

Winston-Salem Chronicle

Founded 1974

ERNEST H. PITT
Publisher

MICHAEL A. PITT
Assistant to the Publisher

NDUBISI EGEMONYE
Co-Founder

ANGELA WRIGHT
Managing Editor

ELAINE L. PITT
Office Manager

JULIE PERRY
Advertising Manager

YVONNE H.B. TRUHN
Production Manager

Jesse must be taken seriously

Jesse Jackson's win in Michigan has sent a message to the Democratic Party that it can no longer ignore -- at the rate he's going, Jackson just might wind up as its presidential nominee this fall.

Political analysts say Jackson's almost 2-1 victory over erstwhile front-runner Michael Dukakis in Saturday's Michigan caucus is a clear signal that the preacher-turned-politician is a very viable contender for the nomination.

Jackson, treated as an also-ran in 1984, has won in eight states so far this year -- Michigan, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Virginia, South Carolina, Alaska -- and in Puerto Rico's non-binding contest.

The string of victories is forcing the party to re-examine the theory that a black cannot be nominated for president in 1988.

"The Democratic voters are sending a very strong message to the party," said Ann Lewis, a Democratic strategist and informal adviser to the Jackson campaign. "The quality of leadership is something they like and admire. This is a referendum on him and a referendum he's winning."

The campaign-watchers also said the Michigan win could translate into victories in other high-stakes contests, including the New York primary on April 19.

"I don't believe Dukakis can stop him," said David Garth, a New York media consultant who is working for Tennessee Sen. Albert Gore Jr.'s campaign, "unless something different happens."

New York, which has 255 delegates at stake, represents a serious challenge for Dukakis, who has failed in the major industrial states of Illinois and Michigan.

"The stakes could not be more critical," said Paul Maslin, pollster for Illinois Sen. Paul Simon's campaign. "He can't just finish second to Jesse Jackson. He can't say I'm the leading white candidate. It's not going to work this year."

"Dukakis has got to win big to even say 'This is the guy the party wants,'" Garth said.

A New York Daily News poll published Sunday showed Dukakis favored by 45 percent of the 528 Democrats surveyed to 29 percent for Jackson. The poll, conducted between Monday, March 21 and Thursday, March 24, had a margin for error of plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.

However, New York Gov. Mario Cuomo has said that if two or three candidates are left in the Democratic race prior to the primary, Jackson has a chance of winning.

A poll by the Marist College Institute for Public Opinion found that 57 percent of 459 Democratic voters surveyed in New York earlier this month gave Jackson a favorable rating, to 30 percent unfavorable. In a survey by the same group in January, only 44 percent had given Jackson a favorable rating while 41 percent rated him unfavorably.

"New York is a fairly volatile state," Garth said. He noted that the state has a large Jewish vote, a group that has been skeptical of Jackson in the past.

In the most recent Marist College survey, 36 percent of the Jewish voters gave Jackson a favorable rating, an increase from 17 percent in January. Forty-three percent gave Jackson an unfavorable rating compared to 62 percent in January. The results had a margin of error of 5 percentage points.

The numbers suggest Jackson is mending fences with Jews whom he offended in 1984.

"There are still some in the political establishment who think 1988 is an inevitable replay of 1984," Ms. Lewis said. But, she added, "The day after Michigan a new world has dawned."

-- Donna Cassata

The Chronicle welcomes letters from its readers, as well as columns. Letters should be as concise as possible and typed or printed legibly. They also should include the name, address and telephone number of the writer.

Columns should follow the same guidelines and will be published if we feel they are of interest to our general readership.

We reserve the right to edit letters and columns for brevity and grammar.

Submit your letters and columns to *Chronicle Mailbag*, P.O. Box 3154, Winston-Salem, N.C. 27102.

CHRONICLE CAMERA

What do you think when you see the Confederate flag?

Several high schools have made the news lately because of the controversial issue of whether T-shirts or other articles of clothing should display the Confederate flag.

First to make the headlines was a school in Surry County, then a school in Durham, and just recently East Forsyth High School was the scene of a major confrontation between Afro-American students and white students over the same issue. A sawed-off .22 caliber rifle, knives, sticks and clubs were confiscated by Forsyth

County deputies. Ten students were charged with possessing weapons on school grounds and several were also suspended.

The school had banned the wearing of the Confederate flag, but several students wore it because they felt as if they were

being denied their right of free expression.

School administrators believe the symbol causes too much tension and stirs up hostility between Afro-Americans and whites.

The Confederate flag is the

banner under which the Confederate army stood during the Civil War in rebellion against the North and the abolition of slavery.

The Chronicle asked several local residents what the Confederate flag meant to them.

Among most Afro-American

respondents, the answer was the same. They believe the flag is a symbol of racism and that it has prevailed throughout the years during the Civil War.

Others believe it symbolizes the South and that it is associated with racism.



