

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Snitching vs. reporting

Black reporters find themselves being held accountable by the Black community for coverage over and above rational objectivity.

America did not understand the points raised by Louis Farrakhan of the Nation of Islam, but the Black community did. Farrakhan only answered a question many in the community had asked. Who snitched on Jackson...and why?

By asking this question, no one is defending the derogatory language Jackson used. However, many questioned whether an off-the-record, private comment should have been dug out of the 37th paragraph of *The Washington Post* and plastered over the front pages of newspapers across the country.

In their quest for objectivity, Black reporters forget that objectivity is the rule if everything and everyone was fair. When it comes to the news coverage of those darker than blue, nothing is fair and everything is judged by two standards.

Milton Coleman is from *The Washington Post*; a newspaper which covers national and international events while ignoring the local communities of color in Washington, D.C.

Staff pressure from *The Washington Post* caused Janet Cooke to lie about Jimmy, her 8-year-old drug addict. She did not have to dream this story up to meet her deadline when, in

reality, Black youth are turning to the needle at an alarming rate. *The Washington Post* had to give the Pulitzer Prize back once their competitors questioned her source.

Was Coleman trying to make up, to his editors, for what Cooke did? His disclosure tinted Jackson's "rainbow coalition" and gave fuel to the fire of those who wanted to see him burn. The increase in death threats and the narrow and racist coverage of Jackson by the mass media were the results of Coleman's disclosure.

Coleman hid behind "professional integrity" when the community called him to the carpet for reporting an off-the-record comment. Every good reporter knows you are only as good as your sources. Who will ever trust Coleman again? What makes a good reporter is not what you can tell, but what you can keep to yourself.

A reporter can develop a proper framework to disclose facts and information. A reporter can weigh the pros and cons and present the facts with a correct perspective.

Coleman did not use "professional integrity" by reporting Jackson's private comments. He was not reporting. He snitched and that kind of reporting does not belong in a newsroom. It belongs in a police station.



"Gender Gap" may defeat Reagan

by Dr. Manning Marable
"From The Grassroots"

Most political observers argue that President Reagan is unbeatable in 1984. The case is mounting, however, for a stunning repudiation for Reaganism at the polls. Reagan received about one in ten Black votes and 36 percent of the Hispanic vote in 1980, but today those figures have dropped to half that. Reagan captured 27 percent of the voters who describe themselves as liberals, but in recent polls he receives less than 12 percent of liberals' support. Reagan even captured 41 percent of the voters with annual family incomes less than \$10,000; today he'll be lucky to obtain one-third of that group's support.

But the biggest factor in the elections of 1984 will be the women's vote. In 1980, six million more women than men voted, and this November, some experts predict that women voters will outnumber men at the polls by nine million. Reagan was never the overwhelming favorite of women—he ran barely one percent ahead of Carter among women voters in 1980. Today, no one believes that Reagan will be able to hurdle the gender gap with this margin.

As political leader Bella Abzug noted recently in the *New York Times*, Reagan is even threatened by "the loss of significant support from two female groups that were among his mainstay in 1980: Republican women and older women." In June, 1983, a Republican poll found that "every subgroup of women is more negative towards President Reagan than their male counterparts," especially older women. As Abzug

argues, "this switch can be traced to fears raised by Mr. Reagan's attempt to tamper with Social Security and the one-year freeze of cost-of-living increases in Social Security benefits."

Working class women are turning against Reaganism for similar reasons. Sixty percent of all working women receive under \$10,000 a year, and only one percent earn above \$25,000 annually. For Black female household heads without a husband, their 1981 median income was only \$7,500. Compounding their plight is the role of sexism in the labor force. In the vast majority of circumstances, women systematically receive 20 to 30 percent less for doing the same type of jobs that men do. Based on an evaluation of educational skills and technical ability, one can establish "comparable worth" between various types of jobs, which would in turn lead to the closing of wage differentials between women and men.

Reaganites find the whole notion of comparable worth utterly reprehensible. Administrative spokesperson Linda Chavez termed the concept "fundamentally radical" and claimed it would "undermine the marketplace economy and the values we believe in." She argued that "inequality in salaries among races or between the sexes is due in large measure to choice—women or Blacks often choose jobs that pay less." Assistant attorney General William Bradford Reynolds also suggests that the reason that so few women

are in upper income brackets is because few "women had ever applied for higher-paid jobs." Equalizing pay scales across gender lines "might discourage women from moving out of traditional women's jobs into better paying jobs." In an even more pathetic justification of sexist pay standards, Reagan administrator Michael Horowitz even termed "comparable worth" a political plot to undermine Black men by white women: "The maintenance man will be paid less so the librarian can be paid more."

Black, Hispanic and white women in increasing numbers recognize the need for legislative reforms to uproot sexism in the work place, and that the Reagan administration represents a major barrier to their political and economic advancement. They generally oppose the President's positions on abortion rights, child care, education, arms spending and the Equal Rights Amendment. To quote Abzug, "for Mr. Reagan to win a majority of the women's vote, he would have to stop picking their pockets and stop being himself. (His) record and continuing actions place him in direct opposition to the political agenda of modern American women." Reagan will have to obtain roughly 65 percent of the white male vote this November in order to win reelection, given the massive electoral trend among Blacks, Hispanics and the poor. Women and racial minorities, fighting for their own material self-interests, may turn the sexist rascals out this time.

