

# Opinion

## Self-segregation isn't racial harmony

I went to Wednesday's keynote speech by Atlanta mayor Andrew Young full of expectations. I expected to hear a vigorous affirmation of human rights from the viewpoint of a participant in both Martin Luther King's civil rights battles and in President Carter's human rights foreign policies. I was sadly disappointed, however, since Young was quite complacent about racism in Atlanta. He emphasized successes without making any concrete plans for advancing his city's race situation beyond basic racial harmony.

I live in Atlanta, and am proud of its economic success and its lack of gross racial discrimination. Yet I don't think the various international contracts that Atlanta has landed to build Japanese hotels and the like is either a sign of improved human rights or racial harmony. Mayor Young claimed that economic empowerment for blacks and multi-racial work crews promoted human rights, yet without social integration as well, this progress will only remain at work and not be transferred to the workers' homes and neighborhoods. In fact, most Atlanta neighborhoods are not racially mixed, and while this form of segregation is self-imposed it is very damaging to improving racial understanding. When I asked him about this division of neighborhoods along racial lines,

**David Ball**  
Staff Writer

Young answered only that blacks and whites could live where they wanted to. They choose to live with people of their race, not interacting with other races, a social problem that Young did not address.

I also asked Mayor Young about Forsyth County, a county which hurled both insults and projectiles against marchers protesting the racial make-up of the literally all-white county a few years ago. He once again refused to acknowledge that real progress still needed to be made, saying blacks could move to Forsyth County if they wanted to and that it was better to be insulted than to have the police, state troopers and senators against the protesters.

Counter to his claims, Forsyth County ran out black families that tried to live there, staying free of blacks for over 70 years because of terror, not because blacks had no desire to move there. Young claimed that the Ku Klux Klansmen harassing the marchers were found in from other areas, not Forsyth County, but the TV footage showing ordinary residents of the county belies this assertion.

Young did have support from

*In trying to paint a rosy picture about Atlanta, Young is only hurting the racial stability he claims is responsible for Atlanta's stunning economic growth.*

powerful governmental figures, which is a sign of progress, but this does not mean that racism is non-existent. Young throughout his answers made a distinction between overt racism and the subtler racism of language and other covert forms of prejudice.

Such an attitude will prevent racial problems from ever being solved. If, as Young told me, "The ball's in your court now (to stop racial inequality)," then he should lend his support to vigilance, instead of resting on his laurels about how there is no racism today. Leadership from figures like Young can help this generation fight racism, but fostering complacency from a position of leadership can only hurt a youth movement's efforts to strengthen racial justice.

In trying to paint a rosy picture about Atlanta, Young is only hurting the racial stability he claims is responsible for Atlanta's stunning economic growth. The current situation is more that of a cease-fire, with

whites and blacks segregating themselves peacefully, than a true situation of racial harmony and understanding. Insidious racism, the racism that exists behind closed doors so that everyone can claim that their neighborhood "doesn't have a problem," is prevalent all across America and should not be ignored. No riots is not a good indicator of racial understanding.

By making a claim that he would carry Forsyth County if he ran for governor, perhaps Young was disclosing his true motivation: appeasement of the white population in Georgia for political power. If so, Young is paying an awfully high price for his glossing over racist problems in the metropolitan Atlanta area. The man who said "freedom is a constant struggle" would do well to heed those words instead of ignoring problems to maintain Atlanta's good image.

*David Ball is a freshman political science major from Atlanta.*

## Let's rename the BCC for a broader scope

For several months, I have been following the DTH reports regarding the movement in support of building a 13,000-square-foot, permanent Black Cultural Center on campus. I've had some nagging doubts about the wisdom of such a movement. However, as a white student, I felt it wise to abstain from commenting on the matter.

On November 15, the DTH printed a letter to the editor ("Band-Aids for gaping wounds") written by Jim Pailin, a black student, decrying the sad state of our campus society which fosters the need for a Black Cultural Center. I'm emboldened by that letter to express my doubts.

