

NEEDED NOW... UNITED COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

BLACK AMERICA ROLL UP YOUR SLEEVES



'BLACK FOLKS THEMSELVES ARE GOING TO HAVE TO WORK OUT MANY OF THEIR OWN PROBLEMS, INSTEAD OF LEAVING IT UP TO THE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS.'

ROY WILKINS

WILKINS

Editorial

Shooting Raises Questions

The fatal shooting of Danny Lee Winstead by Lt. Edward Godley of the Duke Public Safety Office raises serious questions about how we train officers to shoot to kill.

There is no evidence at this point, though we hasten to add that the investigation continues, to indicate that either of the officers present attempted to disarm or disable Winstead before he was killed.

Therein lies the tragedy of this incident.

Information released so far indicates that Winstead had a history of mental illness. There was no way for the officers to know that.

Winstead was wielding a deadly weapon. The officers were in danger. But nothing that we know at this point justifies his death.

It seems to us that police officer training should include the idea of disarming or disabling a dangerous person before the officer chooses to shoot to kill.

The problem of Winstead's death goes well beyond the usual outrage of a senseless killing. The man was not a criminal. There is no indication that had he lived he would have been of any undue danger to society.

We all need to think about that. Mental problems are indiscriminatory. Any of us, sane today, could be in a Durham parking lot swinging a two by four at cars tomorrow. As farfetched as that might sound today, ask yourself nevertheless, if it should happen would you want to face an officer who goes from warning shots to killing shots? Wrestle with that one as we mourn Winstead and wonder who it will be tomorrow?

Beware That Evil Day

Sunday is Halloween, and though danger and fear abound, people still blindly observe it.

[Mayor Markham has designated Saturday as the date for Halloween in Durham.]

All around the country, police departments, local government officials, church and civic groups have issued long lists of warnings to parents about taking their children out to get treats or play tricks.

Some hospitals have agreed to x-ray "goodies" free to make sure they're free of razor blades, straight pins, and other dangerous items. But even if you avoid that, there's always the chance that candy, fruit and other "treats" will be laced with poison.

So why do we even bother to take the chance?

Why do we dress our children, whom we claim to love, in costumes as witches, devils, hobgoblins, ghosts and phantoms and subject them to being seriously injured or even killed because we live in a world of sick, sick people?

Is it possible that we are "forced" to follow this ancient custom, this hallowing of the dead, because we have given up our ability to think for ourselves and surrendered blindly to so-called tradition?

Please think about it before you take your children out Saturday or Sunday night. Ask yourself if the tradition was to toss your lovely child, whom you love dearly, into a burning furnace, just to see if he/she could escape, would you do it?

If the answer is no, then ask: why am I tossing my child to Halloween? The answer might surprise you and shock you to stay at home, out of danger.

We hope so!

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

To Be Equal

Pentagon's Turn For Cuts

By John E. Jacob
Executive Director, National Urban League

The Administration's policy of cutting taxes and domestic spending while sharply expanding the Pentagon's share of the budget has led to record federal deficits.

So pressure is beginning to build for cuts in military spending. There is alarm at a defense budget that will eat up \$216 billion in 1983, with scheduled rises to \$350 billion by 1987. Business leaders, including many whose companies hold lucrative military procurement contracts, are voicing fears that spending on that scale will abort any economic recovery that may take place in the coming months.

The important thing to note is that the new resistance to throwing money at the military is coming not from traditional doves, who would be expected to fight large boosts in the Pentagon's budget, but from confirmed hawks. They are increasingly vocal in objecting not only to the scale of spending plans, but also to the degree of waste in military procurement programs and to the necessity for buying some of the expensive weapons systems in the pipeline.

They are right. It is time to place military spending under the same tight scrutiny reserved for domestic programs, and to make cuts deep enough to restore programs that help the national defense by strengthening our economy and its human resources.

This can be done without endangering national defense. Some costly new

weapons only increase national insecurity while busting the budget.

The notorious MX missile system, for example, will cost some \$25 billion in its latest "dense pack" version. It got the "go" signal at about the same time that a panel of experts reported that land-based missiles of any kind are outdated. Any version of the MX would be vulnerable to enemy attack, they say. And all are agreed that the MX bill will mount through the inevitable cost overruns.

