

Editorials

South African Apartheid Must Die!

As late as the early 1960s racial discrimination in the Southland of America was a brutal reality. The harsh Jim Crow laws of the "old South" parallel the equally harsh system of apartheid that existed in South Africa then and continues today.

For those too young to remember the civil rights struggle of 25 years ago, or for those with dull and faded memories, let us remind you that in those days black Americans in the South were denied the right to vote, had to attend publicly supported schools that were inferior to those attended by whites, were denied the use of publicly operated parks, beaches and restrooms. It took the civil rights movement or revolution in the South characterized by sit-ins, protest marches, and economic boycotts to pressure for change. These efforts were responded to by law enforcement people with cattle prods, clubs, tear gas, and the indiscriminate jailing of black civil rights leaders. This historic reality is being repeated today as an equally, if not worse, to the black people of South Africa nearly 7,000 miles away.

Furthermore, while world pressure has increased for the South African government to take steps toward drastic change to give the blacks and mixed-races of people an active voice in government, South Africa's president, P. W. Botha, says, "I am not prepared to make (a commitment to share power), not now and not tomorrow." This has been evident by the killing of over 650 black South Africans in the past year, the indiscriminate jailing of black leaders for indefinite periods of time, and the use of bull whips, tear gas and rubber bullets to deny people free speech and the right to peaceful protest march.

World Pressure

Ironically, as world pressure is increasing in its opposition to South African apartheid and is calling for the right of blacks have a voice in their government, President Reagan said in a radio broadcast interview last week that he supports the "reformist administration" of South Africa President P. W. Botha because it has eliminated segregation in public places.

"They have eliminated the segregation that we once had in our own country - the type of thing where hotels and restaurants and places of entertainment...were segregated - that has all been eliminated," Reagan said. In America such segregation is in fact now prohibited by law but has little or no meaning for far too many black Americans because continuing disproportionately high rates of unemployment, when compared to the white Americans, prevents opportunities to utilize such facilities. Likewise, in South Africa, for example, racially mixed marriages are said to be now permitted by law; however, with laws prohibiting blacks and whites from even living in similar neighborhoods, gaining equal educational opportunities or freely and equally socializing mixed marriage opportunities are, in reality, a myth in

South Africa.

Americans should, of course, not be surprised by President Reagan's support of South Africa's President Botha and his racist policies because here at home the President's administration is hastily attempting to dismantle the laws, policies and agencies of the federal government that people like Martin Luther King died for to assure the securing and maintaining of civil rights properly due to black Americans.

Support Freedom

The Conservative Opportunity Society, one of many such rightist organizations that has been a supporter of President Reagan, has said through its chairman, U.S. Rep. Vin Weber (R-Minn.) that the conservatives have a responsibility to consistently support freedom pluralism, and representative government around the world." Rep. Weber then adds, "It is time to realize that supporting the South African government, where freedom, pluralism, and representative government are not recognized undermines our moral opposition to communism. South African is a nation of many minorities, and the rights of all its people must be protected."

In another voice, Naomi Tutu-Seavers, daughter of South African Anglican Bishop Desmond Tutu and chairman of the Bishop Refugee Fund, based in Hartford, Conn., says she is amazed to hear so much about the reforms being undertaken by the South African government as expressed by President Reagan. The fact is, Ms. Tutu-Seavers continues, "the black majority in South Africa does not seek reform, but dismantling because a system as evil and oppressive as apartheid cannot be reformed. The actions of the government are not those of someone instituting reforms."

South Africa President Botha and his government have failed to heed the message of the American civil rights struggle as war eloquently echoed by the South African United Democratic Front (UDF), an organization that opposes the apartheid policy. UDF said, "History has shown that brutal repression only serves to intensify resistance and strengthen people's hatred toward the system."

There is a message and lesson in all this too for all Americans, especially our current national administration. The message is that if the oppressed peoples in Latin America continue to observe our national government's support of Botha under its "constructive engagement" policy, we will only alienate our Latin American brothers and help pave the way for even greater communist influence. After all, opposing communism is not a valid reason for supporting other forms of repressive governments as is evident in South Africa.

Something To Say?

Do you have something to say? Then do so for everyone to read. The Charlotte Post, the only other voice in town, welcomes all letters on various subjects.

BLACKS MUST REALIZE, WHEN THEY FAIL TO BE COUNTED IN CENSUS, THEY LOSE POLITICAL REPRESENTATIVES, ALDERMEN, ADEQUATE POVERTY FUND ALLOCATIONS, AND PLANNING FOR SCHOOLS, ETC."



School Year Will Be One Of Changes

The 1985-86 school year will be one of change and alteration. The one major change is the new hard line against drug abuse. The proposed policy is tough, bullish, and an invasion of privacy. Drug tests are finding their way into America's schools.

Testing for illegal drug use began in the military, then spread to the sports arena. From those humble beginnings, testing for illegal drug use has made its way into the screening of applicants or employees in private industry. So much so that 25 percent of fortune 500 companies make it mandatory for all applicants and employees. For employers to refuse hiring drug influenced job seekers is understandable. Firms have the right to set conditions of employment to ensure safety for all employees and quality work.

America's schools are not the workplace. Daily attendance during the school year is mandatory. Currently, schools have all the legal rights they need to fight drugs on campus. School officials can and must expel students who abuse illegal drugs in schools. They can and must call in the police to arrest student dealers and they must advise parents



Sabrina

when they know students are experimenting with drugs and/or alcohol. Officials can also search students' bags or pockets for drugs or weapons - according to the Supreme Court decision in January, 1984.

With all the above tools, why do some school officials feel compelled to greet every student who passed through the school doors with a needle for a blood test or a vial for urinalysis. It is intrusive.

