

# EDITORIAL/OPINION

## School Board ethics

Is it the "old board" or the "new board". The new school board is beginning to act much like the old -- preferring to operate in secret.

The fact that the school board would like to discuss as controversial a subject as school desegregation in private is understandable. Flaming headlines in reaction to preliminary reports and ideas could raise public concern. Also, some board members find it difficult to function in front of the press, giving way to posturing for the TV. On the other hand, fear of exposure can hamper free discussion.

That is one of the problems of the democratic process. It is difficult to discuss emotional issues in public -- but after all it is the public's business. And in Oregon we have the open meetings/open records laws. Perhaps those who are afraid to reveal their opinions before those who elected them should reconsider their interest in holding public office -- or their ambitions to seek higher office.

For those whose concern about publicity is genuine -- those who fear scare headlines might hinder their work, they need to carefully review the events of the recent past. Not only do we have the ultimate example of secrecy in government -- Nixon's attempt to steal the government but we have the continuous successful efforts of the Portland school district to evade school desegregation and minority rights.

The desegregation committee not only avoids the press and public by confusing meeting dates and failing to make required public notice, but the desegregation committee even refused to share information with other board members. It allowed its Superintendent to refuse to provide public information to school board members -- his bosses.

up their activities in school desegregation and minority rights.

The members of the "new board" were elected and selected on a platform of open government and citizen involvement. What does it do as it approaches its first big decision?

Although the intentions of some of the committee members might be pure, its actions and their results are not. Open discussion, available to an aware and informed public will bring far better results than the rumors and suspicions that secrecy breeds.

The desegregation committee should consider the cause of its concern. If the suggestions put forth by their Superintendent were so unreasonable as to inflame the white and the Black communities, why not reject those suggestions? Or better yet, why not reject the Superintendent?

Wayne Morse used to say that it is improper and dangerous to use an unjust procedure to pass a good law, because that same procedure can be used to pass a bad law. In other words -- does the end justify the means?

## Letters to the Editor

### Witnessing police brutality

To the editor:

Charles Jordan finds no evidence of local police brutality according to his statement Tuesday on the Channel 2 evening newscast.

Unknown to Jordan, police were busily creating evidence on my neighbor Randy Valentine around 9:30 last Friday evening. A police siren alerted some 15 neighbors out to their porches in time to see an officer pull out a gun on Randy and also to witness him being knocked down hard into the wet puddled street for no obvious reason. He was booked for speeding and eluding an officer, and was taken off to jail.

A taxi delivered him home 24 hours later barely able to walk, cut wrists, throwing up blood and unable to sleep that night because of massive pain.

If it is not enough evidence that we all saw Randy's unmarred face before he was taken downtown, we have on

two rolls of film what he looked like when he returned.

Following is Randy's account as he told his wife, Margaret: "Downtown the officers bashed Randy's face into the elevator wall, and after being beat up he was taken to the hospital to have his face stitched up.

When Randy later asked the officer in the booking room if he was a trustee (because he wanted a cigarette), the officer said, "No!" and told him to shut up.

He then opened the cell and grabbed Randy and started hitting him. Then another officer came and they threw him to the floor and stuck their knees in his back. After having stitches on his face Randy found the officers had made them bleed again. While they were beating him they tore his coat up. Then the two officers took him to another cell where he was finally left alone and things were calm the next day (October 20) when he was released

at 9 p.m.

The officers claimed they were justified in throwing Randy down in the street because they "had to chase him for four miles at nearly 100 miles an hour." Randy's story is that he was only a few blocks from home.

Is an officer justified in throwing traffic offenders around? Isn't Randy's fine of \$300+ enough of a pinch without having a body racked in pain as a victim of policemen's power games? Should officers of the law add to the judgment of the law by mutilating fellow human beings?

Randy has personally filed a protest against his treatment, but that protest will not reach the public. Right now the majority of the public sees the subject of police brutality the way Jordan describes it: without evidence.

Will Jordan see any "evidence" in Randy Valentine's abuse?

Eunice Jean Nance Mitchell

## Affirmative action officer joins PSU staff

(Continued from page 1 col. 6)

Morris says he will try to create a warm perceptive office. He will reach out and be in contact with the Portland community. No one usually comes to see him unless they need his service, or the employer wants to stay out of trouble. The PSU Affirmative Action officer says, the conflict puts him in a situation of jeopardy. His main objective is to make sure everyone is served due process, honesty and equality and normal recruitment ef-

forts are carried out.

Among Morris' many diversified skills, he hopes to use his teaching skills at PSU as well as the city of Portland. He has worked with teachers and administrators in the area of multicultural-non-sexist curriculum. He says America is made of many types of people who have contributed to society, so there is no single American culture to follow. He enjoys helping people to learn about cultural diversities, which ultimately helps to improve the

educational system in America. This education helps provide minorities and the poor with a sense of choosing and sampling of professional careers. Black children must be taught to look to more exotic fields. All children must be given the opportunity to grab hold of their lives and choose their own destinies. Too many minorities, he says, especially young Blacks, feel they are not a functioning part of this society.



