

Trinity College

## Trinity College Digital Repository

---

Resist Newsletters

Resist Collection

---

12-31-1987

### Resist Newsletter, Dec. 1987

Resist

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Resist, "Resist Newsletter, Dec. 1987" (1987). *Resist Newsletters*. 121.  
<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/resistnewsletter/121>

# RESIST

Newsletter #201

A Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority

December, 1987

## Death Squads in the Philippines

FRANK BROADHEAD

**D**eath squads are largely creatures of the national security states that grew up within the US sphere of influence in the 1960s and 1970s. They reached their highest levels of killing in Latin American countries such as Argentina, Bolivia, and El Salvador, and in Vietnam under the "Phoenix" program. Death squads differ from other terrorist organizations in that they function with quasi-official sanction and are closely linked to the military.

Death squads serve three purposes. The first is to be a screen separating the national security apparatus from acts of murder. This is largely a public relations consideration, as the official state apparatus must conform to certain human rights standards if it is to continue to receive US aid and diplomatic support. Death squads—often members of the military in civilian clothes—have no such constraints.

A second function of death squads is to "decapitate" popular movements that function legally, such as trade unions or community organizations, by murdering their leaders and militants. In 1980, for example, death squads linked to the military virtually eliminated the nonviolent Salvadoran opposition from the cities, forcing opponents of the government to rely on armed struggle based in remote rural areas.



Heavily armed paramilitary trooper watches over villagers. Photo: APC

Death squads are also useful to destabilize parliamentary regimes and generate popular support for a military solution to turbulence and violence. This was the result of the campaign of murder conducted by Turkey's "Gray Wolves," whose slaughter of trade union and progressive leaders paved the way for the Turkish coup of September 1980, carried out by the military to "restore order."

Death squads embodying each of these features have now emerged in the Philippines. Their birthplace is Davao City, on the island of Mindanao. Mindanao has been an area of relative success for the armed insurgency in the Philippines. It has also generated a

broad aboveground popular movement, clustered around community and other "cause-oriented" organizations through which the city's poor try to better their lives.

It is these organizations and their leaders that are the targets of Davao's death squads. This disheartening story is told clearly and in chilling detail in a new publication from the Alliance for Philippine Concerns. Beginning with accounts of how several poor neighborhoods succumbed to the terrorism of the "Alsa Masa" ("people rising"), the authors, primarily social workers from Davao, place the emergence of the death squads in a larger class and national context.

*continued on page two*

# Death Squads

*continued from page one*

Alsa Masa and its imitators are composed largely of teenage boys. While some of these gangs have a criminal past, and have been "rented" by the military in exchange for guns and legal protection, others have been formed explicitly for counterinsurgency purposes. Still others are groups of religious fanatics; the "Moonie" organization CAUSA has been an active supporter of the death squads. In all, the Alliance for Philippine Concerns lists 118 death squads in 36 provinces.

The methods of the death squads are extremely straightforward. A few murders serve as a warning to others. Nonparticipants in death squad activities have their houses marked with paint, and so become targets themselves. Progressive activists are visited and warned, and their neighbors no longer dare associate with them. Cooperatives are bombed, or taken over for use by the death squads. Nighttime patrols keep "outsiders" from entering the neighborhood. Whole villages believed to be sympathetic to the guerrillas are terrorized and flee, becoming refugees. The social space for self-organization is simply eliminated through terror.

Davao's death squads have received official support from the military and business leadership of the region. This is a nationwide pattern. Death squads are supported by the Army, and they have been endorsed by Mrs. Aquino and by some leaders of the Church such as Cardinal Sin, who praise these killers as anticommunists. Aquino recently travelled to Davao to laud the Alsa Masa's work as a model for the nation.

The role of the United States in the Philippine death squads is unclear. Earlier this year *Newsweek* reported that President Reagan had signed a "finding" authorizing a multimillion dollar expenditure on counterinsurgency in the Philippines, and adding a dozen more CIA agents to the 115 already stationed in Manila (March 23, 1987). In May a delegation of US citizens headed by Ramsey Clark was in the Philippines to investigate the growing civil war. The delegation's statement noted that the CIA was "advising, organizing, arming, [and] financing" the death squads.

The Alliance for Philippine Concerns calls on the people of the United States to demand the end of US support for the death squads. Their

50-page book, "Death Squads in the Philippines," is illustrated with many striking photographs, and is a valuable introduction to this important issue. It is available for \$5 from APC, PO Box 170219, San Francisco, CA 94117.

