WHAT IS RESIST?

Since Resist has been hearing from many new people lately, we decided to write a short report on how we work.

Resist began in 1967 to oppose the Vietnam war and the draft. Since then we have continued to support organizations working for peace, as well as groups which concentrate on anti-racist, feminist, and pro-working class organizing.

Resist's main work today is to aid progressive organizations raise money. Because of the enormous effort it takes, mounting fund raising appeals would keep most groups from doing their organizing. Such groups need the small grants Resist can provide to initiate projects, establish a staff, get an office, or publish literature. Organizations from all over the country can apply to us for money. The Resist staff helps put together the applications, and does any necessary follow up. The applications are reviewed at monthly meetings of the Resist board, and decisions are made on the basis of the quality of the proposed project, the amount of money available, and judgements about political priorities. We make about ten grants a month, ranging from $100 to $500.

We think the kind of support Resist can provide is especially vital, now that the Reagan administration is so determined to stockpile nuclear weapons and intervene in Third World countries, while depriving women and poor people of what they've been working hard to attain. The kinds of organizations that Resist helps will be relying on us more than ever. We know from experience how much, especially in early stages, even a small grant can do. That's why we continue to devote our own time to Resist, finding out about and responding to the needs of groups that apply to us, writing for the newsletter, and raising money.

More than 1000 people help us in this work. Many are monthly pledges, others contribute occasionally. We send the newsletter to all contributors, and to hundreds of peace, anti-draft, and other organizations.

EUROPE REBORN:
An Interview with E.P. Thompson

The European Nuclear Disarmament movement (END) is an international campaign to make all of Europe, including Eastern Europe, a zone free of nuclear weapons. This movement has already had the effect of forcing Western European leaders to remind the Reagan administration that a pre-condition for the installation of the new cruise and Pershing II missiles in several NATO countries was that the US begin arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

E.P. Thompson is a British historian and a leader of the END movement. The following interview is excerpted from the May 15, 1981 issue of Peace News.

How do you see the future development of END?

We have been steadily gathering support in many parts of Europe for the European Nuclear Weapons Free Zone. This is strongly supported in Nordic countries, in Holland and in Belgium. In France and Germany things are going more slowly. There is a big row about nuclear weapons going on in the German SPD, and the Green Party and various pacifist groups are supporting our proposals. Slowest to move has been Italy, where the bureaucratic control over the movement by the PCI (the Italian Communists, who are anxious to get a share in government) has led them to hold back on the active campaigning needed, so that some of the most active elements are the Italian Radical Party and the split-away communist Manifesto group. As yet you cannot talk of a mass movement there. In Greece there certainly is a mass movement for a non-aligned Greece outside of NATO, and for a European Nuclear Weapons Free Zone.

The other thing is that we are now getting actual practical proposals. It is a very active political issue in Norway and proposals have been made for a Nordic nuclear weapons free zone, possible with a trade-off in which the Russians remove their medium range missiles which could be targetted on Scandinavia from the Kola peninsula. This could extend to new proposals in other parts of Europe.

Have your six months in the US altered your perception of the role of European countries in the disarmament process?

The stance of Reagan, the refusal of his administration to even begin to enter into cosmetic arms continued on page 2
control negotiations, and the tendency of his advisers, who are totally ignorant of European conditions and try to bully even their NATO allies into arrangements like the Rapid Deployment Force, are going to create in middle opinion in Europe a great deal of resistance to American domination. These strategies are exceptionally dangerous not just to peace movements, but to the entire people of Europe, and even established politicians, for example, in Germany, can see this.

My experience in America is really two-fold: (1) I am more than ever convinced that a European strategy is right and viable — dissociating itself from the Reagan administration — and that the tide is going our way, but (2) I am also more persuaded than ever that the way to get progress is to promote initiatives at the level of movements and even small non-aligned states. It’s only when the practical business of disarmament is commenced on a small scale that there’s any hope in the future, and I find even some elements in the American peace movement a little bit super-power in mentality; they are continually thinking of ways in which Reagan and Brezhnev could be brought to a summit, and they ignore all this intermediate consciousness and action which can be taken.

