

Editorials

Living The Work Ethic

One of the more visible social issues in America that is believed to reflect the differing political philosophies of so-called conservatives and liberals is in the concept of "workfare." Workfare's official name is Community Work Experience Program (CWEP). Its basic objective is to get people off welfare and into permanent full time jobs. It uses as an incentive for people to work a threat to cut the individual's welfare benefits if they don't work.

CWEP was started in six North Carolina counties as a pilot project in 1981. A year later the General Assembly offered all counties CWEP as an option with an incentive by the state's commitment to assume half of a county's program cost. With eight additional counties having started their own programs and six others expected to start in July, 1986, Governor Jim Martin hopes to have CWEP operational in half the state's 100 counties by July, 1987.

State officials report that AFDC recipients in CWEP participating counties must work at assigned community service jobs a maximum of 50 hours a month. At the same time the people are given training in job searching skills. The only people exempt from the program are those over 60 years old, disabled or caring for children under three years of age.

Some apparently liberal critics have argued that CWEP is spreading too fast across the state without adequate study of its long term effect. They say, too, that it's unfair to force people into community service work simply because they are poor. We don't agree with this point of view. Anyone living off public taxes should certainly be expected and encouraged to give something back to the community that supports him or her.

Workfare programs, by whatever name they have, have not had much success because of the long-standing polarization between liberals' and conservatives' view-

points about what workfare is or should be. Significantly, this polarization has given way to strong bipartisan support for the highly acclaimed Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) welfare reform program in California.

GAIN is said to be void of the characteristics of what is generally associated with the concept of "workfare." GAIN seeks to help welfare recipients find permanent full time jobs before any community service work is required and before any job training is instituted. GAIN advocates claim that community service jobs are often make-work that offer little incentive or pride to the welfare recipient worker. They suggest also that quite often jobs more suitable to people's needs can be found and thus save the cost of job training.

The State of California has had relatively good success with the GAIN Program and therefore might be a model for the nation.

GAIN, workfare and similar work-oriented programs for welfare recipients all have the objective of encouraging people to become self-sufficient. However, as in so many other areas of American life, we seem to have forgotten to instill, or at least educate people, about the values that underly the activities involved. For example, the "work ethic" is certainly something that needs to be in the individual's set of values if he or she is expected to retain a job on some kind of permanent basis.

The poor workmanship in many American products, the indifferent attitudes of many workers toward their employers and likewise the employers toward the workers appears to indicate a need to revive the spirit of the work ethic at all levels of American society. Then, too, if we expect welfare recipients to have a positive attitude toward work, the people and supervisors around them certainly need to be endowed with the spirit and commitment to the work ethic.



"While the rising incidence of crime has been a source of embarrassment to many black leaders, far too many have remained ambivalent toward the problem. Perhaps through fear of providing comfort to racists masquerading behind a mask of law and order, I recognize these risks. But I also recognize an even greater risk. That blacks themselves may confuse the right of black people to protest their unsatisfactory condition in the United States with the opportunity for criminals to prey on exposed citizens."

Dr. Andrew E. Brimmer

A Challenge To Black Leadership

Have Women Progressed In Working World?

By Sabrina Johnson
Special To The Post

Have women really made progress in the "working" world? Yes and no. It is true that more women have gone into the workforce in the last 15 years and are heading households in record numbers and are making more money. The facts and statistics are encouraging, especially since it is believed that today's women have more options than their mothers and grandmothers.

On the not so sunny side, women have moved up in the work place but not far enough. Many are still segregated into lower paying positions. Women are still in the majority in the fields of elementary school teachers, clerks, nurses, secretaries and typists. In 1985 the average wage for men was \$406 per week. During the same period it was \$277 per week for women, who earned \$.68 for every dollar men earned.

Politically women are underrepresented. Only two seats in the U.S. Senate and 25 seats in the House are held by women, and only 15 percent of state legislators are



Sabrina

women.

The revolution continues, a revolution fought not with bullets but with words. The purpose is to change attitudes toward women and attitudes are changing. Slowly the discrimination against women is being stamped out. With this in mind there is reason to celebrate: adult females are no longer "girls." Help wanted advertisements are no longer segregated by sex. Today, women are firefighters, police officers, carpenters, and a host of other so-called male-dominated professions. There is less sex-role stereo-

typing than in the past.

In Seneca Falls, NY, in 1948 when the Women's Rights Convention was held, a woman had no property rights. She, her children, and the clothes on her back belonged to her husband. In Maryland, until the late 1930s, a man could divorce his wife for being unchaste prior to marriage. A husband could collect his wife's wages in Georgia, Vermont, and Virginia. The state constitutions in Oklahoma and Arizona prohibited women from holding high public office. Looking at these aspects women have come a long way.

