

**AFRAID TO WALK IN BLACK NEIGHBORHOODS?**



**IT'S UP TO US  
BLACKS WHO CARE  
ABOUT THE BLACK  
FUTURE, TO IMPOSE  
ORDER WHERE  
NONE EXISTS  
TODAY. WE HAVE  
TO DO IT BECAUSE  
WE CANNOT ASK  
OUR OLD PEOPLE  
TO SPEND THE  
REST OF THEIR  
LIVES IN FEAR.**

P. Jones

**Editorials**

**Responsibility  
Is Forerunner of Progress**

While we support the constitutionally protected right to protest for redress of wrongs, we also believe that protesters must offer solutions as well as reveal problems.

The recent student boycott at NCCU is a good case in point. Student Government Association president, Curtis Massey, was quoted in these pages last week saying that his goal is to have Central's administration, faculty and students understand that "... we need each other".

In no area is that more true than in the case of money. Mr. Massey says the university should give students who are delinquent in paying their college bills a "second warning" before forcing them to pay by not allowing them to take final exams.

But we believe that Mr. Massey and other student leaders can better serve the university and their constituents by developing a project to encourage students to pay their bills promptly. Students who "forget" that they owe the school have a devastating effect on the university, far beyond the value of their contributions.

Let us explain. University chancellor, Dr. Albert Whiting, told *The Carolina Times* last week that students provide about 11 or 12 per cent of the school's \$31 million annual operating budget. About 45 per cent of that budget comes from the state. But the state has a hard and fast rule that it will only give NCCU the entire state allocation if the university has collected all the money students owe the school.

The figures are startling! The state's portion of the budget is about \$13.9 million, while students contribute about \$3.7 million. Now if the tuition and other student bills are running a 20 per cent deficit, then the university loses about \$744,000 from students, and about \$2.7 million from the state. The total deficit is more than \$3 million, which completely wipes up the value of students' contribution to the budget via tuition.

And so we conclude that student government leaders MUST insist that students pay their bills on time because that's the only way the school can operate with a balanced budget. Only a balanced budget will give students all they've paid for, and all they need from a college experience.

Which brings to mind a truism from Frederick Douglass who said: "While it is not certain in life that you will get all that you pay for, you can be certain that you will pay for all that you get."

And so, if students want more consideration from university administration, then they must pay for it by paying their bills when they are due, or as soon as possible, thereafter, because it is unrealistic to expect to discuss student progress when student responsibility is putting the school in the hole.

**Oh Yes, There Are Issues  
For Durham Voters**

Two weeks ago, incumbent candidates for the Durham County Commission essentially said that there are no issues in the coming elections, and challengers are merely crying "wolf."

The current deafening silence on the campaign trail seems to bear them out. But we assure you that there are issues in this race, and Durham County citizens, inside and outside the city limits will serve their future well to begin asking candidates some hard questions about these issues.

\*Sewage Treatment — Will the alternative on-site treatment projects currently under study serve county needs for the long range future?

\*Solid Waste — As the county continues to grow, will landfills serve us well, or must we begin now studying new ways of getting rid of our trash?

\*Balanced Growth — What is the impact of having a county with most of its industry in the southern end, while much of the residential development is to the north?

\*Land Use — Why doesn't Durham have a current land use plan?

These are but a few of the issues facing this and future County Commissions. But the time to discuss these issues is now. Our future depends on it.

**Business In The Black**

**Whose Welfare is at Stake  
States Involved in Scam**

By Charles E. Belle

What's all this about record deficit spending plans amidst high interest rates whilst welfare is to be shifted to the starving states. Considering that the Commander in Chief of the U.S. military is making like a cavalry captain charging straight ahead, just who is the White House helping to get out of fiscal trouble. The states have no money. Twenty-nine states and District of Columbia had to raise taxes last year.

The number of unemployed workers receiving an unemployment check is currently around 16.9 million. Unemployment benefits average only \$100 a week nationally. Not enough for rent and car payments for people once employed hence bogged down with grocery and sundry bills.

Big bucks are going into the military budget, even at the expense of economic growth for the country. Conservative

estimates of the fiscal 1983 and beyond Reagan military mind-budgets demand \$100 billion in deficit financing each year. This amount of money will be borrowed from investors who might otherwise loan these funds for job producing business developments. Instead, the U.S. Treasury under the Reagan Administration shall take these funds and move to bloat America's military arsenal.

