Government Can Now Back Fight Against Segregation

By James Marlow
Associated Press News Analyst

WASHINGTON (AP)—Negroes' effort to end segregation in the South through direct but passive action—such as sit-ins and bus rides by Negroes and white sympathizers—raises a haunting question.

Would this country be closer to total desegregation if a quarter century ago Negroes had begun their present tactics instead of deciding on the long, slow road through the courts?

Back in the 1950s the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People instead of direct action, began a fight, step by painful step through the courts to have segregation declared unconstitutional.

Before ever trying to get the court to outlaw public school segregation, a truly explosive area, the NAACP fought to get schools on the higher levels desegregated through court action.

As long ago as 1958 the court outlawed segregation on interstate buses, although you might not think so in view of the white mob riots last week in Alabama over buses carrying so-called "freedom riders" of whites and Negroes.

The NAACP's crowning achievement was the Supreme Court's May 17, 1954 decision against public school segregation. All the court's previous anti-segregation rulings didn't have the impact of this.

Out of it flowed the bitterest Southern white antagonism, the determination to make a last-ditch fight in defiance of the court, the Little Rock riots of 1957 and, as an end product, the Alabama riots last week.

Negroes became more confident of breaking down all the Southern segregation barriers with the government now compelled to intervene, even with federal troops, to back up the authority of the court.

But by bit the NAACP lost its role as the almost exclusive champion and spokesman for Negroes. Other Negro groups came into existence determined to fight faster and more directly against all forms of desegregation.

This is particularly true among Southern Negro students who took the non-violent but still direct action of picketing and sit-ins. The first big example of the new policy came about six years ago in Montgomery, Ala.

There Negroes put an economic squeeze on the white-dominated city by boycotting the buses. New Negro leaders, operating outside the NAACP, emerged; like the Rev. Martin Luther King who led the bus boycott.

But the original question still remains: Would Negroes have made faster toward desegregation if they had chosen the direct action road 25 years ago instead of the slower course taken by the NAACP? This writer thinks no.

For this reason: The psychological climate wasn't right. Neither were the circumstances.

1. Africa was still a collection of European colonies. Only in recent years have African Negroes begun to assert themselves and gain independence. This gave encouragement to Negroes everywhere to fight directly for their rights.

2. The United States, seeking to lead the non-Communist world, is made self-conscious every time there is an anti-Negro outbreak in this country.

3. The Supreme Court decisions against segregation have split Southerners' thinking, even of those who may favor segregation but realize there can be only anarchy if the court's rulings are ignored or violated.

4. The court's rulings, coming as they did at one time over years, have conditioned both the country and the South into realization that segregation had to end.

5. The court itself, more than 60 years ago, had approved segregation and considered it constitutional so long as segregated Negroes got treatment equal to that given whites. They did not, of course.

But with the Supreme Court on the side of segregation, Negroes were handicapped. Any demonstrations could have been suppressed on the ground they were violating state segregation laws. The government could have done little or nothing to help, until the Supreme Court reversed itself.

6. Now the situation is different. With the court throwing out various Southern segregation laws, the federal government can back up Negroes protesting segregation, as it did in Little Rock and on the buses.
Survey Results Show 3-1 Against School Desegregation

Residents Here See 'Trouble' in 'Mixing'

By TOM FAISON
Telegram Staff Writer

By a margin of better than 3-1, residents in the Nash-Edgecombe County area replying to The Telegram's poll on school segregation indicated they would oppose mixing colored and white races in public secondary schools at any time.

Opposition to an immediate end of segregation in the schools ran more than 22-1. These figures covered responses from 309 white people who filled out questionnaires.

Results of the survey among colored residents of the area appeared inconclusive since replies were received from only 11 per cent of those polled. But among white residents, who registered opinions, the sample showed no indication that popular acceptance of school integration could be brought soon in this heavily agricultural section.

Among white residents of the strictly rural sections of Nash-Edgecombe, opinion ran 118-7 against ending segregation now and 111-14 against ever ending it. Many of those who foresaw its end in future years indicated they would not oppose mixing colored children segregated in the schools.

Answers included in letters accompanying returned questionnaires and pulled from the multiple choice question themselves show it as a combination of the continuing southern attitude of white superiority—social and economic—mingled with two distinct fears:

The fear of physical violence if the two races are thrown together in schools and on school buses, and the fear that school integration will lead to social integration of white and colored.