People in the USA are under the illusion that we’ve invited Cruise missiles to Britain rather than having them foisted on us by NATO. Can you explain the domination of NATO over our sovereignty, and is it comparable to the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact?

It’s very interesting. NATO is a supreme example of the military-bureaucratic and anti-democratic trend of advanced societies. People in America were informed by NATO that the European states had asked for these missiles, and people in Europe were informed that the Americans intended to send them, while it was an entirely bureaucratic process, largely US military personnel in the NATO organisation itself.

The Cold War is not only a confrontation between the two blocs, it’s also a means of establishing super-power control and client relations with the subordinate Warsaw or NATO powers, and therefore it carries dividends for the super power itself. Elements in the military establishment of both sides want it to continue, because it legitimates their control of client states.

This operation is somewhat similar on both sides, but with the attempts of the Americans and Mrs. Thatcher to extend the area of the operation of NATO to almost any part of the world — certainly to the Middle East — it is becoming doubly dangerous, because what is virtually a military-bureaucratic operation can commit nations without any democratic process to military adventures of this kind.

Sceptics maintain that we have no chance at all of achieving our aims because the vested interests mounted against us are too great. How do you manage to maintain a positive vision that we can, as we must, achieve them?

I don’t. I’m very pessimistic. I don’t think we have very much of a chance of succeeding. Until there is a significant reverse, everything is set for terminal collision. But I do have a positive vision in the sense that to reverse this will involve so great a popular struggle that Europe and the world would be changed beyond recognition. We would succeed not only in reducing weapons, but in loosening up the two blocs, in promoting communication and exchange, in knitting together into a common strategy and understanding the western peace and labour movements and the eastern and Russian movements for democracy and civil rights, and this in itself would give us a reborn Europe in which smaller nations resumed a political space for their autonomous action. We would then see new experiments in different kinds of social order arising from the smaller nations — even from poor old sick Britain itself. So while it’s very touch-and-go, there is an astonishing possibility of transforming the world we are now in.

Peace News gives comprehensive coverage to the disarmament movements in Britain. It is available from 8 Elm Avenue, Nottingham, England. Resist newsletters #136 and #139 published END’s statement of principles and some background on the movement. They are available on request.
PEACE EDUCATION
IN THE SCHOOLS

WHY COUNTER-RECRUITING?

In 1984, given the involvement of such a large proportion of our young people with military service, the military will have become a major instrument for youth socialization — assuming a large portion of the role once dominated by the family, the church, the school, and the civilian work setting.

— Thomas Carr, former Director of Defense Education, Office of the Secretary of Defense

Since the draft ended in 1973, the Pentagon has had to rely solely on volunteers to meet its manpower needs. It has so far managed to do so, but only by greatly intensifying recruiting activities. High school students are the target population. High school seniors are reached by an average of 9 to 10 advertisements per month. Recruiting posters line school hallways. Recruiters themselves lurk in the offices of guidance counselors and are there on Career Day with smooth talk and the latest in color films from Madison Ave. Students fill out grids for multiple-choice "aptitude tests" which turn out to be the ASVAB (Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery). Their results along with their names, addresses and home phone numbers are sent directly to local recruiters. With JROTC and the Delayed Entry Program, 15-year olds can now enlist for up to six years. These are the reasons that anti-militarists must make high schools a focus of their work. Counter-recruiting is both a moral necessity (if we oppose the poverty draft as well as the regular draft) and an excellent approach to peace education for young people. In talking about the choices that directly confront young people (whether or not to enlist, whether or not to register for the draft) one can raise many larger issues, i.e., disarmament, intervention, and government control of our lives. But the main reason to do counter-recruiting is because it’s fun, interesting, and extremely rewarding. It is without a doubt the most important peace work I have ever done. Unlike any other class in society, high school students are uniquely open to discussion of war/peace issues. It is amazing to have students voluntarily spend their lunch hour, after a presentation the period before, discussing whether or not a war for oil is justifiable, or to see them remain after school for an hour (at an outdoor presentation by a recruiter at which counter-recruiters were also present) listening to both sides and debating the issues among themselves. It is practically impossible to do counter-recruiting badly. The kids are highly appreciative that anyone bothers to discuss relevant issues with them; and, if you are open and willing to listen and learn as well as teach, it is practically impossible to have a bad experience.

