



PIEDMONT PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC. DONALD J. CHIPMAN President and General Manager

WALLACE CARROLL Editor and Publisher J. PATRICK KELLY Executive News Editor JOHN E. ESLINGER Editorial Page Editor

WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA, MONDAY, AUGUST 17, 1970

Not Another, Please

THE plans to build a third Senate office building must be viewed with a certain amount of horror. Undoubtedly, more room is needed for the Senate committee staffs. Although the standing and select committees do no more work today than they did five years ago or a decade ago (and even less, considering the impact of new machines and computers on work loads), the staffs have become much larger. Since these extra bodies need space in which to do whatever they do — and we're not sure what that is — a third building is in the planning stage. The original Senate office building is an architectural gem. Built at a time when facades and cornices were embellished by figurative designs, the quasi-Italian Renaissance building is worthy of its inhabitants. But the second and so-called New Senate Office Building is a disaster. More or less completed in 1958, it has the functional beauty of a Serbian comfort station and the approximate dignity of a white elephant. It is a disgrace to the city. Together with the Rayburn House Office Building, it is the best argument for the world for not protecting Capitol Hill with anti-missile missiles.

On the theory that all public buildings become progressively uglier as humanly advanced, we would suggest that the Senate dig out a few more basement levels and put its extra committee employees under the ground. This would not only save Capitol Hill from the hacks who design these buildings, it would also save money. The first Senate office building, after air-conditioning was installed during Roosevelt's second term, was then valued at about \$7 million in real money. The second Senate office building cost about \$28 million in 1958-type money, after new elevators had been put in and after the doors had been trimmed so they could close over the thick rugs. The third Senate office building probably will cost around \$100 million, if the Rayburn House Office Building is any gauge of relative building costs.

So why not spend a fraction of this money putting the staffs in the basement? It would save the same time, newer and more hideous variations on the Early Mussolini architecture that now seems fashionable in the Capitol park.

Dust Pollution

It is interesting to note that the city is considering a possible ordinance against dust pollution caused by land scraping. The proposal would have more meaning if the city landscaped a strip of Cherry-Marshall and W. Eighth streets that it butchered several years ago. The mud and dust on the streets has been a cause of accidents and near accidents for some time now.

W. B. ELLIOTT

Winston-Salem.

Not 'Proud' or 'Right'

After reading Mrs. Cockrum's letter (July 16) becoming so clear to me how a war cannot only drag on endlessly but can be conjured as something right or proud.

I'm certain Mrs. Cockrum's idea of duty and mine differ greatly. I too am proud of the American flag but I also can figure out what's right and what's wrong. The idea of fighting in a war whose only objective is to get out doesn't seem either proud or right to me. Mrs. Cockrum states that we're fighting for our freedom, but I would rather fight for our freedom, but I would rather fight for our leader's pride and mistake. It is a huge, devastating mistake, but as people uphold with protecting our freedom, or safeguarding our economy it can continue.

It's ironic that Mrs. Cockrum talks so much about freedom or anyone, yet supports Vietnam, a country where freedom is just a word.

—DAVID JEFFREY GORDON

Winston-Salem.

Purposeful Force

Re: Mrs. Pate's comments (August 5) concerning the women's liberation movement. The purposes of this movement are not, as she iterated, "for women to seek to be freed from drudgery of housework and raising children to discrediting husbands for fine qualities. It is of a wiser and broader scope. The American woman is now more educated and prepared to deal with Christian, family and business life in a capable manner. For apparent reasons she is finding it her duty of "choosing" to involve herself in the changing world which has been fortunate to encounter.

As always, the men myself and others regard it to be, are spanning a national force, non-vindictive, but a purposeful one which is concerned and carrying considerable weight and influence in business and politics in this country. The power of female, regardless of education, degree, etc., has remained lower than that of the male. I propose that this factor is the main core of this movement and that the essential reasons for its existence. There has long been a growing demand for equality in education and training, salary and opportunities, and America is responding. By 1980, 53,881,000 women will no longer be housewives but career women and mothers. Therefore, we are worthy of being acknowledged as individuals and feel we are capable of contributing equally to both.

