

EDITORIAL/OPINION

The Year of the Child

This year, 1979, has been designated the International Year of the Child by the United Nations. Its major aims are to

- encourage all countries, rich and poor, to review their programs for the promotion of well-being of children, and to mobilize support for national and local action programs according to each country's conditions, needs and priorities.
- heighten awareness of children's special needs among decision-makers and the public;
- promote recognition of the vital link between programs for children on the one hand, and economic and social progress on the other;
- spur specific, practical measures -- with achievable goals -- to benefit children, in both the short and long term on the national level.

The Year of the Child is a response to the needs of 350 million children in the developing nations who do not have the minimum essentials of health care, and education. The Un-

ed States, and Oregon, also have children who are discriminated against, who are neglected or abused, who do not have adequate nutrition and health care, who have physical and mental handicaps.

Oregon does not provide essential services for children in need of mental health, dental and medical care; for child care; for children in trouble with the law; for children whose parents are poor. Oregon does not provide a quality, integrated education for children who are of minority races or who speak non-English languages.

In this Year of the Child an effort should be extended to insure that every child has the opportunity to reach his optimum mental, physical and emotional development and that each child has the love and respect that will allow him to grow to be a happy and productive adult.

This city and this state have a long way to go to reach this goal.

Guest Editorial

Keeping Dr. King's Dream Alive

by John Lewis

It's Martin's birthday again. Had he not been assassinated in Memphis in 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. would have been 50 years old on January 15, 1979.

For many, the civil rights movement which Dr. King led already seems lost to memory. Too many of our young people know little of Dr. King and his role as a Moses, a Nobel Prize winner, a prophet, a friend of the poor, the alienated, and the dispossessed.

Contrary to those who feel that Dr. King's influence had waned by 1968, I believe that the world had yet to experience the depth of Martin's true greatness as a moral spokesperson. Martin was perceived by the world as a Black, American leader. Today, had he lived, Martin might have been an internationalist, a planetary figure fighting to forge a coalition of the peoples of the world to improve the human condition.

As a spokesperson for humankind, Martin would have applauded the controversial and courageous attempt of President Jimmy Carter to make human rights a cornerstone of our nation's foreign policy, but he would have used every ounce of his potent moral suasion to insure that the image was one of substance and not mere rhetoric.

Martin had a personal relationship with American Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, but he also had a way of keeping a distance from any Administration, a way of being free to bring tremendous pressures upon political leaders who might seem inclined to drift toward tokenism.

Martin knew that to become too cozy with any elected official meant an unacceptable compromise of principle and a loss of effectiveness as a movement leader. Martin would have reserved the right to protest and, more, to mobilize against the administration, regardless of his relationship to the President.

Basic to Martin's personal diplomacy with world leaders was his recognition that the movement for social change would not be brought about by the edict of any administration or the action of government, no matter how principled or well-meaning, but could come only by grass roots demands and by the participation of the masses in determining their own destiny.

Were Martin alive today, he would still be a symbol of optimism, for he knew the value of hope. He would have been elated to see the effects of the great legal victories of the 1960s -- the civil rights act of 1964 and, particularly, the progress made under the Voting Rights Act of

1965. It would have overjoyed Martin to know that 4,503 Blacks had been elected to public office, 2,733 of these in his beloved Southland.

But Martin would be greatly troubled today that the flourish of minority political participation in the United States did not result in an equally dramatic record of effectiveness on the part of the officials elected to office. Instead of going about politics as usual, Martin hoped that minority officials would be crusaders for those human values which were the essence of the movement he led.

Martin would have been in the forefront in reminding the government that it's first concern should be the basic needs of human beings -- food, shelter, health care, education, jobs, livable incomes, and the opportunity to realize the full human potential. He would have supported cutting the excesses of government spending, but in the ongoing "guns vs. butter" debate would have made it clear that the greatest threat to our nation is not military, but the danger of losing our soul because we deny those most in need. Martin's first concern was and would ever be the disinherited of the earth and the struggle to find creative ways to share the abundance of this planet.

Dr. King was a moral crusader who would have awakened America from the sleeping sickness of an apathetic, me-first, too-comfortable, selfish society. He would have turned attention to the cries of those who must struggle constantly just to survive.

Perhaps Martin Luther King, Jr.'s greatest contribution would be that of bringing the entire human community together in a caring and sharing Beloved Community, for it was Martin's greatest strength to inspire people to reach out and help.

It's Martin's birthday again, but he's not here, so it's up to us -- the ones he loved, inspired, gave to, and died for to give flesh and substance to his spirit which shall endure to the ends of the earth. If Martin's dream is to be fulfilled, if we are to overcome the negative limitations which have plagued the species, if we are to build a beloved community of caring, sharing people on a planetary basis, we must gird ourselves with the philosophy of life, love, and nonviolence which Dr. King personified.

Martin was not so much a hero as he was a sensitive and concerned human being. By following in his footsteps, we seek not to become heroes, but to claim our rightful inheritance as we nurture that divine spark of love which is the birthright of humanity.



