



The Erosion Of Confidence:

\$65,000 HDC

\$40,000 DBPC

\$3,000 DCABP

Editorials

The Old Way.

The Durham Committee on the Affairs of Black People still does it the old way, and the black community needs a change.

The Committee endorses candidates and issues, asking the black voters to back that endorsement. The black community usually comes through in numbers that often determine the outcome of many political races.

But also, according to J.J. "Babe" Henderson, longtime Committee member and its Chairman Emeritus, the organization gets contributions from various candidates and supporters of issues to "help the Committee carry out its campaign."

Mr. Henderson says there is nothing untoward about this process which recently produced about \$8,000 for the Committee following its endorsements on June 27. The money came from those candidates such as Dan K. Edwards, Mickey Michaux, and Sheriff Bill Allen all of whom were endorsed by the Committee. The group also got about \$3,000 from the supporters of the civic center referendum.

Mr. Henderson assures us that all this is above board because the Committee makes no contact with these candidates and supporters for money prior to the endorsement vote, and even then does not establish an amount that the endorsees should contribute, or even that they should.

"We just make the point that it takes money to conduct a campaign and any help we can get would be appreciated," Mr. Henderson explained. "If they didn't contribute, we'd work just as hard for them, and we'd pay the cost out of our own pockets."

We believe that Mr. Henderson sincerely believes what he says, and we know that the Committee's motives are honorable. But if the Committee (and that means all of Durham's black people) can pay the cost of the political campaign out of its own pockets, it would really clear the air around the endorsement process.

The way it is done now, the way has been done for years, is fraught with pitfalls. What for example keeps some individual member from approaching a candidate early on and agreeing to lobby the Committee for support, in exchange for a contribution?

What keeps some candidate from letting the word get out that he or she would be favorable to a LARGE contribution if the endorsement comes, and in hard times, what keeps the Committee from yielding to that temptation?

It seems to us that an independent Durham Committee, financed solely by the black community, would be less susceptible to the hanky panky that could occur under the present process. It seems that the Durham Committee needs to seriously consider coming to the black community for support, and letting the candidates keep their money, because as the Carpenter from Nazareth once said:

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon." (Matthew 6:24)

And one can't help but ask if the endorsements get the money, or does the prospect of the money win the endorsement? But that question can be easily eliminated by the black community paying our own cost to be our own boss, and again to paraphrase the Carpenter: "...Behold, we'll have a new way."

The New Way.

Some months ago, faced with a severe money crisis, the people who work at the Edgemont Community Center decided to do something other than cry about the budget cuts and Reaganomics in general.

They developed the Ministers Popularity Contest, understanding that our ministers are generally highly respected and very popular in our community.

They were right. During the weeks that the contest ran, promoted each week by a large "ad" in The Carolina Times, a lot of black people in Durham paid about \$1,800, at one dollar a vote, to back their favorite minister.

When it was all over, Rev. B.A. Mack, pastor of the Morehead Avenue Baptist Church, won. His prize was a trip to the Bahamas.

But he decided to forego the trip and let the Community Center use that money for its programs.

This project, the community's response to it, and Rev. Mack's gesture represent a "new way" for black people to deal with our problems.

As Jesse Jackson, president of Operation PUSH, is fond of saying, "there is no one for us, but us" and this Edgemont Community Center project is an excellent example of black people helping black people take care of business.

So our hats are off to the people at the Edgemont Community Center for taking a positive approach to problem solving, and to the black community generally for coming through, to Rev. Mack for proving why our ministers are so highly respected, and to all of the above for giving The Carolina Times an opportunity to help.

Our hope is that more of us will see the light and understand that the real American dream is the opportunity we all have to look out for our own.

Civil Rights Journal

The Sour Taste of Juice

Following an unpopular court decision, the public will often attach blame to one of the primary parties. In the case of John Hinckley, this blame and chagrin has been attached by the jury — who found him innocent by reason of insanity.

Over the last 21 years, we as a nation have witnessed the assassination of one President and the attempted assassination of the last three Presidents. These acts of violence have left an indelible mark on the minds of most Americans. We all remember that fateful day in Dallas.

