

722-8624 Or 723-9863

Ernest H. Pitt
Editor & Publisher

Isaac Carree, II
General Manager

Diana Roberts
Advertising Manager

Melvin Eaton
Circulation Manager

Winston-Salem, N.C. Saturday, December 10, 1977

The Wrong Nancy Wilson

A bad sign: Wayne Corpening hasn't even been sworn in as mayor yet, and already we disagree with him.

He has asked for a salary higher than other city secretarial jobs -- between \$10,851 and \$13,638 a year.

"I don't think a secretary from the bank would fit in very well at City Hall," commented alderman Floyd S. Burge, Jr., who moved for a "no consideration" vote on the issue at the aldermen's meeting.

Corpening wants to hire his assistant from Wachovia Nancy Wilson, also a campaign aide.

We object to this for several reasons. One, he is costing the city more money with his high-priced aides; two, he is ignoring the city personnel department and their in-service promotion program; and three, he is employing someone whose loyalties are to himself, rather than to the city of Winston-Salem.

We started worrying when Corpe-

ning announced that he was going to be a full-time mayor, because traditionally the job has been a figurehead position, with an occasional old man signing petitions and serving as goodwill ambassador on junkets around the country. Corpening wants to work full-time -- doing what?

Then he spent \$30,000 getting elected, more than he will make in salary in his entire four-year term, and we wondered what he can accomplish that will be worth so much money to his supporters? Surely not a few proclamations, or an occasional tie-breaking vote in the aldermen's meeting.

Now he has announced that he wants an assistant. Not a city employee, but a long-time associate who has worked with him in business and politics for years.

We are not sure what Mr. Corpening's plans are, that they should require such special assistance, but we intend to find out by watching his future actions.



BLACK EMPOWERMENT

By Dr. Nathaniel Wright, Jr.
Human Rights Activist

It comes as deeply significant news to all black Americans that one of its closest corporate friends of long standing, Pepsi-Cola, has come through in the nick of time to save black America's most worthwhile sustained place on national public television.

Blacks have long looked to the Pepsi-Cola Company for continued loyalty and leadership and doubtless will be relying on its "first real friend (from many years ago) in the corporate world" to make the relationship one of the fullest reciprocity.

Such has been the black public's relationship with Pepsi-Cola that during the mid-1960's, when Pepsi's major competitor offered its product free to a convention of more than 5,000 blacks in Philadelphia, the convention leaders refused the offer. Specifically, the convention leaders said that they would rather "pay for Pepsi-Cola" than to take its competitor's product free.

True to form, Pepsi-Cola made no charge and served the some 5,000 guests over a four-day period. Even though this generous act may not be repeated every day, the Pepsi-Cola Company has forged strong links with the black community. Those ties need to be infinitely stronger...and

the same should hold true throughout corporate America. Blacks give to all their corporations far more than they receive in fair return.

It is in this particular context that blacks are especially pleased that a vital program of enlightenment like "Black Journal" has been saved for the American television public by an underwriting grant from Pepsi-Cola. Perhaps the most significant aspect about the gift is that it is almost wholly anonymous; that is, there is no accompanying advertising time since it is on "public television".

But there are other deeply significant aspects about the "Black Journal" situation. One is that "Black Journal" has been the only sustained, credible and empowering television program in behalf of the basic interests of black Americans.

In one way or another, it may be held that all other TV broadcasting has been in some perceived interest (or interests) of the white American viewing public. With this in mind, blacks along with all fair-minded Americans, have had good reason to be especially disturbed by the action of the President of the Public Broadcasting System (PBS) for his giving "Black Journal" what was effec-

tively the shaft. "Black Journal" by actions of his leadership, has been shown naively at non-prime time periods, such as 11:00 p.m. or even as late as 1:00 a.m. To support this action, he has relied on a

white-oriented (not public) rationale.

The relegation of this program, which is more vital to the immediate interests of black Americans than any other television production, to such inaccessible hours for most Americans represented an inconceivable act of the grossest discrimination and racism.

Both the F.C.C. (or Federal Communications Commission) and the administration of PBS should see that "Black Journal" is given sustained prime time showing. Further, every effort should be made to increase such offerings as "Black Journal" which are in the manifest interest of all Americans.

The unprecedented--or all time record-shattering--success of "Roots" suggests no inconsiderable interest in a corrective re-drawing of all black-white realities portrayed almost entirely in mythological and ever destructive ways for the nation's wholesome image of itself.

The now famous Humphrey-Hawkins Bill had its origin in the valiant effort of Congressmen Gus Hawkins and his colleagues in the Black Caucus to frame legislation that would guarantee jobs for all.

Such a tremendous change in our traditional acceptance of unemployment as a fact of life is likely to be accomplished by smaller steps. And one of those smaller steps is the President's acceptance of a compromise Humphrey-Hawkins Bill.

The proposed new Bill creates no new jobs, nor does it create structures that would deliver new jobs. Instead, it sets a national goal of four percent unemployment by 1983.

The compromise has been criticized, but it would be self-defeating to take an all-or-nothing stance. The revised Humphrey-Hawkins Bill has great symbolic value. It commits the President and the Congress to pursue policies that will shrink the numbers of unemployed.

That represents a major new commitment.

A Changed Cat

One spring day Alice and the White Rabbit were seated together at a Winstonland tea party when a stray cat wandered up to their table and asked if he could stay.

