

EDITORIAL/OPINION

The current dispute between Commissioner Margaret Strachan and Human Resources Bureau Director Erma Hepburn undoubtedly has roots in earlier fears that Commissioner Strachan wanted to remove Hepburn and CETA program director Joe Gonzales through civil service procedures. While these procedures are instituted to provide a just process for filling governmental positions, abuses occur frequently enough so that continued fears of traditionally excluded groups are understandable and watchdogging is rational and prudent.

Questioning from the press and the community of the possible underlying motives in undertaking civil service reform is legitimate even when the Commissioner leading the charge is a progressive whom we have praised as an advocate for government social responsibility.

However, even giving her the benefit of any doubt and assuming completely pure motives in Strachan's attempt with Commissioner Lindberg to bring added accountability to the civil service process, there is little doubt that Strachan's office was very recently seriously considering firing Erma Hepburn.

While Strachan "does not discuss personnel matters with the press," it is obvious her staff discussed such matters with a member of the mayor's staff, seemingly no less a breach of her employee's confidence. And if Strachan or her staff assumed such a discussion with the Mayor's staff would remain confidential, then she and/or her staff evidenced great naivete. That the Mayor's chief aide went directly to a close friend of Hepburn's on Commissioner Jordan's staff speaks for itself.

What appears baffling at this point is what the "discussion," as Strachan calls it, between her and Hepburn is all about. According to

Strachan, she has never said Hepburn was incapable. Of course, absence of public challenge does not necessarily signify confidence. But there have been, apparently, no major disagreements between them on the directions the HRB should be going in times that try all human service managers' skills and commitment. And, according to Strachan, Hepburn understands that her civil service reform attempts are not aimed at Hepburn personally, but at making the award of City government positions based on merit rather than politics.

So where are the problems between the two aggressively outspoken women that necessitate "discussion" between them and attempts by Strachan's office to involve the Mayor's office in firing the woman the Mayor himself appointed for whatever reasons?

Obviously, there are problems between Strachan and Hepburn that will not be publicly discussed. But any merit-related problems Commissioner Strachan has with Erma Hepburn could be dealt with in the civil service written exam and interview process which has begun. It is most unfortunate and disappointing that the "fair civil service process" Commissioner Strachan sought for Hepburn and other City employees was not viewed as the process that alone would provide fairness and demonstrate integrity in permanently filling the HRB Director position. Instead, Strachan's office fostered the very thing she is supposedly seeking to avoid, playing politics in filling positions and betraying the personnel confidences her employees and the City have a right to expect.

Maybe we're naive, but nonetheless, we are hoping that Strachan and Hepburn bury the hatchet, not in each other, but in common ground mutually searched for and discovered between them.

Lebanon: One Jewish viewpoint

Last week we ran the first installment of excerpts from Martin Peretz's "Lebanon Eyewitness," an article which appeared in *The New Republic*, Aug. 2, 1982. This week's excerpts conclude the article.

Of course, there are Israelis who didn't want action from Jerusalem, even if taken solely in Israel's interests. "I was one of them," said Clinton Bailey. "I was dead-set against this war." Bailey... is a prominent Arabist; he teaches courses on Palestinian nationalism and Bedoin culture. He's been a burr under the saddle of successive Israeli governments, having become a tribune for the nomadic Bedoins displaced by modernization. A Lebanese municipal official told me that Bailey [now serving as... advisor... in southern Lebanon], was particularly sensitive to questions of Arab dignity, "which is why he made sure that the administration of the city was quickly given over to the Lebanese. We had not really had it for six years."

That's the story I was told by Lebanese all over southern Lebanon, in the big cities and the smaller towns, by Christians and Moslems, by people of all classes and educational levels. "I had thought that the PLO had fought for a foothold in Lebanon," Bailey told me. "Not till I came here and spoke to the Lebanese themselves did I realize what the PLO had done here, that they had established a stranglehold."

That is the great untold story of the last six years. It unfolds in every encounter with a Lebanese, even from those few still sympathetic to the plight of the Palestinians. Everyone has his own grievance his own memories. The simplest is that the PLO endangered everyone's lives by making southern Lebanon a target of the Israeli military. But it rarely stops with that. The PLO, it turns out, was not a guerrilla army in a friendly sea.