The jury in the Hinckley case has been the target of severe criticism from both the press and the public, primarily because of the universal displeasure with their decision. But the fact that these emotional responses continue to overlook is that this jury was charged with weighing the evidence as objectively as possible and then looking at the law and determining whether these facts are such that by law they require a particular decision. They did just that.

Certainly, the fact that Mr. Hinckley's

father could well afford to hire the testimony of the nation's top psychiatrists adds to the idea of buying justice, but in our system of jurisprudence, expert testimony is the means by which insanity is proved or disproved.

The defense of insanity requires that the prosecution prove a defendant was sane at the time a crime was committed. This defense also requires that defense counsel prove that the defendant was not sane at the time of crime. This defense is centuries old and is indispensable to justice. Of course, the Hinckley case evoked an emotional furor because the victim of this particular crime was the President. But that does not remove the duty of a jury to look at the evidence objectively, that is without allowing their emotions to prejudice their decision. Once jurors become affected by emotions, the fundamental structure underlying the administration of justice will be permanently eroded.

These twelve individuals were in the peculiar position of setting aside their

emotions in the interests of justice.

The minority community has historically experienced the results of bias within the criminal justice system and perhaps for this reason, has developed a special appreciation for the basic strictures of the criminal justice system. The average lawyers will admit that the insanity defense is often used as a last resort legal strategy. The fact is that in the majority of cases the insanity defense does not prevail. When the insanity defense does prevail, it is the result of careful weighing and analysis of all the existing facts.

Perhaps the cries for a change in the law and the restructuring of expert psychiatric testimony are valid; however, based on the current status of the law, the Hinckley jury had to reach the hard decision. The verdict in the Hinckley case does not make a mockery of our criminal justice system, but instead demonstrates the ofttime bitter taste of justice.

So, let us not look at the twelve jurors as scapegoats but instead congratulate them for a hard job well done.

By Dr. Charles E. Cobb

Executive Director
United Church Of Christ
Commission For Racial Justice

To Be Equal

HELP WANTED:

Summer Jobs For Youth

By John E. Jacob

Executive Director, National Urban League

With unemployment climbing well past the ten million mark, there is a danger that the urgent problem of finding summer jobs for disadvantaged young people will go by the boards.

With companies laying off long-time workers, little thought is being given to creating the temporary jobs that young people can fill until school starts again in the fall.

And the problem is compounded by deep cuts in federal summer youth job programs. Not only will there be far fewer subsidized summer jobs available this year, but the entire program is slated to be ended in the future, folded into block grants to the states where summer job programs will have to compete with other needs for scarce resources.

In city after city, mayors are worried about their ability to mobilize voluntary action by business to plug the gap, and about the results of the failure to do so.

That has led to dire warnings about the possibilities of increased youth crime and even "long, hot summers." I don't think that kind of speculation serves any useful purpose, for there are strong positive reasons to create work opportunities for young people; reasons that transcend the more sensational aspects of the problem.

Work experience and work habits are essential if young people are to take their place in the economic mainstream. Study

after study shows that young people who work while in school or during their summer vacations go on the better jobs and higher pay as adults.

Short changing those kids now means they'll spend years trying to play catch-up, deprived of the work discipline and skills they'll need to succeed. And the lack of jobs also endangers their chances of staying in school, for too many wonder why they should continue their education when there is so little chance for a decent job at the end of the line.

Long-term, this has deep implications for the economy. As it shifts to producing services and high technology products, it needs a work force that is more highly skilled and better educated than in the past.

If our government doesn't seem to understand this, I am hopeful the private sector will. In some cities business groups have come together to pledge money and job slots for out-of-work youth. Their action transcends simple social responsibility. It also aims to ensure the availability of the future work force, preserve social stability, and meet public expectations.

A recent Harris Poll showed large majorities give business poor marks for creating jobs and investing in future growth.

The Poll showed public frustration with business' big tax cuts and its failure to

deliver the economic growth those tax cuts were supposed to bring. Much of the public's frustration is directed at the Administration, but business will be a bigger target if it does not begin to fulfill those expectations and if it fails to come through with jobs for young people.

The problem with an approach that relies entirely on business voluntarism though, is two-fold. First, even an all-out business effort will not plug the gaps left by federal cuts.

