

REPORT FROM Washington

Court Halts "Ethnic Purity" Flap

By Hoyle H. Martin, Sr.
Post Editorial Editor

While Democratic presidential candidate Jimmy Carter was attempting to explain and apologize for his "ethnic purity" statement, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled 8 to 0 that federal courts can order the government to build low-income housing in predominantly white suburbs.

The ruling by the Court, the first significant integration decision in two years, emerged from a Chicago housing case in which black resident charged that federal officials from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) were practicing discrimination in the placement of low-income housing. Specifically, HUD was charged with participating in efforts to keep all low-income housing within the city, and with creating housing patterns of white occupancy of low-income units in white neighborhoods and black

occupancy in black neighborhoods.

The City of Charlotte already has a policy on "scattered site" housing that is consistent with the aims and principles of the High Court's decision. In fact, the Charlotte Housing Authority is currently developing four small low-income housing projects for location in predominantly white neighborhoods on the east and south sides of the city.

This policy or action by the City of Charlotte did not occur out of any commitment to what is morally right or honest, it grew out of a threatened law suit by blacks who argued correctly that public housing was consistently being built on the north and west sides of the city in a manner that was perpetuating racial segregation. Nevertheless, The Post wishes to commend Mayor John Belk and the Charlotte City Council for its actions in the face of considerable community opposition and three years before a decision by the Supreme Court.

Black Behind In Job Opportunities

Barbara Walters' decision to leave the NBC-TV "Today" show to accept a co-anchor position on the ABC-TV evening news program, at a salary of \$1-million per year, has caused some interesting reactions and, more significantly, has overshadowed a far more basic concern.

Women applauded and shouted "right on" for women's lib and equality in the market place. White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) men, particularly news men, have reacted with envy vailed in charges that it (the \$1-million salary) is an attempt to transfer news reporting into show business.

The ballyhoo over Mrs. Walters' salary, which is after all a private matter between her and ABC, has pushed further into the background the important question of income inequality and related job opportunities for women as well as for blacks.

Mrs. Walters is truly one-in-a-million, as is boxing champ Muhammad Ali; however, the vast majority of women and blacks get proportionately less income than white men. Census Bureau statistics, for example, point out that in 1974 women employed full-time had a medium income of \$6,957, or only 57 percent of the \$12,152 received by men. Herbert Hill, labor director for the NAACP, notes that in the same year black family income was only 56 percent of that of white families.

Furthermore, the census data shows that in 1974 also, women who are 4-year college graduates earned an average of \$9,800 a year while men (white) with only an eighth grade education earned \$9,400, just \$400 less. By comparison, the black male college graduate can expect to earn less in his life-time than the

white male high school graduate.

Therefore, the income gap between men and women and white families and black families is approximately the same, 57 and 56 percent, respectively. In addition, black men and white women earn substantially less from an educational standpoint than do white men.

The Post feels that those who would envy a Walters or an Ali would appreciate their own lofty positions and salaries if they would take a look at the millions of blacks and women left behind in the jobs-income opportunity game simply because they are black or female.

As to whether Ms. Walters, or anyone else, is worth a million dollars a year is a matter of what the economist call "supply and demand." Demand (for service) has allowed Ms. Walters to be worth a million dollars on the talent market because she may be able to lift the news ratings of ABC by one or two points. "The gain," as The N.Y. Times has recently said, "of a single rating point puts the newscast into 710,000 additional homes, where it may be watched by approximately 1.2 million extra people. At the rates paid for commercials on the network newscasts in today's market, the gain of a single rating point should mean a gain of at least \$1 million in revenues.

"Thus, if by her presence Barbara Walters should improve the rating for the ABC Evening News by a single point, she pays back her spectacular salary. If by two points, it's a bonanza." Yes, Ms. Walters is truly worth every penny of the million she will get in the big dollar game of commercial television.

BLACK COMMUNITY SELF HELP - MUTUAL AID - SELF IMPROVEMENT - CO-OPERATION



Blacks' Destiny In Own Hands.....

Editorials & Comments

Commission On Federal Paperwork

BY JIM MARTIN, 9th District Congressman

A recent newspaper article stated "Every-time Congress passes a law that is the least bit vague, federal agencies pounce into action to try to add precision through rules and regulations.

