

## Editorial

## Congratulations To Two Men Of Vision

It is fitting that on this weekend, Durham gets a chance to congratulate and honor two men of vision, both of them having dedicated many years to what is now called North Carolina Central University.

In 1909 when Dr. James E. Shepard launched the National Religious Training School and Chautauqua, he put a dream into motion as only a man of vision can do.

While Dr. Shepard undoubtedly had many reasons to not launch his school, he apparently was driven by a compelling desire to contribute something worthwhile and significant to his people and his time.

History, then, has proved him to be a man of vision, and worthy of both our respect and admiration.

Cut from a similar piece of cloth, though framed on a different style, Dr. Albert N. Whiting, too, has been a man of vision.

Taking the foundation planted by his forerunner who guided the school through virulent racism, the Depression and two World Wars, Whiting, for the past 16 years, has prepared Central for a new day.

And just as history has measured Dr. Shepard's contributions and found them to be both substantial and stable, in the final analysis, Dr. Whiting, too, must be fairly and objectively judged by history.

Men of vision are always "before their time", and it is often only in retrospect that we understand and appreciate what a positive and uplifting experience it was to have toiled with them, struggled with them, or even in smaller ways had them touch our lives.

Such is the case, we believe, with Dr. Whiting, and so we say simply: congratulations.

We would be indeed remiss, however, if, understanding the importance of Central's homecoming, we did not also wish to Eagles good luck. So in closing, we say simply to the Eagles: **BEAT THE BULLS!**

## We Are Not A Minority

The word "minority" has become a sickening cliché, an almost useless catch-all term used when we either don't want to be specific or when we wish to confuse the issue.

Webster sheds a little light on the real definition of the word, and how its misuse has come to be acceptable.

"Minority: the period before attainment of majority, the state of being a legal minor, the smaller in number of two groups constituting a whole, a group having less than the number of votes necessary for control; part of a population differing from others in some characteristics and often subjected to differential treatment."

One of the first things to note about these definitions from Webster is the absence of racial or sexual implications in defining minority. The word in its natural state, before it is twisted to mean something else, refers simply to numbers and arbitrarily chosen characteristics.

Being black has no more to do with being a minority than have two eyes to do with being a majority, because if being black makes us a minority, then we chose to believe that having two eyes makes us members of a distinct majority group.

So when you get right down to it, the application and acceptance of the term "minority" depends upon what characteristics you chose to apply it to.

For example, the first definition implies the ability to become a majority, that the term is temporary in its application.

In the second definition, being a minor is almost totally dependent upon the whims of the legislature. If you are 18, you can fight for your country, but can't legally buy whiskey in most states.

In North Carolina, for example, you can be tried in court as an adult at 16-years-old, several years before you can either fight for your country or buy booze. But that, too, can be changed.

Now when we come to the third definition, we see where the corruption has really set in. By this definition, there can only be one whole, and two groups, one of which is smaller than another. You can have adults and children, or marrieds and singles, men and women, or as you stretch the definition, blacks and whites. But you can't correctly have blacks and other minorities.

In the fourth definition, the issue is still simply numbers: Democrats and Republicans, pros and cons, and finally as we consider the definition that speaks to population and differences, we can have "seeing" and blind, "hearing" and deaf, etc.

Now where does that leave us?

Blacks are not, by definition, a minority, because we fit into any of the demographical, political, social, economic or even moral categories that anyone else in this country fits.

What are we then?

We are Americans with a special interest which makes us just like industrialists, farmers, unionists, management or any of the other special interest categories in this country.

We are not a minority, and we should stop accepting that label because the acceptance narrows our vision and hinders much of our progress.

### Things You Should Know

**Frank J. FARRELL**

A renowned machinist and a leader of The New Knights of Labor, which began appointing Negro organizers in 1875. At its peak this union had 60,000 Negro members, and the movement largely grew out of a meeting of 200 delegates at Union League Hall, Washington on December 6, 1869 to form the Colored National Labor Union.

Continental Features



## Reagan and Unemployment

By Congressman Augustus F. Hawkins

Though President Reagan campaigned on the promise that his policies of Reaganomics would produce millions of new jobs for America, at this the midway point in his term, America is still waiting for that promise to materialize. The announcement of the September 1982 unemployment statistics revealed that the national rate of unemployment has hit 10.1%. This is the highest rate of unemployment since 1940. Translated, this means that 11.3 million Americans are out of work.