Of the two fears, opponents of desegregation lined up most strongly with the contention that mixing white and colored in the schools would "cause trouble." Among the 231 whites who said they opposed ending segregation, 207 indicated they felt its end would lead to trouble.

Why and how do these people believe trouble would start? A rural Nash County housewife, mother of four, explained in her letter:

"I had one school teacher tell me that she would not want to teach (if schools were desegregated) because if a white and colored child got in a fight and it was the white child that started it and she punished the white child, then the parents would blame her for not putting the blame on the colored child. And then she said it could be opposite to that; the colored child could be at fault and she punish it and then the colored people would say she was taking up for the white children."

A 48-year-old Rocky Mount father summed up his fears of desegregation by saying: "Desegregation will definitely be detrimental to all pupils—white and colored—once it is forced. I predict there will be fights, wounds, bruises, murder and possibly a revolution." He added: "While or Negro pupils would continually be making remarks to one another to such an extent that education would mean nothing to them except vengeance."

Speaking of the effects of a mixed system on colored students, a Rocky Mount contractor declared: "They would constantly be subjected to slights, indifference and even insults of white students."

Other letters showed a feeling of the primary concern at the prospect of mixed schools by pointing to trouble in Southern Delaware and Baltimore when school integration was attempted there in the fall. With the attendance was the tenor of remarks foreseeing physical violence. On one hand, it did not abate in the rather conflicting fear that school integration would lead to commingling of the races.

The key to this conflict was elucidated by an Edgecombe County farmer who expressed concern that colored and white children in the primary grades would "become friendly" and ignore the color barrier as they grew older. Others agreed with a Rocky Mount man who insisted "unless desegregation is prevented lots of love making may be in the offing right now."

The unceasingly present feeling of socio-economic superiority among many whites was found repeatedly among letters accompanying the questionnaires. Often it took the subtle form of pointing out that North Carolina's colored population paid less of the state's tax than did whites and were, therefore, "sitting on their money's worth" in the present school setup.

Some replies on the strictly social level made feelings more plain. A young farmer veteran wrote: "The Southern people will not allow the Negroes to become equal to whites."
In the Foreign Fields

Austria Threatens World Peace; Polish Disaster

AUSTRIA

War clouds which have been gathering all over Europe in recent weeks have culminated in a crisis in Austria. The departure of Chancellor Dollfuss has produced a situation in which the country is now a potential battleground between the central European powers and the powers of the East.

The crisis began when Dollfuss dissolved the Reichstag and called for new elections. This move was opposed by the Social Democrats, who have been allied with the Nationalists in their campaign against Dollfuss. The election results were a complete victory for the Nationalists, who now hold a majority of 257 seats in the new Reichstag.

The Nationalists, led by Dollfuss, have expressed their determination to maintain the integrity of Austria and to prevent any further interference by foreign powers. They have also called for a meeting of the Central Powers to discuss the situation.

The crisis has been exacerbated by the recent outbreak of fighting in the Balkans, where the Austrians have been involved in a number of border incidents with Yugoslavia and Bulgaria.

CYNOSURE

In beautiful, gay Vienna, the talks between the three great powers have come to a standstill. The conference has been going on for several days, but so far there has been no agreement.

The main issue is the question of the future of Austria. The Austrians want to maintain their independence and their neutral status, while the other powers are pressing for their annexation.

The situation is grave, and the Austrians are determined to resist any attempt to force them to make concessions.

In Austria, the situation is tense. The army has been put on high alert, and the government has declared a state of emergency.

The talks continue, and the future of Austria remains uncertain.
DICTATORSHIP'S EVILS TOLD BY RADIO SPEAKER

Charles City Lawyer Gives History of Dictators in Forum Talk.

Because of the complete and splendid broadcasting the subject, the following address on "Dictators," given by Attorney Erwin Larsen of Charles City on the KCLO North Iowa Forum Monday evening is reprinted almost in full, as given. Mr. Larsen was state legislative chairman of the Iowa department of the American Legion last year. The text of the address follows:

History shows that the greater portion of the world has, at one time or another, been governed by a dictator. In fact the greater portion of written history is of dictators. There are two or three exceptions as far as modern and medieval history goes. In that period, Britain, the Scandinavian countries, and that portion of the North American continent north of the Rio Grande have never had a government of that kind.

Webster's dictionary defines a dictator as "One in whom is vested supreme authority in any line one who rules as dictator; one who prescribes for others authoritative actions."