I should state that I recognize that blacks might, regrettably suffer a sort of culture shock upon arrival at Chapel Hill. Sadly, for all the reasons mentioned by Mr. Pailin in his letter, blacks might feel less than warmly welcomed by the majority. Many blacks also might not enjoy the same landed Greek system as do so many white students at this school. Clearly, there is a present need for providing adequate facilities for blacks to meet to socialize, support one another, study and conduct Black Student Movement meetings.

**Andy Henderson**  
Staff Writer

However, the institutionalization of a Black Cultural Center could have the effect of furthering the insular nature of the black student community on campus. I see the need for such a facility as both extremely regrettable and, hopefully, merely transitory. In fact, I cannot convince myself that any 13,000-square-foot effective monument to racial distinction is ultimately a good thing.

With that in mind, I have a small suggestion. Such a facility might be better named a Minorities Cultural Center. This is not suggested in order to minimize the value or contribution of black culture, but to suggest a somewhat broader inclusiveness for the proposed center. I believe that the name suits a more proper ultimate use of such facilities that would endure beyond the regrettable present needs of black students in our society.

*Andy Henderson is a second-year law student from Chapel Hill.*

## Rhetoric about individual liberty won't end discrimination

One thing I learned about marketplaces in Mexico is that they are good places to go if you want to have something stolen. The same holds true in the marketplace of ideas. The fact that ideological groups are forever stealing concepts from each other is an ancient one, but one which nevertheless always manages to get my adrenaline pumping. What got my adrenaline pumping Monday were columns by David Hood and Chris Osborn. ("When the forum becomes the debate," Nov. 14) They've stolen the concept of liberty, and I want it back.

I am a fan of the Carolina Critic in much the same way that I am a fan of their patron saint, William F. Buckley. Like Buckley, Critic writers are extremely predictable and always consistent. They never shy away from a fight, and you always know where they stand. I respect these traits; they make up for the fact that Critic writers are wrong on issue after issue.

Hood's intellectual defense of his publication was a flawless example of how theoretical postulates can be used to prove almost anything. The argument, and I am sure that loyal Critic fans will correct me if I miss the mark, runs that the Critic is not racist in its attacks on the Black Student Movement because, as Ayn Rand conservatives, they support the

**Daniel Conover**  
Staff Writer

complete equality which stems from individual liberty. Lowering standards for or giving special treatment to any group demeans that group, and, in Hood's words, "makes a bad situation worse." Whether or not I have paraphrased the argument with Hood's eloquence, the argument itself is a sound one.

It is, of course, also wrong. I can already see myself being quoted again in the Critic's "Across the Bows" section for that little bit of logic. One of their witty staffers is sure to ask how an argument can be both structurally sound and empirically wrong. The response (I'll give it to you in advance to save you time) is that the argument exists in the same never-never land that so much neo-conservative logic thrives in.

A philosophical premise of the Critic is that liberty is best served when government is passive. It's a noble idea, one that has been debated in Fabian societies for decades. It develops logically from this premise that the more the government taps public pockets, the more injustice it

does. There are, of course, exceptions. Even the philosophical right agrees that we must be taxed to accomplish goals that individual citizens can't achieve on their own (i.e., defense).

But that's about where the Critic draws the line. Taxes for better nuclear mousetraps are fine, but when it comes to money for child care, health care and affirmative action, their response is a resounding "no!"

"A government that intervenes in the free market and reapportions wealth denies individual liberty!" they scream. "Allowing the federal government to step into these arenas gives the government too much power!"

But power is what it all boils down to. The history of the United States is a dynamic interplay between different groups and forces in an on-going struggle for power. To date, no group has succeeded in amassing enough of it to dictate policy to the rest of us, and as a result we are a healthy, relatively just nation. Neorighties who decry government intervention in free market economics forget that were it not for government intervention, the very same free market forces which they so love would have long ago destroyed economic competition.