*Frank Brodhead is a member of the Resist board and a frequent contributor to the newsletter.*

## GRANTS

**Alliance for Philippine Concerns**  
145 9th St., San Francisco, CA 94103.

For many of us, keeping track of fast-changing events in the Philippines is difficult at best. Newspaper accounts are so influenced by US interests in the region that it's nearly impossible to decipher the available reports and get at the facts. To counter this misinformation, 48 groups supporting genuine democracy and sovereignty in the Philippines established the Alliance for Philippine Concerns (APC) in 1986. Its goals are to provide accurate information about the Philippines and regional issues to North Americans, and to educate Congress about the implications of US policy there.

While the APC's priority is supporting political sovereignty for the Philippines, the organization also takes strong stands against superpower domination in many other areas of the world, working in coalition with CISPEs, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, TransAfrica, the American Indian Movement and other groups.

This year the APC established several broad on-going campaigns that member organizations would work on. These include: ending US aid to the Philippine Military (including education about CIA subversion of Philippine labor, church and other sectors); the withdrawal of US bases (seeking mutual withdrawal of Soviet and US bases to pave the way for demilitarization of the Asian-Pacific region); emergency economic relief; cultural tours, and coordination of North American activities on significant dates in Philippine history.

Early this past summer APC

## TWO SUBS?

With a mailing list the size of Resist's it is very easy to end up sending the same household, or even the same person, duplicate subscriptions. If you are receiving more newsletters each month than you want or need, please let us know! The simplest way to do this is to send the address labels and write a note letting us know which we should delete. Thanks for your help with this project.

groups began gathering information on the rise of vigilante groups and death squads in the Philippines, and looking at evidence linking them to the CIA. At a time when many of us would still like to imagine the Philippines as on the road to democracy, the APC's efforts at revealing this information underlines the fact that the struggle for basic human rights in that country is far from complete. RESIST's recent grant of \$400 contributed to APC's distribution of a booklet on Death Squads in the Philippines.



The Resist Newsletter is published ten times a year by Resist, Inc., One Summer Street, Somerville, MA 02143. (617) 623-5110. The views expressed in articles, other than editorials, are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the Resist staff or board.

Resist Staff: Nancy Wechsler  
Nancy Moniz  
Tatiana Schreiber

Typesetting: Liz Cummings  
Gay Community News

Printing: Red Sun Press

# Detente From Below: The Peace Movement Needs a Democratic Foreign Policy

JOANNE LANDY  
THOMAS HARRISON

*The following is an article which originally appeared in New Politics, an independent socialist magazine (New Politics, Winter 1987, Vol. I, No. 2, copyright 1987). It reflects the view of a growing number of radicals, socialist and non-socialist, who believe it is crucial for the left to propose alternatives to both superpower blocs. The authors are aware that their approach is a controversial one, and welcome comments from RESIST's readers.*

**F**our years ago the American peace movement was lifted up on a tidal wave of mass protest against nuclear weapons. Today, the movement lies becalmed and directionless, largely cut off from majority opinion and unable to exert much influence on political debate. Yet, what has happened is not some sudden and total reversal in the national mood. The Freeze campaign fostered massive opposition to Reagan's arms escalation, and the millions of Americans who were influenced by that campaign have not just turned around and embraced militarism. While there is a lot of naivete about Star Wars, most people are still quite nervous and uncertain about this country's nuclear arsenal and inclined to sympathize with peace proposals like the Freeze and nuclear-free zones. This mood, which might be called "nuclear anxiety," plays a role, albeit a limited one, in the current tussles between the Administration and its Democratic defense policy critics in Congress. Unfortunately, though, it is a shallow, shifting mood, without internal consistency and with very little ultimate effect on policymaking. It is a mood based largely on fear rather than a positive, assertive challenge to the whole range of structures, policies and

ideologies—essentially the Cold War itself—that breed the menace of nuclear holocaust. People are not accustomed to thinking about these issues in critical ways, in part because the peace movement provides them with little or no guidance. To the question that always greets proposals for disarmament—"What about the Russians?"—the movement really has no answer.

