

VOICE READERS COMPRISE A \$30,000,000 MARKET

EDITORIAL

HUMAN RIGHTS vs. STATES RIGHTS

By CHARLES I. WEST, M.D.

The Federal Government had no alternative but to exercise its constitutional function of enacting new laws to protect Human Rights. This move was mandatory to preserve the unity, and thereby strengthen the security, of the nation.

Uniformity of Civil Rights practices in each of the fifty states is an absolute prerequisite to domestic unity and tranquility. The strength of nations depends upon this premise.

Sovereign states are not merely geographic areas. They are areas inhabited by people. There can be no state without people--land does not in itself, make a political entity. People make the land a political entity. Laws are not to regulate the land mass. They are to regulate the behavior of the people who inhabit the land.

In a democratic society the people formulate the laws by which they agree to live, and by which their government shall conduct the affairs of state.

The laws of a democracy are designed to protect the citizen individually, and to protect all of the citizens collectively. The rights of the individual are placed above all considerations except the security of the state. This concept was designed to safeguard the rights and properties of the people against invasion by foreigners, and against changes in the concept of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The state must regulate the affairs of its citizens who otherwise would live in a state of lawless disorder. However, it must always be realized that "State" and "the People" are one and the same--they are synonymous.

The state must lay ground rules for the operation of all business conducted within its borders. Individuals as well as businesses are subject to the public laws which are laid down by the people.

An individual (which includes every form of private enterprise) must be licensed by the people before entering business. The business must be conducted in compliance with the regulatory statutes pertaining, or the privilege granted by the people is withdrawn and the business is forced to close. It is therefore totally illogical that the people would issue a license to do business, knowing in advance that the licensee was not going to play the game by the rules. It is equally illogical to imagine that a licensee after appealing to the people for the privilege to operate should then deny some of the people access to the business, or deny them the right to purchase products or services provided by the business.

It is an accepted fact that a business is usually operated on private rather than public property. It is equally factual that no business could operate on any property without permission or license by proper agents of the people. When private property is put to business use the people dictate the code of operation. Certain personal property rights then become subsidiary to public rights. If the property owner resents any loss of personal rights he should not put his property to public use. The moment that private property is used for commercial purpose that

property is subject to inspection by the agents of the people. The full right and title of ownership is in no way jeopardized but the maintenance and operation of both the enterprise and the property becomes subject to the law of the people.

When a person puts his property to public or commercial use he must realize that he can not appeal to the people for permission to operate on one hand, and deny some of the people the public services offered on the other hand. The people do not decide that an individual enter a certain business--the individual makes his own decision. However, the public law does require that every individual in business conduct that business in accordance with provisions within the law. Any individual who objects to such compliance should choose some other livelihood or change his ways to fit the situation.

To dispute this principle upon the pretext of violation of constitutional rights of property owners is absurd. To argue that the public accommodation section of the Civil Rights Act violates States Rights is a subterfuge for the right of some states to continue the practice of doing wrong.

No nation can endure that does not control its affairs by realistic laws. A nation that is operated by the whims of men is a nation headed for decay. Men are subject to their emotions which are unpredictable, while written laws are stable and standardized and subject to change only at the direction of the people.

A nation is people. A state is people. People control themselves by the laws that they prepare to best serve their collective interests. The rights of people will always take precedence over States Rights which deny Human Rights.

Those who place states above humans are those who have never had their Human Rights denied. They are shallow thinking selfish people who distort the meaning of the law and of the Golden Rule to fit their own designs. They are people with either no standard of Human Rights morally or people with a double standard of morals which are ingeniously flexible to fit the situation. They are the breed that makes it necessary that man enact laws to protect himself from his fellow man, so that all men may have the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Pursuit of happiness certainly includes the right to be treated as a human being.

The Federal Civil Rights Act should be implemented in Nevada by a realistic state law. Such a law would remove federal interest in how Nevada treats its minority citizens, and would strengthen the sovereign right of Nevada to continue legalized gaming without fear of federal intervention.

Uniform assurance of Human Rights is Nevada's best assurance of preserving States Rights. Human Rights will guarantee States Rights. States which deny Human Rights are not deserving of sovereignty. Such states weaken our national strength and produce irreparable scars on the image of democracy.