School principals have a difficult job. If they see a crime being committed they must do all in their power to protect the innocent and condemn the guilty. However, when police-state tactics march into the class-

room - a dividing line must be drawn and maintained.

The drug testing requirement is unconstitutional. While well-intended, the decision of the Becton School Board to require all students undergo drug screening is an unconstitutional invasion of privacy - that has been justly halted by the courts.

The United States Constitution guarantees that the government will not search any citizen without probable cause to believe that a law has been violated. The plan of the Becton school does not meet this basic requirement - all students are forced to submit to the tests. Not only would students lose constitutional rights, parents also lose. The plan would deprive them of the control over what is physically done to students.

Also such a plan would take the decision of drug treatment from the parents and put it into the hands of school officials.

Becton's School Board wants a severe penalty for failing or refusing a test. Penalty: students would be excluded from school - meaning they would be denied the basic right of a free and fair education.

In addition to this, the plan lacks the policies and procedures for questioning test results and contains no provisions for continued educational studies and work. Is not it true that students who fall behind are prone to dropping out? This plan reinforces the current dropout rate and nurtures the growth of it in the future.

One fact in the world of drug testing remains true: people who have not used drugs can and do fail and drug users can and do pass. Inaccurate testing brands students as druggies and sends officials on 1984 witch hunts. It also forces students into rehabilitation and denies education.

Officials have the authority to deal with drugs on campus. Why do not they implement them?

The plan for drug testing sets a dangerous precedent. If urinalysis or blood tests are permitted without probable cause to believe a violation has been committed, other intimate searches will surely follow. Are parents and children willing and ready to relinquish their privacy in exchange for an education.

Instead of lessons being taught in an atmosphere of fairness and justice - lessons will be conveyed in a building of police-state brutality. Schools are to teach youth to value the protections guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

Miller Says:

Tomorrow's Paycheck: Time And Productivity!

By Sherman N. Miller
Special To The Post.

There is no doubt in my mind that President Ronald Reagan views the United States as a free trade beacon that will guide the world towards American style prosperity. Yet I have come to question whether free trade is a "practical concept" or merely a "theoretical illusion." When I grapple with some of the ill-fated estimates of the deleterious impact of the high U.S. trade deficit, I find myself trying to discern if America is currently trapped in an "ideological chasm."

I feel that a person's personal tenets dictate his actions regardless of whether they are supported by facts. I believe American jobs are being lost because the Reagan Administration has unintentionally demonstrated a lack of understanding of the international definition of "free trade."

Many people had hoped that the flood of foreign textile goods into the U.S. would be controlled by the Multi-Fiber Arrangement but this did not occur. This point is made clear in a July 18 letter from U.S. Senators William Robert (Delaware), John W. Chafee (Rhode Island), and



Sherman

John C. Danforth (Missouri) to President Reagan.

These Senators write, "...there has been a tremendous increase in textile and apparel imports over the last five years, an increase that was not supposed to have been possible with the Multi-Fiber Arrangement in place. This increase has had a devastating impact on communities in each of our states and is causing great hardship and fears among many of our constituents. Our constituents no longer find the MFA a currently enforced and credible response to the textile and apparel trade issue and frankly, we agree."

If President Reagan elects to stand firm on his view of free trade, then the U.S. Congress will have to carry out the wishes of the American people. This suggests

that Senate Bill 680 (The Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act of 1985) may evolve as the catalyst that moves America away from the ideological rhetoric of free trade towards the practical pursuit of saving America's high standard of living.

I wanted to know when the American people might expect some congressional solutions to this foreign import crisis so I asked Senator Roth's executive assistant, Allen Levin, to give me a timing when Senator Roth would be expected to move aggressively on The Textile and Apparel Trade Enforcement Act of 1985. Mr. Levin replied, "The end of the legislative recess."

When pressed to offer a more definitive timing Mr. Levin says that Senator Roth will decide by September 9.

I think the vast domestic United States of America market has evolved into an international market; therefore, long-term participation in this market demands that domestic businesses compete on international standards. That is, American industry must learn to compete on international standards of excellence or

any actions by the U.S. Congress will merely delay the imminent erosion of America's high standard of living.

I am very confident that American industry can compete in this new international arena if they understand the rules of the international marketplace. Leonard A. Morgan (General Electric's manager-engineering consultant), in his article entitled, "The Importance of Quality," points out why foreign companies are presently better at international business than Americans.

Morgan declares, "In our opinion, foreign competitors are more successful because they listen to customers, are more responsive to customer needs, and provide better value (performance versus price)."

Although Congress will most probably give American industry a respite from the onslaught of unfair foreign competition, U.S. companies must recognize that productivity and product quality are absolutely necessary ingredients for long-term survival. Morgan also highlights the importance of these key survival ingredients.

THE CHARLOTTE POST	
North Carolina's Fastest Growing Weekly	
704-376-0496	
"The People's Newspaper"	
107 Years Of Continuous Service	
Bill Johnson	Editor, Pub.
Bernard Reeves	Gen. Mgr.
Fran Farrer-Bradley	Adv. Mgr.
Dannette Galther	Office Mgr.
Published Every Thursday by The Charlotte Post Publishing Company, Inc. Main Office: 1531 S. Camden Road Charlotte, N.C. 28203	
Second Class Postage Paid at Charlotte	
Member, National Newspaper Publishers' Association North Carolina Black Publishers Association	
National Advertising Representative: Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.	
One Year Subscription Rate One Year - \$17.76 Payable In Advance	
USPS No. 965500 POSTMASTER Send Change of address to: Charlotte Post 1531 S. Camden Rd. Charlotte, N.C. 28203	