

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 9, 1970 NUMBER TWENTY-EIGHT

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

SENATOR SAM ERVIN

★ SAYS ★



WASHINGTON -- After a seven-week debate on U. S. Southeast Asia policies, the Senate has passed far-reaching amendments to the Foreign Military Sales Act. These amendments include the repeal of the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and the adoption of the Cooper-Church Amendment.

While the Senate actions on this bill are still subject to House approval, if that approval occurs it could present us with a constitutional quandary which is without precedent in our nation's history. I say this because it was a most surprising development that the President sought to defeat the Cooper-Church Amendment which merely undertakes to put limits upon his power to wage war in Cambodia and Laos, and then later appeared to sanction the proposal to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution which would not only take away his power to act in Cambodia and Laos, but also take away his power to act in South Vietnam.

For the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution gives the President the authority to act as Commander in Chief in Southeast Asia with the power of commanding American forces there. In my judgment, the United States has no power apart from the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to be engaged in armed aggressive attacks in Southeast Asia. When the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed, it was, as I contended on the floor of the Senate some time ago, tantamount to a declaration of war.

That resolution expressly states that the President may use the Armed Forces of the United States to resist aggression from North Vietnam. It was under that power that the SEATO Treaty obligation was accepted by the United States. It was under that power that the United States undertook to wage war in Southeast Asia. It was the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution which gave the President the power as Commander in Chief to invade the sanctuaries in Cambodia.

I do not know what the position of our boys in Southeast Asia will be if we repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, because the President of the United States has no power whatsoever to act as Commander-in-Chief in that part of the world with the exception of withdrawing the troops if this repeal carries. I therefore opposed repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution at this time because I believe such action would make obscure the powers of the President as Commander-in-Chief in Southeast Asia and his powers as such to protect the lives of our men in South Vietnam. I see no good in making these powers obscure.

Moreover, I voted against the Cooper-Church Amendment, because I think it would be tragic for our boys in South Vietnam to be informed that it is the sense of the Senate that the enemy can occupy sanctuaries in Cambodia and issue forth from the sanctuaries into South Vietnam to kill and maim them, and that they cannot enter those sanctuaries even to save themselves from destruction unless Congress passes another law on the subject.

There can be no doubt of the fact that our involvement in Vietnam is one of the most tragic experiences that this country has ever had. But unfortunately, the Senate's effort to repeal the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution and its subsequent adoption of the Cooper-Church Amendment only gives assurance to our enemies that it is not necessary for them to attempt to negotiate a settlement because we will abandon the field to them very soon.

I have favored the President's program that we should try to negotiate a settlement at Paris, or on failure thereof that we should train the South Vietnamese so that they can defend their own land or have a reasonable hope of doing so while we gradually withdraw our forces from South Vietnam. But, in my judgment, Congressional adoption of the amendments mentioned above would cast a cloud of doubt about the authority of the President to take appropriate steps to secure an honorable end to our involvement in Southeast Asia.

straight talk

By Tom Anderson



WE BECOME WHAT WE CONDONE

More appalling today than the noise of the bad people is the silence of the good people. We become part of what we condone.

The God-killers are also killing our country. The morals of our leaders are low because the morals of our people are low. The graveyards of history prove that nations get what they deserve. Few, if any, nations have ever been conquered from without unless they were rotten within. Our nation was founded by men who believed in God, in individual freedom, in high moral values and in personal responsibility. Whether we survive as free men or slaves depends upon whether we can resurrect our moral and spiritual strength.

The time could be approaching when the question will be not whether America can be saved but whether America is worth saving. Sodom and Gomorrah were not. Only the moral deserve to be free. The Apostle Paul said: "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty." (II Cor. 3:17)

We cannot oppose evil by compromising with evil. We cannot go forth into all the world and spread the gospel of Jesus Christ if we deny Jesus Christ in the United Nations, in our schools and in our daily lives.

Jesus Christ was not "a moderate." He was an "extremist." The "modernists" amongst us today proclaim that there is no black and white; that sin is imaginary, non-existent; that we are to be "moderate" and "tolerant" in all things, including evil.