I suggest that Mrs. Pate abandon her "deep sorrow" for women involved or supporting this movement and please inform herself as to precisely what is going on.

—CAROLE P. BULL

Winston-Salem.

Rights and the Law

Did the Supreme Court have the jurisdiction and constitutional right to pass the civil rights law of 1954, which involved 200 million people? Instead it should have been left to a vote by the states. Did President Truman oppose the passage of a law so contrary to the presidents before him? Did the Constitution imply it should not be passed until 1954, or ever?

Mr. Lincoln, when he was running for president in his speeches that he would not interfere with slavery in the states but would oppose it in territories as they became states. Was it because it was already law? He should have recommended a tax on people who pay at least part of the investment in slaves who get cotton for the United States and thereby prevent bankruptcy and the Civil War.

Dr. Cheek, president of Howard University in Washington, D. C., a Negro school, appeared on "Face the Nation" and did not seem enthused about racial balance in schools. However, he stated that all schools had an equal opportunity to secure an education and all opportunities. He also seemed to favor choice of schools. Agitators thought, no doubt, that all racial and religious groups should be in the South; but all burning of cities and most marches and riots were in the North. There will be a tomorrow.

—O. A. DAVIS

Mount Airy.

Hippies and Disneyland

It was indeed interesting to read that the "hippies" are now being banned from Disneyland. I, for one, wonder what would happen if Jesus Christ himself showed up at the gates seeking admission (long hair, beard, unusual dress, etc.). If this policy reflects the spirit in which Walt Disney created the park, then I have lost all my respect for the man. Perhaps the American Civil Liberties Union or some other similarly disposed group should look into this ridiculous situation.

—JAMES L. MILLER

Winston-Salem.

The Unemployed

There is much controversy about people who are unemployed and on welfare. But seemingly those who are raising such a great fuss about this are not taking any consideration as to why these people are unemployed and on welfare.

On the one hand, people are saying that there is plenty of work for those who are able to work and want to work. On the other hand, I know from experience that there are those who are on the job and who want to work everywhere they apply for work, yet they are turned away — some because of their age; some because they do not have at least a high school education; and still others because many of the jobs are raising such a great fuss about this are not taking any consideration as to why these people are unemployed and on welfare. Why is there nothing being said or done about this?

—LESTER GRIFFITH

Winston-Salem.

Drunk Fish?

Fish kills in the Yadkin River are alleged to be caused by waters from a local brewery. Maybe the fish only drink! The brewery sells a high-grade beer, markets the spent grain as cattle feed, and then pours the residue down the drain. Let's call that stuff Old Yadkin Beer. Old Salem.

In a more serious vein, I suggest the city look into the possibility of increasing the water flow in the Muddy Creek. The distance from there to the Yadkin is not far along I-40, and siphoned river water would return to the river eventually. Six years ago in New Jersey a similar scheme was used to fill a reservoir from a nearby lake.

Who should pay for this sluice? Why, anyone who sells bottled water, or who is out of town for profit. They can carry it on their books as advertising, if local authorities are cooperative. I can see it now — a three-foot diameter pipeline along the highway. The pipe looks like giant beer cans laid end to end.

—W. CONRAD LAWSON

Winston-Salem.

The Real Tyrants

I fully agree with F. Ray Bottom's letter in which he writes: "The question is: are men courageous enough to stand up to these tyrants who in every way have gone against the Constitution and against every freedom for which our forefathers came to this country?"

The question is, however: Who are the real tyrants? I submit that if it were not for brave courageous Supreme Court justices, human beings would still be made to sit in the back of buses, would not be allowed in certain restaurants, could not shop in certain stores, could not attend certain schools, could not attend certain hospitals, could not live in certain neighborhoods and even could not pray in certain churches.

The tyrants are not the judges but instead some shallow individuals who feel that a man's color determines his fitness to enjoy the freedom and liberty for which this country was founded. People should realize that the only democracy should be measured by the protection it gives its weakest minority.

—RUDDY DIAMOND

Winston-Salem.

