

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Re-examine integration

Integration, an aftermath of the civil rights movement of the 1960s, has had dubious benefits for the very group it was supposed to help — Afro-Americans.

Historically, our grandparents organized around the demands for basic human rights. In the 1940s and 50s, apartheid was draped in red, white and blue as race separation determined where you sat, ate and attended school. To combat this, our grandparents inherited a foundation of economic vitality, self-determination and race consciousness. Money spent in the Black community stayed in the Black community.

As the demands for equality became more confrontational and less willing to compromise, integration was developed and grasped by the institutions as a solution to the problems created by the exclusion of Americans of color. Equality in education was interpreted as forced scattering of children away from their culture and community schools, instead of upgrading schools near their homes.

Affirmative action was supposed to get our foot in the door. But once in, the few individuals who benefitted either closed the door themselves or allowed the institution to close the door. Financially, the removal of "No Colored Allowed" from majority owned businesses started the era of capital leaving the Black community, never to return.

Hindsight is always 20/20 and we need to evaluate the negative and positive aspects of integration as a tactic and focus of our struggle as we set our eyes on the 21st Century. The decline and effectiveness of the civil rights movement occurred when our middle class leadership merged with the majority's values and institutions. Therefore, our goals and tactics were defined from a perspective of the value system that perpetuated structural inequalities.

In the 1970s Black children were bussed into a society which recorded their only significant contribution to America as slavery. At that time we never looked at the wealth of theory and

knowledge that was penned by our pioneers. The practice of integration in America diluted our culture. Cultural chauvinism integrated Afro-Americans into society as individuals instead of Afro-Americans as a group.

Those who were employed to represent and upgrade us as a group sometimes forgot the group and cashed in on contacts made while the group became bankrupt in terms of economic growth, educational opportunity and political accountability.

We need to return to the policies of self-reliance and self-determination. This was an integral part of our history that got washed away during the thrust for integration. The Reagan Administration is quick to point out the number of Afro-Americans dependent on government resources. Yet, they remain mute when government policies under both political parties encourage dependence rather than independence. The advice of pre-integrationists should be re-examined. In 1892 Ida B. Wells, Black journalist, said, "Let the Afro-American depend on no one but himself for his salvation. Let him continue to put money in his pocket. When we have dollars in our pockets we can move away from oppression and injustice."

Educator Mark McLeod Bethune said in 1938, "If our people are to fight their way out of bondage, we must arm them with the sword, the shield and the buckler of pride — the belief in themselves and their possibilities. . . from our own history our youth will gain confidence, self-reliance and courage. We shall raise their mental horizons and give them a base from which to reach out higher and higher into the realm of achievement."

Why did we forget their words in the 1970s? Integration was first welcomed by the masses and our leaders. But its actions and interpretation was superimposed on us by the majority in power. Well, the illusion is over. The theory, practice and actions of integration cost us more than what it gave.



POSAF ON SOUTH AFRICA

Events mark King's death

Across the country during the weeks of March 21 - April 6, many communities will take part in actions commemorating important events in South African and American history: the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre in South Africa (March 21), the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. (April 4) and the execution of African National Congress freedom fighter Solomon Mahlangu

(April 6). Here in Portland, the two weeks will be marked by activities centered around the fight against apartheid and racism and focused on the South African divestment bill, H.B. 2001, that is in the Oregon State Legislature.

Monday, March 25 — A speaker from the African National Congress will be at Allen Temple Church at 7:00 p.m. No charge, donations welcome.

Tuesday, April 3rd — Hearings on the divestment bill sponsored by Margaret Carter and Mike Burton will be held at 1:30 p.m. in Salem. Call 282-1300 for further information.

Thursday, April 4 — Portland will join in the national observance of the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. The public is invited to the King Neighborhood Facility for an event sponsored by the Black United Front and Portlanders Organized for Southern African Freedom (POSAF). Speakers to be announced.

Saturday, April 6 — The annual March Against Racist Violence will begin at noon at Alberta Park. The march to the King Neighborhood Facility will be followed by a rally with details to be announced. Call Avel at 230-9427 for further information.

Internal problems threaten GOP

Along the Color Line by Dr. Manning Marable

Despite his 49 state sweep and 59 percent electoral mandate, Ronald Reagan and the Republicans are in trouble. No, the Democrats have their own set of difficulties, and should present little organized opposition to the GOP's austerity agenda. The basic problems of the Republicans are primarily internal.

