

The State

WILLIAM D. WORKMAN JR.
Editor

CHARLES H. WICKENBERG JR.
Executive News Editor

8-A Columbia, S. C., Wed. Jan. 3, 1968

Label For Disloyalty

ANOTHER CATEGORY needs to be added to the classes of individuals who serve — or refuse to serve — their nation in time of military need.

We suggest the formal establishment of a classification to be known as "Conscientious Defectors." The thought comes to mind as we ponder the status of the four young sailors who deserted from the USS Intrepid last October and have since made their way to Sweden — via Japan and Russia.

Perhaps we are unduly charitable in ascribing conscientious motives to these particular deserters. But undoubtedly there are some Americans (to use the term loosely) whose sincere love of peace — or of Communism — makes them willing to give up their citizenship rather than serve their own country.

We should clear the way for them. Obviously, the United States has no further use for the four deserters from the Navy, or for the handful of soldiers who have left their posts of duty with NATO forces in Europe, or for the indeterminate number of young men who have fled into Canada or elsewhere in order to dodge the draft.

But there are still in our midst a

number of persons whose disloyalty thus far has been reflected by protest rather than by outright flight from the country. Those who breach the peace or who break selective service (or other) laws, should be prosecuted and, if found guilty, imprisoned.

But we are not speaking so much of overt acts as of matters of conscience. Persons who sincerely reject the United States in times such as these should be relieved, in fairness to them and to the nation, of what (to them) is the burden of being an American.

Under the prevailing but highly dubious rulings of the federal courts, the only way a person can lose his citizenship is to renounce it voluntarily. In our view, citizenship can not only be renounced but forfeited.

Individuals whose opposition to their nation extends beyond dissent and into outright disloyalty or tacit treason should be tagged with the label, "Conscientious Defector," and shipped out of the United States to some country more acceptable to their particular form of conscience.

Citizenship is a bilateral arrangement. Those who shirk its responsibilities are not entitled to its benefits.

Sons Of Carolina

GRADUATES of the University of South Carolina must swell with pride these days as they gaze upon the magnificent new structures which now dominate the Columbia skyline and attest to the growth of the institution.

And how proud they must be also of their university's long and illustrious roll of distinguished presidents, professors, trustees, and alumni whose names are perpetuated in the handsome new structures which soar above the campus.

We refer, of course, to such notable Carolinians as the late Commodore Epanimondas J. Capstone, whose service to his school, state and the Confederacy is preserved for posterity in the towering gold-hued dormitory known as Capstone House.

And speaking of towering, there is South Tower itself, named for that eminent 19th Century scholar, Professor South Bywater Tower, a native son of East Babel, South Carolina.

The sparkling Undergraduate Library commemorates the worthy contributions to old South Carolina College (as it was known in its formative years) of the valiant old trustee, Under Graduate, who with his older brother, Post Graduate, defied General Sherman's troops when the Yankees threatened to burn the campus bookstore in February of 1865.

Unseasonal Silence

CHRISTMAS CAROLS were not sung at Munger Elementary school in Duluth, Minnesota, this season. Garry DeYoung, 44, father of nine children, objected on grounds that "religion has no place in the schools."

DeYoung contended that "a school's use of a religious holiday to present a religiously-oriented program (of carols) is a direct violation of the First Amendment to the Constitution."

Nonsense. The Founding Fathers (remember them?) feared the establishment of a state church. They did not fear state recognition of the fact that religion is a part of human life.

Where the Constitution speaks of an "establishment of religion," it does not imply that the state should be empowered to wipe out religion altogether.

The First Amendment to the Constitution says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion . . ." But it goes on in the next phrase to say, ". . . or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

If children are to be prohibited from singing *O, Little Town of Bethlehem* at an elementary school Christmas program, then we might as well kiss our Constitution goodbye.

This whole question of the separation of church and state has become so hopelessly confused, we often wonder if the Supreme Court really understands what it's about. When the U. S. Constitution was drafted, a state church was something to be feared. A 1967 Christmas carol service, however, is not a state church. In fact, it

isn't much of anything except a Christmas carol service, period.

Does Mr. DeYoung suppose that officials at Munger Elementary are conspiring to establish a state church in America?

