

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Just-Us once again

The refusal of the Grand Jury to return an indictment in the police killing of Lloyd "Tony" Stevenson slaps justice right in the face and distributes his blood evenly on the hands of the Police Commissioner, Police Chief and the District Attorney.

Every third-year law student knows that the D.A. controls the grand jury and the D.A. can get an indictment anytime he sees fit.

District Attorney Michael Schrunk refused to break out of the definition of being the cop's attorney, so when it came time to prosecute the police for incompetence, racism, and brutality, Schrunk neglected his responsibility to all Portlanders by representing just the boys in blue.

We would be just as biased, irresponsible and ignorant as the D.A. if we were to suggest that the actions of Barbour and Pantley were representative of the Police Bureau. But the system perpetuates their racism and foul-ups by covering up for them. Thus, the D.A. has aided and abetted criminals.

Where is the charge of perjury when Barbour

lied about checking Stevenson's pulse? Where is the reprimand or charge of insubordination when Barbour incorrectly applied the sleeper hold while Stevenson was standing? Why aren't impeachment proceedings started against Dr. Richard Ganner who revised the old regressive, racist theory that it's hard to tell if Blacks are not breathing because we do not turn pink?

District Attorney Michael Schrunk never questioned or challenged this racism or perjury. And we will remember him at the polls.

The inconsistency of Penny Harrington's police force should frighten all Portlanders as individual officers are allowed to break performance standards at will.

It's unthinkable how an officer can be fired for creating and distributing T-shirts (Don't Choke 'em, Smoke 'em) while officers involved in the wrongful death of a citizen are back on the force sucking up our tax dollars.

We fear the criminals and we must be very cautious with the police. Who do you call when justice, once again, means Just-Us!



U.S. helping South Africa

Along the Color Line by Dr. Manning Marable

The debate over foreign investments in South Africa has escalated in recent months, as well over one million Americans have participated in hundreds of "Free South Africa Movement" protests, campus and labor union demonstrations. Both defenders and opponents of U.S. investments in South Africa frequently share two basic beliefs: (1) the system of apartheid is morally repugnant and indefensible on social, political and economic grounds; and (2) no matter what Americans do or think about apartheid, the Black people of South Africa are and will be the decisive factor in the inevitable abolition of the present white minority regime. These are NOT universally-shared positions. Secretary of State George Shultz, in a recent speech before the National Press Club, declared that "apartheid must go... it is a system contrary to all that we stand for as a nation." But Chester A. Crocker, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, has also stated, "in South Africa it is not our task to choose between black and white... the Reagan administration has no intention of destabilizing South Africa..." Or as one of President Reagan's top African advisers declared in late 1980, "The problem with Reagan is that all he knows about Southern Africa is that he's on the side of the whites."

If we can accept the two propositions above, a constructive debate can be held on the issue of divestment. One rather weak argument against economic disengagement is that American investments comprise a relatively small part of total foreign investments in South Africa, and/or that such investments are not crucial to the regime's survival. Actually, over 6,000 U.S. firms do some business with South Africa. By early 1983, direct American investment reached \$2.8 billion, roughly 20 percent of the country's total foreign investments. U.S. based investors also control over \$8 billion in shares in apartheid mines, and another \$3.8 billion in loans to South African companies have been made by U.S. banks. Most experts state that the total U.S. financial connection with apartheid amounts to roughly \$15 billion. According to researcher Elizabeth Schmidt, "U.S. companies control the most vital sectors of the South African economy: 33 percent of the motor vehicle market, 44 percent of the petroleum products market, and 70 percent of the computer market." American computers run the Johannesburg Stock Exchange, and help to manage the oppressive "pass law" system. Goodyear and Firestone sell tires to the regime, some of which are used for police vehicles. This ongoing trans-

fer of "U.S. technology and expertise" according to Schmidt is "helping South Africa to become strategically self-sufficient," and thus less resistant to American pressures for democratic change and internal reforms.

A more popular argument is the view that U.S. investment can be a force for democratic social change. Between 1977 and 1983, 145 American companies agreed to follow a set of voluntary employment guidelines drafted by an Afro-American, the Rev. Leon Sullivan. In brief, the "Sullivan Principles" originally advocated "desegregation of the workplace, fair employment practices, equal pay for equal work, job training and advancement, and improvement in the quality of workers' lives." If every company in South Africa strictly followed the Sullivan Principles to the letter, apartheid would still exist, but the system would receive a sharp blow.

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

Divestiture update

by Rhys Scholes

Oregon moved one step closer to severing its ties with South Africa when the State House of Representatives approved legislation calling for divestment. House Bill 2001 would remove Oregon's public investment funds from some of the banks and corporations doing business in South Africa.