Nevada MUST enact a strong Civil Rights Bill at the next legislative session.

DEFEAT BARING



AFRICA in Today's World

By CHARLES I. WEST, M.D.

It was less than a century ago that serious, and consequential exploration of Africa's interior was undertaken. The inhabitants, who dwelt within the interior of the continent, had no stimulation to explore unknown lands, because nature had endowed their land with all of the necessities of life. The Africans had no change of seasons to cope with--they had summer the year round--no winters to plan for, so consequently, they had no motivation to venture into distant lands. Their lands were lands of plenty, so they stayed close to home, living leisurely off nature's generous endowment. The Europeans did not venture inland, and the natives did not wander coastward, so there was limited communications between the two. Routes of travel from the coast to the hinterland were not established until after the middle of the past century--a scant century ago.

European sailors began plying the Atlantic coast, making contact with West Africa, the Cape, and the Southeast coast of the continent at the turn of the 15th century. They were searching for a new passage to the Orient, which had supplied Europe with its winter foodstuffs via the laborious overland route of Marco Polo.

The Spanish, Portuguese, English and Dutch sailing ships began trading with the Africans in the newly discovered areas in the mid-16th century. It was a century later, in 1652, when Dutch expeditions established the first European settlement at the Cape. This Cape settlement was set up to serve only as a half-way supply post for the ships sailing to the Orient. A few trading posts had been set up on the West coast by the Portuguese, the British, the French and the Spaniards. They dealt chiefly in slaves and spices. Two centuries elapsed before, the European nations took more active interest in colonizing the continent.

In the early to mid-19th century, the European countries experienced an industrial revolution which demanded new sources of raw materials, and foods which were critically low in Europe. Factories which had sprung up all over Europe has exhausted the supply of basic raw materials. The population shift from rural to urban areas had created critical shortages in food supplies. This situation demanded serious interests in the exploitation of Africa. In the mid-19th century, the European nations started a land grab of Africa. Each nation seeking and searching desperately for new resources for survival. Near the end of the nineteenth century, the entire African continent was under European control except three established sovereign states: Ethiopia, Liberia and Egypt, the latter being a British protectorate. In 1910 the Union of South Africa became the fourth independent nation as a member of the British Commonwealth.

The colonized territories has their geographic boundaries fixed by arbitration. The boundaries were artificially contrived by the bargaining powers, but did not become permanent until the early twentieth century. The size and choice of location of the colonies was determined by the military and industrial potential of the powers. Belgium and Portugal were exceptions to this general formula, because of squatters rights established by their early exploration and settlement of certain areas. This size of each nation's slice was commensurate with the nation's might. England and France cut off the largest slices, Portugal and Belgium got slightly smaller pieces, while Spain, Italy and Germany divided the crumbs.

The Colonial governments confined their exploration and development only to the coast areas, penetrating no more than 150 miles inland. The intense jungles, plus fear of disease and disaster, limited overland travel. The peculiar topography of Africa rendered its many waterways unnavigable to sailing ships. Africa has a low flat coastal area that extends inland 50 to

(See AFRICA, page 11)

GIVE

**AMERICAN
CANCER
SOCIETY**

See your doctor every year for a health checkup.

**LAS VEGAS
Voice**

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER (Published every Thursday) DEDICATED to the INTERESTS and ASPIRATIONS for a BETTER LIFE of the NEGRO CITIZENS of the STATE of NEVADA

CHARLES I. WEST, M.D. - Editor and Publisher

GEORGE KING - Executive Advisor

ROBERT REID, DOROTHY WEST - Editorial Consultants

SONDRA REID - Homemaking, Fashions / EDDY K. KIM - Social

RICHARD WILLIAMS, ROBERT JOHNSON, FRED BATES - Advertising

CHARLES LOFTON - Circulation / EARL PERKINS - Northern Nevada

EDITORIAL, ADVERTISING and CIRCULATION OFFICES

812 West Bonanza Road, Las Vegas, Nevada

ADVERTISING RATES FURNISHED UPON REQUEST