That correctly emphasizes the way bureaucratic empires in Washington have been able to proliferate over the past few years. It should be added, though, that these agencies don't just leap in as though to fill a vacuum. They are expressly directed to do so, and it is not a good way to serve the public. What happens is that the Congress, anxious to "do something" about environmental concerns, about occupational hazards, about unsafe consumer goods, etc, but uncertain as to what specifically should be done, just passes a general authorization for someone else to decide what to do.

Instead of writing protective laws for the appropriate agency to administer and enforce, Congress for the last two decades has increasingly taken the easier route to creating a new agency with authority to write and enforce its own regulations. In this way, the laws setting up such agencies direct the Secretary of the agency to promulgate such laws as he or his administrators deem necessary for the operation of the agency. In other words, Congress abdicated its responsibility to an agency head not elected by the people. Left to promulgate (to issue laws), the agencies have obliged Congress to the point that an avalanche of paper flows forth from Washington each year, generally requiring a larger flow of paper to convey your complaint response back to Washington.

Attempts are now being made to rectify the paperwork burden which costs consumers and taxpayers billions of dollars. The Commission on Federal Paperwork, which is charged with designing a plan to reduce paperwork, will itself go out of business in 1977. In other words, it will not have had time to be absorbed into bureaucracy. In the interim though, the Commission will be trying to weed out the unnecessary paperwork which has begun to choke American

business as the self-employed, from doctors and lawyers to farmers.

The small business operator has been at the mercy of mountains of forms he is required to fill out which consume time and give an added expense that is eventually passed on to the rest of us as taxpayers and consumers.

In setting up the Commission, witnesses told members of Congress that in 1972 the Nation's small businesses spent \$18 billion, to process an estimated ten million sheets of paper required in federal reports. With staggering figures such as these, I shudder to think what the government spends to process the small business paperwork, not to mention the paperwork filed by the major corporate giants. This assumes, of course, that someone actually reads all the reports - which assumption may not be valid.

In summary, regulatory excess can be and must be dealt with directly. Proposals to dismantle the agencies are not going to succeed, because the original reason for their existence will still be there. What we can do is regulate the regulators.

TO BE EQUAL



VERNON E. JORDAN JR.

Food Stamps Fate On The Line

The fate of one of the most important federal programs—and one of the most often attacked—will be decided soon.

The Senate has passed a measure revising the food stamp program and the House is considering a version of its own. No one knows what the final changes in the program will be, but the struggle to preserve the food stamp program as an essential weapon in the arsenal against hunger faces an uphill fight.

Congressional reconsideration of the program comes after many months of abuse hurled on the program, ranging from outright misstatements of facts to name-calling by people who should know better. Secretary of the Treasury William Simon, for example, made a big splash a while ago with his now-famous statement that food stamp recipients are "Chiselers."

A good part of the hostility toward the program is due to the simple fact that it's effective. Some 19 million people receive stamps, making it one of the really successful federal programs that relieves some of the burdens of poverty.

Big as the program is, it still reaches less people than it should; a recent Congressional study found that up to a fourth of the population could become eligible for food stamps at some time during the year.

So long as the program was relatively small and ineffective it was tolerated but as soon as it began to accomplish its aims of supplementing the incomes of low-income families it became a target for the budget-cutters.

There is in our society a reluctance to subsidize people who are poor and in need of assistance that's balanced by an enthusiasm for subsidizing the better-off and politically-powerful blocs. The food stamp program for example, started out as a subsidy for farmers, helping to distribute surplus crops.

With the big rise in food prices in recent years, the program has become transformed into one that helps low-income families afford to buy food for the dinner table. And that's when the howls about chiselers and the high cost of the program started.

The numbers of recipients started to mushroom when the economy went into its down-spin and people were thrown out of work. The high cost of the program is part of the high cost of keeping our economy on a high unemployment basis, and it will decline when people get back to work at decent wages. Every time unemployment rates go up just one percent, another 750,000 people get the stamps.

Recipients are all poor or near-poor. Nearly half are on welfare, a fifth are "working poor", a tenth are elderly people who qualify for supplemental social security aid. Nine out of ten households in the program earned less than \$6,000 last year.

So there's not much room for chiseling there, regardless of the ill-tempered remarks of the program's wealthy critics. Such cheating as occurs comes from that part of the program its critics most want to keep untouched—the purchase provision.