Approved by the House on a 34-25 vote, the bill represents a significant compromise from the proposal originally introduced in February. While the original bill would have divested from all corporations with South African involvement, this measure only affects those companies which fail to adhere to the Expanded Sullivan Principles which guide corporate conduct. Companies which sell military or computer equipment to the South African government would also be divested.

The House action moves the bill to the Oregon Senate. A public hearing will be held before a Senate committee, followed by a vote of the full body. If the Senate approves, the bill will go to the Governor for his signature.

The fight for divestment began in February of this year when State Representative Margaret Carter (District 18/NE Portland) introduced the legislation. She was supported in this action by many organizations around the state including Portlanders Organized for South African Freedom and the Oregon Rainbow Organizing Committee. The Rainbow got involved early, raising money to bring expert witnesses for hearings, hiring a lobbyist/organizer, and working to encourage attendance at public hearings.

The first public hearing on House Bill 2001 was held on April 3, before the House Human Resources Committee. More than 300 people attended, forcing a move to a larger hearing room, and eventually overflowing two rooms and into a third. They heard testimony from economic expert John Harrington of the Working Assets money market fund. He testi-

fied that alternative investments are available for state money and that South Africa divestment would not cause an economic hardship for the state. Dumisani Kumalo, a Black South African now working for the American Committee on Africa in New York City also testified. He challenged the notion that state investments should be judged only by their profitability and not by their social impact. "If that is the case," he said, "then why not invest in pornography or cocaine, for they are more profitable than racism."

The House committee held several work sessions over a period of weeks following the hearing. When support for the original bill proved insufficient, Representative Tony Van Vliet (District 35/Corvallis) offered the compromise language including the Expanded Sullivan Principles. The amended bill passed out of committee on May 10 with Representative Eldon Johnson (District 51/Medford) serving notice that a minority report would be introduced.

After several delays, the bill came to the floor of the House on May 24. The first order of business was the consideration of the minority report. Supported primarily by Republicans, this substitute proposal embodied the thinking of the State Treasurer. It would have affected only the Public Employees Retirement System and would have divested only the funds of employees or retirees who requested specifically that their funds be divested.

Representative Jim Hill (District 31/Salem) criticized the minority report, calling it a "weak statement" because "it takes no action." Calling divestment an issue of "freedom and decency," he urged the House to "send the strongest possible statement." This action is needed, he said, "to prevent another bloodbath."

Representative Carter discussed the financial aspects of divestment, pointing out that "South Africa-free portfolios historically out-perform South Africa-related portfolios" according to expert research studies. She suggested that money could be better invested "right here at home, in

Oregon. Investments could be made in areas which would create jobs for our jobless, and build homes for our homeless. Investments could be made in health care and in human services or in alternative energy resources and conservation."

Representative Mary Alice Ford (District 8/Beaverton) expressed her strong opposition to any large-scale divestment. "How can we, on the one hand, woo General Motors to establish a Saturn plant in Oregon, yet tell General Motors that their stock is unacceptable for Oregon investment?"

Rep. Van Vliet responded to Representative Ford and pointed out that General Motors and other companies she mentioned would not be divested under the plan in the majority report. "There is not going to be a jeopardy to the funds," he said.

Lacking sufficient votes, the minority report failed and the majority report came to the floor.

Beginning a period of brief debate, Representative Mike Burton (District 17/North Portland) explained, "What we are risking here is losing South Africa to more than you may think. Because when the Black South Africans finally do obtain the rightful majority role in their country, who will they look to as having been their friends?" He urged support for the bill.

Representative John Minnis (District 20/Portland) spoke against the bill. He suggested that Blacks in South Africa have better living conditions than Blacks in other African countries. He described South Africa's problem as the threat of a Communist take-over.

In the final vote on the bill, only two Multnomah County Representatives voted no: They were Representative Minnis, and Representative Ron McCarty (District 16/Portland). Of the 25 Representatives voting against the bill, only two were Democrats — Representative McCarty and Representative Al Young (District 5/Hillsboro).

SUMMER SPECIAL

**COME SEE
OUR EXCELLENT SELECTION-
NEW & USED CARS!**

FREE
A \$50 or \$100 Gift Certificate from Nordstroms

FREE
If you purchase a New or Used Car
from Ken B. Long
at Bob Brown Olds.

Contact: Kenneth B. Long
BOB BROWN
Oldsmobile/Subaru
1005 S.E. Grand Ave.
232-4163

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

Box 3137, Portland OR 97208

Mr. _____
Ms. _____
Miss _____

Street _____ Apt _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

CLIP IT
TO START THE PORTLAND OBSERVER COMING EVERY WEEK

Portland Observer

The Portland Observer (USPS 959-680) is published every Thursday by Exie Publishing Company, Inc., 1463 N.E. Killingsworth, Portland, Oregon 97211, 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

288-0033
National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York