



REV. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. 1929 — 1968 "FREE AT LAST. FREE AT LAST. THANK GOD ALMIGHTY I'M FREE AT LAST"

EDITORIALS

What Of The Dream?

"And they said one to another, behold, this dreamer cometh. "Come now therefore and slay him..."

tively, to remove man's inhumanity to man. He was fatally gunned down in Memphis, Tennessee in 1968 by the very violence he deplored...

Those who so loudly did and still do proclaim King's greatness must ask, nine years later: What has become of his dreams? Much has been accomplished, but far more remains to be accomplished.

On this Saturday, January 15, 1977, may we each rededicate our efforts to the peace, freedom and justice for all mankind for which Martin Luther King gave his life.

"My country, 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty, Of thee I sing: Land where my fathers died, Land of the pilgrims' pride, From every mountain-side Let freedom ring."

Foodstamps An Economic Boost

The Department of Human Resources has announced that \$145.2 million in Federal funds was brought into the state of North Carolina by the Food Stamp Program during the 1975-76 year.

Many people do not realize what a boost the Food Stamp Program is to the state's entire economy. Sometimes we only see the very few people who may be securing Food Stamps illegally.

All welfare recipients are eligible for food stamps, but only about one half of them actively participate in the program. The majority of the recipients are low-income people, NOT ON WEL-

FARE.

During fiscal year 1975-76 recipients in North Carolina paid \$78.3 million dollars for \$223.5 million dollars worth of Food Stamps.

The \$145.2 million in Federal funds stimulated three dollars for each one dollar in the overall boost to the economy, according to a recent study.

Families who may be eligible should investigate the Food Stamp programs in their county. This will assure more of the basic foods needed for well balanced family meals.

Without a doubt, good nutrition is basic to productivity and accomplishment in school and on the job.

Things You Should Know

Jan E. MATZELIGER...



HE CAME TO THE U.S. FROM DUTCH GUIANA IN THE EARLY 1870's, WENT TO WORK IN A SHOE FACTORY IN LYNN, MASS. AT AGE 25 /AFTER 5 YEARS SPARE-TIME WORK ON AN INVENTION, HE REFUSED AN OFFER OF \$1500. /5 YEARS LATER, ON MARCH 20, 1883, HE PATENTED A NEW ONE - A SHOE LASTING MACHINE THAT REVOLUTIONIZED THE INDUSTRY ALL AROUND THE WORLD!

Martin Luther King Legacy--

By Bayard Rustin

I am strongly in favor of making Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday a national holiday but not for the reasons that are often given to justify such a momentous, indeed radical, departure from tradition.

The arguments I have heard from countless Blacks are all based upon Dr. King's extraordinary contributions to his people. There is also reference made to the psychological and symbolic significance of creating a national holiday in honor of a leader of a minority that has suffered so many centuries of oppression and discrimination.

I find these arguments compelling, but in the end they are not sufficient. For what is to prevent an Italian or Jew or an Irishman from demanding similar recognition? One could argue, I think correctly, that these minority groups of Americans have not suffered nearly as much hardship as have Blacks, and that, therefore, creating a national holiday for Dr. King would be a form of just compensation for a people so sorely denied.

But don't let the majority of Americans be convinced that it is fair to single out one minority group above all others for special treatment. Nor do I think that creating a national holiday for Dr. King would be an adequate form of compensation. It would be important as a symbol, but it would hardly do much to end discrimination and poverty. We should be wary of purely symbolic gains because they may be taken by many people as a substitution for the real thing: namely, the

kind of social, political, and economic equality that was the objective of Dr. King's struggle.

There is a much more basic reason for honoring Dr. King. More than any single individual, he was the symbol of racial reconciliation, and if the races in America are not reconciled with each other this nation will not survive. The division between Black and white throughout American history forms the core of our national drama...

Dr. King was able to maintain a balance in his life that is absent in the romantic and often suicidal notions of many so-called revolutionaries and in the narrow world of conservatives as well. He saw that democracy was not a sham but a precious and fragile form of government, and that American society, despite its terrible injustices, could be changed through democratic struggle.

