

**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 16, 1970 NUMBER TWENTY-NINE  
 SUBSCRIPTION RATES \$3.00/YEAR  
 OUT OF COUNTY \$5.00/YEAR

**SENATOR  
 SAM ERVIN  
 SAYS**



WASHINGTON -- The postal reorganization bill which won Senate approval on June 30th contains a "unionshop" provision which I strongly opposed during debate on this measure. The Senate version of the bill to convert the Post Office Department into an independent government agency differs from the House version which eliminates the compulsory unionism requirement for employees of the proposed U.S. Postal Service.

I voted for the Fannin Amendment which would have assured all employees of the Postal Service the right, without fear of reprisal, to form or join labor organizations, or to refrain from such union activities. I regret that the Fannin Amendment was rejected by the Senate, because I believe that every man should have the right to join a union or the right to refrain from joining a union. I also believe that where persons voluntarily join a union--it makes no difference whether they are Federal employees or employees of a private employer--they should have the right to negotiate through representatives of their choosing with their employer, whether it be the Federal Government or a private employer, in respect to conditions of their employment insofar as those conditions are not regulated by acts of Congress.

The Senate-passed bill proposes for the first time in American history that Federal employees shall be compelled to pay to labor unions sums of money for the privilege of working for their government. It would give to unions as autocratic a power as the kings of France had in their most despotic days. Once the kings of France possessed almost absolute power over the lives of their subjects, and French men had to pay their king for the right to earn a living during that tyrannical era.

Today, we find this doctrine enunciated by those who advocate compulsory unionism in the Postal Service. In essence, what is now proposed in the Senate-passed bill is that the right to work in the Postal Service is a labor union right, which the labor union can sell and the individual postal employee must buy if he is allowed to earn a livelihood for himself and his loved ones.

During a previous generation, labor unions rightly condemned "yellow dog" contracts whereby employees were required to agree either to join a union selected by their employer or to abstain from joining any union whatever. The current demand for compulsory unionism in the Postal Service in my judgment, is actually a demand for a "yellow dog" contract in another form. There is no difference in the eyes of freedom between a "yellow dog" contract which says that a man cannot join a union and a "yellow dog" contract which says that he must join a union.

No free man ought to be compelled to join any organization against his will for the privilege of earning his bread, and no man should be required to join a union or to financially support a union except by his own free choice. Certainly, no man ought to be required to pay union dues as the price of working for his own government.

For these reasons, I am hopeful that the Senate-House conferees, who are considering this bill, will eliminate the possibility that postal employees may be compelled to join a union irrespective of their own free will.

**We Cut Cane, They Made Hay!**

The loony left volunteered their services to Castro, supposedly to harvest the sugar cane crops. But the Cuban Commies were smarter than that. They used every spare moment to indoctrinate the young American

rebels in the ways and means of seizing the nerve cells of a city and a country. While the gullible young Americans cut cane--the Commies, as usual, made hay!

**VIEWPOINT**

By Jesse Helms

The associate pastor's opening prayer at services Sunday seemed largely devoted to cataloguing the troubles of the nation and the world; the Lord was of course implored to deliver us from them. No offense intended to the sincere man who delivered the prayer, but his entreaty somehow seemed less a plea for divine guidance in troubled times than his own recommended course of action submitted simply for Providential approval.

There was something to the effect that we should be made to "hear" the young people today. Just which young people was not made clear; the implication was that the minister had in mind those young people who have gathered together a vocabulary of condemnatory cliches which have become such a familiar part of almost every protest movement and noisy demonstration.

The fact is, of course, that there are indeed plenty of young people worthy of being heard, whose company is a delight, and whose ideals are nothing short of inspiring. But these are not the ones who skip classes, or duck exams, or dodge the draft. And the impression will not go away that, astonishing as it may seem, these are in the majority.

Yet there is small room for comfort even if it is only a minority that today is picketing, protesting, petitioning and parading; cursing their country and reviling their President. History has an awesome way of repeating itself.

For it was only a minority that gave rise to Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany in the 1920s and 1930s. It was a student revolution that became the backbone of Mussolini's support in Italy and which won the German universities for the Nazis. There are too many frightening similarities, between then and now, for present-day Americans to ignore in apathy.