An agnostic is a moderate. Moderation is not a virtue when one is moderately wrong or moderately sinful. Christ had this to say about moderates—a religious type He denounced in

extreme terms: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot. I would thou were cold or hot. So because thou art neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

The Bible is not tolerant, it's "narrow-minded." And so is the compass, radar, the multiplication table, the boiling and freezing points of water, nature, and the Kingdom of Heaven. The gates of Hell are broad-minded. God, the Bible, sin, and Jesus Christ are unchanging. Hebrews 13:8 says: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and tomorrow." The Ten Commandments are forever the same. A true Christian has an unchanging standard.

The "modernist" preachers have decreed that God is dead; that Christianity has failed; that they will create a new religion "suitable to our complex times." God is eternal, of course. Christianity has not failed—it hasn't been tried.

One of these young "modernist" preachers accepted a call to a little country church in Alabama. After a few Sundays he announced that henceforth the members would refrain from such out-moded behaviour as saying "Amen!" and "hallelujah!" during the sermon.

The very next Sunday a little old lady got carried away and loudly exclaimed "Amen! Praise the Lord!"

Two ushers hastened down the aisle, lifted her gently but firmly out of her seat and half carried her down the center aisle.

She waved her handkerchief to the congregation all the way, crying: "Jesus rode one into Jerusalem and it takes two to carry me out!"—American Way Features

VIEWPOINT

By Jesse Helms

MRS. MITCHELL AND THE "LIBERAL" ESTABLISHMENT

The leftwing set has been having a field day portraying Mrs. Martha Mitchell, wife of the U. S. Attorney General, as a fool—which she assuredly is not. She is a lady concerned about her country, who has the courage of her convictions. And though she may sometimes lack expertise in polishing her phrases, she has not been perceptibly off course in her fundamental appraisals of what is wrong and who is responsible.

So the "liberal" press, television and radio have pilloried Mrs. Mitchell. She is not, of course, the real target. The target is Mrs. Mitchell's husband—or, more specifically, what Attorney General Mitchell stands for in terms of cracking down on the elements in America who have been tearing the country to shreds.

Mrs. Mitchell has committed at least two deadly sins in the "liberal" lexicon. First, she expressed frank apprehension that many of the protest movements plaguing the country have been engineered by communists. Well, the lady was on sound ground; there is solid evidence that she was right.

Then when Senator Fulbright, the darling of the leftwing set, voted against Carswell, Mrs. Mitchell—like Fulbright, a native of Arkansas—telephoned a protest to an Arkansas newspaper which devotedly supports Fulbright. An adroit politician—which Mrs. Mitchell does not pretend to be—would have been more selective, but Mrs. Mitchell thought the argument should be taken where it ought to be: with the folks who disagreed with her. That seems to us to speak well for the lady's forthrightness.

The treatment she has since received brings up the question of "tolerance" for other views—a subject which "liberals" pretend is

dear to their hearts. Contrast, if you will, the scorn heaped upon Mrs. Mitchell with the tender treatment given, for example, the wife of liberal Senator Hart of Michigan, who was arrested for deliberately defying the law with her protest activities.

Or, for another example, the torment heaped upon Haynsworth and Carswell by the "liberals"—ironically at the very instant they were defending Supreme Court Justice Douglas.

Still another example: Governor Kirk of Florida, right or wrong, saw it as his duty to try to protect the rights of the citizens of his state who, in the vast majority, have made clear their opposition to forced bussing of their children. Pious condemnations from the Liberal Establishment poured upon Governor Kirk; he has been described across the land as an evil man—when all Governor Kirk asked was a hearing by the U. S. Supreme Court. Which was denied.

Yet Martin Luther King, who preached civil disobedience from one end of the country to the other, was praised for his "courage" by the same voices which now condemn Governor Kirk.

To cite such contrasts is not meant to imply approval of civil disobedience by any citizen at any time. The point is simply that the leftwing set—including the politicians, press, television and radio—these people make their rules as they go along. Anything their side chooses to do in advancement of their cause is—to hear them tell it—courageous and proper and justified. But let the other side try it, and a chorus of pious lamentations rises from coast to coast.

Just keep an eye on the situation, and see for yourself.—American Way Features