The Pentagon itself admitted that costs for 37 weapons systems were \$4.3 billion higher than originally estimated. And that's just for one year — 1981. The cost of one of those systems rose by 167 per cent; another rose 53 per cent, or \$250 million — equal to what the Administration wanted to cut from the nutrition program that feeds pregnant women and children.

Pentagon cost estimates are continually being revised upward; anytime the government puts a dollar figure on a new weapons system, the true ultimate cost will be far higher.

And some of those weapons are dubious at any price. A new navy cruiser with a one billion dollar price tag was recently found to be so overweight that its projected speed was sharply lowered and questions have been raised about its tipping over in rough seas.

The troubled-plagued M-1 tank will cost \$20 billion plus overruns, but field

tests indicate it breaks down after only 44 miles. In a simulated battle test, half the tanks were out of operation after five days. The M-1 spends more time in the repair shops than in the field.

Few defense observers believe the B-1 bomber is necessary or even that it meets the need for a modern bomber. It would be active for only a few years until a new bomber, now in the works, is ready. The cost — about \$40 billion.

Then there is the plan for adding two nuclear-powered aircraft carriers for about \$7 billion. But the price tag does not include the cost of the small fleets of ships required to protect each carrier.

It doesn't make sense to keep pouring billions down the Pentagon's bottomless pit at a time of national depression, record deficits, and deep cuts in people programs that weaken our society and our defense.

With scandalous cost overruns breaking the budget, with military waste estimated by some government figures in the range of \$15 billion a year, and with no indication that those expensive new weapons make us safer, it's time to slam on the brakes in military spending.

And that means not a little trimming here and there, but a full-scale review of defense needs and the total elimination of weapons systems that are of dubious utility, applying the strictest cost-benefit standards.

Scrutinizing The Candidates

By Congressman Augustus F. Hawkins

One of the most haunting refrains which I recall from the 1980 Presidential election was the comment that, "there's not much difference between the candidates." It was difficult to understand this comment because the differences between the candidates were quite clear — and I think history and many millions of Americans will agree with me on this point now that President Reagan has been in office more than a year and a half.

As this election season approaches, it is particularly important that voters devote some time to sorting through the issues as they decide which of the candidates will get their vote. This is especially so in light of the effects we are now seeing as a result of the selection of Ronald Reagan to the Presidency.

Proclaiming that his election signaled the desire of the American people to see drastic change in the Federal government, President Reagan set about to take the country back through a time warp. Who can forget his comment that he never knew the country had a problem with race relations. And I guess he feels we would all be better off if there were no Social Security system as evidenced by his desire to dismantle the program. Though President Reagan went to college, and as a result has seen many opportunities come his way, he must feel that we would all be better off with a less educated populace —

after all, the less people know, the less they can protest for change. And make no mistake, it is important to be careful in the choice of our elected officials as their decisions affect us all quite significantly.

It would be hard to find any American who has not been personally effected by the sweeping changes which President Reagan and his conservative cohorts in the Congress have sought to bring about. From the 1981 tax cut (which yielded the average worker approximately \$1.00 more per paycheck) to the 1982 tax increase (the largest peace time tax increase in U.S. history) all of us are affected by the policies coming out of the White House — no matter how conflicting!

It is not only the college students, poor children and the elderly who have felt the influence of President Reagan's policies. Consider the millions of Americans who have been added to the unemployment rolls while President Reagan allows unemployment to rise as the inflation rate comes down. And one important point, the reduction in the inflation rate for which President Reagan takes credit is largely as a result of the stabilization of petroleum prices — something President Reagan has no control over.

At any rate, the problem of letting unemployment rise even though the inflation rate comes down is that by the time the inflation rate reaches zero, the rate of

employment will be probably zero.

Proposed changes in the Department of Labor's Office of Contract Compliance have meant that the enforcement of equal employment opportunity laws with regard to Federal contractors (who are paid with the tax dollars of all citizens) have been relaxed, thus lessening the assurance of equal employment opportunity for minorities who might seek work with such contractors.

Perhaps the most chilling changes have come in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Justice Department. Both of these agencies have drastically reduced their pursuit of the principle of protecting the rights of all Americans.