Both Mussolini and Hitler rode to power on the wings of socialism. A thunderous minority of students, then as now, embraced the theory that the government ought to control the destiny of man, and student mobs took to the streets to demand it. Oddly enough, it was the Nazis who invented the phrase "Das System"—meaning "the system." The system was wrong, the students of yesterday shouted. They

demanded its overthrow. Fascinating are the Nazi youth slogans: "The system must die so that the people can live"—one slogan went. "Common good before personal advancement"—went another.

The students fancied they were fighting for freedom, but they were campaigning for socialism. And when they finally learned their mistake, it was too late.

Not long ago, a 21-year-old senior at Harvard University, Steve Kelman, quit the student radical SDS movement of which he had been a part for more than four years. The older he got, and the more he learned about history, he said, the more misgivings he had about what is going on in America today. He took time to do independent research of the history of totalitarianism in Germany and Italy. He dismissed from his mind the advocacies and exhortations of his professors. "I wanted," he said, "to find out for myself."

It came as quite a shock to him that there is a devastating similarity in the manner in which young people were used by Hitler and Mussolini, and the way young people in America today are being swept up into a frenzy of protest against what they call "The Establishment."

Commenting on the end results of Nazism—results quite unexpected by the young people who helped bring Nazism about—Steve Kelman recently said: "Come the day of mass murders and regimentation in the United States, and today's young revolutionaries will turn away." And he adds: "I can just see the ones—like myself—who were deceived, painfully and pleadingly asking themselves, why? They will be saying: 'This isn't what we meant by revolution. This isn't what we wanted.'"

Steve Kelman's message is that it isn't so important that we "listen" to young people today as it is that a way be found to reason with the ones who have jumped the track. How to do it, he doesn't say. Maybe that's the responsibility of the majority of young people, the ones who do not agree with what's going on today. The rest of us had better start encouraging them to speak out—before it's too late.—American Way Features

*The Manion Forum*

By Marilyn Manion

**A MANY-SIDED STORY**



News items that didn't exactly make the headlines:

"White River Junction, Vt.—A student who said he saw four of his classmates killed when National Guard troops fired on demonstrators at Kent State University in Ohio on Monday says the Guardsmen were not to blame.

"James Young, 20, of White River Junction, said in an interview yesterday with radio station WNRV that the Guardsmen 'had to fire to defend their lives.'

"Young, who said he watched the incident from a dormitory window 150 yards away, said the students were an angry mob.

"I really believe the crowd—if they had tried hard to hand to fight their way out—would have beaten them to death, Young said.

"The news reports sort of gave the impression that the National Guard was entirely wrong," he said. "But that's not true. They were defending their lives. They had no alternative but to shoot."

"He said that from his vantage point, he saw about 30 Guardsmen come up a hill from a green and down the other side to a football field where they confronted more than 2,000 students. . . ." —Associated Press, May 8, 1970

Miss Berta Jean Ozeran of Benton Harbor, Mich., a graduate student (at Kent State) told the Benton Harbor *News-Palladium* she heard a single shot fired, apparently at National Guardsmen, before they returned the fire and cut down four students. She said innocent bystanders had left the scene 10 minutes

earlier so that 'anybody who was still on the scene when the shots were fired was strongly involved, if not radical. . . ." —Walter Trohan, in the *Chicago Tribune*.

The tragic day at Kent State is etched in the minds of millions. But whose picture is it that is so firmly imbedded in everyone's memory? In the first emotion-charged days after the shootings, the public got the impression that trigger-happy Guardsmen fired into a crowd of innocent kids.

The "young innocents" were protesting the President's decision to protect our forces in Vietnam by attacking enemy strongholds in Cambodia. How dare he "escalate" the war in this way without asking them first! And, wouldn't you know, the forces of repression would arrive on campus when word of an impending riot got out?

It is now evident that the move into Cambodia was successful. The amount of captured supplies and weapons is, according to one account, simply "incredible." But who cares? "It may ultimately be shown," opines *Fortune* magazine, "that Nixon had excellent military reasons for sending U.S. units into Cambodia. But Cambodia was not his main problem. The condition of the U.S. was his main problem."

In other words, the President had better do just what the Weathermen, yippies, peaceniks, Communists, potheads, et al want him to do. If he dares oppose them, the resultant blood will be on his hands. There's no logic to that—but it's what an awful lot of people believe today.—American Way Features