

# EDITORIAL/OPINION

## Citizen Achievement Awards

The Observer is proud to present Citizen Achievement Awards to persons with outstanding achievement in their fields.

Each is an example of individual accomplishment in his field of endeavor and each serves as a roll model for youth.

We present the Man and Woman of the year — Ronnie Herndon and Linda Williams — selected for outstanding service to the community; Ruth Haefner for her many years of work for others.

In the various fields: Corporate Executive,

Earl Wantland; Finance and Banking, V.F. Booker; Sports Executive, Harry Glickman; Small Business, Cora Smith.

State Government, Gretchen Kafoury; County Government, Don Clark; City Government, Charles Jordan; Community Service, Edna Robertson.

It will our pleasure to present these awards at our first annual awards banquet in April. Each year we will look forward to honoring those who serve.

## Prisons or milk?

President Reagan has proposed additional \$1 billion cuts in the Aid to Dependent Children (AFDC) program. This would be added to the \$1 billion already removed from the program in fiscal 1982.

The administration says the reductions, along with reductions in other social and educational programs, will help erase the projected \$150 billion deficit.

Among the suggested methods to absorb this cut is to terminate AFDC to children over 16 years. This would mean that the family would receive no money to feed and clothe teen-age children who are still in school. The result would be to force the child out of the home or deprive younger children in the home.

This is a heartless proposal—to force young

people out of their homes and into the streets. It comes at a time of high unemployment, especially among young people, and a time when opportunities for training and education are being eliminated.

Along with this proposal come drastic federal cuts in education and employment training, and state and local cuts in education, vocational training, rehabilitation services, social services, etc.

What are young people deprived of home, education and employment supposed to do in this country? Join the growing numbers of prostitutes, addicts, beggars and thieves and spend the majority of their lives in jail?

Would we really rather build prisons than feed our children?

## Consider state lottery

Governor Vic Atiyeh has proposed a series of budget cuts to meet the expected state budget deficit. These reductions cut deeply into the education and human services programs.

The Democrats—who traditionally have attempted to develop and protect programs to assist the disadvantaged—have arrived in Salem for the Special Session of the Legislature that begins Monday without a program.

Having already gone through budget cuts some of the state agencies serving the poor, children, and the elderly are unable to absorb additional cuts and still provide even basic services.

The governor's budget also proposes such drastic cuts in higher education, in economic development, in forestry research, in environmental protection that future generations will be endangered.

As opposed to making these drastic cuts the Legislature will have to consider other sources of revenue. Limitation of property tax relief to only those of low-income would return millions

to the general fund. Increased corporation taxes, luxury taxes and a sales tax will probably be considered and rejected.

The Legislature should also study the potential revenue that could be raised through a state lottery. Oregon is conservative with respect to gambling—outlawing everything except racing and Bingo games operated by non-profit organizations.

Many states and local jurisdictions use a lottery to supplement their general fund budgets or to support specific programs. There has been much opposition to a lottery here based on morality, on the idea that the poor are more likely to abuse it, that compulsive gambling will deprive their families. Perhaps these are valid fears.

The Legislature should study the issue and determine whether some type of lottery would be a valid method to raise funds to provide food, shelter and medical care for the state's most needy.



## Comrade Mazordze's unfinished agenda

by Fungai Kumbula

(Note: Zimbabwe's Minister of Health, Dr. Mazordze, died on December 5th, 1981, after having been in office for just over three weeks. Previously he had been the deputy Minister of Health. Thousands of grieving Zimbabweans attended his funeral.)

Before his appointment as the Minister of Health of Zimbabwe, following the dismissal of Dr. Ushewokunze, the late Comrade Dr. Mazordze had granted the following interview in which he had spelled out some of the Ministry of Health's objectives. These objectives are designed to overcome the imbalances and inequities in health care inherited from previous colonial regimes.

Briefly: fully 75 per cent of the three hundred or so doctors in private practice in the country were based either in Bulawayo or Salisbury. Further, Salisbury's hospitals, though serving only about ten per cent of the population, were gobbling up a whopping 30 per cent of the national health budget. There was, therefore, a definite need to correct this imbalance so all Zimbabweans can be more equally served.