## Brouhaha over PLO

by N. Fungai Kumbula

Andrew Young was forced to resign as Ambassador to the UN over his contact with the Palestine Liberation Organization and since then, the PLO has become a cause celebre among Blacks in this country. Young had argued that only by talking to the PLO can there be any hope of lasting peace in the Middle East. The official US position parallels that of Israel which refuses to recognize the PLO and so refuses to engage in any dialog with them.

With Young gone, his cause has been taken up by quite a few other Black leaders. Dr. Joseph Lowery of The Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), D.C. delegate Rep. Fauntroy and Reverend Jesse Jackson of Operation PUSH have led delegations to the Middle East, in recent weeks, in efforts to get the PLO and the Israelis talking. They met with such leaders as Anwar Sadat of Egypt, Hafez of Syria, King Hussein of Jordan and Yassar Arafat, leader of the PLO. Each delegation also visited Israel in an attempt to talk to Israeli government officials but, apart from Moshe Dyan who met with Jackson, Israeli officials shunned them all.

Back in the US, these various Black leaders seem to have incurred the wrath of other Black leaders and this gives the illusion of a rift in the Black leadership. Vernon E. Jordan, president of The National Urban League, has let loose a barrage of vituperations against "those Black leaders who would cavort with terrorists." He went on to castigate them for meddling in foreign policy matters, instead of grappling with such immediate Black problems as unemployment and crime. This same sentiment was echoed by Bayard

Rustin, of the A. Philip Randolph Institute, who has since led his own delegation to Israel to "reassure the Israelis that not all Blacks back the terrorists and bomb throwers." The message that all three Black delegations that visited the Arabs passed on was basically the same. Stop the killing and start talking. All stressed the importance of peace and, at worst, their efforts would leave the present Mid-East situation as is. At best, they could get the warring factions together because as Young put it; How can there be peace when the two sides are not even talking?

It seems, therefore, that the Jordan and Rustin vituperations were ill-founded, ill-conceived and ill-executed. To say that Blacks have no business meddling in foreign policy is about as myopic as one can get. Anything Blacks can do to aid in the cause of peace anywhere in the world, they should feel free to exercise this right. Are they not Americans like anybody else? Is foreign policy any special group's business? This is the dangerous kind of thinking that has kept Blacks uninvolved in foreign policy matters for so long with the tragic result that Africa has been relegated to a very low priority.

Jordan and Rustin are entitled to their opinions about the PLO-Israeli issue but for them to try and muzzle other Black leaders is utterly ridiculous. If these Black delegations that went to the Middle East had condoned the violence being perpetrated by either side, then Rustin and Jordan would have had a legitimate beef. Only when Blacks get involved in foreign policy issues, such as this one, will they be taken seriously enough for their interests to

be taken into account when this country deals with Africa, the Caribbean and other parts of the world populated by our people.

This is the second time I can recall that Jordan has come up with egg on his face. As president of the National Urban League, he also sits on the board of several major corporations, some of which are very much involved in South Africa. Several months back, one of these corporations asked its board members to vote on whether they should withdraw from South Africa. Now anybody who has followed events in South Africa knows that the Africans have been urging foreign companies to get out of South Africa, and thus, aid in the Black struggle for liberation. One of the few Blacks in a position to cast such an important vote, Jordan voted for this corporation to stay on in South Africa.

Adding insult to injury, the statement he made to the press regarding his vote demonstrated a disturbingly high degree of insensitivity. His statement read: "I could not eat three meals at home everyday, then come in here and vote those people out of a job." To somebody who does not know the issues involved, I could forgive this kind of ignorance, but not Jordan. He knows the dollar was more important and those brothers and sisters languishing under South Africa's slave system be damned.

Since Israel is now emerging as one of South Africa's foremost trading partners, could Jordan's anger at Black "intrusion" into foreign affairs have been prompted by this bit of intelligence? Is he afraid lest his bosses get upset?

## The political vision of Africa's top leader

(Continued from page 1 col. 6)

becomes a sort of "benevolent" rationale for continued Western involvement in Zimbabwe -- to prevent civil war. What do you think of this outlook? And the civil war projections?

**NYERERE:** I must say that it is a great concern for me. I will confess I don't like the fact that there are two armies fighting in Zimbabwe. No liberation -- no country -- has had two armies. You can't have a country with two armies! But you know ZAPU and ZANU are fond of the British parliamentary model. I say to them, "Look, if you follow the British model, then you must have only one army." I have told them they must overcome this problem, and we have discussed it until I think they don't even want to hear from me anymore. But the situation has not changed. I am concerned about this, and I think if the West is concerned about this as well, then this is a good concern on the part of the West. It isn't a justification to meddle in the country's affairs, but it is a reason for concern.

**Q:** Before we look at the rational course of development in the post-colonial period, I wonder if we could look at development gone astray. Where do the Idi Amins and Emperor Bokassas come from? What do they represent historically in terms of post-colonial development for Africa?

**NYERERE:** Sometimes I think I, also, am a racist. When a Bokassa behaves as a Bokassa I feel bad. When Amin behaves as Amin I feel bad. There is a sense in which I am also like those blessed racists who point to Bokassa or Amin and say, "Ah! look at Black Africa." But they don't point to Hitler and say, "This is a white man." Or to Salazar or Franco and say, "This is a white man." They simply say, "This is Hitler. This is Franco. This is Salazar."

