

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Veto shallow, superficial

Governor Victor Atiyeh's veto of House Bill 2001 — Oregon's divestment bill — rubber-stamps oppression abroad and highlights Atiyeh's narrowness, racism and insensitivity here at home.

The Atiyeh administration is notoriously anti-low-income, anti-family, anti-small business and just plain regressive. His refusal to aggressively and effectively assist and save Oregon's timber industry plunged our state into a depression.

So why should we expect a governor who cut welfare assistance to two-parent families understand the institutional destruction of Black families in South Africa who suffer daily under the oppression of apartheid?

Like a bully picking on a small, defenseless child, Atiyeh cut Aid to Dependent Children on a statewide basis while Reagan was reducing resources on a federal level.

Atiyeh has spent thousands of our tax dollars in a bankrupt attempt to attract overseas dollars to Oregon. But he failed and brought in pennies while small businesses were ignored and folded.

Atiyeh's reasons for keeping Oregon in the Middle Ages and ignoring the wishes of a significant sector of Oregonians is shallow and superficial. His decision to veto HB 2001 appeases the "old boys" in the old boy network and leaves the status quo intact. In South Africa, the status

quo represents death, oppression and exploitation financed by Oregon taxpayers.

The state treasurer deployed a ruthless and insidious scare tactic by claiming divestment would threaten the financial stability of the Public Employees' Retirement Fund.

This couldn't be further from the truth and proponents of divestment provided evidence and research to counter the state's contrived misconceptions. Would Atiyeh invest Oregon funds in Nazi Germany? According to this latest veto, he would.

Throughout this struggle, Representatives Carter, Burton and Hill all showed us commitment combined with courage as they saw this legislation through. The Oregon Rainbow Organizing Committee, Portlanders Organized for Southern African Freedom, American Friends Service Committee and the Black United Front should be commended for their effective grass-root lobbying and educating the public about the legalized slavery in South Africa.

It's a good thing he's a lame duck governor, because this veto quacks with oppression, racism and colonialism. Atiyeh has demonstrated that he has the backbone of a chocolate bar, a limited (and all-white) vision of the world and an imperialistic attitude in regard to international affairs.

U.S. AID FOR THE CONTRAS...



Letters to the Editor

The Observer welcomes letters to the editor. Letters should be typed or neatly printed and signed with the author's name and address (addresses are not published). We reserve the right to edit for length. Mail to: Portland Observer, P. O. Box 3137, Portland, OR 97208.

To the Editor,

I am writing this note as a concerned community member who was among nine others attending the funeral of Roberta Tate on July 11, 1985.

I don't feel this number of nine attending the funeral was as significant as the number, I honestly believe, should have been there to pay last respects, console the family or just "come out of curiosity" as they do at other funerals. Where were the remorseful, sorrowful or caring others? Among the numbers giving testimony, raising questions regarding the untimely death of Ms. Tate at King School the night before, where were they at the time of the funeral?

Need I say more? I feel she died and was put away in a disgraceful manner.

MARIAHA A. TAYLOR

To the Editor,

Dee Armstrong is something else! Have been following with interest her Religion Updates. They have been excellent. Keep up the good work! And make a visit to our Center a priority on your agenda. Would love to meet you.

EVELYN COLLINS
Director
Grace Collins Memorial Center

To the Editor,

Appreciated your article on Education by Nathaniel Scott. He is so right and said it so "drastically," but I remember saying to him about the article he wrote about us and he said, "Sometimes you have to get drastic to arouse the people."

Hopefully this article will awaken people, especially our youth. I am reading excerpts to my staff. I liked the emphasis on "scholarship."

As I read "A Poem of Remembrance," I never expected Nathaniel Scott's name at the end. I could hardly believe it!

Even though I may not ways approve of the way it is said, keep on saying it!

EVELYN COLLINS
Director
Grace Collins Memorial Center

To the Editor,

Appreciated your article on Stan Peterson. I, for one, did not know he was on the City Payroll. I do not feel we, as citizens, are under obligation to pay any union officials as such. They are working for the union and not Portland citizens!

As citizens, we have every right to question the actions of any department of our city. We as citizens pay the bills and as long as we pay the bills we need to know what is being done with our money.