Letters to the editor must include full names and addresses in order to be printed. Because of limited space, letters must be 300 words or less. The editors reserve the right to edit any contribution. Short letters will be given priority.

Why Do You Buy Stocks?

By Sylvia Porter

Why do you buy stocks?

If you are among the overwhelming majority of the 31 million individuals who own shares of corporate stock and mutual funds in the U.S. today, you buy to achieve conservative, traditional, generally admirable long-term goals. Only if you are in a tiny minority — a scant one out of 10 of us — do you think short-term gains are a "very important" reason for buying and holding stocks.

This is a hitherto undisclosed finding of the 1970 New York Stock Exchange census of shareholders. It was uncovered in a random survey of investment attitudes as part of the recent study. I have obtained the basic data. Specifically, here is how you rate various reasons for buying stocks:

First to me it dramatizes again a warning to our politicians — in the White House and in Congress — not to underestimate the importance of the stock market's fluctuations to the nation's economic health. The entire figure of the census — 30,850,000 shareholders at the start of 1970, up 53.5 per cent in just five years — originally shouted that warning to the Nixon Administration. Now this disclosure on investor motivation is confirming it — and this time is warning Congress not to dawdle on passing legislation which would insure us against losses resulting from the failures of brokerage firms themselves.

Second, it underlines the fact that most of us are not gamblers looking for a fast buck (short-term gains). Of course, many were dazzled by the promise of the go-go funds in the late 1960s, were lured into stupid speculations by the performance-crazed institutional "money managers." That was obvious. But most Americans were and are in the stock market to enhance our nestegg over the long-term. Most of us invest with goals

Americans have in the past always held as worthy.

As Stan West, director of the NYSE's research department, puts it: "All the evidence points to the conclusion that millions of ordinary people are sold on the long-term growth prospects of the American economy and want to share in that growth through stock ownership."

Third, it suggests that the go-go era of the late 1960s may be even deadlier than we suspect. A real investor doesn't actively seek to double or triple his money in a matter of months! He actually feels uncomfortable with risks of this calibre — and he surely is even more chastened after the stock market debacle of 1969-70.

And fourth, it telegraphs the return of the blue chips to prominence — the stocks of the top-rated, great corporations of the land which were the outstanding performers until the institutional money gamblers dirtied and distorted the markets with their deals.

In short, on the premise that the above are the fundamental motivations of investors, we are entering a much healthier era in Wall Street. In fact, you'll find a most fascinating finding in how stockholders with long-term investment objectives made out against stockholders with a goal of short-term gains.

To begin with, the study shows that the majority of owners made money or broke even — only a minority lost money. But the percentage of investors with the objective of short-term gains who made money or broke even was substantially lower than the percentage for investors with long-term goals. Almost one-fourth of those whose aim was short-term gains lost money; the proportion of losers among the long-term investors ranged from 12 to 15 per cent.

Defecting Republicans Could Doom Goodell

By Kevin P. Phillips

WASHINGTON August has not been a good month for New York's leftist, anti-Nixon Republican Sen. Charles Goodell, but September is likely to be worse. A substantial number of prominent Republicans are getting ready to endorse his Conservative Third Party opponent, James Buckley. The reason: increasing evidence that grassroots GOP voters are spurning Goodell, and that the real race may well be between the Conservative nominee and the front-running Democrat, Richard Ottinger, who has won the endorsement of most key liberals.

Both the White House and the Rockefeller-controlled New York GOP are withholding vital campaign funds from Goodell, but greater woe is yet to come in organizational and leadership defections. There is even speculation that Thomas E. Dewey, the former New York governor and two-time Republican presidential nominee, may come out for James Buckley. Since he retired to private law practice in 1955, Dewey has grown somewhat of a liberal. In recent years, he has publicly urged consideration of repeal of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, concerning due process of law. He is still a powerful name in New York politics because from the suburban subdivisions of Long Island to the wineries of the Finger Lakes, many Republican state committeemen and county chairmen cut their political ties with Dewey in the 1942-1954 Dewey era, undoubtedly the haleyon years of the New York State Republican party's influence nationally.