"The first thing I think of when I see that flag is the Civil War and racism. I think the flag is symbolic of white supremacist views also."
Bernard Hicks



"I can't stand that flag. It stands for racism. It lifts up the views of how people of the old South thought about black people."
Lee Valentine



"The Confederate flag has nothing to do with racism. It just symbolizes the south."
Melissa Akers



"It's symbolic of the racist attitudes the confederates had towards black people. It's very offensive and white people should be more considerate."
Viola Gentry



"It's all in the eye of the beholder. You interpret it. The flag can symbolize racism or it can be a look at the 'Lost Cause' that was the way that the South was run."



Drug abuse funds: Reagan 'just said no'

NEW YORK -- President Reagan's drug prevention program has popularized the slogan "Just Say No." Well, the president certainly knows the meaning of the word. He has said "no" to adequate funding for urgently needed drug prevention, treatment and rehabilitation programs ever since he took office.

The president says that the country is "beginning to win the crusade for a drug-free America," while his wife, Nancy, says that "the people who casually use cocaine are responsible" for the drug crisis. Both statements divert attention from a major problem -- lack of funding for drug programs. From 1980 to 1986 the Reagan administration slashed funding for such programs by a whopping 40 percent, according to the Congressional Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

The effect of insufficient funding for these crucial programs was noted by Diane Canova, director of public policy for the National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, known as NASADAD. This non-profit organization is composed of the state administrators of publicly funded drug prevention and treatment programs. Clearly, they know whereof they speak.

Canova discussed the impact of the funding cuts, saying: "In

most states, waiting lists for drug treatment are common, usually averaging a two- to three-month wait. What this means is that even

1987 level, a level which the administration agreed to only because Congress forced the issue.

We have all become alarmed



CIVIL RIGHTS JOURNAL

By BENJAMIN CHAVIS JR.

when intravenous drug users finally make the decision to seek treatment, they are being turned away, and then have nowhere else to turn. These users are at particularly high risk of contracting and spreading AIDS."

It is estimated that there are, right now, as many as 1.5 million IV drug users in this country. NASADAD estimates that only 10 percent of these addicts are currently being treated. More importantly, they also estimate that an additional 30 to 40 percent of these addicts would seek treatment if only it were available.

The Reagan administration, with its usual one-step-forward-two-steps-back approach, has proposed an increase in drug abuse funding over last year. But, as Canova points out, this will simply bring the new funding level to the

by the evidence of the increasing drug crisis -- and the related AIDS epidemic -- in our communities: the young people who roam our streets like the walking dead, the innocent children who have been slain by errant bullets during battles among drug dealers.

The nation's cities are under siege. Yet the funding for those programs that might offer some relief is woefully inadequate. Rep. Floyd Flake, the congressman from Queens, N.Y., sections of which are ravaged by drug violence, reminds us that on the federal level, the \$3 billion earmarked for drug education and enforcement represents a meager 1 percent of the \$300 billion defense budget. And this at a time when the drug abuse crisis has been called the No. 1 threat to this country's national security.

Please see page A5

Jackson's victory: Time to face facts

NEW YORK -- "Jackson's fervent preaching style also troubles some (whites). He's kept his flamboyant rhetoric mostly for Afro-American audiences during the campaign, and made appearances before traditional political gatherings more low-key," wrote Leslie Phillips in *USA Today* of Jesse Jackson's 1988 campaign style.

Phillips also pointed out that the most successful Afro-American candidate for president in history is "speaking less about black empowerment, the crux of his 1984 campaign, and more about economic injustice ... and has kept his relationship with Black Muslim leader Louis Farrakhan under wraps."

Jesse Jackson has compromised and gained political power, not unlike any successful politician. On Super Tuesday, with the least capital resources of the Democratic candidates for their party's nomination (a campaign void of any discussion of Afro-American issues),

Jackson won several states, placed second in eight and third in three.

Jackson's victory was so astonishing to white people, and Afro-American people who doubt Afro-American empowerment, that the *New York Post*

she is Afro-American. An Afro-American would need 65 percent of the non-racist electorate to offset the racism factor alone.

Add to that Jackson's high negative percentage (42 percent say



TONY BROWN

Syndicated Columnist

claimed him as a "man whose ancestors were black slaves, Cherokee Indians and Irish plantation owners" -- no longer just Afro-American.

Although Jackson received 20 percent of the vote in Minnesota, where the population is only 1.3 percent Afro-American, and 28 percent in Maine, where only 0.3 of the population is Afro-American, about 23 percent of the national white population will not vote for an Afro-American because he or

they will not even consider voting for him, in part due to his ultra-liberal views) and it will provide the correct context for understanding the 91 percent Afro-American and 7 percent white vote (Peugeot Yuppies, not poor whites) that made history in 12 southern states on Tuesday, March 8, 1988.

While Jackson plays down black empowerment in his campaign, that is exactly what he is

Please see page A5