Unfortunately some people would still deny women full participation in society. These "people" insist that women belong in the home - thus turning back the clock to the father knows best days. Consequently, they blame social ills on women's fight for equality. They want a return of the days when a woman's place was in the home and she had no affair to concern herself with other than cooking, cleaning, rearing and having children. With all that, what more could a woman want?

Homemaking is an option today; but not the only option, nor should it be. Thus the fight for equality goes on.

Although the fight for equality, equal pay and fair hiring practices are real issues, the most pressing one seems to be the fight of breaking away from second class citizenship. Meaning women's rights became minority rights. Women and minorities historically have been kept in the background doing the ground work to make others look good.

There were a select few who made their way to the closed agenda, got in and made an impact - but the fight was so difficult that for periods of time no one followed. The ground breaking for women centers itself around Seneca

Falls, N.Y., and later with Susan B. Anthony. For minorities, particularly blacks, it centered itself around the official freeing of the slaves but truly manifested itself during the 1930s through the 1960s with the civil rights demands and Acts.

Society must realize and understand that no man or woman is better than another because of sex or race or religion.

South African Chaos

The brutal and inhumane tactics of the white-ruled government against the black and mixed races of people in South Africa has been condemned by Americans and many other nations. Yet, one of the unanswered questions, one that few people are willing to discuss, is how well and with what degree of unity will blacks govern South Africa? Secondly, how will they treat white people?

These questions are an issue of concern for a number of reasons. First, one white South African said, "We whites have got to maintain power because the blacks will treat us just as we've treated them if they rule the nation."

Secondly, and of even greater concern, is the fear of possible internal conflict between South African blacks primarily along tribal lines. Fierce tribal fighting between the Zulus, the country's largest tribe with over five million people, and the Pandos. This tribal conflict has been used

by the white-ruled government to justify its argument that only they can and should rule the South African nation.

Unfortunately, too, the lack of human rights in other parts of the African continent cause a concern about what the future may hold for South Africa. White South African racial policies have been designed to divide and rule the 85 percent black and mixed race population that civil war is bound to occur. Again as we look at South Africa we must look at what is happening elsewhere in black-ruled African nations.

For example, the forced inhumane expulsion of two million blacks from the urban areas in South Africa is being done elsewhere on the African continent by black rulers.

These actions and acts of political imprisonment, public flogging and torture are not uncommon in many of the black-ruled nations of Africa.

Miller Says:

Reconciliation: Black Socioeconomic Progress

By Sherman N. Miller
Special To The Post

I have experienced difficulty convincing some blacks that they are just another American ethnic people. These ill-natured blacks usually argue that their skin color precludes them from peer acceptance in Mainstream America. When I recount these ill-fated discussions, I feel disquietude because these recalcitrant blacks' actions suggest that black America desires cultural segregation.

In a conversation with National Republican Committee Chairman Frank Farenkopf, I came to realize the impact of blacks' cultural isolation. I asked him to comment on black America being viewed as a distinct voter segment.

"I think we have made a mistake in the past by doing that," replied Farenkopf. "I think the way we have to, as a Party, grow in the black community, is, in effect, to convince a majority of black voters in this country that what is good for all Americans is also good for those in the black community. Making particular promises to one area or segment of our society, that is what the



Sherman

Democrats have been known to do."

I have overheard blacks doubting the Republican Party's sincerity in its effort to attract them. Farenkopf burned my ears with a discourse which attempted to legitimize the Republican Party's efforts to attract blacks.

"I think, what we have to do, is make (it) clear, as a Party, that we want blacks. We want them involved in our Party. We want them not only for their votes. We want them to become leaders in our Party. We want them to run for office and get elected as black Republicans."

Farenkopf did admit to a shortcoming in the Republican Party's inability to communicate with blacks. He

contends that they intend to do a better job communicating in the future.

"I don't think we have been very good spokesmen for our own cause. At the same time I think that, perhaps because of a history over the last 50 years of blacks being told that Republicans don't care about them and don't want them, perhaps there have been some closed ears in the black community. We are going to try to speak a little stronger, a little clearer with a more pointed message and we hope that message will be heard."

Although Farenkopf's comments sounded very promising, I felt he would not make significant progress on re-enfranchising black America in the Republican Party without a serious reconciliation effort with the traditional black leadership. I queried him on the Republican Party's efforts to bridge their chasm with the traditional black leaders.

"The President and Vice President continually, during this administration, have reached out to the leadership of the black community."

"The President, this administration, and this Party

| | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 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 | |