King: Tough Mind, Tender Heart

by Herb L. Cawthorne

We pause, in the hurried lives we live, to give thanks to the Almighty for the privilege of knowing the spirit and deeds of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

We pause on the day before the anniversary of his birthday to acknowledge the achievements of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. He faced some of the greatest odds, some of the most vicious hatred, any American leader has ever endured. It is fitting that we honor him.

The story we all know best began in 1955. Fresh out of a seminary institute, the young Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., enjoyed his work as Pastor of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama. Within a year, the spirit of the times had tracked him down. Within a year, he found himself the leader of a movement -- a collective drive for change that set the fires of reform throughout the South and across the nation.

One day, a tired Mrs. Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a white person on a crowded public bus. The custom of segregation required that she give up her seat and move to the back of the bus. This time, though, she refused. She was promptly thrown off the bus. The courageous action of this single Black woman, Rosa Parks, began the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Dr. King later said, "It was the beginning of a movement, where 50,000 Black men and women refused, absolutely, to ride the city buses, and we walked together for 351 days."

As the movement spread, the philosophy and techniques of non-violent direct action were applied to the struggle in America. For twenty years now, we have debated this philosophy. By now we should know that Martin Luther King was right. Non-violence is, as he told us, "the sword that heals." Non-violent direct action is the best method for us today.

In a book published before his death, Dr. King took time from his busy schedule to write out some of his best-loved sermons so that we might read them again and again.

One was called, "Tough Mind, Tender Heart." I would like to explore what Dr. King may have meant by this expression. What does it mean in light of a commitment to

non-violent action for change?

We need to build a community which is cohesive. One which looks out for its own interest. And, following Dr. King's advice, we will do this building in a non-violent manner. The job we have to do for ourselves and our children requires a "tough mind" and a "tender heart."

(Since we will not be violent) never lowering ourselves to the pits where those who oppose us reside, we will soon come to realize that our best weapon in the fight for equality is The Mind. We have no atomic weapons. We are without an army. We have no air force. We are not cowardly saboteurs and terrorists. No! The weapon against oppression is The Mind -- a strong mind able to see Western society with an African soul.

A weak mind is a crack in our defense. It is extra baggage. It slows us down. But the tough mind -- that's what Dr. King talked about, and that's what we need today.

He never said the tough minded had high college degrees. The tough mind sharply focuses on the facts, always keeping history up front. When the facts are clear, the tough minded Black person has no desire to change them around. There is no need to cover them up with roses in order to make a bad situation smell sweet.

The tough mind has trained itself to recognize the present facts. It is not afraid to place these facts into historical context. There is no delusion, no excuse, no denial. The tough minded see the facts. They recognize many struggles right here in Portland:

1. They recognize that desegregation is inequitable. As long as we permit it to be so, we will contribute to the inferiority complex our children often develop;

2. They recognize that city government has not provided our community with a fair share of federal funds sent here to develop Portland and us.

The tough mind cannot turn its head and act as though the facts do not exist. The tough mind is honest, forthright, and understands the meaning of progress. Yet it knows that cold, hard facts are dangerous

by themselves. The facts must be balanced with compassion, with love, with a will to forge a better tomorrow. The tough mind and the tender heart go together.

It is the tender heart which makes us move. The tender heart makes us want to contribute something positive for someone. The tender heart gives us direction.

The facts make it clear that we need change in Portland. But we do not want change that will oppress others as we have been oppressed. We are compassionate enough to realize that, simply because we have been alienated, the willful alienation of others is no answer. Although we cannot stop fighting for better opportunity, we can always look our adversary in the face and say, "When this battle is over, we shall be brothers."

The question most inspired by the tender heart is not, "If I stop to help someone in need, what will happen to me?" Instead, the question is, "If I do not stop to help someone in need, what will happen to them?"

This question preoccupied Martin Luther King, Jr. And this is the question which, in the answering, made him great. He asked us all to think about the "tenderhearted" question.

We honor a man who had the courage to ask the "tenderhearted" question, and who had the toughness of mind to follow the answer. He was, and is, and always will be, of such great stature. We can capture only a small bit of his greatness.

But, in our humble way, we can make it so that his living will not have been in vain. We can honor his sacrifice. If we develop our minds -- by reading and study, by conversation and listening, by organization and mutual support -- then we honor him, and we share in his sacrifice.

If we never say, first, "What will happen to me?", but instead, when we see the facts, if we will always ask, "If I do not stop to help someone in need, what will happen to them?"

Then we honor Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and we show our undying gratitude by practicing the Greatness he taught us.



Those damn mercenaries are back again

by N. Fungai Kumbula

Theoretically, it is an offense for a U.S. citizen to either go fight in a foreign country with which the U.S. is not formally at war or to recruit for a foreign power (country). U.S. Code Title 18, Sec. 959 (a) reads:

"Whoever within the U.S. . . . hires or retains another . . . with intent to be enlisted in the service of any foreign prince, state colony, district or people as a soldier . . . shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both." Section (b) of this same act goes on to define as an offense, the use of U.S. personnel in a war against a country with which the U.S. is at peace -- a reference that could easily be applied to both Zambia and Mozambique which have been repeatedly raided by Rhodesian soldiers with the help of American mercenaries.