Instead of giving stamps to qualified families, the government distributes them through 6,700 vendors who sell the stamps to eligible participants for cash. One report suggests that millions have been embezzled by some of the vendors, so cheating in the food stamp program is largely a matter of white collar crime, not recipient fraud.

as i see it

New Name For Beatties Ford Road?

By Gerald O. Johnson.
Post Staff Writer

Thursday morning May 6, 1976 I was quoted on WSOB Radio as saying that I was opposed to having Beatties Ford Road renamed to Martin Luther King Boulevard. The quote was 100 percent accurate.

There is absolutely no gain in commemorating Martin Luther King 8 years in retrospect by changing the name of Beatties Ford Road.

I believe Dr. King has been over commemorated in petty manners. If we were sincere in our push for giving a great man his deserved recognition, we would do all within legal limitations to see that Dr. King's birthday became a legal holiday.

This would mean a lot more universally than naming a street in this town or that town after Dr. King.



For a man that has done so much for the world, it is only fitting that he be commemorated urbanely.
ONE MAN FOR ONE WOMAN, UNNATURAL

One of the quirks of society

is the moralistic viewpoint that once a man takes a wife that is it. Fooling around, as it is called, is unchristian.

After seriously pondering this point, I have come to the conclusion that men have been had. The reason is simply that it defies nature.

Since man is from the animal kingdom one need only look into the behaviorism of other animals for the answer.

First of all, man is the only creature in the animal kingdom that is stupid enough to try such a thing.

There are five or so lions' to every male lion. Ten or so cows to every male walrus. I could go on but I think you've gotten the point.

Since the objective of all species is to perpetuate the species, then it is natural for many females to every one male.

During a female pregnancy, she is incapable of conceiving.

However, a male is still capable of impregnating.

This natural occurrence is justified because the male should have the freedom to impregnate another female. This is precisely why in all animal species there are more females than males. It is not a coincidence. The chances of having a male offspring to a female offspring are one to four. There exist four chromosomes, two in a male and two in the female. The two in the female are only capable of producing females. The two in the male are capable of producing a male or a female.

Hence, in order to come up with a male, the X chromosome of the male (X is the symbol for male chromosome) has to match with one of the Y chromosomes of the female (Y is the symbol for female chromosomes). If you still don't understand, get out your high school biology book.

The point is nature has set up a fool proof method of guaranteeing that there will always be more women than men.

This would also explain why the male's sex drive is much greater than the females. Nature has provided men with the sex drive to be able to meet the requirements of many females. When one female is unwilling, then you move on.

The menstrual cycle women go through is another time when pregnancy is impossible for the female. Now, it only stands to reason that if the man upstairs wanted one woman to one man, then he would have caused the males sex drive to die down a little during the menstrual cycle. Or he could have had all women go through the menstrual cycle at the same time each month. But obviously this wasn't the intention.

Thus due to puritanical movements, man has defied the faultlessness of nature and has made his society into a guilt feeling mad house.

The family institution, that is fast becoming extinct, is failing because it is based on morals and not realism. Since morals become extinct with time, those things based on morals necessarily become extinct.

Though the overtones in this article might appear chauvinistic, believe me they are not. Any liberated woman would be furious about now.

My only reply is I don't make the facts, I simply report them as I see it.

Subject matter in this column, as you have probably noticed, ranges far and wide. For that reason, we at the Post urge you to challenge us. If you have thoughts you think are different and unique, write us.

THE CHARLOTTE POST
"THE PEOPLES NEWSPAPER"
Established 1918
Published Every Thursday
By The Charlotte Post Publishing Co., Inc.
2606B West Blvd., Charlotte, N.C. 28208
Telephones (704) 392-1306, 392-1307
Circulation 11,000

57 YEARS OF CONTINUOUS SERVICE

Bill Johnson Editor-Publisher
Gerald O. Johnson Business Manager
Rex Hovey Circulation Manager

Second Class Postage Paid at
Charlotte, N.C. under the Act of March 3, 1878

Member National Newspaper Publishers
Association

North Carolina Black Publishers Association

Deadline for all news copy and photos is 5 p.m.
Monday. The Post is not responsible for any
photos or news copies submitted for publication.

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.

45 W. 5th, Suite 1403 2400 S. Michigan Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10036 Chicago, Ill. 60616
(212) 489-1220 Calumet 5-0200