Stop CIA actions in Nicaragua

France, England and other nations are loudly protesting the illegal mining of Nicaraguan ports by CIA operatives supported with American tax dollars. So, too, should loud voices of anger be heard from Oregonians, including our Congressional delegation.

The mining is intended to strangle Nicaragua's economy by frightening merchant ships away from its ports. Already, six ships, including a Soviet fuel tanker, are reported to have been damaged by mines in ports on both the Pacific and Caribbean coasts of Nicaragua. Such mining is tantamount to an act of war against Nicaragua and must be stopped at once.

The Nicaraguan government announced Monday it is suing the U.S. government in the

International Court of Justice, to stop the covert war, of which the mining is only the latest manifestation. The International Court of Justice is a United Nations' organization based in the Hague, Netherlands. The State Department labeled the appeal to international law a "propaganda" act and gave abrupt notice that it would not accept the court's jurisdiction in Central American issues for a two-year period. It is the same court to which the U.S. itself appealed, in 1980, to resolve the fate of the American hostages held by Iran.

American citizens must ask this question: which government is seeking to block justice and which is spouting propaganda? If the United States has nothing to hid, why not let the court decide?

Guatemala human rights violations

(Continued from page 1, column 3)

with Mexicans on our border." He said the Guatemalans do agricultural work in Florida or other states, and that many seek political asylum here.

"The State Department is refusing to give them asylum," Paul explained. "It would indicate there is a problem with human rights in Guatemala and we don't want to offend the government of Guatemala."

"The violation of human rights there is gross beyond conception,"

he added. "Death squads are more extensive and active in Guatemala than in El Salvador. Tourism has been cut down to virtually nothing."

In contrast to other Central American countries, in Guatemala, anyone who "looks like they are working with the Indians and it might lead to an uprising, is killed," Paul said. School teachers are particularly suspect, he added, and many schools and universities have been closed.

Paul said that to portray tensions

in Central America as a byproduct of East/West conflict, as the Reagan Administration is doing, is not correct. "It's a red scare that's exaggerated."

He said many people in the U.S. have "the correct attitude but have no information on what's really happening there."

"I would suggest that people do all they can to educate themselves on the topic and then put pressure on Congress. Write to your congressmen and senators and tell them what's happening."

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

CAMPAIGN '84

Black judicial candidates

(Continued from page 1)

Robinson

(Continued from page 1, column 4)

diversity to the court system. I have a commitment that goes beyond the 8 to 5 of the courtroom. I believe in going into the community and encouraging young people to pursue the legal field."

Brown

(Continued from page 1, column 5)

court and most of the time are angry with one another. One is going to leave the court angry with me. So, I don't try to please anyone. I just do what I think is fair."

Around town, Judge Brown is praised for his no-nonsense way of dealing with people; also, as a man who puts on no airs. He can be seen moving among all social and economic circles.

He pulls no punches when addressing the disproportionate number of Afro-Americans behind bars "Blacks commit crimes; the types of crimes where it is easy to get caught...you break into someone's home...you don't know who you are selling stolen goods to. You don't really know who you are selling drugs to and if you are a prostitute, you don't know a cop from anyone else. In Oregon, very few people go down to the joint without first having an opportunity not to go down there. Whether you are Black or white, who do you blame for that?"

As for the victim, "They have

never gotten a fair chance. They are trying to do something about it now. But, the system does all this stuff for the criminal and very little for the victim. I'm glad it is changing and sitting on the bench, I'm going to make sure that it does."

Diez

(Continued from page 1, column 6)

attorneys who feel she operates more on mother wit than judicial rules.

The criticism does not bother her. At 66, she is confidently running for another six-year term. On the bench, she has witnessed the change in American family structure. "An increasing number of children today are being raised by a single mother rather than a two-parent family. I see more and more young mothers who are children themselves, needing the assistance of all kinds of agencies to help them become good parents."

Simultaneously, she has seen young men not assuming responsibility like they used to.

"A number of these men are not married to the women that bore their child. Even though they are not making a lot of money, they are not sharing their income with that mother and their child. I don't understand why they don't feel obligated to support the child."

But Judge Diez is always positive. She observed, "More and more minority people see to it that they

get their education. And, there are many, many wonderful families out there. As a judge, I only see one side."

Her experience has led her to push for an innovative way to deal with the entire judicial process when it comes to child abuse. "It is difficult to place criminal blame on the perpetrator, because the children are so young it is impossible to put them through the trauma of testifying."

She advocates using video tapes of children explaining their molestation with the aid of sexually explicit dolls. "I'm talking to lawyers and legislators to (encourage them to) accept the idea of setting up video tapes in the courtroom so these children's stories can be told."

Judge Diez stopped short at saying the perpetrators were coddled by the criminal justice system. "But there is a lot of plea bargaining in this area. The emphasis is on treatment of the grown-up. The trauma suffered by the child goes on and on."

FOR THE SMILE OF HEALTH.



© 1983 Chatten, Inc.