In Baltimore, for example, a corporate effort set a target at 1,000 jobs and overshoot its goal substantially, creating 1,400 jobs. But federal cuts eliminated 5,000 jobs slots and the city estimates there are 40,000 disadvantaged youth that would qualify for subsidized jobs if they were available.

Second, private sector efforts usually wind up skimming the cream of the crop; placing young people most likely to succeed on their own and failing to place the hardest-to-employ among the disadvantaged.

That is not to downplay the importance of private sector efforts. Rather, it is to restate the obvious — that federal summer job programs for the disadvantaged need to be sharply expanded, with enough resources committed to provide meaningful jobs for all young people.



Business In The Black

Nuclear Hits the Pocketbook

By Charles E. Belle

There is going to be high-level nuclear waste as long as the present administration's policies are in power. Naturally, nuclear weapons are not the end all and be all of the nuclear problem of the world. But keep it in the back of your mind.

Much of the U.S. foreign policy is predicated on a nuclear weapon superiority over the Soviet Union. Unless this madness is made clear, any discussion of the commercial use of nuclear energy is so clouded as to confuse even the most educated environmentalist, namely, my brother-in-law. Nuclear energy reactor plants for producing electricity for the public are not exactly a by-product of our nuclear weapons program, but its not a bad argument. As long as you are going to have the bad news about nuclear energy, why not take some of the good? Government currently controls the waste disposal program, such as it is, of both public and private use of nuclear energy for good or evil. Hot stuff can kill the harmless.

The management of nuclear waste is in the hands of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). They are awaiting this administration's long-term policy for the proper disposal or storage of nuclear waste. The question of permanent disposal or storage for later use is key to the public's interest. Storage means re-use of the radioactive material with a greater degree of risk of leakage and public harm. Hanford Reservation, Idaho Falls and the Nevada Test Site facilities of the DOE have adequate plans for disposal of low level waste.

Low level waste is anything that has been exposed to high level radioactivity and if you hang around it for too many

months, your hair might start to fall out. A couple of years, your teeth might drop, then a few more years you drop, assuming constant exposure. Cancer, you know. High level waste can do the death trick in 17 seconds.

So, considering the risk why mess around with radioactive hot stuff? Suppose you could save life rather than take life away with nuclear energy, would you be interested? Sure, if it was your life. Have you ever had an X-ray, it may have saved your life already, so don't be so quick to cut off your nose to spite your nuclear face.

Everyone wants electricity cheap. Country after country around the world has revised its energy policy to pay its petroleum bill. Believe it or not, they have increased their use of nuclear energy. Nuclear generating capacity outside the U.S. jumped nearly 22 per cent during 1981, with the new poor people's France leading the growth. After France, the countries depending most on nuclear energy for electricity, as of 1980, are Switzerland (28%), Sweden (27%), Belgium (23%), Taiwan (19%), Finland (17%), Japan (16%), and West Germany (14%).

U.S. nuclear power plants will generate 15% more than a year ago, accounting for a record 13.4% of U.S. electricity by the end of the year. People will support policies which provide cheap energy. This country is blessed with an abundance of oil and gas — not so for other countries. Coming to grips with the expense of the environment, nuclear harm is the hot issue, not just radioactivity in the atmosphere.

At a dinner party during the winter the

wish is for cheaper utility rates, not a lower radioactivity rate. Nuclear energy is substantially cheaper in the short term than oil, gas or coal. The nation's 72 operating nuclear power plants today provide electricity for approximately 32 million Americans and their work places. Whether or not to favor nuclear power for peaceful purpose presents a problem for rich and poor people.

The Carolina Times

L.E. AUSTIN
Editor-Publisher 1927-1971

(USPS 091-380)

(Mrs.) Vivian Austin Edmonds
Editor-Publisher

Kenneth W. Edmonds
General Manager

L. M. Austin
Production Supervisor

Milton Jordan
Executive Editor

Curtis T. Perkins
Contributing Editor-Foreign Affairs

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 28.

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: Admagnum 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.

This newspaper WILL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE for the return of uncollected pictures.

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 Douglas.
