

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Affirmative action on the block

The Reagan Administration's move to eliminate affirmative action regulations has been joined by members of Congress.

Senator Orrin Hatch has introduced Senate Joint Resolution 41 which would amend the United States Constitution to prohibit the U.S. Government or any state from making or enforcing any law that makes distinctions on account of race, color, or national origin.

The bill states that laws that prohibit discrimination "shall not be construed to permit the establishment or maintenance by such private individuals or enterprises of any program or policy that makes distinctions on account of race, color, or national origin."

The bill would forbid the U.S. or the states from maintaining affirmative action goals or guidelines and prevent them from requiring or allowing any individual or company from maintaining affirmative action goals or guidelines.

The bill would also define discrimination according to intent, and would not allow discrimination to be judged according to its disproportionate impact on individuals of ethnic groups.

The bill would deny to any court the right to make any determination that takes race, color, or national origin into account.

Smith opposes King honor

The U.S. House of Representatives passed legislation Tuesday providing \$25,000 for a statue memorializing Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., to be placed in the national capital. Dr. King will be the first Black to be so honored.

Unfortunately, the story is not all good for many of the Congressmen voting to honor Dr. King in this manner did so in an effort to head off the campaign Black members of Congress

Obviously, the purpose of this legislation is to eliminate any legal recourse for those who are left out of the economic system because of race. Already Reagan has removed 75 per cent of the employers from affirmative action requirements. This bill would go further—it would negate the major portion of civil rights legislation designed to provide equal employment opportunity.

The actions of such as Reagan and Hatch are to be expected. The disgusting development is the bandwagon chasing of such Black "intellectuals" as Thomas Sowell who has already testified as to his strong aversion to affirmative action before the Senate hearings. Sowell uses the results of the government's failure to enforce existing affirmative action regulations as his evidence that affirmative action is so difficult to administer and its goals so vague as to render it suspect and unworkable.

The testimony of those who will serve their own selfish ends by supporting racism will be plentiful as the Senate hearings on this and related bills continue. Those who defend the rights of minorities to participate in this country's economy should also make their voices heard by contacting Senator Hatch and their own Senators.

have waged for many years to have Dr. King's birthday a national holiday.

Oregon's Congressman Denny Smith distinguished himself by being one of the few Congressmen who voted against the bill. Oh well, Denny Smith also mentioned during his election campaign that if the 1964 Civil Rights Bill were before Congress this year he just wasn't sure that he could vote for it.

And the game goes on...

Forty nations have threatened to boycott the 1984 Olympic Games to be held in Los Angeles of the South African Springboks Rugby team plays in the United States and the *Washington Post* reports that the Soviet Union will ask that the games be moved in order to allow the Third World nations to participate.

The pleas of Mayor Tom Bradley, whose city is scheduled to have the 1984 games, have fallen on deaf ears. They mayor and city council of Chicago, where the Springboks are supposed to play, passed a resolution condemning South Africa's racial policies but refused to cancel the game.

The mayor of New York City finally did cancel the permit to use that city's public stadium but not for reasons of human rights. Mayor Koch was advised by his Chief of Police that the cost of policing and possible damage from rioting opponents would cost too much. Rochester also cancelled the team's appearance but Albany, New York accepted. A third game is to be

played somewhere in the midwest.

The U.S. State Department started it all by giving permission for the team to enter the U.S. in spite of opposition here and abroad. The excuse: the government doesn't want to interfere with sport. Mayor Byrne and others like her perpetuate the myth by refusing to deny their "constitutional right" to assembly. It doesn't seem to matter at this point that the Chicago appearance will be in secret, with few if any spectators. And the excuse for bringing the team here in the first place was to expose Americans to the sport of rugby.

While American leaders argue the right of the South African team to play its game in the U.S., the rest of the world is attempting to isolate and condemn that nation for its inhuman practices against its Black citizens and its illegal occupation of Namibia. The United Nations General Assembly condemned South Africa Monday with a 117-0 vote. (Twenty-five countries, including the U.S., abstained.)

Deny AWAC aircraft sale

The United States should end its career as the world's leading provider of arms with the refusal to sell the AWACs aircraft to Saudi Arabia.

Armaments is a lucrative business in the U.S. and American-made arms are readily available on the world market. Often both sides of a clash are using U.S.-made arms—whether two nations in a border war or two sides in a civil war.

The U.S. government is also in the arms business. Immediate plans are to provide arms for Saudi Arabia to use against Israel, to Taiwan to use against China, to China to use against the Soviet Union, to Pakistan to use against Afghanistan (or India), etc. These can be provided

through sales, gifts or loans (usually written off) but all are paid for by American citizens.

The U.S. will also supply arms to some of the cruelest dictatorships—Chile, Guatemala, El Salvador, Brazil, Argentina. These countries murder, torture and imprison thousands of their own citizens each year. The only possible use for military equipment is to use against their own people or against each other.