What confounded nonsense! Keep this up much longer, and anyone caught with a penny in his pocket that says "In God We Trust" on it will be liable to a prison term. Has the U. S. Mint some design to take over America?

This newspaper is absolutely and irrevocably committed to the concept of free speech. If the children at Munger Elementary were anxious to sing *O, Little Town of Bethlehem* at the top of their little voices, they should have been permitted to. To have declared, as DeYoung did, that they were engaged in an "illegal activity" was shameful.

One-Way Rule

A GENTLEMAN from Ohio, writing to the *Wall Street Journal* after that newspaper had reported on the Christmas boycott of white stores by Milwaukee Negroes, had this appraisal of the injustice of the new civil rights laws:

"A shop owner or restaurant owner is not permitted to say to a customer, 'I don't want to serve to you as you are black.' Yet a customer is perfectly free to tell the shop owner, 'I don't want to buy from you as you are white.'"

'Imagine Him At The Negotiating Table'



Nation Debates Open Housing

By Russell Kirk

In state after state, the abstract question of open occupancy — that is, legislation to compel house owners and realtors to deal with prospective house purchasers regardless of color or creed — is hotly debated by legislators and city councilmen. The odds are against passage of most such bills, and even were they to pass, the lot of Negroes and other ethnic groups would be little improved, practically.

Gov. George Romney has been trying to force such a proposal through the Michigan Legislature. His endeavor seems to be destined to humiliating failure. For one thing, some Negro leaders know that victory on this issue would be barren.

James Del Rio, a Negro civil rights activist and a member of the Michigan House of Representatives, says that he may vote against the open-housing bill. The average Negro of the inner city simply can't afford to buy a fashionable suburban home, Del Rio declares — so why offer him the empty abstract right?

"This bill has nothing to do with riots. It won't stop one riot or start one," he said. Certainly last summer's riot

class," he says. Few people desire to live next door to enthusiastic lawbreakers, whatever their color or creed.

Dr. Martin Luther King has roused no real response among Negroes by his open-housing marches in Chicago — so he proposes to bully Congress, a la Bonus March, next summer. He's marching up a dead-end street.

On the Kuppelnet show, one of my fellow guests was a colored alderman of Chicago, an amiable and sharp mortician. He represents a ward, he says, "99 and 44-100ths percent pure" Negro. Recently, at the invitation of the Soviet government, he made a trip to Russia. He found no discrimination there, he declared.

"No discrimination against Jews, Christians or political and ethnic minorities?" I inquired. "This made the alderman a trifle uncomfortable; but he said, hopefully, 'Weren't Lenin and Stalin darker than most Russians? Didn't they come from Southern Russia?'"

The southernmost Russians, of course, are great, blond Caucasians, literally. But this alderman's misunderstanding is only a variation on the confusion of many open-housing zealots.

'National' Government Needed

Times Demand The Best Men Of Both Parties

By James Reston

WASHINGTON — The talk of Washington at the turn of the year is about leaders and political parties. What man and what party can win the Presidency in 1968? Yet, these may be the wrong questions. The problems before the country now are obviously bigger than any of the presidential candidates or either of the parties. They are national in scope. They demand the very best talents available in and out of both parties. The question is not who can win in 1968, but who can put together a team that can get enough confidence to govern from 1969 to 1972. In short, we do not need a personal government or a party government, but a national government that can restore at least a little more unity and purpose in our national life.

PARLIAMENTARY governments follow this principle in times of extreme tension. When they are confronted by great external or internal dangers—as Britain was during the last World War—the parties combine in the national interest. We cannot follow the same procedure under the presidential system in the United States, but we can follow the same unifying principles.

Franklin Roosevelt understood the point when he brought Henry L. Stimson and Frank Knox, both republicans, into his Cabinet during the Hitler crisis. The historians are kind to President Truman today not because of his great intellectual powers, but because he put together a "ministry of talents," and relied on his Cabinet to help make the great decisions of the early post-war period.