Supreme Authority.

The modern version of a dictator is that one person in whom is vested supreme authority over the country, rights and property of all within the confines of any certain nation or group of nations.

The foundation of a dictatorship is poverty, enthusiasm of a certain powerful group for one individual, and it is maintained by terror. In the earlier days of the Roman empire, dictators were elected in time of public calamity by the Roman senate and were given full and complete power. One of the most famous of these is Pompey, so called because of his curly hair. At the time Rome was attacked by barbarous hordes the senate selected him as dictator and granted him dictatorial powers. He left his fields, went into Rome, ordered all able-bodied men to report to him before sundown and under cover of darkness attacked and annihilated the enemy. He ruled for 10 days as supreme commander of the Roman empire and all its peoples. At the end of the 10 days his job was done and he resigned. His fame rests on the fact of his voluntary relinquishment of the power which was his.

Alexander the Great.

About three centuries B.C. Alexander the Great, son of Amyntas, a mighty warrior, because of the countries surrounding the sea around Asia Minor. His dictatorial power was based on military power and was the forerunner of those to follow.

Julius Cesar almost a century later was a dictator, to a great extent,shortly after the subjugation of Gaul, crossed the Rubicon with his army and attacked Rome. The attempt failed in five years and of the military power he had established himself as supreme dictator of the entire Roman empire.

Napoleon Bonaparte is an example of one who took over a continent, but his personality and military power were his downfall. He was defeated at Waterloo and his empire was destroyed.

At the turn of the nineteenth century Napoleon Bonaparte established himself as a dictator, not only of his own adopted country of France, but of all European nations. His dictatorial power was based on military power and his personality. His empire was destroyed at Waterloo and his downfall was due to his overestimation of his own power.

Menghini, dictator in about the twentieth century, failed because of his personality and his military power. His empire was destroyed and his downfall was due to his overestimation of his own power.

Dictators All Over.

Right new Italy, Greece, Poland,
Reagan: Soviet Nuclear Edge Bars Freeze

Kremlin Says U.S. Wants Superiority

WASHINGTON (AP) — President Reagan is trying to blast a congressional drive for an immediate nuclear arms freeze by saying it would leave the United States dangerously behind the Soviet Union and prompt the Kremlin to pursue real weapons reductions.

Reagan, declaring in a nationally broadcast news conference Wednesday there could be no winner in a nuclear war, also invited the Soviets "to join with us now to substantially reduce nuclear weapons and make an important breakthrough for lasting peace."

The Reagan, responding today to Radio Moscow, said, "The president supported a speedy buildup of U.S. strategic armaments, including new bombers and ground- and sea-based missile systems."

"Only when that was completed, he said, would his administration begin talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear weapons. This proves President Reagan's intention to break strategic parity and to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union," the statement said.

Reagan said Wednesday night that the nuclear freeze proposal by Sens. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., and Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., would maintain a "definite margin of superiority" favoring the Soviets.

"The Soviets' great edge is one in which they could absorb our retaliatory blow and still emerge," he said.

Hatfield and other proponents of an immediate freeze reacted quickly.

"When he talks about the Russians being able to absorb a retaliatory strike, which indicates fantasy and not fact," he said, "the Republican senator said.

Reagan threw his support in a rival resolution, backed by a majority in the Senate, that would only block his plans to deploy new strategic bombers, missiles and submarines from a Soviet-American accord on arms reduction.

ON EL SALVADOR, the President said, with a "right-wing coalition apparently emerging in El Salvador," any attempt to retreat from current reforms there "would give us great difficulties in continuing support for the Central American nation."

The president, in his first public comment on Sunday's elections in the Andeicountry, said the voting "really showed that there is a real desire for democracy there, and I am therefore going to be optimistic about what happens."

Asked whether the administration would back away from supporting any government in El Salvador that abandons social reform initiatives, he said, "current U.S.-backed military-civilian junta led by Jose Napoleo Duarte."

Reagan avoided endorsing the idea that the rightists would form the government.

"We are watching this very carefully. I think that even to go somewhere in that direction would give us great difficulties if a government now appeared on the scene that really turned away from the reforms that have been instituted," he said.

On the nuclear weapons issue, Reagan said the Soviet Union has achieved "a definite margin of superiority." An immediate freeze of U.S. and Soviet forces, he said, "would not only be disadvantageous, in fact, even dangerous to us but also would remove Soviet incentives to negotiate substantial reductions."

