

EDITORIAL/OPINION

Editorial Opinion: Meese Unfit to be Attorney General

When President Ronald Reagan nominated Edwin Meese III as U.S. Attorney General, civil rights organizations bitterly opposed his nomination. They argue that Meese would not enforce the nation's civil-rights laws. The group's fears about Meese has become a reality.

Meese has demonstrated that he is unfit to enforce this country's civil-rights laws. Meese's anti-civil rights crusade has contributed to the increased racial divisions in this country. He lacks the sensitivity, moral distinctions, and legal knowledge required to be Attorney General of the United States.

Meese has deliberately made misleading public statements in an effort to weaken civil-rights laws. Meese has repeatedly labeled affirmative action programs as a "quota" system and affirmative action have favored unqualified minorities over qualified white males.

This assertion by Meese is an outright lie. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled such actions as illegal. Affirmative action programs were implemented to remedy blatantly discriminatory hiring patterns. Meese's unfitness as this nation number one enforcer of civil-laws, can be observed further when one examines the statement he made equating affirmative action as a new kind of discrimination.

Reagan Wants Workfare

BY Jane Motz

President Ronald Reagan wants workfare instituted throughout the country because he thinks it can cut welfare spending. He has improvised a set of extravagant and unfounded claims about the workfare program he operated as governor of California in the early 70's. According to Reagan, 76,000 people were placed in private jobs by this program. According to state records, however, only 8,000 people were enrolled during the three-year life of the program. California officials say they have no idea how many of these people may have found jobs as a result. They also have no idea where Reagan's number came from.

While Reagan cites the Massachusetts Employment and Training: Choices Program (E.T.) as proof that his form of workfare works, Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis retorts that E.T. is **not** workfare. It is an employment and training program, providing child care and transportation to welfare recipients, mostly women with children, who are enrolled in training programs. Under E.T., most participation is voluntary and many choices are offered. Under Reagan's workfare, participation is mandatory, on an "or-else" basis.

The controversy over these claims covers up the real problem with both workfare and E.T. Both programs may, in fact,

get people off the welfare rolls — one by coercion, the other by encouragement; but neither program gets people out of poverty. A study of E.T. by the American Friends Service Committee shows that most E.T. graduates and their families are worse off financially after E.T., because the jobs they get are low-paid and dead-end, and any increase in income is eaten up by costs and by loss of needed benefits, particularly medical insurance.

The basic questions remain. How can women who head households and who may lack saleable skills be helped out of poverty? How can we assure that government programs focused on work or training do not depress overall wage levels or interfere with workers' rights? How can we eliminate the sex and race discrimination that contribute so greatly to poverty among women and racial minorities?

To answer these needs, we must institute major public service employment and training programs, peg the minimum wage to inflation, (it hasn't been increased since 1981) and renew our commitment to equal job opportunity, affirmative action, and adequate income maintenance programs.

Jane Motz is national associate secretary for community relations, American Friends Service Committee, Philadelphia.

crimination. Such interpretations reveal his lack of legal knowledge of the law. Affirmative action has been found legal by the federal courts for years. Affirmative action was designed to provide one form of remedy for the remaining effects of past discrimination and also to help remedy present discrimination. Such a program is needed to ensure that all in society are given the opportunity to participate in mainstream America, especially when racism is still embedded deep in that society.

Instead of being the leader for equality for those who are victims of discrimination. Meese has been the driving force behind the efforts by those not committed to equality. He is the proponent behind the Reagan administration's attempts to rescind an executive order mandating affirmative action in awarding federal contracts.

Meese not only has been criticized by civil rights organizations, he has been scolded by members of the U.S. Supreme Court. Justice John Paul Stevens criticized Meese for ignoring the development of the law over the past 200 years and for his "ludicrous" argument that the Bill of Rights does not apply to states. A man with ideological bias such as Meese is unfit to be this nation's chief law enforcement officer.



Reagan's Budget vs. Blacks

Along the Color Line by Dr. Manning Marable

Several weeks ago, President Reagan sent his 1987 budget to Congress. Unquestionably, the President has proved decisively that he is the greatest proponent of welfare in American history — welfare for the rich. Indeed, the budget can be summarized as nothing less than a political offensive to smash the social, economic and educational rights of Blacks, Latinos, and the poor. It is anti-Black, anti-neighborhood, anti-family, and in the words of the Reverend Jesse Jackson, "a misery index for the poor."