Khalil, a 25-year-old Moslem who had just left West Beirut, told me

that his brother had been killed by a sniper shooting from a Palestinian stronghold. Jabber, slightly younger, said that his family's car had been confiscated by a PLO faction. Hussein said that his sister was constantly being accused of being an Israeli spy: "Not true; she resisted some Palestinian's advances." Ahmet said, "They got their way always by showing the pistol; if not the pistol, the Kalashnikov." Toufek—his brother called him Tommy—said, "This was our land and they ran it as if it were theirs." I heard similar complaints dozens of times.

The PLO's behavior in the south does not quite fit the neat image its propagandists convey to the press. Confiscations, harassments, young people forced into the militias, schools closed, rapes, molestations, commandeering of licenses, passports, services, offices: this was the stuff of everyday life in the web of the PLO's "state-within-a-state." A doctor in the former PLO "protectorate" of Sidon reported that the PLO regularly sacked hospitals and doctor's offices for medical supplies. "We couldn't keep our ambulances. The local population suffered." So much so that whole villages and towns were evacuated, sometimes leaving only the aged and the infirm. The Shiite village of Arnon, for example, in the far south, near Beaufort, or Rihane farther north.

I spent some time in others. Aichiye is one. It was a Maronite village of maybe 3,000 people, emptied save for 30, maybe 40, since shortly after a PLO massacre that took 75 lives. I have before me the names of comparable towns with comparable recent histories: Brih, Kaa, Jdaidet Baalbeck, Kaddam. There is a similar list of Lebanese towns shot up by the Syrians. No one pretends that the massacres were one-sided—Maronites shed the blood of Moslems, too, rivers of blood. Even Pere Boulos Oneid, Aichiye's mayor-priest, admits that. But he still seemed stunned by the world's indifference, and even the Pope's, to

the PLO's "rape of my native village. I am happy to be back. Ten or fifteen families return every day. Maybe with the grim lessons of the past behind us we will be able to live better with our neighbors."

The Palestinians have always been hostage to the recalcitrance of their leaders. For sixty years a compromise was possible between the two peoples whose past and futures are inextricably tied to the one land of historic Palestine. But no compromise satisfied the Arab leadership—not even the tiny little statelets proposed for the Jews by the British in the 1930s, not even the partition plan of 1947. The PLO was formed, it is urgent to remember, in 1964, when the West Bank and Gaza and East Jerusalem were all still in Arab hands. Always the Palestinians were hostage to the dream of a map without Israel. That's why the leadership never really permitted the mass resettlement of refugees anywhere. Their homelessness was to fester and explode; the camps were to be the launching pad for "the return." UNRWA, initially a humanely motivated operation, became hostage to the refusal of the Arabs to find a compromise.

The Arabs of Palestine suborned their rights to the exiles in Lebanon, and the exiles chose armed struggle. The truly enormous caches of arms I saw, heavy arms, from the Soviet Union and North Korea and France and the U.S. were not being stockpiled for the social service organization which Jonathan Randal now says (*Washington Post*, July 8) is the real function of the PLO. All those weapons... held the Palestinians in thrall to the idea of some decisive defeat of the Israelis. It was the PLO which, having chosen armed struggle, inevitably provoked it, and was decisively defeated in it. Surrounded and isolated in Beirut, its fighters are now hostage to the idea of dying for Palestine. As in Sidon and Tyre, cities held hostage for six years, they don't care who dies with them, and their partisans don't really seem to care either...

Dartmouth College: Ivy league racism, part II

by Dr. Manning Marable
"From The Grassroots"

On April 24, I spoke before a student audience at Dartmouth College on the necessity to rebuild the black and progressive white student movement. During the lecture, I criticized the racist and sexist articles which had appeared over the past two years in the *Dartmouth Review*, a conservative students' publication. Specifically I deplored the blatantly racist polemics of the paper's president, Keeney Jones.

