

Democratic dictatorship is gone with the wind

The election returns have all finally trickled in, showing that Democrats have failed in their valiant attempt to elect a "Republican-proof" Congress.

"It's too bad we couldn't have gotten rid of those pesky Republicans," said one Democrat. "Then there wouldn't have been any need to vote on anything. The Democratic leadership could have decided all the issues, and we could have taken our salaries and gone home to relax and fish."

As it is, Democrats are glumly delaying their take-over until 1976 in the wake of unexpected Republican victories in almost one-third of the districts of the U.S. House.

Over in the Senate, Democrats were despairing over the fact that they will have to deal with an even higher percentage of Republicans than in the House.

"I don't see how we can ever establish a stranglehold on the country and destroy all chances for world peace with 38 Republicans still in the Senate," said one member of the potential Democratic dictatorship.

In North Carolina, Democrats came closest to victory in that state's senate, where only one Republican, Donald R. Kincaid of Lenoir, survives.

N.C. Democrats were gleeful over the results, predicting little difficulty in closing off any attempted Republican filibusters.

Even though the N.C. Senate is not completely Republican-proof, some Democrats feel it will actually

be better that way.

"If we have one Republican, then we also have a convenient scapegoat for anything that goes wrong," said a typically inexperienced N.C. senator-elect.

However, other N.C. Democrats were openly worried about possible Republican propaganda advantages.

"In 1976, any Republican candidate can claim his party was totally unified in the state senate and showed a consistent party-line vote," predicted one politico.

The one Republican in the senate will also gain because there cannot possibly be a split in the party caucus, and there is bound to be no disagreement over who should be minority leader and minority whip.

"I suppose they'll have a cage down there to put me in so they can throw peanuts at me and show off," Kincaid was heard to say.

Some Democrats say this can be a good source of diversion. "Who really wants to read bills and listen to speeches," said one newcomer, "when we can just sit there and make fun of a Republican?"

But despite a near-victory in North Carolina, Democrats across the country are still generally saddened.

Their mournful cry can be heard across the land: "Our dream of the one-party system is gone with the wind."

Tom Rice

Equality and institutional racism

Rorin Platt's recent article on the "morality" of discrimination is a gross oversimplification of the real issues involving affirmative action programs and whether such programs perpetuate reverse discrimination. Furthermore, Platt's views are dangerous to our society because, if they were implemented, they would cause increased racial stratification and antagonism in the United States.

Platt's views on reverse discrimination are overly simplistic because he fallaciously interprets the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment as prohibiting the consideration of race as one factor in evaluating minority applicants for jobs and school admission. He contends that racial quotas "are not only immoral, but alien to the American tradition of equal justice for all."

Platt has very little basis on which he can validly make this statement. Almost without exception, recent Supreme Court rulings state that race can and must be considered as a neutralizing factor to help eliminate institutional racism and socio-economic deprivation. The following are relevant court rulings involving the use of race as one criterion to evaluate minority applicants to various institutions:

• In *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, the Supreme Court ruled that institutions, must, in some way, compensate for the inherent racial bias in standardized tests if such tests are the sole criterion for accepting or rejecting a minority applicant. The Court ruled similarly in *Gregory v. Litton Systems, Inc.* and in *Johnson v. Pike Corp.*

• In *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, the Supreme Court found that "intentional, official consideration of race is permissible when necessary to remedy past discrimination and to assure equal opportunity."

• In *Louisiana v. United States*, the Supreme Court ruled that remedial action is needed "which will so far as possible eliminate the discrimination effects of the past."

• In *Norwalk Care v. Norwalk Redevelopment Agency*, the Second Circuit Court ruled that "classification

by race... where it is drawn for the achieving of equality will be allowed.

The court has even gone as far as requiring the implementation of quota systems to alleviate de facto segregation:

• In *Associated General Contractors v. Alshuler*, the Supreme Court ruled that Massachusetts construction companies must hire, in certain cases, minority persons until such people comprise 20 per cent of the working force in all job categories to remedy *prima facie* racial discrimination.

• In *United States v. Montgomery County Board of Education*, the Supreme Court ruled that the school board must employ two black teachers for every twelve white teachers presently teaching in the county public schools.

It is clear, I think, that the American judicial interpretation of racial justice justifies the consideration of race as one possible criterion for minority job and school applicants. Furthermore, it is illegal for such institutions to ignore an applicant's race, if his race, due to no fault of his own, may have harmed his chances of meeting specific mechanical requirements. Clearly, the courts have shown that to guarantee equal protection under the laws to minorities, compensatory measures must be implemented.