A couple of pointers before you rush on over to your local school: dress and act respectably, but not necessarily stodgily; and if at all possible bring a vet and a draft counselor with you. The veteran will legitimize talking about these issues, and the counselor can answer specific questions that the kids will have. If you bring written material it should be simple and brief, but not unsophisticated. As a place to start I highly recommend the counter-recruitment packet which was produced by AFSC/Baltimore for a recent anti-militarism conference. It includes information about ASVAB, JROTC, the enlistment contract and Delayed Entry Program, as well as actual counter-recruitment pieces. It is available from them at 317 East 25th St., Baltimore MD 21218. The cost is five dollars.

Amanda Claiborne

FALL 65

When they dropped them A-bombs on Japsville I wasn’t even an idea, but I paid for it anyhow all through growing up and I’m still paying. The “war baby” gig ain’t no smartass headshrinker’s dumb theory, and all the people who grew up when I did can tell you that. I used to have horrible dreams of goblins in tiny planes circling my room and bombing my bed most every night age six or seven; every time a fire truck or an ambulance passed the house I was pissing with fear in my mother’s arms with the idea that it was the air raid finally come...

WINTER 66

I was thinking about how I can divide my past into lumps of time in which I had myriad, “important” reasons to wish (and earlier, say from seven to nine or so, to pray) that the end of the world, that the pushing of the button would wait just a little while longer... Age eight: hoping that the big shots could cool it, could postpone the bomb one summer, so I could play just one whole season in my first year in little league baseball before the end.

But it’s not at all just something that’s past and solved. Not at all. It’s just that I can see it a little clearer now, that fear is their tool... and it works very well... and they use it very well.

— from The Basketball Diaries by Jim Carroll
Public school administrators and staff want to maintain the appearance of objectivity. Most are reluctant to be associated with one or another side of a current political issue, which means that forums or debates are always preferred to speakers who espouse one particular viewpoint. It is generally taken as a simple fact, however, that military service is a good thing and that on-campus military recruiting is in the public interest. Citizen pressure can affect this, but left to itself this presumption acts to exclude anti-draft and anti-war information and supports a pro-military atmosphere in the schools.

School decision-making is governed by a near-religious reverence for the "proper channels." The normal line of authority is — from the bottom up — teacher, department head, principal, superintendent, school committee. Community groups seeking approval for an activity can be stalled, often interminably, simply for not going through channels. Although the process is often painfully slow, it can also serve upon occasion as a means of gathering allies. It is important to understand the special place the principal has in this picture. Principals feel personally responsible for what happens in their schools. Anti-draft groups should recognize this and avoid any unnecessary non-issue-related alienation of these central figures.

Years of socialization in homes, churches and schools have shaped the attitudes of high schoolers regarding war and military service. Many young men feel that war and killing are expressions of masculinity and as such are vehicles for them to achieve a measure of self-esteem. Similarly, many feel that the US should conduct its foreign policy as they conduct their street lives — with swift, devastating retaliation for even slight insults regardless of moral considerations. (Hence, the "Nuke Iran" slogan is the equivalent of beating up someone who has insulted your girlfriend.)

A further consequence of this "rugged individualism" is a serious aversion to joining formal groups; the operant philosophy seems to be, "You're not a man if you need to join some organization to deal with your problems." These manifestations of the macho mentality usually mean that anti-draft workers in high schools are predominantly female. Male or female, anti-draft organizers must early on confront the prejudice that those who are anti-war or against the draft are unmanly or cowardly.

