

IF WE DON'T CARE... WHO WILL?



EDITORIALS

THE DAY CARE VETO

The Day Care Veto by President Ford was a cruel one when we look at what Day Care provides for many children involved at all levels of our society.

Day care, when provided by competently staffed centers, has proved to be socially and educationally and culturally enriching. It has also enabled parents to enter the job market who would otherwise be unemployed and, or on welfare, thus providing a net gain for the federal budget.

The vetoing of the \$125 million bill to help day care centers meet federal standards was just added on as another serious veto, without thought of the human needs involved.

President Ford is well aware that

state standards in most instances have never been adequate in most areas of human development. It takes help from the government to meet and keep up to standards that may be necessary to improve our day care centers.

Many states and communities have been unwilling, or in many instances just plain unable, to improve and provide day care services that will meet the federal guidelines.

Just as the many subsidies [high class welfare] for the more affluent are given priority day care subsidies were also needed to guarantee an adequate program.

We hope that the Day Care legislation will somehow gain favor at a not too distant future date.

U.S.-AFRICA A NEW DETENTE NEW

On balance, we think the Kissinger proposal for a new U. S. policy on Africa as outlined by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in his Lusaka speech deserved the support of the American people.

We find the two-year limitation for settlement of the Rhodesian problem faulty. The government of Ian Smith is as intractable as ever in its determination to deny majority rule of the Blacks in that country. Two years from now, unless the full force of world opinion is brought to bear, white supremacy will remain the same. Time has run out for placation. The cry of the rightful majority is for freedom now. Nothing less can be acceptable.

It is too early to make a complete assessment of the Kissinger Africa mission. Some aspects of it, however, are already sharply in focus. First, it is clear that this trip was necessary. Perhaps, it was too long overdue to repair the damages from years of neglect.

To his credit, Dr. Kissinger sought to make up for lost time. Once the decision was made, he threw himself into the task with the same energy and determination that has characterized his past performances in the realm of diplomacy.

Not surprisingly, there was wariness on the part of African leaders as to the sincerity of his motives. Kissinger was "disappointed" by the Nigerian rejection of his bid to include that nation on his schedule.

The abrupt cancellation of the Ghana visit was another setback.

The six countries that did receive him, provided him with the learning experience he needed on Black Africa. Now, that he has come to know something of the personalities of these leaders and sensed the feelings of the people, we hope the lesson will lead to improved communication between Africa and the United States.

The 10-point program will not satisfy everyone. Let us say, it is a forward step in improving relations. Neither benign neglect nor the harsh rhetoric of recent days will serve the interests of Africa or America. There must be a partnership of mutual respect.

Africa is the last great storehouse of raw materials. In his address to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at Nairobi, Dr. Kissinger called for a more equitable code of conduct in the sharing of that wealth.

U. S. Blacks have a vital stake in the accomplishment of these goals. For better or for worse, our destinies are entwined. To that end, we must pledge all of our energies. We call upon those national organizations that have led in the struggle for civil rights at home to join with others in the formation of a strong, effective peoples lobby to promote a new African policy for progress, peace and prosperity.

TO BE EQUAL

The Reverse Discrimination Myth

By VERNON E. JORDAN
Executive Director National Urban League



Forces opposing affirmative action to make up for discriminatory practices against blacks, women, and minorities have come up with a catchy new phrase calculated to win support for their position -- "reverse discrimination."

The idea is that it's bad to discriminate against anyone and that the affirmative action thrust constitutes a form of discrimination against white males. Supporters of the reverse discrimination theory hold that they're not against providing equal opportunities, they're just against preferential treatment.

The trouble with this theory, like others, is that it doesn't stand up to harsh reality. So-called preferential treatment consists of remedies to correct previous discriminatory practices and to restore to the victims of discrimination their rightful place, be it a job or a company seniority benefit.

Affirmative action is then, a legal remedy to make up for past illegal action. A recent Supreme Court ruling upheld this view and other pending cases are likely to further decline the constitutionality of various affirmative action programs.

In March the Court ruled that blacks denied jobs in violation of the Civil Rights Act must be awarded retroactive seniority once they were hired, even if it means bumping other workers who had actually been hired before them.

The Court's ruling doesn't settle the issue because of its limited nature. The ruling applies to

individuals; it's not a blanket guarantee of seniority to groups that had been discriminated against.