The U.S. has the responsibility to stop the escalation of the arms race and to provide the leadership needed to negotiate arms limitations. It can begin with a withdrawal of its offer of AWACs to Saudi Arabia and let the world know the store is closed.



U.S.A. and U.S.A.: 'Natural' allies

by N. Fungai Kumbula

In the hushed chamber, the eyes of the world turned to the one lone hand raised in opposition to the wishes of the rest of the civilized world. The lone hand belonged to the UN representative of the United States of America, otherwise abbreviated to U.S.A. The vote in question was a Security Council condemnation of the barbarous invasions of a fellow UN member's territory by an almost member called the "Union of South Africa" also abbreviated to U.S.A. An audible groan of disgust, anger and frustration could be heard from the African and Caribbean quarters that had both lobbied so hard for this simple, straightforward censure.

With that one veto by the U.S., the move to condemn the South African invasion, a move that had been approved by every other UN member including all the other Security Council members (Britain, France, W. Germany, China and the Soviet Union) died. In spite of the clear violation of the UN's own charter to which the U.S., self-proclaimed leader of the free world, claims to adhere, the U.S.A. still vetoed a mere condemnation of the aggressor, South Africa. This one act alone further drew the U.S.A. and the U.S.A. closer together as more "natural allies" in spite of the Reagan administration's lame protestations at displeasure with South Africa's internal policies.

To make matters even worse, the above vote came just a few days after the U.S. had vetoed another UN resolution calling on South Africa to withdraw from Angola forthwith. Then as in the later vote, the

U.S.A. was the only country to come to the aid and salvation of the other U.S.A. There was a vague, ambiguous statement from the U.S. White House which sought to lay the blame for the invasion as much on Angola as on South Africa. Can you top that? Blaming Angola for being invaded!!! The African, Caribbean and other Third World countries that are immediately concerned about events in Angola had bent over backwards trying to accommodate U.S. concerns in the Southern African region and had re-worded their condemnation of South Africa accordingly to avoid the expected U.S. veto, but it was to no avail.

In a third vote at the close of the week when a move to expel South Africa from the upcoming debate on Namibia was tabled, again it was the U.S. that led the fight to sit South Africa. This time, though she was able to drag 21 other countries with her, the vote to bar South Africa passed by a lopsided 118-22. South Africa, therefore, will be barred from the debate to focus on independence for Namibia scheduled for later this year.

These three votes by the U.S.A. (United States of America) supporting the other U.S.A. (Union of South Africa) have damaged what American credibility this country still had with the rest of the world. The Black community in this country was outraged and a number of prominent figures have initiated steps to correct this country's foreign policy, among them former U.N. ambassadors Andrew Young and Donald McHenry as well as the

National Council of Churches.

The Africans are also considering moves of more effectively dealing with both U.S.A.s. Already all fifty-one African countries have indicated to the International Olympic Committee that they plan to boycott the next Olympics scheduled for Los Angeles in 1984. In 1976, all but five of the African countries stayed away protesting the participation of New Zealand which had hosted a rugby (South African version of football) tour by the South African Springboks. This year, not only has New Zealand allowed another Springbok tour (amidst some of the most violent demonstrations the country has seen in quite some time) but the Springboks are scheduled to come and play in this country later this month.

They had originally scheduled four matches but two of them in Rochester have been cancelled due to popular opposition. The other two, one in Chicago, are still scheduled starting September 18. If they should go on as scheduled, we can all write off the 1984 Olympics because not only will all the Africans boycott but they will most likely be joined by most of the Caribbean, the Soviet Union (remember the Moscow Olympics and the U.S. boycott?) and even some Asian and South American countries have indicated they may join the boycott. Already plans are under way to hold alternative Socialist Games somewhere in Eastern Europe. Maybe in place of all these countries planning to boycott, the U.S.A. can invite the U.S.A.

South Africa recharges Blacks

by Joel Dreyfuss
Pacific News Service

Although the Reagan administration appears largely to have neutralized Black political opposition on domestic issues, a major storm is brewing on the foreign policy front.

To Black Americans who know the legacy of racial injustice in their own country, South African apartheid evokes the same kind of deep-seated emotion that memory of the Holocaust triggers in American Jews. Thus, the recent U.S. veto of the United Nations Security Council resolution condemning South Africa's raid on Angola may well do what the administration's conservative economic and social policies have not: galvanize Black America.

Washington's conciliatory approach to Pretoria already has provoked a formidable organizing effort in Black communities, much of it centered in churches. The Rev. Wyatt T. Walker, pastor of the Canaan Baptist Church in Harlem, heads the New York-based International Freedom Mobilization, a coalition of Black churches in 40 cities across the United States which coordinates Sunday sermons and special exhibits, aimed at politicizing millions of Black voters on the issues of Namibia, Angola, Zimbabwe and South Africa. One Sunday in August, for example, was devoted to South African Liberation Day.