The president reiterated that his goal is "to reduce nuclear weapons dramatically, ensuring testing peace and security." He declared his support of a congressional proposal that calls for a freeze of weapons only after the United States has closed the gap in warheads and his, he says the Soviet Union has an edge.

The administration could be ready by this summer to begin talks with the Soviets on reductions in strategic weapons, Reagan said.

In any nuclear war, he said, "I don't think there could be any winners. Everybody would be a loser if there's a nuclear war."

Reagan said the rival nuclear freeze resolution, by Sens. John Warner, R-Va., and Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., was "an important move in the right direction."

In Congress, the Hatfield-Kennedy proposal reflects anti-nuclear sentiment in the nation, while the substance

Warner-Jackson measure has the support of defense-minded senators.

The Warner-Jackson measure calls for major, verifiable reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons to equal force levels. Reagan said these are "essential elements of a truly effective arms control agreement."

Jackson, meanwhile, said he anticipated that the president had indicated "his support of the general thrust" of the proposal he and Warner have made.

But Senate Democratic leader Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, who has signed both resolutions, warned of growing impatience with the president's stand on arms control.

"It is disheartening that after 16 months in office the president is still unable to provide any specifics about his intentions," Byrd said. "I hope that his statement is a first step along a path of meaningful and expeditious negotiations."

Former Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie said the ten Reagan called a new conference "was a victory for the freeze movement."

But Muskie said he was not reassured by the president's "superiority talk."

Paul Warnke, the U.S. arms control director in the Carter administration, disagreed with Reagan that the Soviets have a lead in strategic nuclear capability. Warnke said that the Warner-Jackson resolution does "in effect provide for a continuation of the nuclear arms race."

Barbara Roche of St. Louis, representing the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign, said there is "no logic in a policy which calls for arms in order to disarm, for spending billions more on nuclear weapons in order to keep up with fewer nuclear weapons."

Leon Stull, national director of Americans for Democratic Action, said Reagan's support for the Warner-Jackson resolution "is out of step with America's wishes. Its eventual purpose is to continue the buildup of intercontinental and expensive strategic forces."
Senate filibuster blusters on MX missile foes successfully stall vote

MIKE SHANAHAN
Associated Press

WASHINGTON — Senate proponents of the MX missile failed Thursday to curtail a filibuster led by Democratic presidential hopeful Gary Hart, even though deployment of the strategic weapon has been affirmed by the House, and eventual approval seemed inevitable.

The Senate vote was 55 to 41 on a move by Republican Majority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr. to limit further MX debate, five short of the 60 needed to invoke cloture, the parliamentary state where each senator is limited to one hour of debate.

The vote demonstrated that when the MX issue reaches a conclusive vote in the Senate, President Reagan is almost certain to get approval for building at least 21 of a planned 100 MXs included in a $200 billion defense authorization bill which the Senate has been debating for nearly two weeks.

As the filibuster rolled on the Senate floor, sources who spoke on condition they not be identified said behind-the-scenes efforts to end it and allow final votes, probably next Tuesday, were under way.

In part, the negotiations among Hart, Baker, Minority Leader Robert C. Byrd Jr., D-W.Va., and other Senate leaders focused on Hart’s insistence that pro-MX senators answer the arguments of opponents that the MX is a weapon “without a home or a mission,” as Sen. Paul Sarbanes, D-Md., said Thursday.

In addition, Sen. Joseph Biden, D-Del., said he believes if the MX is built, it will lead to a new nuclear arms buildup, including anti-missile missiles to counter weapons like the MX and encompassing development of nuclear weapons in outer space.

“We are stepping on a treadmill that we will not be able to step off,” said Biden.

Arms control policy in the Reagan administration, Biden said, is under the control of officials who have shown a “demonstrated instinct for nuclear madness.”

In the House, MX foes said despite their defeat late Wednesday, they would fight on when the issue comes up again in the fall.

Two Senate Republicans, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, and Bob Packwood of Oregon, voted with 39 Democrats to permit the filibuster to continue. There are 54 Republicans and 46 Democrats in the Senate.

Baker said he would try again on Friday to shorten the debate, and Republican sources who spoke on condition they not be identified predicted he would win on the second attempt.

