

**PERSONAL  
PARAGRAPHS  
BY  
JACK RIDER**

Last week my wife asked me several times to go with her to see an Ingrid Bergman movie. I kept putting it off with one excuse and then another. Finally, when pressed hard enough I made known my real reason for not wanting to see Miss Bergman play the role of an English Missionary in China. In substance, I declared:

"I know she is a great actress, but she is not great enough to erase from my mind the fact that she is morally a slut. I am no blue-nose who thinks divorce is wrong. In fact, I believe it to be the best thing when people are miserable in a marriage, and are making life miserable for themselves and all around them. But Miss Bergman cannot hope to claim any such nice privilege. She lived with this Italian for months before divorcing her first husband, deserting her children by her first marriage and creating a scandal that still smells, even in Europe.

"A woman with that kind of background cannot act well enough to convince me that she is a 'dedicated missionary'. In each scene, I'd imagine she was taking the 'sack measurement' of every male soul she was trying to save. That makes an evil, gray-headed old man out of me, but that's just the way the inner-springs bounce.

"I know full well that Miss Bergman is not the only tramp in her trade. Rita Hayworth could probably spot her 'cards and spades' and beat her at any boudoir game, but then Miss Hayworth ain't been playing missionary roles recently.

"The great stage or screen artist is supposed, on paper, to create characters, but no matter how great they are they are still part of the image that they have created of themselves in the public eye. Humphrey Bogart would have had difficulty playing a Baptist preacher, at least for me. Andy Griffith cannot aspire to Fred Astaire suavity. Judy Canova could not play Juliet. Oscar Levant cannot be a Van Kliburn.

"For other people, this reasoning may be as 'square' as an honest dice, but for me it's just thataway and I'm making no effort to drag my artistic appreciation in any other direction. If Miss Bergman wants to play parts that fit her real-life temperament, I'll enjoy her along with the rest of the world, but not as a missionary, please."

I'm not one of those who believe Hollywood is a den of iniquity, filled with immoral people. Sure it has some of that flavor, but what village doesn't. On that subject there has recently been a lot of bitter things said about the "All American Boy" Eddie Fisher forsaking his wife for Elizabeth Taylor. I've seen Debbie Reynolds in TV appearances! never in a movie, and last year I saw Miss Taylor in a movie. Can't say that I blame Fisher.

That makes a double-standard bearer out of me, at least on the surface. I "OK" for Fisher, what I've just denied Miss Bergman. But it ain't necessarily that way. My objection, very largely is to one of these "bed hoppers" trying to play a part that is so completely different from their real self. I don't approve of wholesale divorce, but it is a legal method of handling a problem that would otherwise be difficult. If a couple cannot get along, it's better for them to divorce and remarry a dozen times than to flaunt accepted moral standards by simply "shacking up" with first one and then another.

I tell you this, and in full reach of my wife, sanctified as I am, I'd sure be in a helluva fix if I was being tempted by Elizabeth Taylor.

... And Have a Strong Back!



**EDITORIALS**

*Never Forget That These Editorials Are The Opinion Of One Man, And He May Be Wrong.*

**Didn't Read Papers**

Despite the fact that every news media from coast to coast proclaimed the November elections as a "Great Liberal Sweep" there are positive indications that the men elected take a different view of things in general and their responsibility in particular.

The opening skirmishes in both houses of congress were clear victories for conservatives. The defeat of Joe Martin was brought about by desperation in the Republican Party, not from any notion about socialization of the GOP.

In the Senate, Lyndon Johnson has called the tune quite effectively and now the same newsmen who were talking about a "liberal sweep" in November are reexamining those legislators who three months ago had that label hung on them.

The Democratic victory was largely a result of Republican "Me-tooism"; the effort of Republicans to out "New Deal" the Democrats.

There is also a very great difference between a "liberal" from Montana and one from Harlem. The western "liberal" is a man who wants public funds for conservation practices for the general welfare,

while his "liberal" next-of-kin in Harlem is a simple political pimp to nothing more altruistic than reelection.

The vote of the senate so soon after the opening of the 86th congress on the so-called filibuster rule indicates several things, and we do not believe we are merely taking an exercise in wishful thinking to assert that among these is: The senators have been home and have heard what the home folks have had to say on the civil rights issue.

The senate is our last bastion of constitutional government, and happily it has had the courage to resist the pious chantings of the flapped liberals, the NAACP, the Supreme Court, the narrow-gauge religionists and the broad-bottomed hypocrites who have and still seek to use the race issue for their own selfish ends.