Nor does Dewey's influence end there, we must remember. New York's 1970 Republican state campaign director is R. Burrell Bixby, a longtime aide and protégé of Dewey's, subse-

quently a partner in the former governor's law firm. If Dewey endorses Buckley, Goodell probably cannot expect too much from Burrell Bixby.

However, although Buckley strategists are delighted with the prospective swelling of Republican support, they do not want Ottinger to fall apart too quickly. They want him to stay alive long enough to force Democrat Ottinger to the left.

Right now, Ottinger clearly leads the three-way race by dint of a surprising ideological array of support reaching from moderate anti-Goodell Republicans and Italian and Polish Democrats on the right to Jewish liberals and all-out Rockefeller liberals on the left. It is because of this anomalous coalition is fragile — the unstable result of the usual two-party contest — Ottinger does not want to narrow his ideological number. Liberal Jewish, Negro, and Puerto Rican voters constitute his main support base, but the Democratic nominee also knows that some middle-of-the-road backing is necessary. And because he has been able to maintain a centrist stance between Goodell on the left and Buckley on the right, Ottinger continues to enjoy much middle-of-the-road support.

To win, either Buckley or Goodell needs to break up Ottinger's tenuous coalition. But Buckley's conservative oratory cannot draw Ottinger off the center; only Goodell's threat from the left can do so. As regular Republicans (and many Democrats) are hedging their bets, Goodell will seek inroads on Ottinger's left flank, calling the Democratic nominee a lawn-party liberal, a millionaire dilettante. Such an attack would force Ottinger to openly articulate his liberal philosophy, disquieting many of the upstate moderate Republicans and middle-of-the-road Catholics who are now

supporting him. Thus Goodell would pick up some liberal votes from Ottinger, while Buckley would pick up some moderate-conservative support from both opponents.

As autumn unfolds, so should the Conservative strategy. A steady proclamation of Republican announcements for Buckley may push Goodell — and then Ottinger — to the left.

The most telling switches to Buckley should come among the state's congressmen, many of whom served with Goodell in the House of Representatives and all of whose names appear right below the Senate candidates on November's ballot. Among the Republican representatives who have announced for Buckley or who are giving it consideration are: James Grover (Long Island), Martin McKneely (Lower Hudson Valley), Hamilton Fish (Middle Hudson Valley), William King (King of the Hills), Robert McEwen (Adirondacks-North Country), Barber Conable (Finger Lakes), Henry Smith (suburban Buffalo-Niagara) and James Hastings (Allegheny-Lake Erie). Hastings, who backs Goodell's old district, is not expected to oppose the senator publicly. Other GOP congressmen who are straggling the Goodell issue include John Wynn (Long Island) and Alexander Pirnie (Utica). All three of the state's conservative Democratic congressmen — Otis Pike (Long Island), Samuel Stratton (Mohawk Valley) and James Delaney (Utica) — are hedging their positions and could eventually pick Buckley over Ottinger.

If this sort of shifting takes place, leaving Goodell and Ottinger to divide the left and uniting a bipartisan coalition behind Buckley, then New York — the liberal citadel New York — could actually elect a third-party Conservative to the Senate.

A Delayed Opening?

THE decision of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school board to delay the opening of school for at least six days is a wise one under the circumstances. Delaying school opening till Sept. 9 while the board hopes to give the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals and perhaps the Supreme Court, too, an opportunity to overturn an order by Judge James B. McMillan that would desegregate every black school in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County.

But leaving the board's hopes entirely aside, the idea still has merit. Whatever the decision of the higher courts, a delay in opening the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools reduces the probability that a game of "fruit basket turn over" will be played after the children have settled in to their routine.

Fortunately North Carolina law does not fix the date for the beginning of the school year; it merely requires a 180-day school term. This gives each school board facing interim desegregation orders an opportunity to decide for itself whether a delayed opening would be desirable.

Certainly there would be drawbacks. Parents who had expected to get the children off their hands by Aug. 26 and had made plans accordingly might have

to change those plans. And there would be problems with faculty schedules and pay, as well as a need to alter the school calendar for tests and vacations for the entire term.