Not only is Platt's argument grossly oversimplified, but it poses a threat to our society. If Platt's view were implemented, we would have perpetual institutional segregation because minorities, who were unable to meet biased job qualifications, would be unable to work their law into many professions which require certain education backgrounds.

There is no question that minority persons, on the average, score worse than white students do on standardized tests. But, according to the Ford Foundation study entitled *Minority Access to College*, this is not the fault of the minority test taker but instead is the fault of the tests, which were shown to be culturally discriminatory.

In realistic terms, Platt's system of racial nonconsideration is dangerous because it would make it extremely difficult, say, for minority students to enter medical and law school, due not to

the students' lack of intelligence but due instead to institutional racism in the subtle form of standardized tests. Such persons would be denied equal protection under the laws. Their increased inability to "make it" in white society would most likely lead to great racial antagonism and would lessen our chance of attaining a well-integrated society.

Rorin Platt is wrong in believing that affirmative action programs have been instituted primarily to help minorities at the expense of the majority. In reality, affirmative action programs try to compensate for existing institutional

racism which prevents minorities from competing with whites on an equal basis. "What we desire," Justice Douglas states, "is not the consideration of a person's race but the neutralization of race as a criterion in objectively considering the qualifications of white and minority applicants alike." Such desires, as I see them, are moral ones which would produce a society much more desirable than the segregated one advocated by Rorin Platt.

Tom Rice is a junior economics/geography major from Silver Springs, Md.

Letters to the editors

Scarlett and Rhett can't replace grits

To the editors:

Re your latest edition of *Variation*: In what was an otherwise well-written article, Joyce Fitzpatrick has severely misrepresented the true ideal of southern heritage.

As a native-born Southerner, I must take exception to the following statement: "To many Southerners, Scarlett and Rhett are... as much a part of their heritage as grits and hush-puppies..."

In my opinion, the fictional characters in Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* can never attain the place of grits and hush-puppies in a true Southerner's heart.

Edwin H. Blackwell
312 Lewis

Host for Devlin bothered reader

To the editors:

I have never before submitted a letter to the *DTH*, but I wonder if you would be kind enough to insert a brief note that pertains to the Carolina Forum performance of Monday evening Oct. 28. I heard the speaker, Miss Bernadette Devlin, give an enlightening speech on the trials and tribulations of Northern Ireland and came away concluding that she is a real crusader for her people.

One thing that perturbed me, however, was the fact that her host preceded her on the stage and appeared to read his introduction in a perfunctory manner so that it was hardly audible. Perhaps this was due to the acoustical irregularities in the hall.

More than that was the fact that the host then left the stage immediately and did not even grant the speaker the courtesy that one

Black Student Movement

Reverse bias is a myth

The myth of reverse discrimination is one of the last philosophical mainstays of the die-hard racist. As in the past, the oppressor is attempting to make the victim the criminal by asserting that any effort to bring about an equitable order is discriminating against whites. Understandably, the exploitative class, i.e. white middle-class males, is on the defensive because the power base from which it oppresses may be undermined.

In this context governmental quotas are the instrument superficially being used to bring about a minimal degree of equity. However, this class should not feel threatened to a great degree because the government is going just far enough so as not to alter any power relationships which exist, only far enough to pacify (the government accepted the Desegregation Plan farce.)

By virtue of the fact that blacks have always been denied the right to equal opportunity, some steps must be taken to remedy this situation. And since it is quite obvious that those who wield the power aren't going to be charitable enough to act humane, governmental pressures are a necessity.

To assert that to hire blacks to fulfill these quotas in a university will cause the diminution of that university's academic stature is intrinsic nonsense. Any black who is hired in a faculty, staff, or administrative position will always have his academic integrity called into question by his colleagues. This is due to the fact that many whites still adhere to the faulty illusion that blacks are innately inferior and whites innately superior.

In terms of admission quotas, black students must be admitted to this university to receive the type of

education they wish if the university is dedicated to achieving its educational purpose. Those proponents of black academic inferiority used the WMCCT (White Middle Class Cultural Test), better known as the SAT, to buttress their morbid myth. It is utterly absurd to believe blacks should, on the average, do much better than whites on a discriminatory cultural test designed for and based on a culture which is totally alien to blacks—white culture.

