

# EDITORIAL/OPINION



## A Mayor with a vision

by Herb L. Cawthorne

## Hold up there, Frank!

For many years it has been the practice of School Board and City Council members to resign before their terms end, thereby allowing their fellow Board members and not the voters to choose their successors. The remaining members can select someone who will fit in with the "club" or, as former School Board member Jonathan Newman so aptly put it as he rejected candidate Dr. Darrell Millner, "a member of the family."

Former appointees currently holding office are School Board members Joe Rieke and Herb Cawthorne, and City Commissioners Mildred Schwab, Charles Jordan and Mike Lindberg.

Frank McNamara has announced that he will resign from the School Board in January, six months before his term ends. McNamara's early resignation sets the stage for the appointment of a successor who will have the advantage of being an incumbent in the March School Board election. This is an expert way either to select a favorite candidate or to reject someone who is not wanted but might feel the urge to run.

Joe Rieke, Charlotte Beeman, Dean Gisvold

and Bill Scott can select this new member. The new member, of course, will be expected to join the coalition of Beeman, Gisvold, Scott and, at times, Rieke. Needless to say, this is a significant problem for those who hope and work for progress toward quality and equity.

McNamara's decision might seem wise at first glance, but actually it is a subversion of the democratic process and a symptom of lack of confidence in the voters. Although McNamara undoubtedly has valid personal reasons for leaving early, he should rescind his decision and remain on the Board at least until after the March election.

The progressive voters must quickly identify and support a candidate who, if not appointed to the vacancy, will challenge the appointee in April.

Additional School Board positions will be up for election in April—those of Rieke, Buel and Scott. Now is the time to organize and support candidates for those positions now held by Rieke and Scott. The time is growing short.

## The real McCoy

The big question in the Oregon Senate is who will be elected Senate President. Frank Roberts of Portland holds the lead but currently lacks the votes to win.

And the bone of contention, at least with some Portland liberals including the editors of *Willamette Week*, is Senator Bill McCoy. While all of Multnomah County's Democratic senators support Roberts—who is reputed to be a "progressive, urban-oriented candidate"—McCoy has thrown his vote to Senator Cliff Trow of Corvallis.

*Willamette Week* castigates the "unreal McCoy" for "teetering on becoming obstructionist" and advises him to "start worrying less about helping downstate presidency candidates and more about helping the state." The newspaper did give McCoy a compliment though, calling him a "progressive, urban-oriented legislator who has conscientiously represented Portland interests for nearly a decade." This is high praise for McCoy, compared to that newspaper's usual less favorable descriptions of McCoy's work in the legislature.

We must compliment McCoy on his stand and trust that he will not give in too easily to his fellow Portland legislators. McCoy explained that he had committed his vote to Trow months ago when Trow had successfully served as Senate President Pro-Tem and sees no reason now to go back on that promise.

There are times when it is proper to put personal commitments before politics, and for McCoy, this is the time. It behooves McCoy's constituents to watch carefully to see if the eventual winner takes revenge by denying McCoy choice appointments as has frequently happened in the past. Principles before politics, Mr. President.

## Our president

Our president is spending his week visiting some of the poorest nations on earth offering bombs not bread, war not peace, destruction not development, annihilation not education. This is our contribution to the world?

## Weapons bring super-violence

(Continued from page 1 column 6) with weapons of much greater accuracy and possibly higher rates of fire and mobility. It will feature intensive electronic warfare and possibly chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons."

Clearly, the prospect for survival of soldiers sent into combat in such a conflict will not be very high. In another Pentagon report, defense officials note that "Because of technical advances in weaponry and the great mobility of armies today, a future large-scale war overseas will probably... produce casualties at a higher rate than in any other war in history."

Based on these assumptions, the

Pentagon has estimated that in any full-scale conflict with Soviet or Soviet-backed forces in the Middle East, the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force could expect to lose 66 percent of its personnel in the first 60 days of combat—a casualty rate far higher than that ever experienced by U.S. forces in comparable engagements.