Schools are tightly controlled and guarded institutions. Some creative thought must be given to getting inside to inform, educate and organize secondary school students.

The best vehicle of entry into a school is the students themselves. It has long been established that students cannot be prevented from distributing flyers, collecting signatures or posting signs in school so long as it does not interfere with the educational process. Non-students do not have such freedom to use school facilities to disseminate information. (Although high school officials often will seek to deny students their rights of free speech, persistence on the part of students to defend these rights usually will be successful.) Since students can exercise such a degree of free speech within the school, all activities by community anti-draft groups must, to some degree, be aimed at attracting new students into anti-draft work.

Other avenues of entry include:

**Guest speakers.** Teachers usually have a great deal of autonomy over the events in their classrooms. Speakers can be brought into individual classes without requiring formal approval. Relevant academic freedom guidelines are generally in the teachers' contract which is part of the public record. In the case of an objection by a student or parent, the teacher needs to be prepared to demonstrate that the speaker fits into the class curriculum. Whereas social studies or contemporary issues classes are best for anti-draft speakers, we need not be

---

**Successes**

In 1978, a group in Cincinnati foiled Pentagon plans for a public military high school in that city.

A group in New York City will train high school students as draft counselors this year as part of the City-As-School program.

A Boston, Mass. anti-draft coalition defeated a bill introduced in the State Legislature that would have required high school principals to give names of students to military recruiters.

Twenty-nine churches in Portland, Me. sponsored a peace essay contest in the public and private high schools in the area. The program was administered through English departments and local congregations. Packets were mailed to ministers and department heads, and reading materials for the contests were on reserve at the public library. Over 135 essays were received from twelve schools.

There's an annual poetry and poster contest for peace in the Dade County, Florida public schools.

Parents Against the Draft in Massachusetts has gotten a resolution passed by the school committee of Cambridge, Brookline, and Newton that requires that draft information be made available in the high schools. (Similar legislation was passed in San Francisco and Berkeley.)
limited to those. Psychology (post-war stress 
syndrome), English (critical reading of news articles),
and science (nuclear power or weapons) classes are
among other possibilities. The most important criterion
is the receptiveness of the teacher. Supportive teachers
can be found through random canvassing (lists of 
teachers are on the public record) or through students
approaching teachers whom they think will be receptive.

Student clubs. Faculty advisors of student clubs
operate with the same autonomy as classroom teachers 
but are watched even less closely. In addition, students
can exercise a great deal of control over club activities.
Although student councils, current events or human 
rights-type clubs are the best bets, don't rule out any 
club. Be creative in addressing their particular interests.

Leafleting. Distributing informational leaflets to 
students on their way to school in the morning (prefer­
able to after school) must be done off school grounds 
but can be done effectively with a group of 8-12 volun­
teers. Leafleting at school-related events such as sports 
activities or cultural programs presents another oppor­
tunity for interaction with students. Also, distribution
of counter-recruiting information when military recruit­
ers are present in the high schools is important. School 
officials may object but will be reluctant to remove 
people for fear of appearing biased. Plans for such leaf­
eting efforts should be communicated to sympathetic 
school committee members so they can, if necessary, 
confidently defend the activities of counter-recruiting 
leafleters if matters of "equal time" are brought before 
the committee.

Assemblies. Forums or debates before large groups of 
students are good ways to attract potential activists. 
School officials will insist upon a fair and balanced 
presentation. Securing approval and making all the 
necessary preparations will usually take from six to 
eight weeks, an important consideration when contem­
plating the usefulness of such an approach.

Each opportunity for contact with students should be 
used to attract others into subsequent activities. There­
fore any materials distributed should include some 
mechanism, such as a coupon or a phone number, 
through which students may indicate further interest or 
address questions.