Have we forgotten the lesson of the Robber Barons? Do we no longer

understand why Teddy Roosevelt had to "bust the trusts"? Or do we simply ignore the context in which Franklin Roosevelt restructured the nation's control of financial markets? In each of these cases, economic power became concentrated in the hands of a few, and the power which this bought them endangered American democracy. We have a constitutional government based on the idea of checks and balances, and over the centuries wise leaders have seen that economic checks and balances are required as well.

How does this relate to racism? Very directly: legal discrimination was ended by the civil rights movement, but discrimination itself didn't go away. The new oppression is both racial and economic as entrenched WASPs try to protect their share of the economic pie from minority intrusion. It is true that all men are created equal, but we certainly aren't born that way. In the eyes of the law we are all the same, but in the eyes of bank loan officers, private schools and other institutions, we are very, very different. Being poor is a

handicap for anyone, but it's even worse if you are poor and black, poor and Hispanic, poor and Native American or poor and female. Are we to believe that the well-born succeed in greater numbers because they are innately superior? I think not.

It is one thing to affirm the philosophical equality of all people, but quite another to put teeth in that premise and ensure that it means something in the real world. We have to choose between neo-rightie happy-talk about libertarianism and addressing the reality of inequality.

I am not advocating communism; I'm advocating that we remember our principles and then act on them. We believe in equality — let's level the playing field and allow all to compete on an equal basis. Pretending that all of us have the same chance to succeed is a wonderful advantage for the well-off, one we can't afford to give them. No matter how well Hood packages his product, it remains hazardous to our nation's health.

To Mr. Osborn, who seems direly confused and in search of some

needed sympathy; perhaps you need some rest. How can a person who wrote, "when minority children in many public schools are singled out for discipline by a white teacher, they have been conditioned to cry 'Racism' and 'Discrimination!'" change his tune and expect us to care about his abstract defense of conservatives as nice guys? You will soon face the real world, Mr. Osborn, and I suggest you get ready for a shock. Your future critics won't be nearly as kind as I've been.

We must face up to de facto discrimination in this country. Spouting idealistic pabulum about individual liberty does nothing for the man who doesn't have it, and mislabeling the debate as a conflict between totalitarian socialism and Jeffersonian libertarianism does nothing to resolve it. Liberty is not a personal possession; it is a hard-won right which is meaningless if it is not shared with all.

*Daniel Conover is a junior journalism major from Carrboro.*

## Hatcher is no spokesman for conditions in Robeson County

As a graduate of the greatest university and the news editor at Lumberton's newspaper, The Robesonian, I was doubly distressed to read that Eddie Hatcher spoke at a forum that was part of a four-day event held in conjunction with Human Rights Week.

I would defend Mr. Hatcher's right to say what he wants to whom he wants. My quarrel is: Could the Campus Y not have found somebody who could have shed some real light on what is happening in Robeson County? That is, after all, what his lecture was supposed to deal with.

When and how did Mr. Hatcher become an expert either on human rights or Robeson County? Did his ability to saw off two shotguns and terrorize innocent people make him so?

I asked Ms. Zenobia Hatcher-Wilson, director of the Campus Y, which sponsored the event, that question. Ms. Hatcher-Wilson suggested that Mr. Hatcher's invitation to speak in no way represented an endorsement of his actions by the

**Donnie Douglas**  
Guest Writer

Campus Y. Maybe not, but it certainly gave the false impression of legitimizing his actions.

Mr. Hatcher is not the one to ask to speak on conditions in Robeson County, not if one is interested in getting information free from bias. Neither are the county officials he is so fond of accusing of corruption. The same for Pitts, who is neither objective (as Hatcher's lawyer) nor a resident of Robeson County. Pitts' only knowledge of Robeson County is fueled by Hatcher's paranoid rambles.

How can one believe someone who masquerades as a Tuscarora Indian despite the fact that both his parents have WHITE written on their birth certificates?

Did Mr. Hatcher mention that Robeson County holds elections in the tradition of this great country? That is the place to make meaningful change, at the ballot box.