Reagan's total projected military budget, including nuclear weapons, would increase from \$286 billion to \$320.3 billion in 1987, and up to \$405.9 billion by 1991. The Pentagon would receive 28 percent of the total federal budget. This includes \$4.2 billion for 21 MX missiles, 21 Trident submarine missiles and other Midgetman missiles; and an extra \$4.8 billion for "Star Wars," an increase of 77 percent above current funding levels.

It doesn't take an Einstein to determine who's going to pay for all the military hardware. Human needs and social service programs will be cut by \$106.8 billion over the next five years. Some of the most callous cuts would be in the following areas:

Federal aid to public education would drop from \$9 billion to \$5.6 billion. Guaranteed student loans would be cut from \$3.2 billion to \$2.5 billion this year, and down to \$1.5 billion in 1991. Federal spending for compensatory education for elementary and secondary school students from low income families, which was \$4.2 billion last year, would be slashed to \$3.5 billion next year.

Aid to Families with dependent Children would be reduced more than \$600 million by cutting out

unwed mothers under 18 years old if they leave their parents' homes, by stricter work requirements, and by halting payments to families when their youngest child reaches age sixteen, instead of eighteen. Food stamps would be reduced by \$300 million in the next year. And spending of child nutrition programs would be cut by an extra \$704 million.

Jobs programs, including the Jobs Corps, would be cut by 12 percent. Chicago mayor Harold Washington has estimated that his city would lose \$268 million in 1987 alone under Reagan's budget: "The effect would be disastrous." Mass transit funds would be reduced from \$3.5 billion to \$1.6 billion.

How does the Reaganite budget preserve and extend racism and social class inequality? Richard Greenstein, the director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, states that Blacks would suffer disproportionately from the budget cuts. Greenstein notes that "24 percent of those using legal services were Black, and that Blacks made up 37 percent of those receiving food stamps, 45 percent of those receiving Aid to families with Dependent Children, and 45 percent of the youths involved in Job Corps." In short, the budget accelerates institutional racism.

Perhaps the most perceptive comments about Reagan's latest offensive against Black and poor people were made by Marian Wright Edelman, head of the Children's Defense Fund. The Reagan budget will create "a new apartheid" in America, Edelman asserts, "widening the gap between the rich and the poor." A broad national coalition of all budgetary victims must be forced to fight against this "new apartheid."

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



Healthwatch

by Steven Bailey N.D.

A few weeks back the New England Journal of Medicine published a report that "finally proved" that exercise may improve and extend your life. While this surprised few people, except possibly those researchers who contend that you can never prove life extension since we only die once, it did statistically document that those individuals who regularly exercise have a lower rate of death than those who exercise less, or those who don't exercise at all.

While this seems sort of like proving the wheel exists after 70 years of automobiles, it will provide doctors with the "hard evidence" needed so that they can tell their patients that exercise is beneficial to their health. Ironically many doctors refuse to accept the obvious, until "reputable" journals document the particular case. I've written a few times on subjects such as high fiber against colon cancer (science accepts 1985, in text books its 1858) and the continuance of these practices of waiting for hard proof speaks poorly of the limitations of our medical model.

Many people claim that the single drug, animal study model of medicine is the only "pure science", yet this model has left us at a place where over 30,000 Americans die annually from drug caused conditions. Estimates that 25-40% of hospital emergencies are caused by doctor and drug conditions appear throughout American journals. Yet while doctors accept this high rate of death in their therapeutics, they are afraid to recommend high vitamin C, exercise, Beta carotene etc., until conclusive evidence shows their proven benefits. Not too surprisingly the drug companies and food industries are not eager to research or investigate non-patentable forms of medicines. The major journals of Ameri-

can medicine are almost entirely filled with ads by pharmaceuticals. It is not surprising that life-style, nutritional and preventative medicine are grossly absent from their journals. Likewise the medical colleges which educate most of our doctors, receive most of their non-federal money from drug and food industries. No surprise that their curriculum reflects the vested interests of these wealthy industries. Our doctors are victims of this to nearly the same degree as the consumer. While there is a tremendous amount of evidence on the efficacy of nutritional and preventative therapeutics, the average doctor receives fewer than 1 credit hour of nutrition in their training. It is only through individual research, often to the displeasure of their peers, that a doctor develops a working understanding of the effect of life style and nutrition on health.

