

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Congratulations Jesse!

Jesse Jackson's Middle East initiative, resulting in the freeing of Lt. Goodman by Syria, is to be applauded. Jackson has shown himself to be not simply an adroit campaigner, but more, that he is able to provide real political leadership.

Jackson's purpose, in addition to gaining Goodman's release, was to reduce the tension between the U.S. and Syria, and to create a diplomatic climate favorable to more fruitful negotiations. In this he was successful—with the re-

sult that pressure has been put on the Reagan administration to pursue more peaceful options.

Jackson's visit has also created a more open political climate in the U.S., where overnight it is now easier to present a case for an alternate U.S. foreign policy based on peaceful negotiations, instead of military confrontation in defense of U.S. corporate interests.

So congratulations, Jesse—run, and keep on running!

Reagan should oust Graham

We ought to be used to racial slurs from Reagan appointees by now, but the latest set of remarks—by Dr. George C. Graham, a member of President Reagan's Task Force on Food Assistance—is simply incredible.

Not only has Graham denied the reality that there are hungry Black children in America, but he has the gall to blame the problem of low birth weights and premature births of Black children on the mothers, advising them to "avoid sex during pregnancy."

Common sense alone would tell you that low birth weights have something to do with malnourished mothers, and nothing to do with sex. But not trusting to common sense, we called

Zuky Sak, Prenatal Care Specialist at Outside In clinic. Ms. Sak told us that "it's just fine for people to have sex during pregnancy—unless they're actually threatening to miscarry," and that Graham's remark is "the most racist thing I've ever heard... it's just sick."

We agree. Not only does Graham cruelly put the blame for low birth rates on Black women, he does it by propagating one of the deepest racist stereotypes that exists in our society—the image of Blacks as oversexed brutes.

If President Reagan had the slightest sensitivity to the concerns of Black people, he would immediately repudiate Graham's remarks and pull him off the Task Force on Food Assistance.

Letters to the Editor

Enforce voter mandate

To the editor:

Former Public Utility Commissioner Lobdell's grant of a rate increase to PGE and PP&L to pay for abandoned power plant projects is a travesty and a repudiation of the will of the Oregon voters.

This rate increase, which will amount to over \$100 million, is to pay for the utilities' abandoned investment in two uneeded and expensive nuclear power plants incurred before passage of Ballot Measure Nine in 1978. As Executive Director of Oregonians for Utility Reform, the sponsor of Ballot Measure Nine, I know that our exact purpose was to prevent these charges from being passed on to utility ratepayers, a position which was ratified by 69 percent of the voters.

This unfortunate decision has confirmed my worst fears that the process of utility regulation in Oregon is breaking down. The Public Utility Commissioner, appointed and accountable to the Governor, no longer is representing the public's interest as he is required by Oregon law to do. Further, we do not have an independently funded consumer advocate in rate case proceedings as Wisconsin does with its

highly effective Citizens Utility Board.

To enforce the will of the voters' decision in 1978, I expect to join shortly the lawsuit filed by the Coalition for Safe Power to overturn this wrong and unnecessary rate increase. While the utility companies have a pocket as deep as your utility bill to protect their rate increases, we as consumer advocates do not. Therefore, we must now appeal publicly for your support.

The Ballot Measure Nine Defense Fund has been formed to support our attorney in the upcoming court fight which could go all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. Please send your support to the Ballot Measure Nine Defense Fund, Box 863, Clackamas, OR 97015.

Dave McTeague

Outraged at racism

To the editor:

I feel rage but no surprise at reading the views of the pediatrician who is a member of President Reagan's task force on hunger, Dr. George Graham. According to *The Oregonian*, Dec. 29th, Graham stated that Black people's achievements as athletic stars is proof that Black children "are probably the best-nour-

ished group in the U.S."; that although Black people "have devastating social problems such as education and housing," that if they're led to believe that food is going to solve these problems, "they're deceived"; and that the problem of low birth weights and premature births was "overwhelmingly a Black problem" that might be addressed by "a series of cultural changes," including "avoiding sex during pregnancy."

I thought about what possibly could be the good doctor's rationale for this "solution" offered up to pregnant Black women who are malnourished. Possibly the doctor believes that sex burns up too many needed calories in malnourished women. If that is so, I have an unprintable suggestion for the doctor with an empty head and heart whose mouth is obviously crammed full, to an overweight Edwin Meese, et. al., as to what they should do to themselves to reduce their bloat.

