

Point of View

*A Letter
To The Editor*

Walker Insults Viable Candidates



CARL ROWAN

Horray for 'teacher power & poor power'

Editor:
May I respond to the article by Mr. Lee Walker in your August 21, 1980 issue. The article is a slap at people who desire political change. He advocates the same kind of nonsense that has been perpetrated upon our people by the majority race. We have fought and died for an opportunity to be free to work, vote and contribute to society in anyway that we see fit, as long as it is within the laws of this Country. I chose to file for office in a race that is filled by a three term assemblyman. Mr. Walker is advising people to "think before you so eagerly support or vote for another." May I suggest to Mr. Walker that if his "discussion" was based on fact, we would still be in slavery. How do you initiate change if you readily ac-

cept anything that is thrown your way because of a case of seniority.

The article is insulting to the intelligent viable candidates who have prepared themselves well to meet the challenges of this decade. I consider myself to be one of the above. I do not intend to be eased into the twilight by a subtle attempt to promote incumbents. Unless my understanding is nil, this is what I perceive the writer to mean.

The Sentinel is a class paper, who could do without such unfounded information.

Thank you for allowing me to have my say.

Sincerely,

Louise H. Jordan

WASHINGTON — I sat down for a television discussion with four of my journalistic colleagues last weekend and found three of them in a fit of angst over those delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

One professed to be appalled by the number of delegates who were welfare recipients. Another was horrified that the National Education Association (NEA) had muscled so many teachers into this gathering of the majority party. Three were disturbed that, in their view, the 3,381 delegates to the New York convention were phonies, masquerading as representatives of "the people" when in fact they were mostly on the government payroll, or dole, and had vested in-

terests in the perpetuation of huge and wasteful governments — federal, state and local.

Since I accused the Republican delegates of being a bunch of private clubbers, looking for a president who will govern America the way they govern their country clubs, I felt a duty to see if the Democrats were truly a bunch of free-loaders, crafting a platform and picking a candidate guaranteed to keep those bureaucratic goodies and government giveaways coming.

CBS News surveyed all 3,381 delegates and computerized the results. I asked CBS how many of the delegates were on welfare and was told that only 29 delegates were unemployed and that even they were not necessarily on welfare.

A mere 5 percent of the delegates had incomes under \$12,000 a year, whereas 40 percent had family incomes of \$25,000 to \$50,000 and 27 percent had incomes of more than \$50,000 a year.

It is the worst kind of slander, then, to suggest that the delegates to that convention were either "poor" or "eating at the public trough."

Let me make it clear, though, that it would not have bothered me if several welfare recipients had been there, since I reject the elitist notion that only the moneyed and the propertied have any right to say how this country should be governed.

But what about this alleged teacher-coup in Madison Square Garden? The NEA, the

nation's biggest teachers union, did indeed play a powerful role — suggesting that the nation's teachers are not the slow-learners they seemed to be for decades.

The NEA disdained politics until 1972 and made its first presidential endorsement (of Carter) in 1976. CBS says that this year NEA sent 246 delegates to the convention. The rival American Federation of Teachers had another 85 delegates. Add school administrators and you have 522 delegates representing education.

Does the presence of all those educators bother me? No. I prefer them to 522 ward heelers who are nominated by some craven political boss. The National Association of Manufac- (See Carl Rowan, page 7)

MX Equals Mighty Expensive

By Andrew Young

NEW YORK — The most important debate at the Democratic National Convention here was centered just where it should have been — on the economy.

It boiled down to one question: Should we develop a plan for real economic growth with wage and price stability and a policy for full employment, or should we continue the pursuit of military "superiority" while the economy descends into the abyss of inflation and recession?

Unfortunately, that debate was obscured by the inevitable drama between the Kennedy and Carter forces. They engaged in a prime-time

argument over short-term economic policy and then abruptly ended the exchange in sweet compromise.

Meanwhile, there was a serious but little-noticed discussion of economic priorities and military spending policy, as symbolized by the proposed MX missile system. The MX would be a kind of moon-shot spectacular, featuring nuclear-armed rockets scurrying around on railroad tracks in the deserts of Utah and Nevada.

This scheme supposedly would bolster our confidence in our ability to destroy the world better than the Russians can. It would also siphon billions of additional dollars for the



ANDREW YOUNG

defense establishment — dollars that most Democrats agree are badly needed for jobs and human services. Delegates on the con-

vention floor waved signs inscribed "MX" — Mighty Expensive."

Speaking for the anti-MX plank at the convention, Oregon Democratic Chairman Bill Smith emphasized that the MX dispute was not a fight between Carter and Kennedy partisans. "I am a loyal Carter delegate," he said, "and I am here because I see the country I love about to make a tremendous mistake" — namely, to go ahead with the Pentagon's massive MX project.

Given the choice between \$12 billion targeted to create new jobs and productivity, and a similar appropriation for new bombers and missiles, there is no doubt where the

nation's mayors, the black delegates or the schoolteachers' convention bloc would have lined up.

The Carter administration, long since committed to the new missile system, decided to keep the MX in the platform. But there was a clear consensus among Carter and Kennedy supporters alike that the U.S. has to develop a policy of economic growth and stability — and that we can't afford to squander resources on Pentagon wish lists.

To get an idea of the kind of economy we need, we might look at some of the European countries. While we allocate additional billions of dollars to our arsenals around the

world, the Europeans are directing their attention to economic revitalization.

Sweden and West Germany appear to be winning the battle against inflation. They resist expanded military commitments. They have declined to use wage and price controls, tax cuts and high interest rates in their policies on inflation and employment.

Instead, they are patiently constructing a social contract among labor, business and government. They have undertaken large-scale training and retraining of the unemployed for specific growth industries.

Most European coun- (See Andrew, page 23)