But Black concern on this subject hardly is limited to Sundays or church-goers. A 1980 Black Enterprise poll of its largely middle-class readership showed that more than 90 per cent felt they should participate in the struggle against apartheid. When TransAfrica, a Washington, D.C.-based Black lobby on foreign policy issues, gave a \$100-a-plate dinner last spring, 1,200 people showed up. TransAfrica support committees now are being set up in most major cities.

The Joint Center for Political Studies, a Black think tank in Washington, D.C., which has concentrated on domestic issues, recently obtained major foundation funding to expand into economic and foreign policy areas.

Many of these Black organizations have begun to forge links with traditional white liberal anti-apartheid groups.

While most Black Americans view the situation in southern Africa as a last attempt to retain white supremacy as a legitimate basis for governance, administration conservatives see it differently. For them, it is less a matter of racial injustice and conflict than it is of East-West confron-

tation.

In the Hoover Institution book, "The United States in the 1980s," Peter Duignan and L.H. Gann outline the prevailing conservative view: Decolonization has left Africa worse off; the continent is a "field of international competition" between the Soviet Union and the United States; and American global interests should take precedence over "local concern."

"Despite its authoritarian streak," Duignan and Gann argue, "South Africa is not nearly as oppressive as numerous African dictatorships with whom the United States enjoys correct relationships." Duignan, who has been mentioned as a candidate for U.S. ambassador to South Africa, goes on to suggest that Black South Africans are better off than citizens of other African countries.

This interpretation of the facts is politically convenient, but South Africa—with its rigid racial separations, jobs reserved exclusively for whites, computerized passbook systems, denial of political and educational rights to Blacks, banning orders and family separations forced by the homeland system—would easily qualify as a totalitarian state under U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick's own standards. Moreover, white South Africa's ability to control 20 million Black people is vastly increased by its advanced technological development. Few African dictators have the infrastructure to exercise the kind of control South Africa has over its Black population.

Black South Africans do, in fact, earn higher wages than workers in most other African nations because their country is the continent's richest state. But a recent Rockefeller Foundation report showed that Blacks in the homelands—South Africa's land set aside for "independent Black countries"—actually have lower living standards than Blacks in all but the poorest African nations. For example, the infant mortality rate of Blacks in rural South Africa is 240 per 1,000, compared to 12 for white South Africans and 64 for urban South African Blacks. The infant mortality rate is 160 per 1,000 in Zaire and 200 per 1,000 in Niger.

In the present hostile racial climate at home, the links between such statistics and U.S. domestic politics is sobering: If America still can justify racial repression abroad, it again can justify racial repression here.

In any case, Black Americans and other minority groups have long

been struggling with the legacy of a dual economy created by racial segregation in this country, an economy which is quite similar to that now in existence in South Africa. The arguments about "lower standards" posed by defenders of apartheid sound to U.S. Blacks much like those made by opponents of affirmative action in America. And South Africa's increased repression of Blacks during the very period of its greatest economic growth raises serious questions about the potential effects of supply-side economics at home as well. (Reports last month indicated that Black unemployment shot up to 15 per cent while white unemployment dropped to 6.1 per cent. What will the future bring?)

In a sense, therefore, the real value of the conflict in southern Africa for Black Americans is the clarifying role it plays in their own struggle. Complex economic issues, divisions over busing, the inability to engage whites in a constructive debate about opportunity and racism, have made it difficult for the traditional Black leadership to organize around domestic problems. Economic insecurity has reduced the generosity of white America and threatens to make Blacks scapegoats for many of the nation's problems.

But South Africa is a powerful moral issue, and its moral dimensions offer some surprising possibilities for coalition, among them traditionally conservative Roman Catholics who themselves are angered by the administration's moral insensitivity in Central America.

The impact of other ethnic groups in America on U.S. foreign policy has long been accepted as a factor in the foreign policy process. For example, Jewish and pro-Israel organizations are expected to lobby hard against the sale of AWACs to Saudi Arabia—while the common perception of Blacks is a large, poor, powerless group that has no business in foreign policy. Indeed, a large part of the Black population is sinking evermore deeply into despair.

But an equally large middle class has been created in the last decade. There presently are more middle-class Blacks than middle-class Jews in this country. And in the 1980 election, more Black votes were cast than Jewish votes. Why should they not influence foreign policy?

The Reagan administration's insistence on seeing everything in the Third World—and especially in Africa—in U.S.-Soviet terms could make these signs harbingers of a more potent Black political future as well.

© Pacific News Service, 1981



Bruce Broussard
Editor/Publisher

Portland Observer

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

Subscriptions: \$10.00 per year in Tri-County area. Postmaster: Send address changes to the *Portland Observer*, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208.

283-2486

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York



MEMBER



MEMBER