Claudia K. Fisher

The Observer welcomes Letters to the Editor. Letters should be short, and must contain the writer's name and address (addresses are not printed). The Observer reserves the right to edit for length.



Support Margaret Carter

An Open Letter to District 18



Remember what happened to the Black community in the elections of 1982? We lost the chance for leadership! A new district, created through aggressive Black leadership and the reapportionment process, gave this community an excellent opportunity for representation in the Oregon State Legislature. Seven Blacks ran for the District 18 position. They split the Black vote. None of them won.

In 1984, the District 18 Leadership Forum said, "This cannot happen again!" On October 7th, we called together 21 organizations, all known candidates, and the ministerial leadership, to discuss a way to help narrow the field and concentrate the community's resources on one candidate. We established a Forum, where residents in District 18 could listen to the candidates and vote on the one of their choice. The

vote would be decisive. Everyone agreed to this, including the candidates.

On November 5th, at Vancouver Avenue Baptist Church, Margaret Carter won the vote. She was persuasive, informed, and enthusiastic. She deserved the victory. The District 18 Leadership Forum urges everyone to get behind her campaign. She needs your support; she needs your money and your time to unseat the incumbent. For the sake of this community, for the sake of unity, we urge you to help Margaret Carter now so she can help us in the State Legislature.

Tragically, one individual—who agreed to this process in the beginning—is now saying different things. We cannot control anyone's integrity except our own. The District 18 Leadership Forum supports Margaret Carter because she won

the straw vote on November 5th, and we think those who did not win the vote should honor their commitment to withdraw from the race.

It's a matter of simple math. If two Black candidates run on the Democratic ticket, they will split the vote and, again, our community will lose a chance for representation. Don't let what happened in '82 be repeated in '84. Support our "unity" candidate, Margaret Carter, with your money, with your energy, and with your time. She has earned every bit of support we can give her.

Yours in the struggle,

Herb Cawthorne
Ron Herndon
Rev. John Garlington
Marian Scott
Steering Committee
District 18 Leadership Forum



What's wrong with Mondale

by Dr. Manning Marable

Since Jesse Jackson has announced his candidacy for the presidency, a number of Black elected officials and civil rights leaders have continued to back former Vice President Walter Mondale. They insist that our principal goal should be the defeat of Ronald Reagan next November, and that Mondale has the best chance of defeating the incumbent president. Any Black candidate is simply a "spoiler," they claim. It's time that we take apart some of these flawed and faulty assumptions about national politics.

First, our immediate political goal must not be simply the defeat of Ronald Reagan, but the entire reactionary philosophy of Reaganism—the elimination of public programs in health care, jobs, public housing, and welfare; the buildup of both conventional and nuclear weapons; an expansionist and imperialist foreign policy abroad; and the repudiation of the very concept of social justice for Blacks, Hispanics, women, gays and lesbians, the elderly, poor people and the disabled.

Politically, this requires that the Black community target all of Reagan's supporters for defeat in the November, 1984 election. It also demands support for progressive representatives of civil rights' interests who challenge moderates inside the Democratic Party primaries this coming spring and summer. I am much more optimistic about our ability to defeat Congressional Reaganites than I am about the removal of the incumbent president. As things now stand, either Walter

Mondale, John Glenn or Reagan will be inaugurated in January, 1985—and Reagan is the clear favorite. Among the white males currently seeking the Democratic Party's nomination, only Alan Cranston and George McGovern could be identified as "progressives." But neither have substantial links with Black, Latino or labor groups, and the tardy entrance of McGovern has all but scotched any "dark horse" possibilities for the California liberal.

What's wrong with Mondale? First, Mondale's strategy is not new: we are witnessing a revival of Hubert H. Humphrey's 1968 and 1972 presidential campaigns. Mondale's crucial base of support is organized labor, big city Democratic Party organizations, and the most moderate elements of national minority leadership. His speeches and policy statements clearly indicate that he is not a progressive or true liberal, but a moderate in the Cold War Liberal tradition. Black leaders who have now committed themselves to Mondale's campaign insist that he is the "most liberal" candidate who has any hope of derailing Reagan. This may be true: if Mondale wins the nomination, a larger number of minorities, labor, and other liberal constituents will turn out than if Glenn is the nominee.