When a student anti-draft group begins to form, what 
can it do? What can happen next?

Unfortunately, student anti-draft groups may have to
spend a great deal of time initially struggling over issues
that should not have to preoccupy them, such as securing 
the right for students to pass out flyers on school 
grounds after it has been unjustly denied them by the 
principal. Although such efforts are time-consuming, 
they can give the students a sense of shared struggle and 
provide useful political experience. Beyond such 
matters, possible issues to pursue include:

Equal time. Military recruiters are a common sight in 
our high schools, either on a regular basis or on career 
education days. Attempts to totally eliminate their 
presence will undoubtedly fail. However, demands that 
couter-recruiting information be made available or that 
a draft counselor be admitted into the school on an 
"equal time" basis may be successfully pursued.

New course offerings. Students can demand that 
courses be offered on the history of Vietnam War, US 
military and foreign policy or the like. Some states 
require that a course be offered if petitioned for by a 
certain number of community residents. A key link, 
however, is that a teacher already on staff be willing to 
teach the course and help in the preparation of the 
curriculum.

School committee resolutions. Students can seek a 
resolution from the school committee or other local legisla­
tive bodies opposing the reinstitution of the draft. 
Although a victory here would have only symbolic 
value, it would be an opportunity to raise the issues and 
to gain political experience.

In general, student anti-draft campaigns should be 
designed to involve as many students as possible in their 
planning and execution. Also, issues should be chosen 
where potential victories would be visible and meaning­
ful for the students involved in working for them.

Finally, in its initial stages of growth, the high school 
anti-draft groups should be allowed to develop indepen­
dently from other, non-student community efforts. 
Students need to feel that it is their organization work­
ing in their best interests and not on someone else's 
agenda. Once a student group has developed a history 
of activity and success, it can come together with anti­
draft community groups or similar groups from other 
high schools and, while continuing to organize within 
their own school, become involved in the broader 
efforts to make our society peaceful and just.

ALAN BRICKMAN

Choose the training you want.

☐ field cannon and rocket artillery  ☐ motor transport  ☐ killing  ☐ chemical  ☐ ballistic missile repair apprentice
ORGANIZATIONS & RESOURCES

The following is a somewhat arbitrary list of eleven groups which have done significant work in peace education. Because of space limitations, all of the many, many groups working in this area could not be included.

CCCDO-Task Force on Recruitment and Militarism (PO Box 15796, Philadelphia, PA 19103. 215/568-7971) Publishes CounterPentagon, an excellent newsletter for counter-recruiters. CCCO also puts out some of the best anti-military literature specifically directed to young people.


Children's Creative Response to Conflict, and the Youth Action Program of the Fellowship of Reconciliation (Box 271, Nyack, NY 10960. 914/358-4601) CCRC is primarily interested in teaching conflict resolution to young children. Their major publication is The Friendly Classroom for a Small Planet which teaches non-violence and non-competitiveness as sane alternatives to the current system. Highly recommended by peace educators. The Youth Action Program has inherited the work of the late Committee on Militarism in Education. They have just reissued a piece for guidance counselors, and are now revising “The Military & Education: A Massive New Partnership” and producing a peace education packet.

Consortium on Peace Research, Education & Development (Center for Peaceful Change, Stephen Hall, Kent State Univ., Kent, OH 44242. 216/672-3143) COPRED has a bi-monthly newsletter and a peace education packet. They are also sponsoring a “Peace Heroes” project to develop a peaceful superhero for children, and their University Network helps establish peace education courses at colleges and universities.

Institute for Education in Peace & Justice (2913 Locust St., St. Louis, MO 63103. 314/533-4445) The Institute publishes a book, Educating for Peace & Justice, as well as lots of material on parenting for peace and justice. Send for a free literature list.

NARMIC (1501 Cherry St., Philadelphia, PA 19102. 215/241-7175) NARMIC is a project of the American Friends Service Committee. In addition to their excellent work on weapons and military spending they also focus on universities and their links to the military. They have published several how-to pieces for people who are interested in researching their own university.