Besides the human tragedy involved, such casualty rates would tend to lower the threshold at which tactical nuclear weapons would be used. And once that occurred, it would only be a short step to the outbreak of all-out thermonuclear warfare.

All this suggests that the distinctions between different types of warfare—localized and global, conventional and nuclear—are rapidly breaking down. Therefore, involvement in any type of conflict involves the risk of escalation to all-out nuclear war.

Most important, it suggests that the Reagan Administration's plan to enhance U.S. security through a \$1.6 trillion military buildup and stepped-up arms sales to allies will produce little real protection so long as the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms continues, and that only a vigorous program of both nuclear and conventional arms control will improve our chances of survival in an era of super-violence.

© PACIFIC NEWS SERVICE 1982

There's some jockeying going on at City Hall. Which of the present City Council members will run for Mayor? Your guess is as good as mine. The fact is many, many people in this city think that the present Mayor, Frank Ivancie, needs a good challenge. Then, if the people of Portland elect him again, they deserve what they will get.

Looking through the dictionary for words to describe Portland's present Mayor, one would choose such words as contentious, abrasive, insecure, and paranoid. Putting words together to make phrases, Ivancie would be described as "lacking in vision," "unable to coordinate with others," and as having a "political chip on his shoulder."

Recently, Mayor Ivancie sought Council approval to include intelligent, detective type dogs in the Police Bureau's arsenal. The proposal got bogged down in the Council proceedings. Why? Mayor Ivancie refused to grant his fellow Council members the simple professional courtesy of consultation or the basic respect that comes with the legislative responsibility of the Council. Consequently, the whole affair looked like a cartoon—with Council members slinging mud across the Council chambers, the Mayor complaining with dirt on his face, and the people wondering what the controversy is all about.

The Mayor does not understand the process. He's impatient and self-centered. He ignores the fact that

Portland does not have a strong mayoral system. It requires cooperation, coordination and a special brand of leadership. In this regard, Ivancie has been promoted far beyond his level of competence.

When Ivancie proposed a wage freeze for city employees, it was a good idea, timely and responsive. But his surprise announcement caught his colleagues off guard. It was down hill from there.

The crime rate in Portland has risen over the past few years. The Mayor's response was a War On Crime program that makes the criminals laugh in the streets. Nothing to deal with the elderly being ripped off daily, nothing to deal with drugs, nothing to deal with violent crimes. A simple public relations campaign. But even in so simple a program the Mayor ignored all sense of process. He did not consult with the very members of the Council who were required by law to approve his new ordinances. Had he consulted, taken suggestions, organized a joint venture among the Council, his War on Crime might have been introduced as more than a comedy act.

The Mayor lacks vision. Pure and simple. A sound vision does not always make friends, but when enemies are made, they are the result of aggressive action toward a specific end. Ivancie's actions make enemies where none are necessary. He creates a heated debate on issues on which he can achieve unanimous agreement. He doesn't know where

he wants the city to go. Therefore, every issue is fought as a major battle, every disagreement becomes the vicious "enemy" who's out to get him.

The people of Portland will have to think carefully about the kind of mayor needed to revitalize our potential. Mayor Ivancie is, perhaps, the most undesirable force Portland could have in these times. Our City Council is made up of people with rather average ability. Coordinated and working in harmony, they have a chance to be outstanding. They are not "outstanding" as individuals, but if they worked together as a team, they could do Portland proud. Teamwork is impossible with a quarterback who changes the plays at the line of scrimmage without telling any of his teammates. Coordination is the key to the effectiveness of this present City Council, and coordination is Frank Ivancie's weakest suit.

As the race begins to take shape in these early stages, let it be known that Portland needs a leader as Mayor. We need a leader with vision, and the courage to express it, defend it, and persuade others of its correctness. We need a Mayor who respects his colleagues—if not on their merits as politicians, then on the simple fact that he depends on their votes to guide the city toward a better future.