CHANGE FOR BETTER

He also saw that nonviolence was not only morally necessary, but the only form of social struggle that could change the society for the better. If offers a way for the victims of society to be truly free, for it is at once an effective form of struggle and a guarantee that

the victims will not become the new oppressors. And Dr. King maintained his faith in integration throughout his life. The ideal of integration has been attacked from many sides in recent years, and yet the violence and the hatred that have been associated with these attacks have only proved how vital integration remains as an objective.

Dr. King was a man of love, and for that he was loved, hated and mocked. We should appreciate the spiritual side of his nature without sentimentalizing it, for he was also acutely aware of the economic context in which people live. He believed not only in brotherhood, but also in the redistribution of wealth, and he engaged in struggles toward that end.

Dr. King was a man for all of us. He challenged what is worst in our society by appealing to what is best in our natures. Though he is no longer with us, he still symbolizes our hopes and our ideals, the ideals of equality, freedom, and peace. By honoring him America would be doing justice to itself, for it would be creating a symbol -- a day of national observance -- of how we must behave toward one another if we are ever to realize the principals upon which this nation was established.

To Be Equal

By VERNON E. JORDAN



Blacks and Carter's Cabinet Selections

Executive Director, National Urban League

In general, the response to Jimmy Carter's Cabinet appointments has been favorable, with some grumblings about some of the designees and considerably more than that about one of them.

That's about par for the course; it's impossible for any President to satisfy everyone in naming a Cabinet. The group assembled by President-elect Carter is at least as good as previous Cabinets and a lot better than some of them. The black presence in Cabinet-level posts was limited in two -- a bit less than what many blacks (though) would happen. But if the quantity is less than expected, the quality is very high indeed.

Some people have attacked the appointment of Patricia Harris as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development on the flimsy grounds that she's not a housing specialist. But few of her predecessors have been, and few can match her competence. She can be counted on to provide leadership in the fight to revitalize the cities.

The appointment of Congressman Andrew Young to visible and critical UN post has been rightly well received as evidence both of the Carter Administration's determination to conduct foreign policy on a more moral basis and to reach out to the Third World. But few have commented on the unique symbolism of this outstanding appointment; twenty years ago there

were few places in the South where blacks could vote and now a black southerner is America's spokesman to the world!

The most controversial appointee is Griffin Bell, Carter's selection for Attorney General. The attacks on Bell center on his personal friendship with Carter, (many believe the Attorney General should be totally independent of ties with his chief) his appeals court decisions, his endorsement of Harrold Carswell for the Supreme Court, and his memberships in private clubs that exclude blacks and Jews from membership.

Some of these criticisms are valid. The onus is on Judge Bell to prove their implications wrong through forceful action on enforcing civil rights laws, cooperation with minority communities to cut crime, and by appointing blacks and women to policy making posts in the Justice Department.

That Department has traditionally demonstrated a shameful neglect of blacks, even in the days when professed liberals were running it. Only a bare handful of blacks held high posts in Justice ever in the days of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations.

The focus on private clubs' discrimination is useful. The controversy over Judge Bell's club memberships finally put a national spotlight on such discrimination. These clubs are more than

just social; they're the place where the elite of industry meet and shape policies. Minorities barred from membership find their career prospects limited because they're cut off from contacts with their white peers.

The real focus should not be on Judge Bell -- he's resigning from his clubs. The real issue should be the continued existence of discriminatory practices by private clubs whose "social" aspects also involve informal decision-making that affects many areas of our lives.

It should be recognized that many people who think of themselves as liberals and as enlightened on race belong to clubs that bar Jews and blacks from membership. I know lots of prominent people, among them many I count as friends, who belong to clubs that are segregated. New York and Washington are full of such clubs and it might be more graceful for some of Judge Bell's critics to resign from their own clubs before casting stones.

Perhaps that's an issue that should be on the Attorney-General's agenda -- an investigation of segregated clubs with a view to determining whether any of them benefit from governmental concessions in violation of laws that bar discrimination.

Such an investigation might help keep the harsh glare of publicity on the undemocratic practices still common to the higher echelons of our society.

Benjamin L. Hooks

"Big Government"

"The myth and reality" of Big Government charges are explored with a surgeon's scalpel by Senator Gary Hart (D. Colo.) in a speech he delivered before the Western Electronic Manufacturers' Assn. earlier in 1976.