Project for Global Education (Suite W-219, 1011 Arlington Blvd., Arlington, VA 22209. 202/524-2141) Their "Annotated Resources Bibliography" is highly recommended as a tool for further study.

 Westminster House (Oregon State University, 101 NW 23rd St., Corvallis, OR 97330. 503/753-2242) Their brochure, "Resources for Peacemakers", is a good introduction to available curricula.

WILPF (1213 Race St., Philadelphia, PA 19107) Of all the national organizations, WILPF has been the one most interested in peace education. Their monthly newsletter, Peace and Freedom, has a consistently useful peace education column, and they have written two highly recommended resources for teachers — Peace Is In Our Hands (grades 1-6), and Learning Peace (grades 7-12).

Top twenty universities in military research for fiscal years 1979 and 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University or University-affiliated Institute</th>
<th>FY 1979</th>
<th>FY 1980</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>$155,801,000</td>
<td>$163,327,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$132,724,000</td>
<td>$154,564,000</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California (system)</td>
<td>$24,159,000</td>
<td>$29,679,000</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$23,442,000</td>
<td>$26,319,000</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>$10,694,000</td>
<td>$18,099,000</td>
<td>-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>$15,072,000</td>
<td>$15,772,000</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rochester</td>
<td>$12,848,000</td>
<td>$15,480,000</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech Research Institute</td>
<td>$8,360,000</td>
<td>$14,758,000</td>
<td>-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Dayton</td>
<td>$13,564,000</td>
<td>$13,859,000</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>$14,562,000</td>
<td>$12,226,000</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>$11,872,000</td>
<td>$10,260,000</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>$8,717,000</td>
<td>$10,069,000</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alaska</td>
<td>$9,338,000</td>
<td>$8,119,000</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>$4,536,000</td>
<td>$7,335,000</td>
<td>-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>$3,727,000</td>
<td>$6,797,000</td>
<td>-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>$5,426,000</td>
<td>$5,472,000</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$3,309,000</td>
<td>$5,428,000</td>
<td>-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>$1,421,000</td>
<td>$4,902,000</td>
<td>-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$3,132,000</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td>-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>$4,052,000</td>
<td>$4,848,000</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ivory Tower

If you study or work at a university and would like to find out (1) what they really do in the Math Building, (2) how your least favorite professor manages to live so well on his assistant professor's salary, (3) how many weapons systems your school has personally helped develop, or (4) whether the Chancellor has already handed over student records to Selective Service; or if you just need some good reasons to protest ROTC, the following articles are a good place to begin: “The Pentagon in the Ivory Tower,” “Social Science for Social Control,” and “The Chancellor Goes to Washington” in the June, 1981 issue of The Progressive; and “Resurgent Militarism in Academia,” and “Challenging the Weapons Labs” in the July/August, 1981 issue of Science for the People.
ATTEMPT TO MURDER VIETNAMESE SCHOLAR AT HARVARD

The shocking attempt to assassinate Ngo Vinh Long, a long-time critic of the US war in Vietnam, is of more than local significance. Though many Vietnamese in the US are economic refugees, many others collaborated with the US counter-revolutionary war against their own people. Now they, like the Cuban exile community, provide a base for terrorism against those who would work for normalization of relations between the US and post-revolutionary regimes, and against those who attempt to remind us of the horrors committed in Southeast Asia in the name of our country. The fact that this attack occurred with the apparent collusion of Harvard intellectuals is also significant, for these are the people who are attempting to rewrite the history of the Vietnam war, to draw a veil of historical amnesia over the recent past, and prepare the ideological justifications for future counter-revolutionary wars — eds.

