolina who has enjoyed a rather spectacular success as a presumed authority on just about everything connected with government and politics. The young man's name is Tom Wicker. Not many years ago, he was publicity man for the State Welfare Department here.

Needless to say, Mr. Wicker's speech at Campbell College was a 24-carat espousal of the liberal doctrine. No doubt, he made an impression upon the students who heard him. After all, who is to question the all-encompassing declarations of a "spokesman" for *The New York Times*!

It is not difficult to understand Vice President Agnew's comments about the leftwing bias of the major news media of America. To become a part of the country's major news mechanisms, it has been imperative that young journalists be political and philosophical "liberals"—and none others need apply.

The deadly by-product, of course, is that too many politicians are inclined to make their decisions solely in the hope that they will be praised by the news media. And the only politicians who are praised are the "liberals."

Just watch it for a few days, and see for yourself.—American Way Features