

"It doesn't cut 'em down like it used to!"



# EDITORIALS

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

## Panic Sets In

In Jones County, and many more beleaguered counties all across the South an aching panic has set in as the opening of schools approach.

People who have had their heads buried in the sands for over a decade are now finding out the hard way what the blackmail power of federal judges and federal agencies really is.

Headmaster Ray Wooten of Kinston's Arendell Parrott Academy which enters its fourth academic year in September says he has a stack of student applications — largely from Jones, Greene, and Pitt counties — as Lenoir Countians still wait, passively for this educational guilotine to mow their school system down.

The pairing of elementary schools in Jones County under the ugly illegal writ of a pompous judicial ass named Algenon Butler has brought the issue to a head in that small county. So far there has not developed any real leadership in Jones County to cope with this problem.

Efforts to start a private school in one of the county's churches are moving, but slowly and one church cannot hope to accommodate the hundreds of children

whose parents—white and colored alike—resent the enforced integration of their children in schools that neither the child nor the parents wish them to attend.

Schools officials are more interested in keeping their jobs and the lush appropriations they have been wasting than in saving education in their respective counties.

In counties such as Jones and Greene where more than half the population is colored an exact mix along racial lines immediately creates a school system that is fair to neither white nor colored students.

Both of these wealthy counties of Jones and Greene have ample resources to not only meet but to solve this problem, but everyone seems to be sitting on his hands and waiting for 'John to do it.'

Time has run out on these and many more counties, and now they will have to do something more constructive than wringing their hands and cursing themselves for having voted their children into this ugly corner.

## Nixon and Agnew

No man ever came back so strongly from the political graveyard as Richard Milhaus Nixon. We won't know until after November 5th whether it is flesh or spirit that is now briefly among the living.

And with Nixon in this ghostly reincarnation there is an ebullient, handsome Baltimore politician who has performed several modern political miracles by walking in Republican shoes on the normally Democratic waters of The Great State of Maryland.

They offer an intriguing combination which will give Democrats and Wallace-ites a warm time for the next several weeks.

Nixon has been honed to the finest cutting edge of his incisive career. Double defeat has mellowed the tough caricature created of him in 1960, and the events of the day in our streets and in the jungles of Vietnam have given him whatever tool he needs for the moment to needle or to bludgeon the hapless Democrats who have floundered so badly while adrift without a rudder on this stormy sea of affluence.

But the Democrats have 25 million social security patrons, eight million wel-

fare recipients, four million soil-bank-check farmers and nearly four million government workers who get all or most of their paycheck from "Uncle Sugar," and this is a pretty potent coalition. Some say it adds up to a majority on any given voting day, and it may.

Americans, we are told, will more frequently vote their pocketbooks than their principles. This, too, is probably under the heading of truism, since the prevailing cynical view is that far more Americans have pocketbooks than have abiding political principles.

Somewhere between the millstone of Hubert Humphrey's special brand of socialism and the promises of Nixon drifts the political enigma of George Wallace. Not until November 5th, or the early hours of the 6th will the "people's choice" be known, and possibly even then there may be snags along the presidential trail; such as the possibility of a decision having to be made in the house of representatives rather than in the voting booth.

Nobody should complain about 1968 being a dull year; not politically in these none-too United States.

## The Dachau Complex

Men sitting on the federal bench such as John Larkins of Trenton suffer the identical disease that caused good Germans to carry out the ghastly orders of their superiors in the murder camps which hang like rotting albatrosses around the necks of all Germans today.

Larkins, and the many other federal judges who rubberstamp the mad mutter of that scant majority on the supreme court hide behind the illogic that the superior officer must be obeyed even when one knows he is utterly wrong.

In the lockstep of military conformity this is true; discipline cannot be maintained any other way except for orders to be obeyed.

But in the judiciary of a once free nation such as the United States, in which the individual judge is guaranteed life tenure to protect him from the pressures of superiors, the exact opposite philosophy should rule, since Judge Larkins and all of his colleagues are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and not the whim of any transient, thin majority of one on the supreme court.

Larkins and his brethren argue, unconvincingly to themselves, that anarchy would result if they didn't operate as rubberstamps, rather than as men of principle, who have the courage to support their innermost convictions.

But anarchy is being spread because they do follow the imbecilic illogic of that thin majority on the supreme court. Unhappily, from Earl Warren down the vast majority of the federal judiciary are men who failed in the political arena and who were given judicial sinecures for "service" to the party.

The same lack of courage that frequently caused their failure in the elective political arena carries with them into the pompous mumbo-jumbo of the courts, where they are surrounded by sycophantic lawyers and hired lackeys who bow and scrape and agree with every notion that may penetrate the head of these pensioned practitioners.