First, Reagan's popularity among white voters did not translate into a Congressional realignment. Last year the Republicans gained only 14 seats in the House and lost two Senate seats. Eight of the fourteen House seats lost had been held by Southern "Boll Weevils" who were already backers of Reagan. Afro-American voters provided the critical margin of support to elect three white Senators and at least eight Democratic representatives. Reagan carried Iowa, but liberal populist Tom Harkin defeated ultra-right Republican Senator Robert W. Jepsen. The President won in Illinois, and liberal Democrat Paul Simon received only 43 percent of the white vote in Illinois. But with 87 percent of the vote from Blacks, Simon defeated powerful Republican Senator Charles Percy. There were other anomalies as well. Reagan carried Los Angeles County by 55 percent, but a "Jobs With Peace" referendum on the same ballot, calling for cuts in the military budget to fund jobs programs and human services, passed with 61 percent. The odds are probable that the Democrats will take back the Senate in 1986, since nearly twice as many incumbents seeking reelection that year will be Republicans. Representative Tony Coelho, chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, emphasized to Reagan: "You are a lame duck.

Accept it. Elected officials do not have you to contend with any more." New Right leader Richard Viguerie agrees, predicting that "Reagan faces two years with a hostile Congress — and the likelihood of an electoral disaster in the 1986 congressional elections."

For the Republicans, Reagan's reelection simply meant that the struggle for power between the moderate conservatives vs. the radical Right would now be fought without quarter. Moderate conservatives "won" the first round last year, as veteran Senator Robert Dole of Kansas, denounced by New Right Congressman Newt Gingrich as the "tax collector for the welfare state," handily defeated New Right candidate James McClure for the post of Senate Majority Leader. Liberal Republican John Chafee of Rhode Island also defeated ultra-rightist Jack Carn of Utah to become chairman of their party's Senate Conference Committee. The Republican New Right suffered other blows as well. The removal of presidential adviser Edwin Meese to the post of Attorney General will reduce the rightists' immediate access to Reagan. The resignation of Kirkpatrick from the UN, lamented Viguerie, was "a loss from which Reagan's foreign policy will never recover." The battle to succeed Reagan is now on, and its resolution may well determine the future of the Republican Party. Currently the best known Republican aspirants are traditional conservatives: Dole, former Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker of Tennessee, and Vice President George Bush.

If Reagan remains "neutral" in the 1988 campaign, the Republican presidential nomination will probably be won by a New Right leader. The two candidates to watch are Jack Kemp and Lew Lehrman. In 1984 Kemp campaigned personally for nearly 100 Congressional Republican candidates, and raised \$220,000 on their behalf. Kemp is a favorite of the Moral Majority, and should have the powerful backing of major academic and financial institutions, including the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, and the Smith Richardson Foundation. Millionaire Lew Lehrman, a conservative Republican narrowly defeated by Mario Cuomo in New York's 1982 gubernatorial race, has created the "Citizens for America (CFA)." The CFA recruits "leaders" from the small business sector to mobilize conservatives in Congressional races; recently it has advocated the deployment of the National Guard in "high crime areas" of major cities. Lehrman's CFA is now established in over 225 congressional districts and although he has never held public office, political observers note that his private wealth is such that "there's no limit to what he can spend." Given their internal divisions, the bitter battle to succeed Reagan inside the GOP gives the Democrats the opportunity to make substantial gains — IF they are able to achieve unity themselves.

Dr. Manning Marable teaches political sociology at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York. "Along the Color Line" appears in over 140 newspapers internationally.

Street Beat

by Lanita Duke and Richard J. Brown

The debate over state funding of abortion was the topic this week as the Street Beat team asked, "Should the state allocate money to pay for abortion for low-income women?"



Mary Ernce
Sales

"In certain cases when the mother's health is jeopardized or in the case of rape."



Anna Butler
Diet Aid

"No. Women should take birth control. The state should not pay."



Craig Wooten
Student

"If it's a life or death situation, I believe it's O.K."



Janice Bustrin
L.P.N.

"No, the state should provide housing, re-training and counseling."



Ruth Dorner
Sales

"No, I don't believe in abortion. I don't want my tax money paying for something I don't believe in."



P. J. Fink
Student Nurse

"Absolutely not. The state should provide birth control and not abortion."

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.

MEMBER
NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION - Founded 1885

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

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York

283-2486

PORTLAND OBSERVER \$15 for one year \$25 for two years

Box 3137, Portland OR 97208

Mr. Mrs. Ms. Miss

Street Apt

CITY STATE ZIP

CLIP IT

TO START THE PORTLAND OBSERVER COMING EVERY WEEK