But it's still an important positive step toward erasing the effects of past discrimination. It's not enough to say to a worker that although his job application was turned down years ago, the company will now comply with the law and will hire him. Just giving him the job he should have gotten earlier still leaves him with real losses.

A minority of the Court was willing to let him have, in addition, some seniority benefits such as vacation time, pensions, and other fringe benefits dating from the time his original application was illegally rejected. The majority went a step further to insure job security in the seniority system as well.

But where does that leave blacks, women, Mexican-Americans and others who never even applied for a job because it was well-known in the community that a company never hired anyone but white males? It's a tricky question because a lot is at stake, including fairness to those workers who stand to lose their privileged position through no personal fault of their own because their company discriminated against minorities.

There are rights on both sides of that particular issue, but if justice is to be done, past victims of discrimination must get all the rights and privileges they might have enjoyed had their skin been white or their sex male. If this leads to a

transition period of quotas and preferential treatment for some groups, that would not constitute "reverse discrimination," with all the negatives that implies.

Rather it would be society's effort to break the perpetuation of the effects of discrimination that robbed minorities and women of their rights.

Many people are upset by a concept that seems to infringe on seniority, merit, and similar hallowed ideas. But those ideas never were followed. The keys to success in our society have always been distributed according to family background, sex, race, religion and ethnic origin.

There's always been a quota system, and a rigid one, that informally excluded minorities from equal access to jobs, schools and rights.

The question may boil down to which quota system will we have, the old one that inflicted negative discrimination against all but white males of the right background, or a temporary set of goals and timetables designed to right past wrongs and to democratize the structure of our society.

The Court, which proved so timid in the De Funis case, has taken a limited step in the right direction. It should extend this positive attitude in future affirmative action cases. That would not be reverse discrimination, it would be reversing discrimination!

Congressman Hawkins' Column

American Democracy Still Strong

For too long in this country we allowed too many of our citizens the luxury of thinking that skin color, or language, or custom, or ethnic heritage--was an open sesame to preferential treatment. Namely, that white skin, the English language, Anglo customs and ancestral birth in Northern Europe, had a unique-ness which called for discriminating against all those without these qualities. In effect, the possessors of these "big four" qualities got the best of everything: jobs, housing, education, health care, recreation, political and civil rights protections, and other things related to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness goodies.

It was a nice ball-game, with all the advantages and very few essential, starting-gate, disadvantages for the "big four". But it couldn't last forever, and it didn't.

Fortunately, those lacking the "big four" qualities, could think; and since thinking comes to those of all shapes, sizes and colors, regardless of ethnicity, these American thinkers first began to challenge discrimination based on color.

A landmark political-legal case, that of a slave called Dred Scott, was probably among the first to challenge the conscience of America, and a here-to-fore acceptance that no slave had a right to anything except his perpetual servitude.

Scott was a slave in Missouri, which was a slave state. His owner, Dr. John Emerson, an army surgeon, took Scott to Illinois, a free territory, in 1834, and then to Wisconsin, where slavery was also forbidden.

Four years later Emerson returned to Missouri, with Scott, who in the interim had married, and had fathered two children. Scott, at this point questioned his slave

status decided to sue for his freedom, on the basis of his former residence in the free territories of Illinois and Wisconsin.

Scott won in the lower court. When the case was appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court, its Chief Justice, Roger B. Taney, in 1857, ruled that Scott was not a citizen, but a slave, and as a slave, lacking citizenship, Scott could not sue in the federal court.

Taney went on even further, laying the seeds for the Civil War, by declaring that blacks were inferior to Whites, and could therefore by justly reduced to slavery for their own protection and benefits.

As though warming to his racist task, Taney continued by moting that under the Constitution slaves were property, and that their owners could do with them as they so chose since slaves "had no rights which a white man was bound to respect."

Taney also declared that according to the Constitution, a citizen could hold slaves anywhere in the nation; this upset certain Congressional laws which relegated slavery mainly within the boundaries of the Southern states.

Americans opposed to slavery met the decision with bitter protest; Abraham Lincoln urged the President and the Congress to disregard Taney's decision as a rule of law.