The temper of the people has been sampled and the senate has reflected it in rising to resist the Paul Douglas kind of mummery that would ruin our country in the name of some kind of namby-pamby philosophy erected upon the equalitarian principles of an ant heap. Hurrah for Congress.

**Castro's Cuba**

Cuba's new "Strong Man", Fidele Castro, has promised that his enemies will be given a "fair trial" before being shot. Seems to us we have heard that line some where before.

Let us assume that Castro is cut from the finest democratic cloth and that he means all the things he has said about a better Cuba than existed under the heel of deposed Dictator Batista. After swallowing that assumption we then may go on to the next question: Are the Cuban people capable of ruling themselves?

There is serious conjecture on that point. The overwhelming majority of Cubans are Catholic, which automatically conditions them to autocratic rule. Also

practically all Cubans are either Spanish, negro or halfbreeds of that combination and the political and religious heritage of both is rooted ages deep in dictatorship.

The experiment which we carry on here in the United States in republican government is the end product of over 500 years of effort in that direction. Since King John and Magna Carta there has been a foment in the affairs of Anglo-Saxons for more and more self government. The history of this effort is a tedious tale of sacrifice, war, revolution and evolution and it is not ended yet.

To expect a people to read about this in a book and adapt themselves suddenly to its responsibilities is too much, far too much.

**Just Before the Battle**

Up until now the socialists on the federal courts have been toying with children, but now that they have moved in to the State of Georgia in their determination to mongrelize education and society they will find, and quickly that they are dealing with a far different breed of people than in such weak-kneed states as North Carolina and Florida.

The federal court order to admit negroes to a Georgia college is about as valuable as a used postage stamp. There is some chance that the order may have a negative value, in that it will crystallize even more solidly the resentment and resistance of the South against the illegal invasions of these turncoats in the federal judiciary.

North Carolina with its Malcolm Seawell and Luther Hodges are eager to "take the middle road", the path of moderation, the surrender-a-little-bit route.

In this fight over state rights, and this extends far beyond the simple question of racial integration, there is no middle ground. Either the 10th Amendment means what it says, or it means nothing.

The modern fashion of writing laws in long-winded technical language was not the style in the Constitutional Convention, and when the Bill of Rights was added to that original draft the same simple, concise language was in use.

Even a child in the third grade can understand the 10th Amendment, it says: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Compare that with the 14th Amendment which was extracted under duress from the prostrate South by a vengeful north. The 14th Amendment is 440 words long, consisting of five sections. The last 15 of those words are: "The Congress shall have power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article."

The first four "provisions" of the 14th Amendment, in substance, guarantee equal protection of the law to all citizens except those who were members of the Confederate Army, spells out the qualifications for voting and holding federal office—again excluding members of the Confederate Army, repeats the same in the third paragraph and in the fourth sanctifies the "public debt" as it pertains to "pensions and bounties for suppressing insurrection and rebellion", but repudiating all debts incurred in aid of the same rebellion.

From beginning to end the 14th Amendment is an instrument of vengeance, heaping insult upon the injury of the South. Later, and until this day, Congress in a less bitter mood has left the 14th Amendment to fester without a single, solitary bill to "enforce" its bitter provisions.

But in this generation a court has been jerry-built out of discarded fragments from the political scrap pile: Such weak "stones" as a socialist law school dean, a pensioned Ku Klux Klanner, an ex-attorney general, whose knowledge of the law is infantile, a blundering California hypocrite, a mountain-climbing intellectual goat and a number of other pieces of similar value. This collection of shysters, sworn to uphold the Constitution, has grasped one tiny fragment of the entire framework of government and is doing its venal worst to shake down the whole structure of government.

Left to their own petty devices, they would succeed. Given the pious contradictions of a Seawell or a Hodges and they would keep playing their deadly game. But happily for our Constitution there are men like Almond, Russell, Talmadge, Ervin, Easterling and Long who are not only armed with greater courage but with a far greater intellect, and above all are fighting in a far more righteous cause.

The battle has just begun, but victory will be with Constitutional government, we earnestly pray.

**JONES JOURNAL**

JACK RIDER, Publisher  
Published Every Thursday by The Lenoir County News Company, Inc., 403 West Vernon, Ave., Kinston, N. C., Phone 5415. Entered as Second Class Matter May 5, 1949, at the Post Office at Trenton, North Carolina, under the Act of March 3, 1879. By Mail in First Zone—\$3.00 Per Year. Subscription Rates Payable in Advance.