Still, these disadvantages must be weighed against the possible advantages of a delayed opening. Our own school system, for example, is not yet prepared to carry out the desegregation orders of the District Court. There is transportation to be found and paid for, desks, books and records to be moved, and reassignments to be carried out.

What is important, and the same in the question of court timetables. Whatever the District Court's final judgment on the local schools, the possibility exists that the appeals court will not concur with the Supreme Court's decision in the Charlotte case might well affect our own schools.

If the school board and its attorneys believe that an appeals court judgment might be forthcoming pretty soon, then the board should give serious consideration to postponing the opening day. Certainly anything within reason should be done to reduce the likelihood that many of our children will be transferred in mid-year.

A Comely Old Lady

A SOUTH CAROLINA political candidate has decided, with some justification, that his state's tricentennial celebration is the "biggest event in the state's history," James Henderson, who is running for lieutenant governor in the Palmetto State, said the \$10 million "wasted on the state's 300th birthday" should have been used to solve other problems. "While we want tourism and while our people have been working hard," he said, "we look at what's happened and we see that we don't even have the exposition in Greenville finished."

The trouble seemed to be in deciding whether the celebration's emphasis should be on quality or quantity. Quantity seemed to win, and the planning of the celebration was turned over, for the most part, to public-relations groups and persons dealing in tourism, conservation and development. Since these people were told to Think Big, even on

their shoe-string budget, the state had several expositions rather than a single one, each of them emphasizing some aspect of the state's history. The result was a scatter-shot effect that impressed very few visitors.

So the official celebration fell far short of expectations. But what was impressive about our sister state's 300th birthday was the super-activity of individual citizens and garden clubs. New floral groves were started, especially in the major cities, and cultivated with a care that would be envied by gardeners and leopards in Winston-Salem. New shrubs and trees were planted, not by the state or the tricentennial commission, but by individuals. The result made South Carolina a comely old lady on her 300th birthday — and gave the state a legacy of beauty that will be around long after the expositions are forgotten.

In this sense, the tricentennial was a rousing success.

Strictly Personal

By Sydney J. Harris

A reader in Massachusetts has challenged me to "say a good word on behalf of President Nixon." His letter implies that I am too biased to be objective on the subject.

Actually, I am happy to say several hundred good words over him. Early this summer, President Nixon was one of the finest proposals ever to come out of the White House. I know it is one of the finest, because I proposed exactly the same thing in the column a few months earlier.

The President urged us, as a nation, to declare the ocean floor (beyond the depth of 200 meters) "the common heritage of mankind" rather than allowing each nation to exploit the great potential mineral wealth to be found there. He called for an international regime to regulate the seabed, with royalties collected on the minerals "to be used for international community purposes, particularly economic assistance to developing countries."

In this way, the richer nations of the world would avoid a newer form of colonialism, the widening gap between the haves and the have-nots could be narrowed, and, in his words, "The oceans will be used rationally, equitably, and for the benefit of mankind."

As I remarked in the column early last spring, more of the world today is afraid of America's economic power than

of Russia's or China's military power. With only six per cent of the world's population yet commanding some 60 per cent of its resources, we cannot expect our two billion poor relatives to be grateful for the few bones we throw their way.

Yet it is equally obvious that we cannot provide limitless aid to developing countries, especially when so much of it is channeled through their political processes, and is often used to maintain a bad status quo rather than permit necessary reforms.

But by a common effort to exploit the riches of the seabeds, with most of the resources going to the countries that have a healthy shift in the whole spectrum of international wealth before them on their own feet, in their own way, without any imputation of "influence" on our part. Moreover, this will provide a new source of development funds, and will increase our potential markets as much as it raises their standard of living.

If the treasure of the seabed is as vast as we have been led to believe, this could mean a healthy shift in the whole spectrum of international wealth before the century is out — the poorer nations benefiting enormously without loans or charity from President Nixon. It deserves the fullest recognition and respect for his strong support of this wise, generous, and unifying policy.