



**The Editor's Desk**

ALFRED LEE HENDERSON



**WE SEE THE WORLD THROUGH BLACK EYES**

**Youth need example**

We are encouraged to learn that since our recent editorial pointing out the fact that the Oregon Legislature had only three Black pages and door-keepers, a Black has been appointed as a page for the Senate.

We all know that these are political appointments that usually go to the children of legislators, to the children of their loyal supporters or to party workers. But this young lady does not seem to fit the picture -- she is not the relative of a legislator; her parents are not prominent Democrats.

This appointment will encourage young Black people who visit the capitol and see someone who is Black and who is not too much older than they participating in the legislative procedure.

But it will also encourage other young people who consider themselves to be outside the boundaries of political favor.

Well done!

Now let us go one step further and look at the professional employment situation in Oregon -- a field in which the Legislature should have some influence. There are a large number of young, educated Black people in the Portland area who have held administrative or professional positions in public and private social agencies, or in education, who are qualified and experienced to move to positions of a higher level.

But where can they go? Many have applied for state employment, but state jobs seem closed to them. The Portland Public Schools only recently has allowed Blacks to move to middle and upper level jobs, and usually those are in federally funded programs. Private industry still is not hiring Blacks according to their qualifications and potential.

The Legislature needs to take a good look at this problem and do something about, especially in the area of state employment.

If the Oregon Legislature were to make a real impact in this field, then the young Black people of Oregon could look to it with respect and with some hope for a secure and rewarding future.

We often look at some of our young people with dismay or anger because of their seeming frivolity, their disillusionment, their hostility and their ventures into delinquency; but how can we expect them to make serious efforts in the present when the goal of success in the future is closed to them?

Published every Thursday by Exie Publishing Company, 2201 N. Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97217. Mailing address, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208

Subscriptions \$5.25 per year - Tri-County area, \$6.00 per year - Outside Portland. Telephone, 283-2486.

Application to mail at second class postage rates is pending at Portland, Oregon.

The Observer's official position is expressed only in its Publisher's Column (The Observation Post) and the Editor's Desk. Any other material throughout the paper is the opinion of the individual writer or submitter and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Observer.

Any erroneous reflection upon the character, standing or reputation of person, firm or corporation, which may appear in the Portland Observer will be cheerfully corrected upon being brought to the attention of the Editor.

ALFRED LEE HENDERSON, Publisher/Editor



**SPECIAL!**  
**Dry Cleaning Only**  
**\$2.50 per load**

**SAVE YOUR CLAIM TICKETS!**  
 10 cleaning and pressing claim tickets good for 1 8lb. load of cleaning and pressing.

**BUDGET DRY CLEANERS**  
 7220 N. Fessenden 286-2296



**'PEOPLE WHO WORK, SHOULD HAVE THE SAME RIGHTS AS THOSE WHO DON'T.'**  
 IN RECENT SPEECH

**PRESIDENT NIXON**

They would gladly trade places, Mr. President

**As I See It**  
**Oregon's affirmative action:**  
**Myth or reality?**

by Lenwood Davis

As a preface to this article, I must make the following observations. The editor of the *Observer* has written a number of articles on Oregon's Affirmative Action Agreement. I agree with some of his arguments and disagree with others. I disagree that "Oregon has again lost its liberal image." I believe that "Oregon is again losing its liberal image." Furthermore, Black people throughout the nation do not consider Oregon to be worse than the South because most Blacks have never heard of Oregon. Hence, to them it is literally non-existent. I believe Blacks (like myself) who have lived in the South and now live in Oregon see Oregon as being worse than the South. I agree that "we have seen nothing to make us believe that the affirmative action agreement was ever more than just a piece of paper."

It is not the purpose of this article to agree or disagree with the editor's position since both us conversely arrive at the same conclusion: Oregon is a racist state and the leaders are doing nothing to change the plight of Black people in the state!

It is a well known fact that the State of Oregon has few Blacks in state jobs of any kind. Since a number of OEO employees will soon lose their jobs, the State will miss a marvelous opportunity if it does not employ most of them. Moreover, since a number of Blacks have administrative experience they will not have to be retrained. However, if one judges Oregon by its past history, one can only conclude that it will not actively recruit these Blacks. The state will, as usual, give some superficial and asinine excuse for not employing them: no positions available; not enough education; not enough experience; and that they did not pass the state examination.

have to revise some of its archaic and unrealistic rules and regulations as they relate to education, experience and examination.

Surely, many on the state payroll do not have as much education or experience, in some areas, as some Blacks

working for Model Cities, OEO and other agencies. Yet because they are Black, their expertise will not be utilized. The conclusion is obvious: Blacks again will have to leave the Beaver State to find employment elsewhere.

I conclude by asking the same queries as the editor of the *Observer*: "We ask the Governor, the leader of our state; the Secretary of State; the State Treasurer; and the keeper of the laws, the Attorney General to look into this problem. We ask the State Legislature, that writes the laws, to see what must be done. Why is the state let off the hook? Shouldn't the state set the example? How can state agencies accept federal funds contingent on non-discrimination? How can we expect the citizens to obey the law if the state does not?"

**Another Point of View**

**Black History week discussed**

Dear Mr. Henderson:

I read your article denouncing the local Y.W.C.A. for their efforts on our behalf during the so called "Black History Week" held recently at the Y.W.C.A. and the other places gracious enough to allow the use of their facilities (both so called Black and White).

I should like to know, dear brother, where were you when all this ripping off that you allude to, was taking place? Since you are an alleged writer of sorts and from your article, I assume that you

have access to the news media. Why didn't you make the Black community aware of what was taking place?