There is no man in American political life today who has shown that he can, by his character, personality or politics, win the allegiance of the majority of the American people. Both major parties are divided. Johnson, Kennedy, and McCarthy in the Demo-

cratic Party, and Rockefeller, Nixon, Reagan and Romney in the Republican Party all have their supporters, but none of them can unite his own party, let alone the nation.

Maybe this will change in the next six months. It is possible, but certainly not probable, that one of the candidates or one of the parties will win the confidence of the people. But in the end, the Presidency will probably go to the man who seems most able, not to impose his personality or his party on the country but to organize a government that will bring the best men we have to the consideration of our problems, and let this coalition of the best try to govern the country.

Even on this basis, no coalition or nonpartisan "national" government is going to have an easy time dealing with the problem of Vietnam, or what is probably more important, the problems of the Middle East and the cities and races of America.

No government is going to be able to prove that it has the solution to our internal or external problems. Any government is going to have to rely on the confidence of the people, and the chances are that a "national government," aided by a Cabinet of the best men of all parties, will get more popular support than any personal or partisan government.

If the primary political problem of 1968, therefore, is to find, not only a man who can win but a team that can unify and govern, then we have to look at Johnson, Rockefeller, Nixon, Reagan, Romney and Wallace in a different way.

The question is not about the past but about the future. Not alone about the old or middle-aged but about the

Americans under 30, who will be a majority of our people in the next five years; not about the old political alignments of the "Democratic South" or the "Republican Middle West" but about the majority of the people, who now live in the cities and the suburban areas of the country, where the election will be won or lost.

Can Johnson put together such a government of the best men of both parties that can gain or at least improve, the confidence of the country? Can Nixon? Or Reagan, or Romney, or Rockefeller? It is hard to answer the question but even harder to duck it.

Personal government under President Johnson has not succeeded. Nobody has worked harder or with a better will to prove that the President can run everything from the control of the Vietnam, to the control of the cities. But the task of doing everything in such a complicated government and world is beyond human endurance. Parties are no answer, since it is clear that both major parties are deeply divided about what we should do both at home and abroad.

THEREFORE, we have to find another answer. Johnson offers more of the same. Reagan and Nixon offer a more aggressive war. Romney says too little. McCarthy plunges into the battle, and Bobby Kennedy, who wants to plunge in, stays out.

So at the beginning of the New Year in America, nobody is quite sure about where we are going. The candidates and the parties have let the country down, but somebody may get beyond the personal and the party question, and see the possibilities of a national government. And whoever does touch this yearning for unity and purpose, may very well prevail in November of 1968.

(Copyright 1968)

U.S. Pushing For Political Way Out

LBJ Puts Pressure On Saigon

By Rowland Evans And Robert Novak

WASHINGTON—President Johnson's sudden bid for informal talks between President Nguyen Van Thieu and the National Liberation Front, a move that astonished most of his own high officials here, marks the start of heavy U.S. pressure on the Saigon government to find some political way out of the war.

If, for example, President Thieu, whose main political support comes from the military, ever embraces the idea of making some kind of deal with elements of the NLF (the political arm of the Communist Vietnam), it will only be as the result of Washington pressure.

Thieu's initial reaction to Mr. Johnson's appeal for informal talks was disbelief tinged with anger. He wasn't about to deal with any politicians connected with the NLF unless they renounced the Front, renounced Hanoi, and in effect recognized the sovereignty of Thieu's government.

But President Thieu knows as well as President Johnson that the U.S. holds very high cards indeed to persuade and pressure the South Vietnamese government. It was the clever playing of precisely these cards that brought about the most significant change in the South since the assassination of Ngo Dinh Diem in November, 1963—elections in South Vietnam earlier this year.

Likewise, the official Saigon policy of "reconciliation" between the Thieu government and defectors from the Vietnam was wholly the product of intense U.S. pressure that started at the Manila conference in the fall of 1966. The policy was finally announced by the then Saigon government, headed by Air Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, six months later. Although "reconciliation" has scarcely been a roaring success, the point is that U.S. pressure forced Saigon to adopt it.

Thus, if Mr. Johnson is to have a chance at all in enticing President Thieu into informal negotiations with elements of the NLF before the U.S. presidential election campaign begins in earnest next summer, the time to start is now. But absolutely essential to this scheme is a parallel selling job that must be done right here in Washington.