On April 23 Vietnamese historian Ngo Vinh Long, a long-time resident of the Boston area, was speaking on a panel about Vietnam sponsored by the Harvard Legal Studies Forum. There were a large number of Vietnamese refugees in the audience and the panel discussion became very heated as Long was advocating a more conciliatory American attitude toward Vietnam. Sensing danger to himself from the crowd, Long asked Harvard police to escort him from the meeting.

As the police escorted him from the meeting to his car, a man jumped out from behind a tree and hurled a Molotov cocktail at Long. The homemade bomb shattered against the car windshield but did not explode. The two police officers were splattered with gasoline and glass fragments. The police subdued the alleged assailant and recovered a second Molotov cocktail at the base of the tree.

Originally a long list of charges, including attempted murder, were brought against the alleged assailant, who is a recent refugee from Vietnam. He is now out on $1,000 bail.

The attack on Long was not an isolated or haphazard incident. Long has been targeted by the refugee community in Boston because of his support for reconciliation between the US and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. In the days before Long's April 23 appearance, inflammatory flyers circulated in the greater Boston Vietnamese refugee community accusing Long of being a "communist lackey." The flyers called on the refugees to "come see the enemy who has butchered our families."

Refugees in the Boston area have expressed direct and indirect support for the attacker. Dr. Tran Van Liem, president of the Massachusetts Refugee Association, commented: "He [the alleged assailant] was only trying to make him [Long] be afraid so he will not continue to make communist propaganda."

According to the Boston Globe, Long feels that Stephen Young (an associate at the East Asian Legal Studies Forum at Harvard Law School) has whipped up anger toward him in the refugee community. Young is a former USAID official in Vietnam from 1968 to 1971 where he worked in AID's "village development program." Young's father, Kenneth Young, was once US ambassador to Thailand and was an architect of what came to be known as the village pacification program in Southeast Asia. (Boston Globe 5/7/81)

Young denies to a Globe reporter that he wishes Long any physical harm but made it clear that as a devoted friend of the refugees he provides all kinds of information to the refugee community, including news of relevant speaking events. He added that Long "provokes" reaction by appearing on platforms as an apologist for the Communists in Vietnam. But a New York Times report seems to indicate that Young was one of the very people who recommended that Long be invited to participate on the Harvard panel. (NY Times 5/6/81)

The Boston Globe reports that Young, after the attack, acted as interpreter for the alleged assailant and expressed admiration for the alleged assailant's initial refusal of bail at his hearing. Young's wife acted as treasurer of a defense fund the refugee groups organized to pay legal expenses for the alleged attacker.

Other members of the panel at Harvard who joined with Young in making charges against Long during the meeting were Stephen Morris, an associate of the Harvard Russian Research Center, and Hue-Tam Ho Tai, an assistant professor of Vietnamese history at Harvard.

The friends of Ngo Vinh Long are very concerned about his safety and the safety of his family. This is serious business. Beyond that, our concern is this: The attack on Ngo Vinh Long is ultimately an attempt to stifle any open expression of divergent views about Vietnam, and certainly to intimidate anyone supporting a new relationship of friendship between the US and Vietnam. If Long cannot return to his alma mater to express his views on Vietnam without fearing for his life, then the freedom of all of us to do so is impaired. Now is the time to raise our voices against this organized campaign of intimidation; to encourage refugees to deal with the confusion and anger they feel at the uprooting of their lives in other ways; and to move for an investigation by appropriate authorities of what may well be a conspiracy to murder Ngo Vinh Long.

More information on the Ngo Vinh Long case can be obtained from the Indochina Aid and Friendship Project, PO Box 129, Dorchester, MA 02122. Subscriptions to the newsletter (same address) are $6 per year.
Black American women have the poorest health status of all Americans. The life expectancy for black females is 4.6 years lower than white females. Black infant death rates are double that of white infants. Heart disease, high blood pressure, cancer, strokes, and diabetes are increasing as leading causes of deaths among minorities; and the birth rate for black teenagers is three times higher than white teenagers. The Reagan administration has further compounded these problems by making drastic cuts in social programs that provide services for the poor. During 1981-1982 the National Women’s Health Network will be focusing on black women’s health issues. Resist’s grant will help them set up an initial planning meeting for a national conference. The goal of this project is to alert black women to the health problems affecting their lives, as well as seeking useful treatment and preventative methods. The campaign is planned to reach a variety of audiences and stimulate dialogue between black health consumers, health care providers, and members of the workforce. Over the past five years the National Women’s Health Network has assisted feminist health centers and collectives to become politically effective and has been a strong and active voice for women’s health in the US Congress, the FDA and the Federal Court.