In your failure to do this simple act, I see you in the same position as those you talk about.

I would ask also, why it is that you accuse the NAACP, the Urban League and the Albina Ministerial Alliance of being Black organizations? Has it occurred to you that if these organizations had been

Black, your article would have been unnecessary? Also, why do you as an alleged Black man drive off people who offer to help us. If the Y.W.C.A. did program, direct and finance the entire program, so what? My next question is did the Black people benefit in a positive way from Black History Week? If so, are you to say that we are not to go forward if white people foot the bill? If your answer is yes, then Brother, your

work is cut out for you, for you will have to make the Black settlement aware that they are not yet a community, you must teach them the importance of creating institutions that speak to our needs. You must teach them a love of self. If sir, you are capable of doing the latter, you are too big for the authorship of this article to which I reply.  
 Your Brother in all things,  
 Mr. James Bush

Dear Editor:

I read with great interest your recent editorial, "Black History Week stolen by whites." It is a sad state of affairs when the Black community sits idly by and lets whites appropriate Black History Week. When we as Blacks are apathetic and complacent about our culture and heritage, then we can not expect other people to be concerned.

I often wonder if most Black people are really serious about the Black Experience and are willing to pay the price to be "free". It seems to me that the "noted" Black historians should have also been instrumental in helping to present Black History Week. One could easily assume that since it was not financially profitable to organize such a program, the "noted" Black historians did not take the initiative to see if Black History Week was proclaimed. It is past time for these individuals to use their expertise for the benefit of the Black community.

It is also time that the few lonely advocates of the Black Experience get assistance from other Blacks. Obviously, they can not carry the torch of freedom forever.

As a footnote to this letter, I hope that every Black in the state - especially students - read the "Voice of the NAACP" for March 1st. The arguments made by Carl Rowan, Sylvester Monroe, and Martin A. Kilson (as quoted in the "Voice") give food for thought on the part of Black people!

Lenwood G. Davis



With Ron Hendren  
**A YOUNG VIEW OF WASHINGTON**

**A GOOD TIME WAS HAD BY ALL**

By Ron Hendren

WASHINGTON--Roy L. Ash, director of the President's Office of Management and Budget, came up to the Hill the other day to try to convince House members that his was not a position that should require Senate confirmation.

As it turned out, the encounter was a scene straight out of student government days, conducted in uncertainty and chaired by confusion.

But first a little background. Ash, whose present position often has been termed second only to that of the President in its power, is a former chief executive of Litton Industries, which presently has more than a half billion dollars in disputed claims pending against the Navy. Several weeks ago (in a column entitled "Exit Free Enterprise--Enter Socialism"), I noted that Ash had made no bones about his intention to have a strong say in Navy budget matters, an intention which one Navy official strongly criticized in Senate hearings as being a blatant example of conflict of interest.

Ash denied the conflict of interest charge, and the Navy official was promptly canned. Meanwhile, enterprising reporters dug up incidents of alleged business irregularities involving Ash which still are pending in a federal court suit.

All of these happenings, coupled with the President's strong stance on his right to impound congressionally appropriated funds through the budget office, prompted the Senate to pass legislation that would require Ash's confirmation, on the grounds that he is more powerful than cabinet members who already must get the legislative blessing in order to sit on the throne.

The Administration objected, of course, and that is what brought Roy Ash to the Hill the other day. His first line of defense was that he had no operational powers like department heads, no power at all, in fact, except as an agent of the President carrying out administration policies.

After the snickers died down, Rep. Chet Holifield (D-Calif.) politely disagreed with Ash's own assessment of his power, and allowed as how it seemed pretty clear to him that control of the purse strings involved considerable operational duties.

Rep. John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.) then contributed his belief that Congress ought not to pass the bill "in a fit of pique" over Mr. Nixon's impoundment activities. No points: very weak rejoinder.

All in all, everybody's tongues seemed pretty well entrenched in their respective cheeks, and then the Justice Department contributed its two-cents worth and nearly topped the whole show.

Their judgment is that the legislation is unconstitutional, because it would retroactively require confirmation of Ash, requiring him to be removed from office and then reappointed. Apparently, the significance of that juggling lies in the constitutional provision that the only way Congress can remove Executive Branch officials is by impeachment.

Rep. Jack Brooks said he views the constitutional question with skepticism, but went on to win all awards by confessing that, just in case, he had drafted an amendment that would abolish the Office of Management and Budget and then recreate it, a maneuver that would require the reappointment of Ash in any event, not to mention every other OMB employee from clerk typist to janitor.

On the whole, it was quite a show and clearly a good time was had by all. Meanwhile, back in the real world, the OMB pushed ahead with its mission: ending federal grants to elementary and secondary school libraries, cutting medical benefits to the elderly, and eight single-spaced, small-print pages of other programs to help people.

**SHOP**  
**KENOW'S**  
**FOR**  
**BRANDS you know**  
**VARIETIES you like**  
**SIZES you want**

The Friendliest Stores in Town Since 1908

**IT'S COMING!**

- Prizes every week
- Easy to enter
- Easy to win.

It's the OBSERVER'S new EZ Winner Contest.  
 Watch for details, coming soon in the PORTLAND OBSERVER.

**When you say you Can't afford to advertise**

**You are really saying**

- You can't afford to increase sales.
- You can't afford to reduce costs.
- You can't afford to save money.
- You can't afford to reduce prices.
- You can't afford to expand your trade area.
- You can't afford to increase your profits.

**Which means**

You can't afford to stay in business or succeed in competition.

**YOU SHOULD ADVERTISE IN THE PORTLAND OBSERVER**