But it was Frederick Douglass who with great vision, set the tone for the coming war over slavery: "This very attempt to blot out forever the hopes of an enslaved people may be one necessary link in the chain of events preparatory to the downfall and complete overthrow of

the whole slave system."

The heritage of obtaining equality of treatment in this democracy for all citizens, sometimes falters, wavers, and even hesitates, but since the days of Dred Scott, the path has been right-on.

And it will continue so, no matter how the opponents of equal opportunity attempt to forestall progress.

America will not stand still on this issue, it will only go forward. Amen!!

Things You Should Know

KING CLITUS

300 B.C.



FOSTER BROTHER OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND GENERAL OF HIS CAVALRY, CLITUS' BRAVERY AND BRILLIANCE WERE CITED BY PLUTARCH / ON MORE THAN ONE OCCASION HE SAVED ALEXANDER'S LIFE / BUT WHEN CLITUS REPROACHED HIM LOVINGLY FOR HIS ARROGANCE, ALEXANDER BLEW HIS FRIEND IN A FIT OF RAGE / REPENTING LATER, ALEXANDER TRIED SUICIDE, FASTED AND WEPT FOR THREE DAYS - DYING IN DRUNKEN REMORSE!

TO THE CAROLINA TIMES

OPEN PUBLIC LETTER

Rev. Benjamin F. Chavis, Jr. Wilmington, N. C. 10 Co-defendant

North Carolina State Central Prison Hospital Raleigh, N. C. June 11, 1976

"Continuation of Spiritual Fast and Political Hunger Strike for Justice and Human Rights"

I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the thousands of supporters across the United States and from around the world who have sent letters, telegrams, and messages of solidarity to me as I continued to fast for justice and strike for human rights for all oppressed peoples.

Today marks the forty fourth (44th) day that I have not eaten food in a nonviolent moral effort to awaken the sleeping masses of black and poor people to the ever increasing necessity to

struggle against racism in all of its many forms.

Initially I began to fast on April 30, 1976 to protest the cruel and unusual treatment I was receiving from the N. C. Department of Corrections. The prison officials sought to isolate and punish me for political reasons -- the officials feared I would help fellow prisoners seek their human rights at Caledonia Prison Farm in Tillery, N. C., consequently I was transferred to the state prison sanatorium McCain Prison, in McCain, N. C. Because of the unhealthy environment at McCain and after I found a large roach in my food, for the second time, I gave notice that I would not eat food until I would be transferred to a regular prison unit. On June 1, 1976, I finally was transferred away from McCain Prison Sanatorium. I consider the transfer a significant victory.

However, there is a

greater need to further expose the reality of gross

racial injustice in the United States even as we are in the midst of a bicentennial celebration.

Therefore my conscience compels me to continue fasting to emphasize and dramatize the following:

- a. Freedom for all U. S. political prisoners in 1976.
- b. Support the Wilmington, N. C. Community Involvement Commissions' Black Freedom Festival, July 4, 1976.
- c. Support Dick Gregory national cross country "Run to End Hunger"
- d. Support the National March for Human Rights and Labor Rights September 6, 1976 in Raleigh, N. C. and,
- e. A call for universal love and peace among all peoples and nations.

I will continue to fast as long as I can. Only through constant struggle will the Wil-

lington Ten, the Charlotte Three, and other political prisoners be rendered justice. We shall overcome.

Sincerely, Rev. Benjamin F. Chavis, Central Prison Hospital Raleigh, N. C.

THE CAROLINA TIMES
L. E. AUSTIN
Editor-Publisher 1927-1971

Published every Saturday at Durham, N. C. by United Publishers, Inc.

Mailing Address, P. O. Box 3825 Durham, North Carolina 27702 Second Class Postage Paid at Durham, North Carolina 27702

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

One Year	\$8.50
Sales tax	.34
TOTAL	8.84
Two Years	17.00
Sales Tax	.68
TOTAL	17.68
Single copy	.20

Payable in advance. Address all communications and make all checks and money orders payable to THE CAROLINA TIMES.

Amalgamated Publishers, Inc., 810 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10017, National Advertising Representative, Member of the United Press International Photo Service. The Publisher is not responsible for the return of unsolicited news, pictures, or advertising copy unless necessary postage accompanies the copy.

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

Principal office located at 436 East Pettigrew Street, Durham, North Carolina 27701.