Within the highest levels of the administration, for example, there is no consensus on how far the U.S.—Saigon side should go if the NLF did a complete turnabout and agreed to talk. Former U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, who is now one of the President's roving ambassadors, regards the whole NLF structure as criminal, speaking only for Hanoi and it-



PRESIDENT THIEU

self, not the people of South Vietnam.

But roving Ambassador Averell Harriman, strongly backed by Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, claims that skillful diplomatic maneuvers could break the NLF into factions, fatally damage the morale of the Vietcong, and lead to some kind of political agreement with Saigon.

This disagreement within Mr. Johnson's own Administration is deep and, as of today, not reconcilable. As one official told us: "If the NLF announced tomorrow it would like to talk to Saigon and negotiate a coalition government, it would rip the Johnson administration in half."

Beyond that, some hard-line politicians of both parties would charge sell-out if a coalition government—a phrase carefully avoided by Mr. Johnson last week—seemed to be in the making.

Moreover, the split within the Johnson administration and the politicians is matched by a split within the U.S. mission in Saigon. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker has been trying for months to push President Thieu into new political initiatives, taking advantage of the Vietcong's mounting losses in the military war.

But U.S. military leaders in Saigon, along with President Thieu's government and the Korean government (which is demanding a voice equal to its large commitment of troops to the war) all advocate a policy of military victory, not political settlement.

Into this unmixing pot Mr. Johnson unexpectedly tossed his appeal for talks with the NLF that "could bring good results." It took skillful diplomacy for the President to bring about the Vietnamese elections last fall. To accomplish his newest purpose will require nothing less than a brilliant diplomacy of a kind not often seen here.

(Copyright 1968)

Peanut Butter Battle

If the Food and Drug Administration can make stick its latest order setting standards for peanut butter, consumers soon will find the paste a lot stickier and harder to spread than it is now.

That's because the FDA, while modifying standards it proposed in 1965 and later discarded, is currently insisting that any product identified as peanut butter must contain at least 90 per cent peanuts. It may sound reasonable, but a little history makes it seem less so.

In recent years peanut butter manufacturers, in efforts to make their product more attractive and hence sell more of it, have been adding vegetable oils and preservatives—until, indeed, some peanut butter contained but 78 per cent peanuts by volume, which may have been cutting things a little fine.

Be that as it may, one result has been that most products called peanut butter look and taste like peanut butter, keep fresh longer and are less sticky than peanut butter used to be; they can be spread almost as easily as butter or margarine. This, as industry officials have maintained, evidently is what consumers prefer, even if the FDA does not.

The peanut butter battle, involving lengthy hearings costly to both Government and industry, has been going on for eight years, and it still may not be over. It's taking even longer than it took the Agriculture Department to decide how much chicken ought to be in chicken soup.

All this began before the current wave of "consumerism" really got rolling, affect-

ing as it now does dozens of consumer products. It raises the question about a policy bent on giving consumers what a Governmental agency thinks is good for them.

Will it really be to "protect" the consumer, or simply to make a lot of busy-work for the small army of private and public employees the consumerism movement involves? That question is a lot stickier than peanut butter, FDA-style.

The Wall Street Journal

Numbers Game

Philadelphia police have a federal grant to produce the scientific equivalent of a crystal ball.

The idea is simple enough. Philadelphia's finest are feeding everything they can think of about burglary into a computer. Once the machine has digested all the pertinent data on where, when, how, why and who committed burglaries in the city of brotherly love, they hope to be able to predict where burglaries are most likely to occur.

Then, presumably, zapp Philadelphia police will pounce like Batman and Robin after a quick look at the Bat computer.

It's a great idea. We hope it works.

But there is one question: If the police find out where a crime like burglary is most likely to happen and concentrate their attention there, what's to keep the crooks from playing the same game in reverse?

Charlotte Observer

The State

N. G. GONZALES 1858-1937
AMBROSE E. GONZALES 1857-1926
WILLIAM ELLIOTT GONZALES 1866-1937

AMBROSE G. HAMPTON
Chairman and Publisher

JOHN F. MCGEE
Pres. and Assoc. Publisher