A comprehensive alternative foreign policy that linked the struggle for disarmament and peace with popular concern for democracy and human rights could have a broad appeal in today's uncertain political climate. Many of the particular conflicts in which Washington plays a role as part of its overall policy of Cold War intervention have aroused widespread opposition. There is considerable humanitarian concern over US aggression in Central America and suspiciousness of American policy in South Africa, South Korea and elsewhere. Millions of Americans also care about democratic liberties for people living in Communist countries. The problem, of course, is that sympathy for the victims of Communist oppression tends to get translated into support for the American government's conservative and militaristic brand of anti-Communism, which in turn weakens popular opposition to the Administration's depredations in Central America and further encourages reliance on the nuclear "deterrent." The peace movement can break this deadly circle by offering a democratic foreign policy that calls for the dismantling of nuclear weapons East and West and supports struggles for democratic control in both blocs.

The trouble is, the mainstream American peace movement, despite having made some progress in broadening its political agenda since the fiasco of the 1984 election, remains narrowly focused on its traditional goals: arms control talks, test bans and treaties. It still tends to avoid in-depth

strategic discussions such as how it should address broader foreign policy issues like Communism, NATO, conventional forces, and Third World revolutions. They often see these questions as "divisive." But they are enmeshed in the conflicts and aggressions that characterize the bloc system, and it is extremely unrealistic to believe that the problem of nuclear weapons can be solved in isolation from this highly political world.

Because most of the peace movement lacks a clear and systematic alternative to the bi-partisan Cold War policy of the American Establishment, it has accommodated itself to the liberal Democratic wing of that Establishment. And this accommodation has severely hampered the movement's ability to win even modest goals. In 1984 the Freeze went all out to elect Mondale, who, as a believer in a powerful US nuclear force and a supporter of the deployment of cruise and Pershing missiles in Western Europe, would seem to have been an undeserving recipient of the peace movement's zealous support. And the result: not only was Mondale soundly defeated, but the Freeze did not even become a major issue in the campaign. Since then, the Freeze campaign, SANE, and other mainstream peace organizations have continued to look to the Democrats for leadership. Last year, the House majority did administer a few sharp rebukes to the Administration on nuclear testing and SALT-II issues, responding to the polls showing increased popular dismay over Reagan's insistence on an unrelenting arms buildup. However, all but a handful of Democrats have continued to vote for a formidable array of nuclear and conventional weapons and for Star Wars research, if at lower levels of funding than Reagan would wish. The shallowness of the Democrats' opposition was most clearly shown, though, when Reagan warned Congress not to "tie his hands" at the Reykjavik con-

*continued on page four*

*continued from page three*

ference. Even the mildest demands for restraint were dropped. And when Reagan returned from Reykjavik empty-handed, having once again revealed his intransigent commitment to Star Wars at any cost, almost all Democrats refused to criticize him, saying they didn't want to turn the Iceland meetings into a "partisan issue."

The feebleness of the Democrats' resistance on defense matters is paralleled by their weak opposition to Reagan's aggressively interventionist policies in the Third World. In 1985 many Democrats approved so-called humanitarian aid to the Contras, thus legitimizing the later out-and-out grant of military support. The truth is, because of their ties to the centers of power in America most Democrats fear basic social change in the Third World as much as the Republicans do. Consequently, they are generally unwilling to break decisively with right-wing forces like the Contras and authoritarian regimes (recall Carter's support for the Shah) which they see as providing a guarantee of US "national interest." Intervention and the nuclear threat are the twin pillars of a Cold War foreign policy consensus, to which both parties have adhered since 1945.

### **A Democratic Foreign Policy Would Support National Self-Determination**

Instead of relying on the Democrats, the peace movement should take the initiative with the sort of program that enables it to campaign not just against nuclear weapons, but against the politics that create the danger of nuclear war. Such a democratic foreign policy would include support for national self-determination, the right of a people to decide its own national destiny. This right is today cynically violated by the superpowers' actions in Eastern Europe, Central America and elsewhere. Yet it is a basic tenet of American policy, to which even most liberal politicians subscribe, that the US can legitimately act to prevent smaller nations from choosing any form of government that might endanger American "security" and "national interest"—a view that mirrors the Soviet claim that neighboring countries must remain under its control for reasons of national security. A fundamental premise of a democratic foreign policy is that it is in the true national interest of the American people to repudiate intimidation as a way of

relating to other nations, and that the most secure world is one in which we can find common ground with the aspirations of ordinary people everywhere to change and control their own societies.

Repudiation of the politics of militarism and intimidation would require the US to withdraw its troops from Western Europe, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and elsewhere. A truly democratic foreign policy would provide political and moral support and encouragement to fighters for human rights everywhere, be they in Chile or Poland, South Africa or Czechoslovakia, South Korea or the Soviet Union. It would reject the policy of relying on nuclear weapons for defense, and instead propose immediate, dramatic and unmistakable unilateral initiatives towards disarmament. Not only would the US cancel Star Wars on the spot, but it would end nuclear testing, and cease the production and deployment of all nuclear weapons.