Nothing is sadder than to see a close friend of long standing, such as Larkins, surrender to the self-inflating poison of that kind of power which corrupts all it touches.

History will not forget in a thousand years the crimes of Dachau, Buchenwald and Austerlitz, and history will not forgive for a thousand years the cowardice of the federal judiciary for having so meekly forsworn its sacred oath and most basic principles.

## On Judicial Oaths

Who said this:  
"From these and many other selections which might be made, it is apparent that the framers of the constitution contemplated that instrument as a rule for the government of courts, as well as the legislature. Why otherwise does it direct the judges to take an oath to support it? This oath certainly applies, in an especial manner, to their conduct in their official character. How immoral to impose it on them, if they were to be used as the instruments and the knowing instruments for violating what they swear to support! Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the Constitution of the United States, if that Constitution forms no rule for his government? If such be the real state of things, this is worse than a solemn mockery."

This was the view of Chief Justice John Marshall, felt by many to be one of the greatest judges every to sit on the United States Supreme Court.

The present members of the federal judiciary at every level from the district judge to the chief justice still take exactly the same oath taken by Chief Justice Marshall but for the vast majority of them their oath-taking is, as Marshall said, "worse than a solemn mockery."

**JONES JOURNAL**  
JACK RIDER, publisher  
Published every Thursday by The Lenoir County News Company, Inc., 626 North Heritage St., Kinston, N. C. 28501, Phone JA 3-2373. Entered as Second Class Matter May 5, 1965, at Post Office at Trenton, North Carolina, under the Act of March 3, 1879. By mail first class \$3.00 per year plus 3 per cent N. C. Sales Tax. Subscription rates payable in advance. Second class postage paid at Trenton, N. C.

## PERSONAL PARAGRAPHS BY JACK RIDER

Having daughters who will be at Chapel Hill and Greensboro in their respective branches of the University of North Carolina this fall, I am happily in receipt of a questionnaire from Dr. Lillian Lehman, who is dean of student affairs, and — I hope not to meaningfully — is also an associate professor in the department of zoology. My desk dictionary defines zoology as the science that treats of animals or the animal kingdom.

After meditating briefly on what subtle hint this selection of a dean of students from the zoology department may hold for the average parent I went on and scanned the questionnaire which has to do with the setting up of a new set of rules "governing women students". Since I had not been able to govern the women in my family during even the most fleeting moment of their pre-university years I was drawn to a suggestion from a zoologist that might let me know where I had failed in keeping that stern paternal hand over my small family zoo.

"While the burden of the decision as to how your daughter lives during her stay here should not be yours alone, we, at the University, are interested in your attitudes and solicit your opinions:

"1. Do you think the University ought to be concerned with the social behavior of women students: Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Uncertain \_\_\_" Please check one. I wound up uncertain about whether I want my daughters in a school where the dean of students is even able to ask such a question.

"2. Should the University set guidelines for behavior in the form of regulations: Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Uncertain \_\_\_". My answer: Ditto.

"3. Should parents be notified if it comes to the attention of the University that a student is involved in the use of, or traffic in drugs, serious use of alcoholic beverages or serious aberration in behavior? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Uncertain \_\_\_" This one really hooked me. I sat for a while wondering what kind of a parent would answer this question "No" or "Uncertain"?

"Closing hours: 1. Beginning with September 1968 the closing hours for undergraduate women students (except first semester freshmen) will be 1 a.m. on weekday nights and 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights. Closing hours for first term freshmen will be midnight on week nights and 1 a.m. on Friday nights. Women students are free to leave the residence hall at 5 a.m. What is your opinion of these hours: Too restrictive \_\_\_ Acceptably restrictive \_\_\_ Acceptable \_\_\_ Acceptably lenient \_\_\_ Too lenient \_\_\_" I thought all respectable zoos had more reasonable hours than these.

"Women are presently permitted to visit in social rooms of men's residence halls and fraternities from noon until women's closing hours, seven days a week. Men are granted the same visiting privileges for approximately the same hours in women's dormitories and sorority social rooms. What is your opinion of this present policy?" Somebody had better let Pope Paul hear about this.

"A proposal has been submitted to the administration by students which would allow for visiting members of the opposite sex in individual residence halls and sorority or fraternity bedrooms. What is your opinion regarding such a proposal on a special planned-event-only." And the same series of four questions: Too restrictive, acceptably restrictive, acceptable, acceptably lenient and too lenient? Here again I can't escape the worried wonder about any parent who'd call this bedroom visiting "too restrictive".

After which, all this worried father can gasp: If we haven't taught them what is right and what is wrong by the time they get old enough to go to college zoology professors and administrative regulations and parental shock and prayer and curses and bribery will neither be able to prevail individually nor collectively. Let all parents similarly situate join as Don McNeil says "in a moment of silent prayer."