This type of test was purposely designed in such a manner so as to purport and perpetuate the myth that blacks aren't up to par academically. As a consequence, black students have been refused admission to so-called outstanding academic institutions. Now that this conspiracy has been recognized, by the efforts of black folks incidentally, the university has no other alternative but to admit black students, using a more realistic criteria. This realistic criteria is not a special-considerations mechanism, but one based on grades. If you closely examine the transcripts you'll find them to be most impressive, "the cream of the crop" of their high school graduating classes.

The quota system is remiss once black students are in the university however.

There is no governmental organ to monitor the university to insure that the needs of black students are addressed. This is the vacuum the BSM fills. There is a need for a BSM to fulfill the cultural, social and political needs since the university relates from a white middle class perspective. Consequently, one cannot justifiably label the BSM as being discriminatory since it is bent on averting and combating discrimination, be it institutional or individual.

But it is understandable that this myth runs rampant, not only on this campus, but in society as well. White racists must structure some nonsensical legal rationale to keep blacks out of a school they help finance. (Blacks are taxpayers, you know). The annals of black-white relations reveal this trend (remember Jim Crow), but these same annals also reveal the struggle black people waged to overcome this perverted obsession. And this struggle will continue until the university, and any other societal institution, is purged of those who seek to further oppress and exploit us.

—Algenon Marbley

Algenon Marbley, BSM chairman, is a junior political science major.

Doug Clark

Working for goals— who's competing?

To have a goal is considered a good thing. It gives one purpose and motivation. People will go to various lengths to achieve their goals, depending on the individual's ability to work and sacrifice for that ultimate end, and on how much the individual really wants to succeed. While most people have some sort of general goals, some have very specific ones so important to them that they will dedicate tremendous amounts of time and energy to achieve them.

Athletics are a concrete example of the individual's desire to set a goal for himself and to reach it. When asked, most athletes will say that they want to win, either individually or collectively as part of a team. They may also mention other more personal goals, such as to score so many points or run a certain time, but their main ambition is to better their opponents. To do this they must push themselves to the point of maximum performance. So in a way they are competing against themselves as well as others.

An athlete will rarely, if ever, say that in a given contest he could not have performed better. Therefore, while he is outwardly trying to better an opponent, he is inwardly trying to improve upon his own past performances. He would like to accomplish both. But is there a point where these two goals conflict with each other? What happens to the athlete when he achieves his inward goal, when he actually reaches the point where he can push himself no harder, when he realizes his limit? And what if the achievement of this goal is not enough to insure success in the first aspect, to better the opponent, to win?

At this point there is a conflict that will be resolved in one of two ways. The athlete can abandon his first goal and admit that his limit is lower than his opponent's, in which case he will revise his goal to one more realistic. Or he can refuse to accept the fact that he has been bettered. In this case he will continue to drive himself until he passes his limit. Once past that point, his mind and body are in direct conflict. In such an instance there can only be one outcome. The body will dominate the mind. It will no longer act to hurt itself, but will retreat into its defense mechanisms: nausea, collapse, shock. The mind will not be able to accept this. Its reaction will be incoherence, confusion, blackout.

David Hamilton of the UNC cross country team is an example of what can happen when one's body exceeds its limitations of a given day. Hamilton, who has achieved great success through hard work and determination, drove himself to that point in the ACC cross country championship race. After five miles he was running an incredible race, due more to desire than to conditioning and talent. Then, with less than a mile to the finish, he collapsed, a victim of heat prostration. After several minutes he got up, and, driven by his subconscious mind, finished the race, well after anyone else. He cannot now remember doing so. Neither can he remember his incoherent speech and erratic behavior immediately after the race. He was treated in the hospital for several hours, and was later released.

We live in a goal oriented society. Perhaps this is why our society has achieved so much success in certain areas, such as material achievement. Ours is a wealthy nation, although this may not be evident to everyone. We also live in a nation of ulcers, neuroses, alcoholism and migraine headaches. People who suffer from these symptoms have, in one way or another, exceeded their limitations. When a goal becomes so important that its achievement is valued above one's mental or physical well-being, that goal ceases to be worth its price of accomplishment. To pay that price anyway is nothing less than to be cheated.

Doug Clark is a sophomore journalism major from Hickory and a member of the cross country team.



THE RITES OF WINTER

The Daily Tar Heel

Jim Cooper, Greg Turosak
Editors

Kevin McCarthy, Managing Editor
Barbara Holtzman, Associate Editor
Gary Fulton, Associate Editor
Joel Brinkley, News Editor
Harriet Sugar, Features Editor
Elliott Warnock, Sports Editor
Martha Stevens, Head Photographer
Jim Grimsley, Night Editor