As the race begins to take shape in its early stages, let it be known that what Portland needs is a leader who doesn't know where

## Letters

### Return NAACP

To the editor:

On December 12, 1982 at 4 p.m. in the Vancouver Avenue First Baptist Church, the Portland Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People will have its annual election. This time there will be a choice and not an echo. Mrs. Hazel Hays, present chairman of the Oregon Parole Board has been nominated to run against Bernard B. Richardson, a public relations man for Portland General Electric Power Company. This will be a contest to return the Branch to the people.

Portland Branch NAACP leadership for the last ten years has come from those who want a business-like approach, who would have the Branch enter most of the movements in the city as members of a coalition. Further, at times it has seemed that money has been more important than members. The contest between Mrs. Hays and Mr. Richardson is a philosophical one. Mrs. Hays and her supporters feel that the branch has lost identity in Portland over the last several years. Who knows what the NAACP stands for here in Portland today? Mr. Richardson has expressed interest in the NAACP ACTSO program for young people. We are all interested in ACTSO. It is probably the best program for young people the NAACP has devised in many years. PGE, PP&L, and other business interests have been most generous. But we are sure the white business community will continue to interest themselves as long as our young people have a good program and exceptional contestants.

What Portland Branch needs now is a program addressing NAACP's longtime and only job—civil rights. Mrs. Hays is prepared to provide that kind of leadership. When she was Chairman of the Branch Labor Committee in 1968 the Branch "cracked" discrimination at the U.S. Post Office, in employment, promotion and salary. In fact the Portland Branch received a Thalheimer award for this effort because this case not only affected Portland, but the labor policies of the Post Office in the entire United States.

Mrs. Hays has served NAACP since she was a young person, and plans to continue to do so whatever the outcome of the election. She has shown by her actions that she is a real NAACP-er, ready to fight for



### Error reflects attitude

To the editor:

The *Oregonian* should be commended for its efforts to portray the various facets of Portland's black community. The series of articles were well balanced and thought-provoking. Too often the black community is taken for granted both politically and economically. Unfortunately, *The Oregonian* made what amounts to a glaring mistake to those of us that are members of the black community. On Tuesday, November 16, 1982, on page B3, there appeared two pictures of Portland's leading black businessmen, Henry Scott, president of Coast Janitorial Services, and Venerable Booker, president of American State Bank. The name under each picture mistakenly identifies each man as the other person.

Some people will say that such a misprint is no big deal and we in "the community" should be grateful to have had the article and pictures printed. I disagree. Does this

misprint reflect a lackadaisical attitude toward even the most respected members of the black community? Or is it simply a misprint by a copy person in the basement who did not know any better? Or didn't care? Certainly, you would never confuse a picture of Frank Ivancie and Jack Ramsey.

As a Product Manager for a major corporation in Portland, I realize the responsibility of a company for the quality of its product. If we drop the ball and deliver less than the expected quality, consumers of our product will waste no time in bringing the matter to our attention.

As a customer of *The Oregonian*, I was elated to read about the feature series, but truly let down to see the previously noted misprint, which represents in one word "carelessness." I am sure the audible groan I could not suppress was voiced throughout "the community." Nothing has changed.

Baruti L. Artharee



### Receive your Observer by mail—Subscribe today! Only \$10<sup>00</sup> per year.

Mail to: Portland Observer  
Box 3137  
Portland, Oregon 97208

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_



### 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

MEMBER  
**NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION - Founded 1885**

Al McGilberry, Editor/Publisher  
Al Williams, Advertising Manager

National Advertising Representative  
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.  
New York

### The Observer presents: Community Forum "The Legislature and You"

Senator Bill McCoy  
Rep. Ed Leek  
Rep. Wally Priestley  
Rep. Gratton Kerans

December 4  
10:00 a.m.

The Rustler  
Grand Ave.