A democratic foreign policy could build the peace movement by enabling it to appeal powerfully and honestly to the antipathy many people feel toward the Soviet system and to their belief in the value of democratic rights. What holds many Americans and Western Europeans back from a thoroughgoing opposition to nuclear weapons and the bloc system is their fear of expansion of the Soviet-type system. Most people in the peace movement believe that to acknowledge that there is any legitimacy to this concern will merely serve to fuel popular support for Cold War militarism. In fact, though, the peace movement can address this fear and undercut its current political consequences by pointing out that unilateral disarmament initiatives, troop withdrawals, and support for democratic revolutionary movements in the Third World are progressive and effective ways to deal with the Soviet Union and Communism.\* The American government's claim to champion democracy can be exposed as false and hypocritical by showing how the actual murderous, reactionary policy of the US has had precisely the effect of enhancing the political and social appeal of Communism.

\*In using the word "Communism" we are not referring to Communism as Marx defined the term, but to the Soviet-type social system.

Reagan's performance at Reykjavik, for example, immeasurably enhanced Gorbachev's image as a man of peace. It encouraged people, not excluding peace activists, to overlook such salient features of Soviet foreign policy as the continuing domination of Eastern Europe and the grisly war in Afghanistan. This is only one of the ways in which the bellicosity of the US, far from serving its purported goal of defending democracy and human rights, only provides the USSR with justification for sustaining its own garrison state at home and maintaining its occupying armies abroad. A real challenge to Soviet control over its empire would be posed if the US were to accept Gorbachev's nuclear disarmament initiatives, cancel Star Wars, and, in addition, withdraw American armies from Western Europe. The Soviets claim that their soldiers are in Eastern Europe and Afghanistan simply as a defense against Western aggression. The way to undercut this claim would be for the US to announce the departure of its own troops, not because of any belief that the Soviet military presence in other countries is in fact solely motivated by the American threat, but as a way to put *political pressure*, both within the Soviet bloc and internationally, on the USSR to recall its armies as well.

### **Activists Reluctant to Criticize Soviet Policies**

Unfortunately, many peace and anti-intervention activists are reluctant to criticize Soviet policy, just as they have all too often been reluctant to defend human rights in the Eastern bloc as enthusiastically as in Latin America and South Africa, because they think this "plays into Reagan's hands." But keeping quiet about repression in the East and hailing Gorbachev as a man of peace are what *really* plays into Reagan's hands. It allows him to associate the peace movement with Soviet authoritarianism and thus discredit it. And it lets the Reaganites get away with murder, since in truth it is *they* who have the double standard, pretending to be outraged at the lack of trade union and democratic rights in Communist countries while they are actually complicitous in attacks on human rights in El Salvador, Turkey, Guatemala, and South Korea, to mention only a few examples.

This reluctance on the part of many in the American peace movement to

challenge Soviet as well as American military policy, and the movement's failure, so far, to move beyond a narrow arms control approach, have many sources. Some elements in the movement explain, and even justify, the Soviet Union's massive nuclear arsenal as a purely defensive reaction to US aggression and its domination of Eastern Europe as a legitimate, if unfortunate, necessity given the Soviet obsession with secure borders. This view fails to appreciate that for both sides in the Cold War "offensive" and "defensive" goals are inseparable, that for each side nuclear armaments are a source of global power as well as a way to respond to the nuclear weaponry of the other side. People who hold this view also accept the corrupt notion that it is legitimate for the Soviet Union to control weaker, smaller neighbors on the grounds of "security," even though they quite correctly would never accord the US this moral right.

Most peace activists are reluctant to get involved with questions of repression and human rights in the East, not because they are pro-Soviet, however, but because they fatalistically accept the bloc system—that is, the Cold War division of the world—as fixed and permanent. As long as the blocs are accepted, the only course for the peace movement would seem to be encouraging the superpowers to resolve world tensions through summitry in order to achieve a stable balance of power. But the nature of the Cold War as a conflict of social systems, and not just a geopolitical competition between two very powerful states, makes a long-term stabilization virtually impossible. Whatever detente the US and the Soviet Union might temporarily work out would be inevitably disrupted by the impact of events in the Middle East, Europe, Latin America, the Pacific, or somewhere else. Major social or political changes in any part of the world, even if not initiated by either of the superpowers, inexorably draw them in because of their desire to protect their global systemic interests.

