

Point of View

Editorial

We Must Have Jr. High Sports

One headline read: BOARD AXES JUNIOR VARSITY SPORTS; another said: JV SPORTS, COUNSELORS AXED BY SCHOOL BOARD. Then to cap it off, there was one slotted as: SCHOOL BOARD FIGHTS OVER BUDGET.

Let's see where we stand.

A May 30 article reported that almost three hours of discussion developed at the Clark County school board meeting about its gloomy financial condition. They finally agreed to ask the state for about \$3 million in emergency funds.

At the same meeting, the board members decided to postpone making some \$2.5 million worth of cutbacks in the 1980-81 budget until they met June 12. At that time, the board was faced with about 150 parents protesting any cutbacks. The majority of the members agreed they needed more time to study the proposed cutbacks. Several of the members even suggested other areas that could be eliminated from the district's \$232.7 million budget.

Two of the most bitterly contested proposals called for the elimination of almost all junior varsity sports programs and the scrapping of a pilot program that employed seven counselors at sixth-grade centers.

Administrators had estimated the district could save \$255,893 if they could eliminate all junior varsity sports programs and another \$207,649 by dropping the pilot counseling program.

During the May 29 meeting, the school board had also decided to schedule discussion on whether it should sell \$15 million worth of short-term construction bonds.

The board met again June 12, as scheduled, and it was Trustee Janet Sobel who stood her ground against the board floating the short-term bond issue and her one vote was all that was needed to doom the entire project. State law requires a school board to unanimously approve a resolution for short-term financing.

It was also Janet Sobel, along with Trustee Tom Semmens, who cast dissenting votes, during the June 12 meeting, against eliminating junior varsity sports and sixth-grade counselors and to make other budget cuts totaling almost \$2.5 million.

On the latter matter, the Sobel-Semmens voters were not strong enough. The board voted 5-2 to eliminate JV sports and counselors in question.

[See Sentinel, page 17]



CARL ROWAN

Don't Sell John Anderson Too Short

WASHINGTON -- Rep. John Anderson could be dismissed as just another "independent" soothing his ego after being rejected by his regular party -- except for one thing: Millions of Americans grow more desperate every day for something more than a choice between Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan.

After listening to the disgust and dismay of voters in Detroit, New York, Miami, San Diego, Hartford and other cities, I am now willing to wager that Anderson will carry a few states in November. In doing so he could easily throw the presidential election into the House of Representatives.

Anderson is not the ideal alternative to what some see as the slim pickings of Carter or Reagan. A lot of Anderson's "Honest John" image wore off during his futile campaigning for the Republican nomination, and he is now viewed mostly as just another power-seeker. A lot of Anderson's supporters complain that he is too messianic, and sometimes utterly boring, even in sessions with small groups of people.

Patsy T. Mink, president of Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), claims the press has "allowed Anderson to masquerade as a liberal." ADA points out that over 19 years Anderson's liberal rating has ranged from zero to a high of 58 percent.

The reality, though, may be that American voters of 1980 don't want an ADA liberal, which is why Sen. Edward M. Kennedy is not winning the Democratic nomination. Anderson is likely to do extraordinarily well as an independent because a lot of voters will view him as not as dangerously reactionary as Reagan, not a big-spender liberal like Kennedy and not a bumbler, as they perceive Carter to be.

Carter clearly is in disfavor with millions of blacks, Jews, Hispanics and members of organized labor. His presidency has become economic and social disaster for minorities and working people, and his stance regarding Israel has created distrust among Jews. Still, the president could relax in the certainty that blacks, unemployed auto and rubber workers, Hispanics

and even ADA liberals are not going to dump him for Reagan -- if the troubling alternative of John Anderson did not exist.

Reagan's strategy is to come on as flexible "moderate," to shed his image of a tunnel-visioned spewer of simplistic conservative cliches about everything. But millions of Americans will not buy propaganda about the "metamorphosis of Ronald Reagan," especially when Carter's clan launches its campaign to convince voters that Reagan is more dangerous than legionnaire's disease.

Still, Reagan might expect to win the presidency simply because most voters think they've had enough of Carter -- were it not for the Anderson candidacy.

Anderson's great challenge is to convince Americans that he is a viable alternative. As election day approaches, voters traditionally have looked at independent or third-party candidates and said: "He can't possibly win, so why should I waste my vote on him?"

If Anderson can avoid that, some stunning results are possible in

November, according to recent polls. An ABC-Louis Harris poll shows Anderson getting 36 percent of the votes to 31 for Carter and 29 for Reagan in the eight largest Northern states -- IF voters become convinced that Anderson is a serious contender. That same poll shows Anderson getting 38 percent of the votes in the East, with Carter polling 34 percent and Reagan only 24. Reagan would win in the West with 38 percent, but Anderson would be a close second with 34 percent, way ahead of Carter's 22 percent.

The hooker, of course, is that voters may never conclude that Anderson has a real chance to win.

If Anderson winds up viewed as less than a serious contender, he probably will hurt Carter enough to put Reagan in the White House. But my guess now is that he will win just enough electoral votes to prevent either Carter or Reagan from attaining the 270-vote majority, and that he will wind up as Jimmy Carter's salvation by throwing the election into the House of Representatives.

Fair Break For Haitian Refugees

By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.

The government's policy toward refugees from Cuba has shifted back and forth since the exodus began. But for those who manage to reach our shores, America has welcomed them, in the President's words, with "an open heart and open arms."

But the Haitian refugees are the "invisible boat people." While media attention focused on Russians, Vietnamese and Cubans fleeing oppressive regimes, the Haitians



JORDAN

were ignored.

Over the past several years, about 25,000 fled Haiti. They made their way to Florida in makeshift boats. Some died in rough seas. All suffered on the arduous two week-long trip.

At a time when thousands of Cubans were coming to Florida, about a thousand Haitians were beaching their boats on our coast, some of them in difficult conditions, without adequate food or water for their journey.

The reception the two groups of refugees got is a shameful indication of America's reluctance to welcome black refugees. The Cubans were

officials have put them in jails while being "processed." That "processing" often resulted in attempts to deport them without due

Vernon Jordan is president of the National Urban League.

generally assured of political asylum and the government moved swiftly to help resettle them. The Haitians were placed in the limbo of earlier refugees from Haiti.

For years, immigration

process, on the grounds that they are "economic immigrants" seeking work, rather than political refugees fleeing oppression.

That distinction is a difficult one to make, and it

has been enforced in a wayward fashion. Political asylum is automatically granted to refugees from communist countries, even though many, if not most, flee because of economic conditions.

But refugees from non-communist countries such as Haiti are denied political asylum, even though they escape a dictatorship as oppressive as any communist one. Denial of basic human and political rights is hardly a

[See Vernon, page 22]