I do not know how we can influence the medical system to leave these grasps of self interest. It is clear that we are at a cross-roads of American medicine where risks are high and affordability is beyond a large segment of our population. Part of the change may occur as more and more doctors are held accountable for the numerous "accidental" deaths of their medicines. The mal-practice rates are already putting many doctors into other fields or retirement. The high cost of crisis medicine may also force the issue of preventative therapeutics.

For today the consumer must look out for themselves. We must be aware of the risks of therapies, and begin to enjoin habits that lessen the chance of serious illness. Now that exercise has been "proven" effective, we can get off our duffs and live.

Letters to the Editor

To The Editor:

The news media misinforms the American people when reporting the U.S. sponsored war against Nicaragua by repeating the U.S. State Department's use of the word "pressure" in describing aid to the Contras. The Contras are not applying "pressure" to the Sandinista government; they are United States paid and trained terrorists raping, torturing and murdering a civilian population. John Hinckley was not applying political pressure to President Reagan; he was attempting to murder him. The Contras are not applying "pressure" to the Sandinistas; they are terrorizing the civilian population of Nicaragua.

Because the leadership of the Contras is primarily former National Guardsmen from the government of Anastasio Somoza, a brutal dictator who maintained political power by assassinating his political opponents, Contra conduct is predictable. The discovery of a CIA written Contra manual which described the necessity of using murder and extortion against Nicaraguans only confirmed the obvious.

The consistent misuse of the word "pressure" by the State Department and its affable pitchmen only serves to sugar-coat terrorist activity (state supported) for American consumption. It also implies that a strain of racism exists in the State Department; dead, brown, Nicaraguans are good for bargaining chips.

By recanting the words of the U.S. State Department the news media does not report the news of Nicaragua; they are serving as an extension of the State Department propaganda team.
Herschel Soles

To the Editor:

For years we've been claiming that we don't want nuclear war. Our actions have belied this, however; we have continued to make weapons and install them around the world. We have claimed that our bombs actually maintain peace in the world: an empty, indefensible argument. A bomb, like any other creation, exists to be used. The more bombs that exist, the more likely is their use.

Even more senseless and indefensible is our practice of "testing" these bombs. At least we have agreed that it is not wise to explode them in the atmosphere; so, instead, we explode them underground! What sense does it make? We take the very bombs that we claim to be so against using, and we explode them under our own feet! We are bombing ourselves!

We claim that this is necessary in order to "keep ahead of the Russians." Who are we fooling? The Russians voluntarily suspended their own bombing months ago. They have asked us to do

likewise. Why have we refused? Is it because, in America, appearances are valued more than sensibility? Would it really hurt us to admit that the Russians have made a sensible move? Would it hurt us — except for bruising our pride — to stop bombing ourselves?

In reality we are all merely guests on this planet. The universe has its own rules. We can acknowledge these rules and cooperate with them, or defy them and suffer the consequences.

Recently we have seen a spectacular example of this in the explosion of the Challenger. Our pride and high regard for appearances outweighed our common sense, and we paid a gruesome price. We knew that a cold-weather launch was not sensible, that it was dangerous — but we didn't want to disappoint the television cameras! We were impatient, we would not accept another postponement! So we pressed the button... and the TV cameras got a bigger spectacle than anticipated.

Please, let us be sensible, let us quit bombing ourselves! Let us begin immediately to heal the wounds that have already been made!

To everyone who cares about ending the "testing" of nuclear weapons: please write or phone your representatives in Washington, D.C., including President Reagan. Let your feelings be known!

Don Beckett



"WE'VE MET THE ENEMY—AND HE IS US."—TURNING OUR CHILDREN INTO JUNKIES, INTO THIEVES AND PROSTITUTES, WHO PREY ON THEIR OWN PEOPLE.

PORTLAND OBSERVER \$15 for one year \$25 for two years CLIP IT TO START THE PORTLAND OBSERVER COMING EVERY WEEK

Portland Observer (USPS 959-680) is published every Thursday by Exile 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