Since Jones was conspicuously present, someone asked what should be done about the reactionary publication. My response was that "Jones and company have the right to express their opinions," but that blacks and progressive students had the right to demonstrate and organize to oppose and to defeat their views. After the talk, a number of us marched across the campus in a candlelight vigil in support of equal opportunities for minorities at Dartmouth. I subsequently wrote an essay on the situation at Dartmouth which appeared in newspapers across the country.

In the weeks that followed, the political situation in this "ivy league" campus community rapidly worsened. Even according to the *New York Times*, by late May a "state of division" existed. "The relationship between campus and paper has turned ugly and violent."

The *Dartmouth Review* continued to insult blacks, feminists, Native Americans, gays and others. The editors charged that the "tires of their delivery truck were slashed and its windows were smashed." Copies of the paper were gathered up and trashed by black students. At Donald Temple, of the National Council of Black Lawyers, wrote letters to two *Review* advisers, President Ronald Reagan and Congressman Jack Kemp, asking them to condemn the "blatantly racist publication." On May 11, Kemp issued a letter of resignation from the board, declaring that he was "deeply distressed" by the "racial stereotypes" in Keeney's controversial essay. This public act may have been only symbolic, however. "He sent us another letter saying that he was under a lot of political pressure," stated the *Review's* editor, E. William Cattin, Jr., "but that he was still a kindred spirit."

Matters came to a head in late May. When Benjamin J. Hart, a student founder of the *Review*, distributed papers in the Alumni Center on May 21, he was confronted by a black man, Samuel W. Smith, associate director of Dartmouth's alumni fund. Smith informed Hart that he was going to "throw out" the first *Review* member he saw in the building. A fight occurred, with Hart being kicked, punched, and his glasses broken. On May 22, local police arrested Smith on the charge of "simple assault." Two days later, he pleaded no contest in Hanover District Court, was found guilty and was fined \$250, of which \$150

was suspended.

The incident, and the controversy surrounding the paper, prompted Dartmouth faculty members finally to take a stand. On May 24, by a vote of 113-5, with 9 abstentions, the faculty endorsed a resolution criticizing the *Review*. The resolution deplored "the abuses of responsible journalism" of the paper, stating that it had "contributed to an undesirable atmosphere of distrust and divisiveness. The effect... has been to polarize segments of the college and to hamper the open and free exchange of ideas and opinions." Classics Professor Edward Bradley characterized the faculty resolution as "tepid and toothless," because it did not call for any specific action against the *Review*. But the statement at least prompted Dartmouth President David McLaughlin belatedly to issue his first public condemnation of the *Review*.

By June, several prominent national conservatives had spoken out in defense of the *Review*. Its chief defender was Patrick Buchanan, a former Nixon Administration speechwriter. His ultraright views were too extreme for many Republicans. In *White House Years*, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger confessed that "Buchanan was the resident conservative, deeply wary of those whom he suspected of deflecting Nixon from his natural right-wing orientation, convinced that a cabal of intellectuals was confusing the pristine quality of the President's philosophy, unwilling to accept that it was in the nature of our many-faceted principal to show a different face to different people. He was rarely used in Nixon's foreign policy speeches—I can remember only the Cambodia speech." This was the public decision to dramatically escalate the Vietnam War into Cambodia, which was followed by the killing of four student protesters at Kent State, Ohio, on May 4, 1970.

In the *New York Post* (June 5), Buchanan defended the *Review* as one of "the best-written, best-read of the dissenting conservative campus journals that now dot the Ivy League in the age of Ronald Reagan." He condemned the campus faculty for censoring the *Review*, and attacked McLaughlin's role in the process as "further enrich[ing] the phrase 'academic wimpiness.'" Buchanan justified Jones' racist diatribes with the statement, "after all, the *Dartmouth Review* is not *Der Stuermer*." The right winger ended his essay with a plea which could have been lifted from one of Nixon's speeches: "Are we truly to accept that, on the Ivy League campuses... where wearing the American flag as a loincloth was acceptable [and] where shrines were built to Ho Chi Minh while his troops were killing lesser privileged American boys, [that] a column poking fun at black studies written in mock 'Black English,' 'tests to the utmost'

Dartmouth's commitment to freedom of expression?"