In the said interview, Comrade Mazordze touched on the work the Ministry of Health was engaged in restoring the rural hospitals that had been forced to close as the War of Independence intensified. By the time the War ended, only four hospitals out of a total of sixteen were still operational and, even then, only at half capacity.

The Ministry had managed to secure a grant from the government of the United States to restore these hospitals and clinics and bring them back to 100 per cent capacity.

"To overcome the manpower shortage, we have been using former guerrilla medics who had been the only health professionals in the last stages of the war anyway," added Comrade Mazordze.

He went on to add that there had been a fair amount of resistance when the Ministry of Health first broached the subject of democratizing Zimbabwe's health services. Towards the end of last year, the

Ministry had decreed that those people earning less than U.S. \$210 per month should be entitled to free medical care. A subsequent survey carried out by the Ministry found that less than 5 per cent of the people in the rural areas were making more than \$140 for a whole year. So, the Ministry felt justified in making this decree some objections notwithstanding.

The people raising these objections and who needed convincing about the inequality of health care for the masses were mostly doctors and other similar health professionals, according to the Ministry of Health. After the Ministry stood firm, however, Dr. Mazordze concedes the objectors did begin to see things the same way even though it took them a year-and-a-half to do so.

Asked whether a lot of doctors had not chosen to leave the country rather than follow the Ministry's directives, Comrade Mazordze said this was not the problem at all. The Ministry was more concerned with the reorientation of the emphasis placed on manpower.

So far, this emphasis has been on curative rather than preventive medicine. A lot of the diseases in Zimbabwe are preventable and so more time and resources should be spent on teaching the people in the rural areas how to improve their general health through nutrition, hygiene and immunization programs. This has involved retraining some of the resident nurses we inherited who tended sometimes to be incapable of running rural health clinics on their own. The medical assistants we are now training are a lot more versatile because their training is geared towards serving the people.

On the publicity Zimbabwe's efforts to integrate traditional medicine into the health system have been getting in the overseas media, Dr. Mazordze said that there really wasn't anything new in that. All that his Ministry was doing was to legalize their existence—they were there (the traditional healers) before the onset of colonialism and they have survived to this day. Some of them are very good botanists and they excel in the area of psychiatry.

"But where I think we have been misunderstood, and deliberately too, I think, because it makes it easier to discredit us, is the idea that we are going to take the traditional healers and mix them with the doctors. This is not at all what we are trying to do.

We are trying to get the traditional healers to come out into the open, to talk about their secrets, and how they can use them to the benefit of all. The two systems, the Western style medical practice and the traditional healers are completely separate. We want to encourage a system where there is an interplay between them," the good Doctor explained.

Of the recent government ban of the controversial contraceptive Depo Provera, which has attracted a lot of attention abroad, Comrade Mazordze said the brouhaha was unfortunate and, again, a matter of being misunderstood. The government had decided last year to phase out Depo Provera, not to ban it outright. It was the vested interests involved in the marketing of this drug that raised all the ruckus.

It had been decided that since the drug had not been proven to be 100 per cent medically safe, it would be safer to phase it out over time and the Family Planning Association was advised to put patients on alternative and proven contraceptives.

"We have accepted the need for family planning, and this government has actually increased spending for it. But we also believe that family planning should be taken as part and parcel of our whole development effort..."

If we can provide social benefits during illness, or accidents, or guarantee education- and old-age-benefits, then the need for more children diminishes. That is much more important in the long run," the Comrade said in concluding the interview.

These are some of the programs the late Minister had in mind when he so suddenly and tragically left us barely three weeks ago. No doubt the carrying through of all these programs by his successors will be a fitting tribute to this our departed Hero.

## The nuclear war

by Manning Marable

Two things are certain about the Reagan Administration—it has an absolute contempt for human life and a total disregard for international peace. If Reagan's domestic economic and social policies have reaped massive unemployment and human suffering, then his foreign policies on the question of nuclear arms control must be viewed as a similar disaster.