**CHEMICAL WARFARE**

The Pentagon and President believe in the record \$216 billion defense fiscal budget which by the way wrangles \$30 million to build unchemical devices. Actually about \$123 million is being spent including the maintenance of the pre-1969 weapons stockpile and the \$30 million to acquire new weapons. In this fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, President Reagan's present budget includes \$532 million for chemical warfare.

Well, where were we, oh yes, welfare. When the military part of the budget is up 18 per cent over last year and your President is considering cutting back on spending, it is a sure shot that welfare needs a closer look. As in whose? Welfare is deemed delivering needed services to the needy. Nowhere or way do weapons manufacturers make the list. Let you consider profits a part of a welfare program. President Reagan has quickly placed the \$700 billion budget of the \$3 trillion Gross National Product (GNP) in the position to push profits for military arms manufacturers in front of general services to the people by the government. The intended Republican results of a Reagan budget was to be a smaller federal government with a much reduced role in domestic policy. Instead, it is merely a shift from needed government services oriented budget to a big military build up budget. Or whose welfare is it anyway?

**The New Federalism and Black America**

Norman Hill  
A. Philip Randolph Institute

In the State of the Union message which he delivered on January 26, President Ronald Reagan outlined the broad details of a policy he refers to as the "New Federalism". This sweeping proposal would result in a massive transfer to the states of important federal responsibilities in such areas as Aid to Families with Dependent Children and food stamps. Other programs which would be turned back to the states would include highway construction, mass transportation, and education. In exchange, the Federal Government would assume all costs of Medicaid. If put into effect the "New Federalism" would reverse a fifty-year-long trend which made programs for the needy a national responsibility.

While some political leaders have greeted the Reagan proposal with guarded optimism, organized labor and the black community have been vocal in pointing out the inequities which would result if Reagan's proposal is implemented.

What is there in the Reagan plan which elicits such widespread protest among blacks and organized labor? For black Americans, it is the fundamental perception that historically many state governments were bastions of resistance to racial justice.

Indeed, the very call for "states' rights" is perceived by blacks as a code word for racism and bigotry. Civil rights historically have been extended through the intervention of federal courts and federal agencies. The spectre of returning broad powers to the states conjures up images of the Bull Connorses, Orville

Faubus, and George Wallaces, obstructing racial justice.

Yet for blacks there is more than the lesson of history which is at the root of unease over the "New Federalism". Blacks and their allies in the labor movement are aware that there are severe economic inequities between the states. A transfer of responsibilities to the states would serve to exacerbate these already substantial inequities of wealth. Moreover, it would heighten the inequality of working people in the less prosperous regions and localities. One indication of this regional inequality, which is of particular concern to civil rights advocates, is the fact that while black workers outside the South earn 99 per cent of the wage white workers, in the South itself black workers earnings are only 78 per cent of white workers wages. Such a regional discrepancy is the product of many factors; discrimination, lack of education and lack opportunity for on-the-job training among them.

Yet President Reagan's plan would require southern states to assume the full burden of educating and training blacks to enable them to attain an equal standing with white workers.

It would concentrate a disproportionate burden upon a region which has economically lagged behind other areas of the country and has demonstrated a historical resistance to taking the kinds of steps which would eliminate racial inequality.

Blacks and other workers are concerned that the transfer of increased tax burdens

to the states would refuel competition to see who could maintain the lowest level of taxation and so attract corporate investment. In essence, states which substantially reduce programs for the poor and needy would be rewarded through the relocation of corporations seeking even higher after-tax profits. Such a "negative" competition would be disastrous and would further undermine the social cohesiveness which is the hallmark of a healthy society.

Ultimately the "New Federalism" is not suited to the complexities of a modern technological society. Japan, West Germany, and Sweden, countries whose rate of productivity in the last decade has outpaced that of the U.S., have established a cooperative relationship between the federal government, labor, and industry. These economies have achieved substantial growth in part directly because of national government involvement.

Despite the strong arguments against, one need not be surprised that President Reagan chose 1982 to introduce his "New Federalism" concept. As one Administration aide told *Time Magazine*: "The whole idea was to come up with something that does not require us to respond and defend the economic program. So we're changing the subject."

The Reagan "New Federalism" proposal clearly is nothing more than a smokescreen designed to obscure the failures of the Administration's supply-side economic prescriptions. "We have come a long way, indeed: from 'Voodoo economics' to 'Voodoo civics.'"