Somewhat overshadowed, but not lost in the exchange of polemics, was the actual condition of minority students at Dartmouth. According to one Dartmouth student organizer, a large march was held on campus last semester which proceeded to the open trustees meeting. "The trustees felt ambushed," this source reports, "and it was all they could talk about the rest of the weekend. For once, the students were so well educated on the issues that the trustees' ignorance, arrogance and paternalism really showed through." A Dartmouth graduate and participant in the Foundation Years Program, the Rev. Siddha Webber, spoke before the audience. "All the trustees present had come on board since Foundation Years was terminated and none of them had heard of it. Students outraged at that roared back," the student states.

At a subsequent trustees meeting in June, students "forced the question of Latino admissions." Despite some concessions, the overall situation appears uncertain. Black matriculation dropped 50 per cent for this September at Dartmouth, according to one source. Racial and political tensions, fanned by the *Review's* increasingly obnoxious style, are high. The *Review* has raised \$100,000 from alumni to continue publication. The Jerry Falwell of the Moral Majority was asked to join the advisory board in Kemp's place. As Dartmouth professor and *Review* mentor Jeff Hart joked, at Dartmouth "some of my best friends are white."

From the *Dartmouth Review*:

Dese boys be sayin' that we be comin' here to Dartmut an' not takin' the classics. You know, Homa, Shakespeare; but I hea' dy all be co'd in da ground, six feet unda, and whatchu be askin' us to learn from dem? We be culturally 'lightened too. We be takin' hard courses in many subjects, like Afro-Am Studies, Women's Studies, and Policy Studies. And who be mountin' 'bout us not bein good read? I be practicly knowin' Roots cova to cova, til' my mine be boogying to da words! An' I be watchin' the Jeffersons on TV til' I be blue in da face. Say what, mo-fo? I can't be blue? Scuse me. Shee!

—*Dartmouth Review*,
March 15, 1982

It is not a question of whether women should be educated at Dartmouth, it is a question of whether women should be educated at all.

—October 17, 1980

People criticize the British Empire, but look at Africa. The only country doing halfway well is South Africa, and you know their policies. In fact, the prosperity of an African nation is directly proportional to the number of Europeans that are left running the place.

—March 8, 1982

Letter to the Editor

El Salvador swept under rug?

To the editor:

In an outrageous violation of the Oregon initiative process, County counsel has ruled the Multnomah County El Salvador initiative off the November ballot. The initiative, which is an advisory vote on whether U.S. aid to El Salvador's brutal regime should continue or not, gathered 17,000 signatures, over 4,000 more than needed to qualify. The County's legal counsel claims it's not a legitimate petition because it doesn't call for a specific local action, but rather offers advice on foreign policy.

Isn't it a matter of local concern whether Portland's tax dollars and Portland's young men in uniform are used to support the El Salvador regime's brutality? Voters should certainly be able to express themselves on these and other vital national questions.

The El Salvador Initiative Coalition, which organized the petition drive, is asking people to write or call their County Commissioners soon to protest and call for the reinstatement of the initiative. The Coa-

lition believes opinion on the commission is close enough that public pressure can make a difference.

Send mail to: (Your commissioner), 1021 SW 4th, Portland, OR 97201, or call Dennis Buchanan (West Side, 248-5220), Earl Blumenauer (Outer Southeast, 248-5218), Gordon Shadburne (East County, 248-5213), Gladys McCoy (North and Northeast, 248-5219), Caroline Miller (Inner Southeast, 248-5217).

John Blank
Secretary, Portland Citizens Party

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: \$10.00 per year in the 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

Al McGilberry, Editor/Publisher

Al Williams, Advertising Manager



MEMBER

NATIONAL NEWSPAPER
Association - Founded 1885



Hi! My Mom and Dad read the *Portland Observer*—why not you? Subscribe today!

Subscribe today!
Receive your *Observer* by mail.
Only \$10 per year

Portland Observer
Box 3137
Portland, OR 97208

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____