Hart, the Colorado Democrat seeking his party’s presidential nomination, said he has been attempting to stir a public debate in which it will become clear that the MX is a sitting duck vulnerable to Soviet attack and is more likely to intensify than slow the nuclear arms race.

After Thursday’s vote, Hart said, “The debate has not been as ful and complete as it needs to be.”

Since the MX battle began, Hart said, the debate has persuaded at least one senator, whom he declined to identify, to change his position on whether to build the missile. In addition, Hart said, “Several senators are uneasy” about whether to confine their support.

Hart was asked if he would call off his filibuster if the Senate votes to limit debate on Friday and if a half dozen anti-MX senators are allowed to speak on the subject.

“That’s a strong possibility,” he replied.

Sen. John Tower, R-Texas, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said bitterly that the Senate has heard enough on the MX and should vote to approve its production and deployment.

“Nobody is being enlightened by additional debate,” Tower said, adding “the question is not whether but when” the MX will be approved.

Tower and other MX proponents say the United States must at least begin building the nuclear-tipped missile to force the Soviet Union to seriously negotiate a reduction in its land-based force of intercontinental ballistic weapons.

In the Democratic House, meanwhile, foes of the missile pledged a new fight despite Wednesday’s 220 to 207 vote to go ahead with production of the MX, the newest and most accurate land-based missile in the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

“The struggle is going to go right down to the bitter end,” said House Speaker Thomas P. O’Neill Jr., D-Mass. “The fight isn’t over by any means.”

MX opponents in both the House and Senate said they will seek to delete funds for the missile from appropriations bills which are expected to be debated in September.

Wednesday’s House vote appeared to show they have gained strength since May 24 when the House voted 239 to 186 to release funds for test flying the missiles, each of which carries 10 warheads aimed at different Soviet targets.

Continuing the MX debate Thursday, the House voted to decrease the number of missiles to be purchased initially and installed by 1999 from 27 to 21.

That reduces the initial cost from $2.8 billion to $2.1 billion.

In another vote, the House put into legislation a recommendation by Reagan’s commission on MX that the United States also develop a smaller, single-warhead missile called Midgetman.

The smaller missile is designed to encourage the Russians to also build single-warhead missiles, and thus lower the likelihood of nuclear war.

An amendment urged by Rep. Les Aspin D-Wis., would require the Pentagon to develop the Midgetman, even as the MX is installed in existing underground silos in Wyoming and Nebraska.

The House bill has been brought up for consideration for seven days since May 18, and it appeared late Thursday that lawmakers would not have another chance to deal with it until mid-September, following a five-week summer recess.

Republicans on the House Armed Services Committee complained that the chamber’s Democratic leadership was using the legislation as a “filler” instead of giving it the sustained floor time it deserves. Committee Democrats made no reply.

House Majority Leader Jim Wright, D-Texas, declined a request by Rep. James Courter, R-N.J., that another day of floor action be scheduled before the Aug. 5-Sept. 11 break, to complete the bill. But Wright said, “I’m not going to make any promises one way or the other.”
"News' shouldn't surprise Americans"

Jarring me awake the morning after Thanksgiving, there was my morning paper, with a screaming headline all across the page in big, bold type – "Second Coming type," we used to call it.

"Andropov vows nuclear buildup" it shouted.

News, headlines like that in a newspaper are supposed to denote "news." But where was the news in the announcement that the Soviet Union, in response to the arrival of new American missiles in Europe, plans to increase its own nuclear weapons in Western Europe, as well as on its submarines stationed off the U.S. coasts? News is supposed to be the unusual, the unexpected, the "new." There is nothing new in the Russian promise to match us missile for missile, tit for tat in the nuclear buildup. It has been that way since 1949. It is the nature of the arms race.

The only surprise is that Americans should be surprised. At first, I thought that excited headline was merely the work of a rookie editor filling in on the holiday shift. But then I realized that it reflected the general American surprise that the Soviets would react exactly as we would react to the placement of hostile weapons virtually on our borders. Such surprise reflects an ignorance so abysmal that it may yet kill us all.

What did we expect? The Soviets have been warning ever since American Pershing-2 and Cruise missiles in Europe were first proposed by the Carter administration that they would respond in kind. Those warnings became more frequent and more specific during the past year as the deadline for deploying the missiles approached. I heard the warning first hand from a Soviet official in Moscow last summer and while it came as no news to me, it made a chilling, indelible impression – to be sitting there on a bright, warm Mos-