While millions of Americans are facing the grim realities of coping with the ravages of unemployment, Mr. Reagan and his wealthy, conservative supporters are living in a fool's paradise — insulated from the real suffering of the people and totally uncaring except for lip service paid to the troubles.

Who can forget that when confronted with the effects of his policies an angry Reagan lashed out at the media for distorting the problem out of proportion by asking if it was news that "some fellow in South Succotash someplace has just been laid off that he should be interviewed nationwide..."

There has been much change, if not progress, in the President's reaction to the rapidly escalating rate of unemployment. At first, the President had no plans to attack the problem of unemployment and hardly ever even commented on the subject. However, as unemployment reached post World War II levels, the President sought first to discredit the unemployment data reported by the U.S. Department of Labor by deliberately trying to confuse the public on the topic of whether the unemployment statistics should be seasonally adjusted. In fact, before an audience of school children, the President

asserted that the unemployment rate for March, 1982 was actually lower than it had been the previous month. Seasonal adjustments are applied to the raw unemployment statistics to take into account fluctuations in the number of persons actively seeking work. In the summer, for instance, seasonal adjustments are made in the statistics to take into consideration the numbers of college students who enter the job market. Apparently, Mr. Reagan must have felt that these job seekers were not really looking for work and should have been discounted.

When it became obvious that the Labor Department's methods of analyzing statistics could not distract the focus of attention from the millions of unemployed Americans, the President regrouped for another assault.

If as they say, "April is the cruelest month", then April, 1982 was among the worst. Shortly after President Reagan dropped a bombshell on the school children in Chicago (actually it was more like laying an egg) and he saw that it had no effect, he sought out other means of shifting the blame for the rising unemployment.

At a White House question and answer period in mid-April, the President said, "Part of the unemployment is not as much recession as it is the great increase in the people going into the job market, and, ladies, I'm not picking on anyone, but because of the increase in women who are working today and two worker families and so forth." This was an obvious attempt to blame the rising unemployment rate on working women. Of course, this is totally ridiculous. Economic realities aside, any American who wants to work should be able to do so without our President trying to place the blame for our current economic conditions to their

shoulder. This statement, however, was not surprising coming from a President who has made deep cuts in social programs, the recipients of such programs being largely women and children. It is clear that the President feels that a woman's place is in the home — in as impoverished a state as possible.

Of course, the President makes no mention of the benefits which have accrued to our society as a result of the millions of women who joined the job market in the 1960's and 1970's. Chief among the contributions of these working women are the billions of dollars in taxes which have been deducted from their pay, particularly the deductions for the Social Security trust fund. Not only have women workers added to their families' incomes, but they have added to the goods and services produced by the economy.

More recently, President Reagan has taken up the idea that 6.5% unemployment is acceptable. This is a continuation of the irrational ideas coming out of the White House on the topic of unemployment. This idea seems to fall in the same category as his attack on the way the Department of Labor reports the unemployment statistics. That is, if you don't like the way the game is going, then change the rules to suit yourself.

When these attempts to downplay unemployment exploded in the President's face and he saw that he could not defuse the issue, the White House began issuing monthly statements to coincide with the release of the unemployment statistics to the effect that the President, "remains sensitive to the plight of the unemployed." Hopefully the American people will remain sensitive to the plight of Ronald Reagan when he is unemployed — though many will breathe a sigh of relief.

## To Be Equal

## Which Way For The Economy?

By John E. Jacob

Executive Director, National Urban League

The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Paul A. Volker, recently announced a shift in the Fed's policy that many believe means an end to the tight money policy that has strangled the economy.

The Fed can loosen the strings now, Volker said, because the back of inflation has been broken. I suspect there is another reason. The tight money noose may have helped cut the inflation rate but it has also inflicted such terrible damage on the economy that policy makers decided to change course before disaster overwhelms us.

Everyone knows how bad inflation is; there has been no way to escape the sermons on its evils for years. It is true that inflation was ruining the economy and eroding working people's incomes. And it is true that a large part of our current problems can be traced to the high inflation rates of the 1970s and early 1980s.