But this obscures the more fundamental issues—how can we build a stronger civil rights movement, and how can we reverse the advances of Reaganite conservatism? Moreover, how can we seriously expand the

electorate in 1984 to include millions of young people, Blacks, Hispanics, women and poor people? Working for Mondale in the Democratic primary does not do this—and in fact, it virtually guarantees the defeat of either Glenn or Mondale in the general election. Given our limited resources, we should be involved in campaigns which build the Black movement and progressive coalitions.

The candidate who comes closest to accomplishing these strategic goals is "the Country Preacher," Jesse Jackson. Unlike Cranston or Mondale, Jackson recognizes that the cutting edge of white conservatism is racism—attacks on affirmative action, civil rights and economic opportunities for people of color. Only Jackson calls for an economic program which calls for the total restoration of the 1981-84 budget cuts, tax increases on the corporations, and massive public works programs. Jackson's race will probably increase the number of Blacks who will run for local and statewide office, and will strengthen the potential progressive bloc to undermine the Right. Local "Jackson-for-President" coalitions of national minorities, feminists, environmentalists, etc., could survive the 1984 campaign as progressive, multiracial united fronts. The problem with Mondale is that Black support for him at the present time does absolutely nothing to expand the electorate, nor does it qualitatively advance our own interests. The best way to reverse Reaganism is to back Jesse Jackson.

District 18 Viewpoint

by Ross Danielson,
Democratic District leader

I was recently shocked to receive a call from a well-known Democrat who accused (!) me of supporting Margaret Carter's campaign for election as District 18 state representative. I was even warned that the matter might be brought before the County Democratic Central Committee. And later, at an evening social affair attended by many Democratic activists, an associate of the same Democrat button-holed me to say that he had heard "bad rumors" that I was helping Margaret.

What is astonishing and deplorable in these personal assaults against me as the elected Democratic District Leader is that they reveal a dismal ignorance of the political process and a shocking disdain for the Party's bylaws and traditions.

That such attitudes could be expressed, even by people who could be expected to be familiar with Party matters, suggests that education and clarification of Party policies

are much needed. That such pettiness should be introduced into the District 18 race does not bode well for Democratic unity. For unity in the primary season means unity in diversity, unity in taking opposing sides.

Primary elections are the legislated method for the major parties to nominate their candidates for partisan public office. And in this process ALL Democrats, including precinct people and elected party officials, are free to participate in this process.

The chief restriction on Party officers is that their support or assistance to a candidate should not be given in a way which seeks to imply an official Party endorsement (unless or until a Party endorsement is made as specified in the Party bylaws). But after a candidate wins the primary contest, precinct people and Party officials are expected either to support the candidate or at least to refrain from open support of opponents.

Contrary to one popular miscon-

ception, Democratic precinct people are NOT required to support Democratic incumbents in the primary.

In the primary races, all Democrats are free to choose.

But while I, like other Democrats, am free to choose, others are certainly entitled to ask whom I support. At this time, I do not choose personally to endorse one candidate over the others, inasmuch as each is qualified in their own way and I would like to play a role of promoting party unity. Carter has been an enthusiastic precinct person and is clearly ready for the give and take that politics requires; Leek has a fine record of incumbent votes; and Williams has valuable experience in Salem. I would be pleased to help any of them in specific ways if I could be of assistance.

As Democratic District Leader, I only ask them to commit themselves to Democratic unity, planning to lend their support after the primary election to the most important objective of all: to turn out the Reagan Republicans in November.



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.

The Portland Observer was established in 1970.

Subscriptions: \$15.00 per year in the Tri-County area. Postmaster: Send address changes to the Portland Observer, P.O. Box 3137, Portland, Oregon 97208.



283-2486

Alfred L. Henderson, Editor/Publisher
Al Williams, Advertising Manager

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York

Portland's largest black-owned newspaper.

PORTLAND OBSERVER
News for and about you.

Subscribe today!

Yes, I would like a subscription to the Portland Observer.

☐ I have enclosed my check or money order for \$15. for a one-year subscription.

PLEASE PRINT

Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Mail to: Portland Observer
Box 3137
Portland, Oregon 97208

MR. PRESIDENT—WHY DO YOU DECRY THE LACK OF DEMOCRACY IN NICARAGUA BUT REMAIN SILENT ABOUT SOUTH KOREA?



IN SOUTH KOREA, A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF REPRESSION IS JUSTIFIED BY THE THREAT FROM NORTH KOREA.



COULDN'T THE NICARAGUANS SAY THE SAME THING?



OF COURSE NOT—THEY'RE THREATENED BY US.