**To Be Equal**

**The Forgotten Majority**

By John E. Jacob

Executive Director, National Urban League

My hat is off to Vicki Williams, an Indiana factory worker who qualifies as an example of that middle American everyone talks about and few understand.

Ms. Williams wrote an article published in *Newsweek Magazine* (January 18, 1982) that not only told some home truths but pulled the rug out from under affluent media thinkers who pretend to be so knowledgeable about the feelings of the average taxpayer.

Ms. Williams titled her article "The View From \$204 a Week," that sum being her takehome pay after taxes and other deductions. So she is part of the vast group of average people many think are so fed up with taxes they want to end social programs.

Not true, Ms Williams says. "What the people 'up there' don't understand is that I identify with beneficiaries of those programs. ... There but for the grace of God go I."

She continues: "So far I have never had to rely on welfare, free lunches or Medicaid, but I very well might someday. ... People like me, who live only a hair-breadth from economic disaster, are glad those programs are out there, though we pray we'll never have to use them."

Ms. Williams is not alone, about half the population is in the same boat. They work and earn modest incomes that don't go far enough and all it takes is a plant closing or a bout of illness to drop them into poverty. Ms. Williams reports her husband is out of work and his unemployment compensation has run out.

If her's was currently a two-earner family the "experts" would label them comfortably middle class. If she loses her job, her family would plunge right into poverty.

Most Americans in that position are on-

ly too aware of their situation. They are not fooled by the rhetoric about social programs. They know that all it takes is for the breaks to go the wrong way, and then they will find themselves needing food stamps, or other help to survive.

What we call "social programs" are really a form of social insurance, a compact among all Americans not to let anyone drop below some minimum level of sustenance and to help all to get the aid they need to make it on their own.

Sure, people do resent high taxes. And many do pin the reason for high taxes on social programs' costs. Some even give way to racism and blame poor minorities for everything, including high taxes and social spending.

But most understand high taxes are not caused by the relatively small portion of the budget devoted to social spending. Working people pay high taxes because defense spending is booming and because revenues are lost through tax loopholes for the affluent.

And they aren't taken in by attempts to depict social programs as havens for cheaters. Here again, Ms. Williams is right on target. She writes:

"I know about the cheaters. There are always cheaters. They are a part of life as surely as death and taxes. Certainly, if they are caught, they should be punished and denied aid, but I know we'll always support some cheaters along with the 'truly needy.' If we have to give a free lunch to one child whose parents could afford to pay in order to give free lunches to nine children who genuinely deserve them, so be it."

She is right. Cheating is hardly confined to social programs. We see it in the swollen defense budget, in cost overruns, in ripoffs in both the public and private

sectors. It is wrong to subject social programs to standards not applied elsewhere.

Does Ms. Williams actually speak for the forgotten majority of working Americans? I think so. Poll after poll demonstrates that majorities favor programs aiding the poor, the elderly and the handicapped, and keeping health and education programs, even if it means budget deficits.

Even at the height of the orgy of budget cutting, most Americans were suspicious of the drastic social program cuts. Now with the numbers in need mounting, and with yet another round of callous cuts coming up, the forgotten majority must speak louder in behalf of its own interests in keeping the social compact intact.

**The Carolina Times**

L.E. AUSTIN  
Editor-Publisher 1927-1971  
(USPS 091-380)

Published every Thursday (dated Saturday) (except the week following Christmas) in Durham, N.C., by United Publishers, Incorporated. Mailing address: P.O. Box 3825, Durham, N.C. 27702-3825. Office located at 923 Old Fayetteville Street, Durham, N.C. 27701. Second Class Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina 27702.

Volume 60, Number 9.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE CAROLINA TIMES, P.O. Box 3825, Durham, N.C. 27702-3825.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: One year, \$12.00 (plus 48 sales tax for North Carolina residents). Single copy 30¢. Postal regulations REQUIRE advance payment on subscriptions. Address all communications and make all checks payable to: THE CAROLINA TIMES.

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. Opinions expressed by columnists in this newspaper do not necessarily represent the policy of this newspaper.

*If there is no struggle, there is no progress. Those who propose to favor freedom and yet depreciate agitation are men who want crops without plowing up the ground. They want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean's majestic waves without the awful roar of its waters,*

—Frederick Douglass