Did he mention that the very

minorities he perceives as being oppressed constitute well over 60 percent of the county? Did he mention that some of the officials he accuses of being corrupt have time and again been elected by those people? Did he mention that investigation upon investigation by practically every state and federal agency has failed to turn up evidence about these allegedly corrupt officials?

I would defend Mr. Hatcher's right to say what he wants to whom he wants. My quarrel is: Could the Campus Y not have found somebody who could have shed some real light on what is happening in Robeson County? That is, after all, what his lecture was supposed to deal with.

My conclusion: Only if that organization had sought to, which it obviously did not.

The students at the greatest university deserve much better.

*Donnie Douglas, a 1979 UNC graduate, is the news editor of The Robesonian. This letter does not necessarily express the views of his newspaper.*



St. George and the Dragon, 1988

## Help take a bite out of crime: use SAFE escort service at night

Sunday evening I was sitting in the lounge studying my brains out for an upcoming philosophy exam. There was another guy studying behind me and a girl he knew came in complaining to him about something another guy was trying to tell her.

Her initial statement was that he wouldn't let her walk from her car. When questioned what she meant, the words she said both angered and scared me.

She said she wanted to move her car from behind the dorm to the proper parking lot. Her next statement was the shocking part. "He won't let me walk back by myself." His reply was simple, straightforward and made a lot of sense; it's too dangerous. She came back with the remark that it was not less dangerous if he was walking alone. This is where

**Michael Nuckolls**  
Guest Writer

my anger reached a peak and her words scared me.

First, I commend the girl's friend who made her take him with her. This should be a lesson to us all to never let anyone walk alone at night.

Next, I believe her attitude about a girl (or more generally anyone) walking alone at night is totally wrong, not to mention dangerous. A young woman walking by herself at night becomes a prime target for a crime. I am not saying they are weak or defenseless, just that an attacker sees them as a vulnerable subject. Perhaps the most horrible reason young women are singled out is rape.

I am unaware of the exact statistics, but I would imagine there are many times more women raped than men. This in itself should deter females from walking alone at night.

A good example of the singling out of females is the girl who was attacked earlier this semester but escaped by biting him. She had been chosen as an easy subject for a crime and was lucky he fled. This may not work with every criminal.

The part that scares me is that some women don't take the precaution of having someone walk with them seriously. I myself cannot see how they don't, especially knowing these crimes really do happen. You can pick up almost any newspaper on any given day and find an example of a woman being attacked.

To me, the thought of anyone being

raped should convince a woman not to put herself in that situation. I do not know anyone who has been raped, but when I hear of it happening, it hurts to know what this woman has been through and will go through the rest of her life. I would imagine this hits women even harder and should make them realize the dangers.

I see girls walking alone at night on campus every day of the week, and it makes no sense. When they walk past you they eye you like you are an axe murderer. It seems to me that having someone walk with you would ease the fears a little.

My question to them is why are you walking alone if you are scared of everyone that passes? There are no answers to this question, only excuses. "I am only going a short distance" or "I couldn't find anyone

to walk with me." As far as the first excuse goes I have yet to find a safe place on campus at night that is totally free of hiding places for attackers. There is just no place safe enough to walk, long or short distances.

For the second excuse I say there are plenty of people. A friend wouldn't be a friend if he or she did not help another friend. If no friends are around, there is usually a resident assistant in the dorm who should be more than happy to assist. SAFE escort is a student-sponsored service that provides escorts to anyone to go anywhere on campus as well as off. Campus police also offers their services to students who need someone to get them home safe.

No one is invulnerable to crime, and yes, it can happen to you. Don't

be embarrassed to ask someone to walk you or to call one of the services. To those who care, offer your services to someone going out at night or volunteer for the escort service.

At a university of a high academic caliber such as ours, I fail to see how anyone can lack the common sense to take precautions when walking at night. Those who feel the same way the girl I first mentioned does should realize they are dead wrong. But they should learn to take precautions before something they think won't happen does.

*Michael Nuckolls is a freshman economics and administration of criminal justice major from Winston-Salem.*