But with Africa they generalize. They say, "See what is happening in Africa?" I could just as easily point to Portugal and say, "See what is happening in Europe?"

So you say what does Bokassa represent? Bokassa is a tyrant. Amin is a tyrant and the world has had tyrants. They never started in Africa. Bokassa's hero was Napoleon. Amin quoted Hitler. So what is peculiar about the tyrant in Africa?

To put it the other way around, also, I would be claiming a superior position for Africa if Africa never produced any tyrants at all. I don't

claim any superior position for Africans. We're not saints. We produce tyrants.

My real problem--what I've been complaining about, is the tendency among Africans to feel shy in front of these tyrants, to not denounce them as tyrants. An African feels ashamed when he sees a tyrant instead of being angry.

So I don't think it's a development issue in Africa any more than in Europe, Latin America, Asia. All these continents have had their tyrants. These are not racist tyrants. They are just tyrants of history!

Well, we are doing very well this year. Amin is gone. Bokassa is gone. But these are not the only tyrants that have gone. Somoza is gone. The Shah of Iran is gone. Well! We are doing quite well, aren't we?

**Q:** You've chosen to follow socialist paths of development for the Third World, not just in Africa. Tanzanian socialism is obviously different from other forms. How would you describe its ideology?

**NYERERE:** I would describe our ideology as socialist. That's all. We're fighting against capitalism, all of us. We're trying to establish, I hope, just societies, healthy relationships between individuals.

We've started from different bases. I am not a Marxist. I do accept the economics of Marxism. I do not accept some of the philosophies of Marxism. But even the economics have some difficulty. Classically, Marxism is a socialism of the rich. It is a socialism which starts with highly developed capitalism, a highly developed proletariat. At present it is the United States, under Marxism, which is really ripe for socialism. It has a proletariat, and this proletariat is a product of capitalism itself.

My problem is, having accepted socialism as the right development for my country, whether, I should nurture capitalism until I have the proletariat. In Tanzania the dominant class is not the proletariat, it's the peasants. Socialism here will have to create wealth here. And so starting from a different base, our methodology is likely to be different. But I hope the objective is going to be the same.

I hope we shall succeed with different methods to establish humane societies where human beings can live as human beings and not just be dominated by property. Property was never intended to dominate human beings. Property was always intended to serve human beings. Wealth was never intended to live side by side with poverty, ever.

Wealth was always intended to discover what light is to darkness; where there is wealth, poverty disappears; where there is light, darkness disappears. But capitalism succeeds to work out this miracle--that wealth can live side by side with poverty, because wealth is used as power.

Socialism with poverty--equality with poverty--is a big problem. And so socialists have accepted the language of affluence. I think this is a shame. Because that is where Europe stood, I am still using the same kind of language, as if the wealth was there. It is not there. We have got to create this wealth.

**Q:** Tanzania has sought a course of agricultural development and self-reliance. How would you look at the strategy that you have been following so far?

**NYERERE:** We can feed ourselves because of our land distribution. We do not have landlords. We are a peasant country. The peasants have land, and they can grow what they like. Therefore, if the rains are all right, you can trust the peasants will produce all the food that they need, and enough surplus for the small urban and service population of Tanzania. So that gives us a base from where they can move.

But structurally, farming has not changed. Technologically, farming has not changed. Therefore, our agriculture cannot support a rapidly growing industrialization. We must industrialize. But if the momentum of industrialization was to pick up, become rapid, before our farming has become more efficient, we would run into trouble. And that is our next stage, which is making this farming produce more good surplus of food and also raw materials for our industries.

The problem we have now really is the major problem of the international community. This year we are consuming less oil than we consumed in 1972. But we are paying nine times as much for it. You can't call a country "developing" when today it is consuming less oil than it was seven years ago. The only reason why we're not collapsing is also because of some of our agricultural successes I've been talking about. Otherwise, quite frankly, a country like this could just collapse. But this year I am going to spend half of our export earnings on oil, it is not going to be very easy to pay for the improvement of our farming techniques which we need. This is a vital problem of all Third World countries, the non-oil producing countries.



ALFRED L. HENDERSON  
Editor/Publisher

### PORTLAND OBSERVER

The Portland Observer (USPS 959-680) is published every Thursday by Exie Publishing Company, Inc., 2201 North Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97217, Post Office Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208. Second class postage paid at Portland, Oregon.

Subscriptions: \$7.50 per year in Tri-County area; \$8.00 per year outside Tri-County area. Postmaster: Send address changes to the Portland Observer, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208.

The Portland Observer's official position is expressed only in its Editorial column. 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.

283-2486

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  
ONPA 1973

Honorable Mention  
Herrick Editorial Award  
NNA 1973

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

3rd Place  
Community Leadership  
ONPA 1978



## Subscribe Today

\$7.50 per year -- Tri-county  
\$8.00 per year -- Other

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

Mail to:  
Portland Observer  
P.O. Box 3137  
Portland, Oregon 97208