"We don't really belong in Winstonland," the Rabbit told him. "We just watch what goes on, but it's okay if you sit with us."

"Thank you," said the cat, nibbling on a chicken wing. "So pleased to meet you. I'm new around here, and I don't know anybody. So nice to have someone to talk to."

"What's your name?" asked Alice.

"Napoleon Solo," said the cat.

"Parents watched the

Man From U.N.C.L.E.?" ventured the Rabbit.

The cat shook its head. "No. Father liked French emperors and Mother was a fan of Marian Anderson," it explained.

The conversation continued in desultory fashion, with Alice and the White Rabbit politely discussing topics of general interest, while the cat asked dozens of questions. It seems a pleasant creature.

Several months later Alice had occasion to think of the cat again. She recalled that he worked in the White King's meeting house, with his pockets full of rye, and was an assistant in pie-baking, along with 23 others.

Alice went to the count-

ing house and asked if she might speak with Napoleon Solo.

At length a large striped tom cat appeared in the doorway and surveyed her haughtily.

"Hello," said Alice. "I don't know if you remember me. I met you at a tea party, and I thought I'd stop by and see how you liked Winstonland..."

"I don't think I care to tell you," snapped the cat. "I do not feel the need for that kind of disclosure. However I appreciate your consideration in asking me but I choose to decline. Anyway, one of my friends is mad at you."

"The cat sounded so different," Alice marvel-



ed later to the White Rabbit. "It sounded like a be-so haughty," recording. That cat certainly has changed since last spring. It must be making a lot of money to be so haughty. Perhaps its name has gone to its head," suggested the White Rabbit.

Letter To The Chronicle

Dear Sirs:

Mr. Shertzer's review ("Concert Leaves Listeners Cold," Winston-Salem Journal, December 2, 1977, p. 9) of the Charlotte Symphony Orchestra's concert at Winston-Salem State University on Thursday, December 1, left much to be desired in terms of journalistic objectivity. My initial urge was to express a gut reaction (typical of my initial responses to most of his reviews of previous arts performances at Winston-Salem State University). However, expression of such a reaction (1) would give me the appearance of being downright rude and (2) would make me guilty of the same fault which is one point of this letter----- that is, not sticking to the point.

Hopefully, Mr. Shertzer does not assume members of the entire Black community of Winston-Salem to be last year's fools. I hope he is aware that even an individual with minimum common sense realizes Shertzer's 19 paragraphs of review would have been written with more sophistication and objective sensitivity had the concert been given in Reynolds Auditorium or Wait Chapel rather than William Auditorium. I mention the former two auditoriums neither to denigrate them nor the individuals, organizations, institutions, etc., which might be associated with them. I have had opportunities to attend very fine arts performances at all three auditoriums, and I have also seen some not-so-perfect programs at all three. The apparent problem with Mr. Shertzer's reviews of programs at Winston-Salem State University is that they have generally been unfair. It seems he has accentuated the negative, negated the positive, exaggerated the trivial and played down the excellent. This has not been as characteristic of his reviews of arts performances given elsewhere in Winston-Salem.

To be specific, the first, second, third, sixth, seventh, sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth paragraphs (that is, eight of nineteen paragraphs--or slightly less than half the article) of Mr. Shertzer's review were either inaccurate or expressive of opinions and observations which (since Mr. Shertzer took time to make them) cast doubt as to whether he actually had time to listen to the concert. See Letter, Page 7

THE ONLY THING THAT ISN'T BROKEN AROUND HERE IS MY...



BRANDON JR

...FIXED INCOME

To Be Equal

by Vernon Jordan



Supporting the compromise

Instead of vague promises to bring down unemployment, the Bill provides a firm promise to do so. It represents a short-term promissory note to be redeemed in jobs.

By setting a national goal, the Bill places Congress and the Administration under pressure to meet the goal, and it provides a much needed framework for further full employment legislation.

And even while admitting that a four percent unemployment goal is inadequate, it is far better than the five and even six percent some economists pretend is full employment.

So the first order of business is to get the revised Humphrey-Hawkins Bill passed. And that has to be followed up with swift action to create the jobs to meet its modest goal.

That action should include greatly expanded public service employment and training programs. But it also has to be directed at increasing private sector job-creation through incentives that expand

capital spending and production and aid businesses in hiring and training the jobless and young people.

The private sector has to be given a central place in job-creation efforts. Most jobs are -- and will continue to be -- in the private sector, and no full employment policy can or should ignore that fact.

Some of the steps necessary to get full employment may be unpopular since too many citizens don't mind high joblessness so long as they are not among the unemployed. It's always easier to tell someone else that unemployment is inevitable when you've got a job.

There's also the barrier of the questionable link between full employment and inflation. Experience has shown that high unemployment doesn't necessarily mean low inflation, but the conventional wisdom is that it does. But how fair is it to tell someone he shouldn't have a job because full employment may be inflationary?

Things You Should Know

Joshua R. GIDDINGS

THE FIRST MILITANT ABOLITIONIST IN CONGRESS, KNOWN FOR HIS FAMOUS DEFIANT ANTI-SLAVERY SPEECH IN WASHINGTON IN 1841, HIS EFFORTS DID MUCH TO OPPOSE THE WORK OF JOHN C. CALHOUN, THE PRO-SLAVERY LEADER WHO SAID, IN 1836, "ABOLITION AND THE UNION CANNOT CO-EXIST."