The first eight months of Reagan's Administration were not unexpectedly characterized by vicious attacks on national liberation movements (in Nicaragua, Grenada, Angola, and other countries) and by a call to establish U.S. nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. The justification for the \$180 billion nuclear arms budget was Reagan's view that the only way to deal with "Soviet aggression" was from a "position of strength." Reagan appointed Cold Warriors to sensitive positions, such as Paul Nitze, chief negotiator for the Geneva arms limitation talks with the Soviets, and Eugene Rostow, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Reagan even made public statements that argued in effect that a nuclear war between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. could be "limited" to certain geographical regions. An exchange of deadly 20 megaton bombs would not destroy mankind.

By the fall of 1981, however, Reagan was forced to retreat from his Cold War rhetoric. Conservative white voters in Nevada and Utah voiced opposition to the MX missile system (originally proposed by President Carter), and the plan was changed. On Veterans Day thousands of students at over 150 college campuses attended teach-ins on the mounting danger of a nuclear holocaust. On November 17, 1981, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops denounced Reagan's mas-

sive arms buildup and called on U.S. Catholics to support strategies of international peace. In October and November several million Europeans, both in the West and in Communist states, held rallies and demonstrations against nuclear weapons. Many Western political leaders attacked the U.S. plan to deploy 572 Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe in 1983.

Reagan's next move was a publicity gimmick, designed to blunt Western Europe's criticisms of his insane nuclear policies. Proclaiming his new commitment to world peace, Reagan proposed on November 18 a "zero-option" in Europe. The Soviets had to dismantle their 600 intermediate-range missiles already in place in Western Russia, and stop putting others into place. In return, the U.S. would agree not to put their cruise and Pershing II missiles in Western Europe next year. Reagan's "zero-option" was hailed by the U.S. press, both major U.S. political parties, and by most Western European political leaders as a genuine proposal toward peace.

As in Reagan's domestic policies, the "zero-option" was hardly designed to work. Sufficient political opposition had developed in England, Holland and other countries to America's proposed missiles such that it was already doubtful that the U.S. would be able to deploy all of its weapons. Soviet leader Brezhnev had, two weeks before Reagan's move, rejected the idea of "zero-option." Reagan's own Secretary of State Alexander Haig, hardly "soft on Communism," had previously termed the "zero-option" unrealistic. And even if the Soviets agreed to Reagan's terms, the Administration's next step would be to place the same cruise missiles in U.S. submarines off Western Europe. Since missiles in submarines are impossible to verify, the Soviets would be forced to increase their missile production—leading inevitably to a

greater, not lesser, possibility of World War III.

The U.S. spends billions of taxpayers' dollars every year for nuclear weapons which could be channeled more productively for health care, full employment, education, agricultural production, and other human essentials. The cost of the cruise missile alone is \$11 billion. Both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. build two to three nuclear weapons daily. If present nuclear arms production continues, by 1991 there will be 75,000 nuclear warheads, fifty per cent more than today, with an explosive power of over two million Hiroshima bombs. Perhaps a dozen more nations—including racist South Africa, South Korea and Israel—will possess nuclear weapons by 1991.

We must understand that no one wins in a nuclear conflict. A single one-megaton bomb, dropped over any major U.S. city would create a fireball over one mile in diameter, destroy 50 square miles of city area, and permanently blind all persons in a 1,000-square-mile vicinity who looked at the fireball. A full-scale nuclear war would kill approximately 100 million Americans, and at least 50 million more would die from radioactive fallout or other injuries within weeks.

The only possibility for human survival is a clearcut end to the nuclear madness. Both the U.S. and U.S.S.R. must reduce and eventually outlaw the production of nuclear weapons, dismantle existing systems, and adopt an intensive program to halt the spread of nuclear weapons to all nations. We have the political responsibility in this country to force out of office any politician who does not favor the ultimate destruction of nuclear weaponry. Building a broad opposition to Reagan's cruel domestic agenda means that progressive people must overturn his foreign policies and nuclear agenda as well.



### Portland Observer

The Portland Observer (USPS 959-880) 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: \$10.00 per year in Tri-County area. Postmaster: Send address changes to the Portland Observer, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208.



A. Lee Henderson, Publisher  
Al McGilberry, Managing Editor

Al Williams, Advertising Manager  
National Advertising Representative  
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.  
New York

283-2486