

# Point of View

## Editorial

Las Vegas is one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the United States. In fact, the area is growing so fast that the city and county governments are hard pressed to keep up with the growth. Schools and other public institutions are becoming so crowded that something must be done very quickly to alleviate this overcrowding.

The Black community is also growing. More people are moving to Las Vegas, more families are being started, and more churches are being built.

However, we are not seeing the improvements being made in the Black community that would enable the community to keep pace with this growth. To be sure, there are small businesses cropping up in our community, but what about improvements in the public transportation system? The lighting system in some areas of our community is very poor, the streets are decaying at a very rapid rate. Yet our city fathers seem to look the other way when mention is made of needed improvements in the community. There seems to be a tendency to forget about our community until just before election time when our votes become very desirable.

In order to assure some attention to our community during the coming years, we feel that it would be wise for the community to get behind at least one candidate for the city governmental seat. If too many candidates are fielded, the Black vote will be split and the chances of our electing a person to a position in government will be lessened.

There are several extremely qualified Blacks in our community. Let's get behind some of them and elect them to a position of power within the city government.

However, we cannot vote our convictions unless we REGISTER TO VOTE and then VOTE.

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

I want to talk about some of the things that are happening and what we can do about it.

We are living in one of the nation's fastest growing cities. But they are building all around us. From one mountain side to the other, yet sitting in the middle of our black community is shrinking at about the same rate as the outside area is building.

Let's ask ourselves why. I think the answer can be found right in our community. We are not working together.

We still believe in the old saying blacks don't stick together. Deep down inside of us we know that we can't afford to use this as a cop-out. It is not proven fact that blacks can't stick together.

I feel we have been robbed of our wealth because we simply don't believe in one another.

In this community, according to some verified figures, there are approximately 60,000 blacks with an annual payroll of over \$580 million. It is also interesting to note that black

tourist visiting Las Vegas spend more than \$400 million annually -- nearly a billion dollars poured into the Las Vegas market.

So ask yourself the question why are we shrinking. The answer is because our money is going outside of our own black community -- building all around us. All we get back in return are promises. We already have promissory notes not filled but we are still accumulating new ones. We are not supporting our own black businesses.

The church is said to be one of the strongest organizations in the black community. On Mondays the money is deposited in banks outside of our community. Do you realize that this is done without any transactions made to our own Credit Union.

Why is our community shrinking? Someone is not practicing what they preach.

Neal "Doc" Dillard

## Register

## To Be Equal

# How Much Progress?

By John E. Jacob

A Rand Corporation study commissioned by the Labor Department was greeted by the press with headlines proclaiming the narrowing wage gap between blacks and whites. The reporters should have looked a bit closer.

The study measures the relative wages between white and black men between 1940 and the present. And it found that blacks made significant strides in closing the wage gap.

But America was a different country back in 1940. The South, where the bulk of blacks lived, was still primarily rural and practiced a rigid apartheid system not unlike that in today's South Africa. Given the massive economic, social and political changes since then, it is obvious that blacks would make economic progress.

The issue never has been whether blacks are better off than 46 years ago. The issue in public policy today is whether the measurable gains blacks made in the 1950s and 1960s continued, and whether, 23 years after the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, the

black-white gap has closed sufficiently.

It is too often forgotten that the black goal is not merely to make "progress" and to narrow the gap between the races; it is for parity with white citizens. Any gap between the races should be intolerable.

The study downplays the effects of affirmative action



John E. Jacob

while claiming the improvement in black education is mainly responsible for black income gains.

But that doesn't make much sense, since the improved educational attainments of black men can be traced to affirmative action -- both in the abolition of discrimination in college admissions by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and

various court rulings, and by the aggressive affirmative action programs designed to increase black attendance at predominately white colleges.

The report says that while there was a burst of affirmative action activity in the early seventies, once companies met their goals they slackened off. But that suggests to me that the rush to comply with federal regulations was not followed

black workers are closing plants and slashing payrolls and that opportunities are vanishing for black workers.

Nor would you know that there has been a decline in the proportion of working black males the past 25 years that mirrors the decline in intact black families.

Even in the report's rosy picture there is the admission that "fully twenty percent of working black men in 1980 were still part of

John E. Jacob is President Of  
The National Urban League

up by enforcement of those regulations and by a sustained effort to train and recruit blacks for all job classifications in our economy.

The report joins the pack in blaming black family instability for the continuing black-white family income gap. But it should have related black family instability to the deteriorating employment opportunities for black men.

Reading the report or media accounts of it you would never know that large sectors of the economy that disproportionately employ

the poor black underclass."

What, I wonder, would a report about white male economic status be like if twenty percent of working white men were still part of the "poor underclass." Clearly, it would be treated as a national disaster. Why then, the double standard that makes the same conclusion for blacks a cause for rejoicing?

The gap remains. Black men are caught in the wringer of unemployment and low wages. That situation should be a call to action, not a cause for satisfaction.

## President Reagan: Pro-Family Rhetoric, Anti-Action Child Watch

In his State of the Union message, the President envisioned our children flying to Tokyo in two hours on an Orient Express. But his new federal budget does little to help our children get the health care, education, and training they would need to compete equally if they ever got there. Once again, the President's pro-family rhetoric masks spending priorities that will hurt children and families, especially those struggling to survive the day-to-day crisis of poverty.

In 1983, more than 42 percent of the 13 million poor children in this nation lived in families with incomes less

than half the poverty line, or \$3,969-a-year. Imagine raising a family of three on this amount of money. It means being faced every day with impossible choices between buying food, paying the rent or heating bill, getting essential medical care, or buying clothes and shoes for young children.

How does the President's new budget respond to the painful poverty of millions of American families? With comforting rhetoric, a promise to "study" the problem, and billions more in proposed budget cuts in lifeline programs for the poor.

Under the President's new

budget, poor children and families will lose \$6 billion in federal help. From 1987-1991, if the President has his way, children would lose another \$33 billion in federal support. These cuts could deal the knockout blow to millions of families that are already reeling from the accumulated impact of years of over \$10 billion in annual budget cuts since 1980 and deepening poverty.

The President speaks in his State of the Union message about children's

right to life, but in his budget calls for immediate and

See CHILD, Page 13

The Las Vegas Sentinel-Voice welcomes expressions of all views from readers. Letters should be kept as brief as possible and are subject to condensation. They must include signature, valid mailing address and telephone number, if any. Pseudonyms and initials will not be used. Because of the volume of mail received, unpublished individual letters cannot be acknowledged. Send to: Letters to the Editor, The Las Vegas Sentinel-Voice, 1201 S. Eastern Ave., Las Vegas, Nevada 89104.

The views expressed on these editorial pages are those of the artists and authors indicated. Only the one indicated as the Sentinel-Voice editorial represents this publication.