And I agree with most of his findings. I am however, troubled that he did not emphasize more the fact that individuals not corporations now bear the brunt of current federal taxation. But I found some of his findings absolutely astounding as I am certain you will. For example: "The Federal Bureaucracy, of course, is people -- federal employees. In 1974, the Federal Government employed about five million persons. But... that was almost exactly the same number of federal employees on the payroll 13 years earlier, back in the year 1961."

Moreover, Hart points out, not only has a huge expansion in federal employment not occurred, a significant number of important government agencies are noticeably smaller. For example, three major agencies are smaller now than they were in 1961 -- the Department of Defense, Department of State and the Agency for International Development (AID). The Departments of Interior, Agriculture and Postal Service were also smaller in 1975 than in 1970.

So while critics point out that new agencies are created and others grow, they fail to mention an important fact: agencies also cut back. Hart is relentless. He goes on: "One statistically sound way to measure the size of the bureaucracy is to compare it, year by year, with the population."

This tells how many of each 1,000 citizens are now working in government. In 1950 13 out of every 1,000 persons were civilian government employees. In 1955, 14 out of every 1,000 were federal employees. Jumping 20 years later -- to 1975 -- we discover the statistic is exactly the same: 14 out of every 1,000 citizens are civilian employees.

The same with payroll. In 1950, the payroll amounted to 16 per cent of the federal budget. In 1960, it was 14 per cent, in 1975 it was 13 per cent. Sixty four per cent of the five million federal employees in 1975 worked in just one huge agency: Department of Defense.

This amounts to 3.2 million -- civilian and military in uniform. But the next giant agency is the U. S. Postal Service with about 700,000

employees. The Postal Service is three times larger than any other agency except Defense. HEW -- the welfare giant -- has only 139,000 employees and Treasury, a total of 126,000.

So most of "Big Government" is employed largely in Defense and delivering the mail. "Big Government" charges apply more accurately to the state and local governments than to the federal. Hart points out that in "1960 there were about 5.5 million state and local government employees. By 1975 that had more than doubled to 11.7 million. This growth occurred not in distant Washington, but in the government closest to the people."

Most local government workers (nearly half) were employed as teachers or in other support roles in our educational system. About one million are police and another million are firemen.

So the majority of local and state government employees are in the educational and security systems of local governments. A much smaller number is employed in the delivery of welfare and other social services.

Gary takes a whack at charges of "Big Government" spending. In 1952, federal budget was about 19 per cent of the nation's gross national product. In 1973, the percentage amounted to 20.9 per cent of the national budget, or just about the same.

In 1951 the Federal Government collected about 20 cents of every dollar of goods and services produced in the U.S. A decade later, the collection percentage was the same. In 1973, however, the government took 21 cents in every dollars.

But in concrete terms federal tax burden has not changed significantly in 25 years. Only the burden has been shifted from corporations to individuals. In the three critical areas, then he unmask "Big Government" charges as unfounded.

"The federal bureaucracy is not an expanding octopus," he says, applying facts and figures to my stubborn beliefs. "On the contrary it has remained about the same size. Federal spending has grown in proportion with the economy and inflation -- maintaining a

FCC Commissioner



roughly constant share of our output of goods and services.

I have always felt, as does Senator Hart, that the problem of "Big Government" really is the expectations of our citizens. Big Government promises so much, it raises our expectations it cannot deliver, thus the public is highly disillusioned.

For a liberal Senator, Hart is taking a conservative stance: people in a society that no longer has an unlimited frontier must begin to rely more on themselves. I share that view. I do not believe, however, that the burden of federal taxation should be shifted from corporation who are best equipped to pay, to individuals, who may not be so well equipped. NNPA.

The Carolina Times L. E. RUSTIN Editor - Publisher, 1927-1971

Published every Thursday (dated Saturday) at Durham, N. C., by United Publishers, Incorporated. Mailing Address: P. O. Box 3825, Durham, North Carolina 27702. Office located at 436 East Pettigrew Street, Durham, North Carolina 27701. Second Class Postage Paid at Durham, North Carolina 27702.

NATIONAL ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVE: Amalgamated Publishers, Inc., 45 West 45th Street, New York, New York 10036.

Member: United Press International Photo Service, National Newspaper Publishers Association, North Carolina Black Publishers Association, Carolina Community News Service.

Opinions expressed by columnists in this newspaper do not necessarily represent the policy of this newspaper. This newspaper will not be responsible for the return of unsolicited pictures.