That there are American mercenaries in Smith's army has never been disputed. What has been disputed instead is the actual number -- just how many of all these mercenaries are American citizens? Estimates range from a low of 400 to a high of well over 1,000.

The total mercenary force is now reported to total over 5,000 which, as of 1977, made up half of Rhodesia's regular army. These unscrupulous individuals are recruited by various groups and individuals not only in the United States, but also in Europe, Australia, Japan, New Zealand, South Africa, Taiwan, Brazil, etc.

Last October, you may have read of a Reverend Paul Lindstrom of the Chicago based Church of Christian Liberty announcing that he was sending a force of 300 former Green Beret "Christian soldiers to Rhodesia to reopen Elim Mission. This place had been closed after three British missionaries had been killed by members of Rhodesia's notorious Selous Scouts who had tried to place the blame on the

guerrillas. The leader of these "Christian soldiers," a Vietnam vet called Giles Pace was quoted by *The Washington Post* as saying: "We see ourselves as crusaders. We are not interested in dialogue or detente. We will shoot the bastards on sight." Christian soldier??? He also indicated that some 500 Cuban exiles would probably join them later.

In his book 'In Search Of Enemies', ex-CIA agent John Stockwell makes some disturbing references to CIA complicity in mercenary recruitment during the Angola Civil War of 1975. Most of the names mentioned in that campaign crop up again and again in connection with the current recruitment of Americans to fight for Rhodesia. The above mentioned laws notwithstanding, a David Bufkin interviewed by *The Chicago Sun Times*, *The Washington Post* and National Public Radio among other revelations, admitted he had placed ads in California newspapers and recruited twelve mercenaries to fight in Angola. At the height of the Angola civil war, Bufkin was reported to have been in Kinshasa, Zaire, the staging ground for most of the Angola directed mercenary activities. Stockwell goes on to say that a CIA agent excised Bufkin's records from the CIA files. Newsday reported that the CIA had told the Justice Department it would not cooperate with a pending investigation of Bufkin -- he was never prosecuted.

Internews of California and *The (British) Guardian* both reported the story of a UC Berkeley student, Lawrence Meyers, who was recruited to go fight in Rhodesia by the head of the Reserve Officer Training Corps in 1976. Meyers obtained all the necessary application forms from the Rhodesia Information Office in Washington. Though the FBI indicated it was carrying out an investigation of the Rhodesia Information Office for this and other related illegal activities, nothing ever

came of it. No legal action was taken against the ROTC head either. As for Meyers, who fought for a while in Rhodesia until he deserted to Botswana from where he was subsequently deported, he was granted immunity from prosecution.

The bulk of the recruiting though, seems to be done by *Soldier of Fortune*; a magazine that seems to exist solely to cater to mercenary exploits, recruitment and dissemination of mercenary propaganda. It is run by an Arthur K. Brown, a mercenary with very close ties to both the Smith and Both (South Africa) regimes. It periodically runs interviews with military commanders and recruiters for the Rhodesian and South African armies but never with the leaders of the liberation movements.

Not to be overlooked in this international mercenary network is Robin Moore, author of *The Green Berets* who also runs an official "U.S. embassy" in Salisbury, Rhodesia -- a place which serves as a "political and social center for American and other foreign mercenaries serving in the Rhodesian army." He also runs *The Crippled Eagles Foundation* in Marina del Rey, California which raises money to support Moore's pro-Rhodesia activities. One ex-mercenary, a Major Mike Williams, a Special Forces captain in Vietnam and former commanding officer in the Rhodesian army even ran for Congress but was defeated in the Democratic primary.

A French mercenary who deserted from Rhodesia gave a rare insight into the activities of mercenaries. He said that Americans are doing the bulk of the fighting, virtually all the flying and they constituted a large portion of the murderers who bombed the refugee camps in both Zambia and Mozambique, killing hundreds of women and children. He also accuses them of carrying out most of the worst atrocities and, he (Please turn to Page 4 Column 3)



ALFRED L. HENDERSON
Editor/Publisher

PORTLAND OBSERVER

Published every Thursday by Exie Publishing Company, 2201 North Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97217. Mailing address: P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208. Telephone: 283-2486.

Subscriptions: \$7.50 per year in the Tri-County area, \$8.00 per year outside Portland.

Second Class Postage Paid at Portland, Oregon

The *Portland Observer's* official position is expressed only in its Publisher's column (We See The World Through Black Eyes). Any other material throughout the paper is the opinion of the individual writer or submitter and does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the *Portland Observer*.

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York

1st Place
Community Service
ONPA 1973

1st Place
Best Ad Results
ONPA 1973

5th Place
Best Editorial
NNPA 1973

Honorable Mention
Herrick Editorial Award
NNA 1973

2nd Place
Best Editorial
3rd Place
Community Leadership
ONPA 1975

3rd Place
Community Leadership
ONPA 1976