But sometimes the medicine is more dangerous than the disease. That's certainly the case with tight money medicine. The prescription of high unemployment for an inflation-ridden economy promises a different kind of illness, not a cure.

Exchanging double-digit unemployment for double-digit inflation is no bargain. In fact, it is even worse for the economy.

Inflation could have been cured without throwing us into a Depression. It

may have taken longer, but the cost would have been more manageable.

For one thing, the costs could have been spread more equitably. Since everyone was hurt by inflation, everyone would have been asked to make sacrifices.

By choosing the high unemployment route out of inflation, the burdens weren't shared. They were concentrated among certain sectors of the economy. Industries like housing and autos were put through the cruncher.

Worse, it was the most vulnerable individuals and families minorities, unskilled workers, young people who paid the highest price. They were singled out for high unemployment while others reaped the benefits of lower inflation.

Construction worker and blue-collar workers had double-digit unemployment before affluent occupations felt the pinch. And black joblessness was in the double-digit range for many years without anyone showing much concern.

And whatever harm inflation caused the total economy, high unemployment means over \$300 billion a year is lost in goods and services that might otherwise have been produced.

That's quite a bill, and it will be paid far into the future since we have shrunk our economic base by that amount. The lost jobs, lost opportunities, and our weakened position in foreign markets

amount to a permanent wound inflicted by a mistaken policy.

Now, with lower interest rates, there is some hope for recovery. But that recovery will be short-lived and feeble unless we develop a full-employment economy.

And that means a Universal Employment and Training system that gives everyone a real job and real skills training opportunities. We have to face the fact that many jobs lost in the last decade will never come back — they are victims of technological change.

We have to concentrate on creating the jobs of the future and giving people the skills to hold them. And that won't happen through reliance on the free market or pushing for balanced budgets by cutting human resources investments.

The way to balance the budget is to put people to work. By ending unemployment eleven million people move off the unemployment rolls and onto the tax rolls.

So while the inflation-fighters beat a retreat over a road littered with casualties from their tight-money policy, the next phase will be crucial. All signs point to a feeble economic recovery, when what Americans and a recession-ridden world need is a strong, sustained period of growth. And the way to inaugurate that is through a job training system that gets people working and producing again.

## Tax Exempt Discrimination

Credit former Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman, Jr., with a masterful argument before the Supreme Court in the Bob Jones University-Goldsboro Christian Schools tax exemption case.

No one can predict how the current Supreme Court will rule from day to day on any major issue. But even if it relies on the "intent" reasoning it has turned to in certain civil rights cases, Coleman seems to have presented a magnificently impressive argument.

Appearing at the invitation of the Supreme Court, Coleman contended that the Internal Revenue Service's decade-old policy of denying tax exemptions that discriminate racially should be continued.

The Reagan administration has sought to restore tax exemptions to these institutions, and thus to hundreds more that might discriminate against blacks.

Reagan's Justice Department, siding with pro-segregationist groups in such a major legal challenge to school desegregation for

the first time since the Holmes case out of Mississippi, holds mainly that the IRS has no grounds to deny tax exemptions because the Congress has not passed specific laws requiring it to do so.

In addition, there is the argument which holds that as religious institutions, these schools have the right to discriminate against blacks and others because their religious beliefs call for such an anti-American stance.

Coleman argued convincingly that the Supreme Court and the Congress have shown repeatedly that it is the law of the land and the intent of the federal government that racial discrimination is unconstitutional.

He pointed out that Congress, while not having specifically passed a law telling the IRS to deny tax exemptions to Bob Jones University, has refused to stop that IRS practice although it has ended other actions it did not agree with when they were brought to its attention.

As recently as last year when the passport case involving the CIA and Phillip Agee came up, the Supreme Court used the apparent approval by Congress of certain administrative practices to consider them to have Congressional ratification.

And when President Reagan, battered by criticism of his action favoring schools that discriminate, took his lame plea to Congress requesting specific action on legislation for the IRS to refuse tax exemptions, the Congress told him in unequivocal terms that it felt the IRS had sufficient authority.

Coleman, chairman of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, has made it unlikely that the Supreme Court will back the Reagan administration's blatant bid to turn back the clock in the field of school desegregation by giving aid and comfort to the religious bigots.

This is an NNPA Editorial.

*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

## 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 44.

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 uncollected pictures.