Yes, the \$16,281 should be used to fund the Police Internal Investigations Auditing Committee.

Chief Penny Harrington is not perfect, but I feel she is trying. The unfortunate recent police incidents were done in spite of her, not because of her.

EVELYN M. COLLINS

Support our advertisers
Say You Saw It In The **PORTLAND OBSERVER**



The housing crisis... Part Two

Along the Color Line by Dr. Manning Marable

In New York City, there are usually anywhere from 35,000 to 60,000 people who sleep in the streets, alleys, and shelters of the city on any given night. Earlier this year officials conservatively pegged the number of homeless people in New York state at 87,000, with over three-fourths of this number living in the New York metropolitan area. Despite the so-called economic recovery of 1983-85, the crisis in providing shelter for the homeless is becoming more severe. A 1984 report by the Department of Housing and Urban Development claimed that there were less than 350,000 people in the U.S. without a home. But most experts place the figure at two million. Poor people and low-income workers — especially Blacks, Hispanics, the permanently unemployed, female-headed households — rarely make the headlines. But their housing crisis is ten times more severe than the spectre of foreclosure on the millions of white, affluent suburban families whose mortgage payments now exceed their disposable incomes.

Why are several million Americans living in sewers, subway passages, and alleys, and millions more living as renters in decaying and collapsing apartment buildings? The real roots of the problem consist of Federal apathy, repressive tax laws, the profit-motives of landlords, and gentrification. The Reagan Administration's hostility towards the goal of decent, affordable shelter for all Americans has always been apparent. Once in office, Reagan destroyed the Co-op

Bank, and orders major cuts in the Community Development Block Grant Program. When the President appointed a "Housing Commission" to study the problem of urban shelter, 26 out of 27 commissioners were white, and most represented construction firms, financial and insurance institutions. In 1981, the Federal housing budget amounted to \$29 billion; four years later, the total came to under \$10 billion. Funds were slashed which gave the poor enough subsidies to pay for their housing. This had a devastating impact on low income people in every city. For example, during Carter's administration, New York City received funds to rebuild or construct 4,000 units under Section 8 of the Federal Housing Act. Today this program does not exist. In 1980, New York obtained funds to provide rent subsidies to 7,000 new households annually. By 1985, only enough money for 3,500 new families is available.

The tax laws have always favored property holders over the interests of renters, which also contributes to the housing crisis. A total of \$40 billion in tax deductions for interest on mortgage payments goes to the middle and upper classes annually. Renters — the majority of Blacks, Hispanics, people with less than a high school education, and roughly one-third of all white families — essentially pay the property taxes of their landlords, who in turn receive all the benefits.

But the fundamental factor in the housing shortage for the poor rests

with the landlords. In New York City, 50,000 landlords were offered bonuses of several thousand dollars for each homeless family they secured as renters. The city's strategy was simple. The number of homeless families who had been evicted from their apartments and who were placed in low-cost hotels at the city's expense had soared from 1,400 in January 1983 to nearly 3,300 in late 1984. The bonuses would serve as an incentive to landlords to accept the families, while reducing the city's public housing costs. Yet after 18 months, only 200 families had received new apartments.

Landlords refused to accept poor families partially because of the "risk" that they would not obtain rent. But behind this objection was another fiscal consideration. As tens of thousands of young professionals move back into the urban centers, tenements abandoned long ago could be obtained for peanuts, renovated, and rented to "yuppies" at \$1,000 a month. Realtors and speculators do not invest in housing sectors where profit margins are low.

The only resolution to the housing crisis of the poor is a political strategy which presumes the right to safe, clean shelter as an inalienable right. This would include a massive Federal effort to subsidize cooperative housing programs, tenant controlled housing, and other basic reforms. We cannot leave the private sector's "initiatives" to dictate the approach toward a national housing strategy. Decent housing is a human right for all.



Healthwatch

by Steven Bailey, N.D. and Adam Ladd, N.D.

Conclusion of Quackery and Lung Cancer:

Over the past two weeks I have written about the dismal record of lung cancer treatment programs, and the ironic thrust of orthodox medical groups to purge the American public of "nutritional quacks" and other unproven expensive frauds. These groups sit in quiet acquiescence and tolerance of their many questionable treatment programs, surgeries, and prescriptions, yet find the need and time to single out alternative health care as the major health fraud issue of our time.