GUATEMALA TEACH-IN ORGANIZATION (1718 20th St., NW, Washington, DC 20009).

Conditions of appalling inequity and injustice continue to mar the lives of Guatemala’s Indians, peasants, and workers. Less than subsistence wages, malnutrition, high infant mortality, seasonal and dangerous labor are the lot of the common people of that country. Instead of working toward solutions for these problems, the Guatemalan government has developed a brutal campaign of terror, torture, murder, and political repression to quiet the demands of the Guatemalan people for a better life. They are asking for US military assistance and our government is responding favorably. The people of North America are not aware of what is happening in Guatemala and do not know of the historical and continuing US intervention in Guatemalan affairs. To help remedy this lack of knowledge and understanding, a call to organize a national Teach-in has been made by the Guatemala Scholars Network and the National Network in Solidarity with the People of Guatemala. The Teach-ins will take place during October on college and university campuses, in churches, unions, co-ops, and other community groups. Major public events in Washington, DC, New York City, Boston, Minneapolis, San Francisco, and Los Angeles will center around October 20th, the anniversary of the 1944 revolution. Regional and local groups around the country have already begun to hold forums and study groups to build interest and awareness in preparation for the Teach-ins. Resist supported this project by contributing to the national fund-raising campaign of the sponsoring groups. For more details on the economic and political dimensions of the turmoil in Guatemala, the following reports are available: Guate­mala: Government of Political Murder, Amnesty International, 3618 Sacramento St., San Francisco, CA 94118, $3.95; Guatemala: Repression and Resistance, National Lawyers Guild, 853 Broadway, Rm. 1704, New York, NY 10003, $3.00; Guatemala, Green Revo­lution, PO Box 3233, York, PA 17402, $1.50.

MINERS FOR SAFE ENERGY (PO Box 247, Lead, SD 57754).

Miners for Safe Energy came to life in October 1979, as a result of the constant threat of proposed uranium mining in the uniquely scenic Black Hills area. They are a small, struggling group of hardrock miners and their families and friends, who have been organizing to educate the community about the hazards and politics of uranium mining. Their literature shows a special concern for how working people are affected by the uranium industry: “When the US Government began to produce nuclear weapons in the 1950s, every measure of care was taken to protect the top secret nature of bomb manufacturing. Meanwhile, in the uranium mines of the Southwest, where most workers were Navajo Indians, the government took no measures of care or security to protect the miners. Dozens of these miners died without ever knowing why.” The Miners’ most recent project is a documentary film called “Black Waters,” which is about the dozen or so multinational corporations that want to move into this rural area and mine uranium. It also shows the growth of a grassroots movement to stop them. Resist is helping them to distribute the film throughout the nine communities which will be affected by uranium development. The project was made into a summerlong campaign with members visiting the nine towns to speak about the current needs of the struggle and draw new people into the organizing effort.

THE RESIST PLEDGE SYSTEM

The most important source of our income is monthly pledges. Pledges help us to plan ahead by stabilizing our monthly income. In addition to receiving the newsletter, pledges get a monthly reminder letter, containing some news of recent grants. If you would like to learn more, drop us a note.

Yes, I would like to be a Resist pledge for

☐ $5/month
☐ $10/month
☐ $25/month
☐ $50/month
☐ (other)

Name __________________________
Street __________________________
City __________________________ State ______ Zip ______