I seriously doubt that had President Carter been re-elected we would have seen such drastic changes in the conduct of the Federal government. It is inconceivable to me that Carter would have attacked the disadvantaged as savagely as Reagan has. And, in addition, I do not think we would have such enormous deficits as we have rolled up as a result of Reagan's gorging of the military budget.

So, the next time someone tells you that there is no, or very little difference between candidates for public office, remember the events arising from the presidential election of 1980.

Are Black Americans Being Soul'd Out?

By Joseph Gardner
Chief of Staff, Operation PUSH &
National Coordinator of the Anheuser-Busch Boycott Campaign

There are certain implications in the current fight between Operation PUSH, the Chicago-based civil rights organization which is headed by The Reverend Jesse Jackson, and Anheuser-Busch, the St. Louis-based beverage firm, which are deeply disturbing to all of us who are concerned about black progress in this, our native, land. After we have audited the actions of certain blacks who are beholden to the company, we are forced to ask: Are we being soul'd out... and sold out as well?

Almost a year and a half ago, Rev. Jackson wrote a letter to August A. Busch III, Chairman and President of Anheuser-Busch, requesting a meeting for the purpose of negotiating a reciprocal trade agreement. Busch refused to meet with Rev. Jackson and/or members of PUSH's negotiating team, which is chaired by Johnny Ford, mayor of Tuskegee and president of the 212-member National Conference of Black Mayors. (Among other members of the negotiating team are Congressman Walter Fauntroy, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus; Maryland State Senator Clarence Mitchell III, chairman of the National Conference of Black State Legislators; and Buffalo's Rev. B.W. Smith, chairman of PUSH's National Selective Patronage Council.)

Obviously, PUSH's negotiating team preferred to meet with Busch around the conference table instead of "meeting in the streets." Obviously, also, PUSH was patient: It was not until early September of this year that Rev. B.W. Smith and the PUSH National Selective Patronage Council, with Rev. Jackson and the negotiating team, still being rebuffed by Mr. Busch, called for a national boycott of Anheuser-Busch products, the best known of them being Budweiser Beer. Anheuser-Busch's reaction was to appoint a black company vice president, Wayman

Smith III, as a substitute for Mr. Busch — and, in succeeding weeks, Anheuser-Busch has: 1) attempted to discredit Rev. Jackson, Operation PUSH and, in fact, the entire civil rights movement; 2) attempted to buy black people (the company poured more than \$100,000 into the recent National United Affiliated Beverage Association (NUABA) convention in Chicago (last year they spent \$15,000); 3) reportedly hired a black public relations man to write an editorial in support of Anheuser-Busch, and attacking PUSH and Rev. Jackson, which was published in a black St. Louis newspaper and distributed to other black newspapers around the country; 4) reportedly stepped up its advertising in black media; and 5) begun to brag about its contributions (aid not trade) to black causes.

Primarily because of those contributions, some blacks say PUSH made a mistake when it targeted Anheuser-Busch because Anheuser-Busch has been "so good" to us. But, the fact is, PUSH has targeted all of the major beverage firms. It has, in the meantime, signed reciprocal trade agreements with Coca-Cola, Heublein and Seven Up. What is called "being so good to blacks" actually amounts to no more than tips. Consider a few pertinent, and shocking, figures:

In fiscal 1981, Anheuser-Busch's gross income was \$4.4 billion. Of that amount, Black America spent \$660 million with the company. Overall, 15 per cent of Anheuser-Busch's business was done in Black America; in the top 50 black markets, that percentage was 22 per cent. Rev. Jackson and Operation PUSH declare, with overwhelming logic, that Anheuser-Busch should return fully 15 per cent of its sales in Black America to Black America in the form of trade. Trade, not aid — that is what PUSH's

(Continued on Page 16)

The Carolina Times

L. E. AUSTIN
Editor-Publisher 1927-1971

(USPS 091-380)

(Mrs.) Vivian Austin Edmonds
Editor-Publisher

Kenneth W. Edmonds
General Manager

Milton Jordan
Executive Editor

C. Warren Massenburg
Advertising Director

L. M. Austin
Production Supervisor

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 43.

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.

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