I chose lung cancer as an exemplary case of unproven, expensive treatment programs within American medicine. Recent articles (see July 3 Healthwatch) have revealed "zero" improvement due to chemical, surgical and radiation therapies. In spite of continued documentation of the ineffectiveness of these therapies, we continue to expend enormous sums of money on these treatments. Why has this happened, and why does this sort of "quackery" exist while our medical establishment pursues such a zealous course in opposition to many alternatives?

The fight against lung cancer has been an extremely expensive battle with costs in the billions, and millions of animals sacrificed in the effort to find a "cure." But is a "cure" to be found in the area of drug-therapy? Is a degenerative condition closely associated with tobacco intake and other exposures to carcinogenic substances likely to respond to drugs which retard cell reproduction and further burden the normal health of the body? I think now, yet this battle shows clearly how Americans have suffered in the medical industries self-interest in new drug patents and miracle cures.

While this is the year of nutrition against cancer in the ACS's (Ameri-

can Cancer Society) public relations, there has been an obvious avoidance of nutritional research over the past decades. I mentioned last week that the ACS is governed by a board made up primarily by representatives of the pharmaceutical, insurance and banking industries, with the majority of research dollars returning to the interests of the board members. Historically, the ACS has placed well under one percent of its research dollars into nutritional approaches to cancer.

Another important aspect in the battle against lung cancer is the U.S. policy of tobacco support. A recent conference in Canada on smoking revealed some important statistics on smoking habits. First the number of cigarettes consumed per person (per day) is inversely related to the cost. In non-subsidized countries where cigarette costs reflect production costs, people average 4 to 6 cigarettes per day. In America we average at least seven times this amount. The second statistic of note is that lung cancer rates are related to cigarette intake. Thus while cigarettes are not solely responsible for lung cancer, we by virtue of tobacco subsidies are indirectly leading to thousands of deaths each year. While ex-President Carter's Secretary of Agriculture felt that ending subsidies would be an unacceptable hardship on the nearly 1,000 tobacco growers in America, President Reagan's Agriculture Secretary feels little remorse toward the tens of thousands of wheat, corn, soy, etc., farmers whose un-subsidized (non-carcinogenic) products have failed to provide the return necessary to avoid bankruptcy. Maybe part of the "cure" of lung cancer is to end tobacco subsidies.

While ending tobacco subsidies will go a long way toward fighting lung cancer, another nutritional factor deserves recognition. A recent study by General Electric showed that dietary intake of food high in beta caro-

tene (green and orange vegetables) will provide protection against the development of lung cancer independent of tobacco intake. While ACS has chosen to use the carrot as a symbol of this year's fight against cancer, it was only three decades ago that cancer pioneer Max Gerson M.D. (whose raw juice program against cancer had shown remarkable results) lost all ACS, NHI funding. Similarly, Linus Pauling PhD, has lost funding for his work in Vitamin C research. How can we explore nutrition and support programs if vested interests direct research dollars into drug, and associated late stage treatments?

We have come a tremendous distance in nutritional awareness over the past 30 years. While I have books dating back to 1858 which link white flour, low fiber diet to colon cancer, now in 1985 the ACS has accepted the data and agrees to this logical understanding. Let us hope that the next decade provides additional reverence for whole foods, reduction of simple sugar and fat, a well as an understanding of the need to limit additives, unnecessary medications and the over use of chemicals in agro business. Let us also hope that our regulatory bodies purge themselves of self-interest groups and become "true protectors of public safety." We have the potential to create a tremendous national health system if we avoid the trap of self-interest greed dictating research grants and development. Let us objectively appraise our tools of medicine and accept the benefits while letting go of the "tried and failed" therapies of the past century. And finally, let us hope that the next conference sponsored by our local hospitals, the OMA, etc., is not one on the "quackery" of alternatives, but on improved health through exercise, proper dietary habits, and avoidance of stimulants and drugs.

Send your Letter to the Editor today!!

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.

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

National Advertising Representative
Amalgamated Publishers, Inc.
New York

288-0033

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

MEMBER **NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION - Founded 1885**