### **Challenging the Bloc System**

There is no reason to assume the bloc system is our common fate. Those who think it is hopeless to challenge the existence of the blocs fail to appreciate the significance of the many important movements both East and West that are doing just that. In Western Europe,

a large part of the movement for European Nuclear Disarmament, formed in 1980, explicitly called for dismantling the bloc system by working for a "united, neutral and pacific Europe," in the words of the END Appeal. In Britain, West Germany, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Italy, Spain and elsewhere, a grassroots mass movement with a visionary program managed to pose more of a threat to the war-making powers of the US and NATO than any treaty has ever done. Even more unprecedented and extraordinary, however, was the emergence of counterparts in the East bloc, even in the Soviet Union itself.

Perhaps the best known of these is the Moscow Trust Group, formed in June, 1982, at the same time as the massive peace demonstration in New York City. However, independent peace voices have been raised throughout Eastern Europe. In Czechoslovakia, for example, the human rights movement Charter 77 has engaged in intensive dialogue and discussion with Western peace activists and has played a key role in introducing the idea of a "democratic peace" as a common goal for disarmament and human rights movements. In Yugoslavia, increasing numbers of people have become involved with the peace issue, and in East Germany a grassroots, unofficial peace movement has been in existence for several years. In 1985, an independent peace movement, Freedom and Peace, was formed in Poland. Freedom and Peace activists have been imprisoned for refusing to take the military oath, which demands a pledge of loyalty to the "fraternal armies" of the Warsaw Pact, or for simply being active in an independent organization. In May 1987, Freedom and Peace staged an unprecedented peace seminar in Warsaw, which was attended by more than 60 Western peace activists and over 150 Poles. The success of this seminar has inspired independent activists in other Eastern countries to plan similar international meetings. (The next issue of RESIST will feature an in-depth article on the whole range of East-bloc independent movements.)

Compared with the American peace movement, many West European peace organizations have been far more involved in talking with and defending East-bloc activists. Europeans have more clearly understood that movements for democratic and

social rights can provide a critical source of strength to the cause of peace, and that it is disastrous for disarmament groups to appear indifferent to the hopes of people for human rights. To the extent that American peace organizations have paid any attention at all to the tasks of encouraging, defending and communicating with East-bloc counterparts, they have merely added this work to a long list of activities and "priorities"—rather than making these links the basis for an alternative perspective.

There has been progress. Many peace activists no longer believe that the struggle for peace is separate from the struggle for human rights. They are far less often reluctant to enter into discussions with independents in the East for fear of offending the official state-sponsored "peace councils" in the Soviet bloc. Solidarity from the West has challenged the belief among many East-bloc activists that the Western peace movement was merely playing into the hands of Soviet foreign policy. Nonetheless, the American peace movement has yet to become an active participant in this East-West grassroots dialogue, which is, along with movements for democracy and social change in Africa, Asia and Latin America, part of the process of detente from below.

Communication between West European and East bloc activists, which began only recently, has already given birth to the concept of detente from below. On both sides, this concept has come to mean the integration of the fight for peace with the fight for democracy. The Gorbachev reforms, undertaken out of desperate economic need, have opened up new spaces for autonomous groups and individuals in the Eastern bloc—even though it is reasonable to assume that this was not their purpose. Yet, enormous obstacles remain. The polarization of the Cold War has been planted deep in the hearts and minds of people everywhere; it will not disappear tomorrow or next year. But, in Europe, the process of consciously challenging the Cold War itself and developing an alternative to the blocs has begun. By joining this process, the American peace movement could give it tremendous impetus. At the same time, by making East-West grassroots cooperation a part of an alternative democratic

*continued on page seven*

# Finnish Women for Peace

## “Sweep Back” Nuclear Power

LeROY MOORE

*Resist supporters LeRoy Moore and Barbara Engel left for the Soviet Union recently, with promises that they would send us information on the peace movement and feminist activism in the USSR. Bureaucratic problems intervened and they're temporarily "on hold" in Helsinki. Undeterred from their work, Moore sent this report on recent civil disobedience campaigns of Finnish women anti-nuclear activists.*

**F**orty Finnish women, many of them dressed as cleaning women, showed up at the Olkiluoto nuclear plant on the day before Father's Day. They had a gift for the fathers of Finland. Brandishing brooms, they announced: "We have come to sweep away the nuclear plant!"

They paused at the entrance, greeted the single guard on duty, then danced past him into the interior of the plant. A seventy-year old woman conducted the dance with her broom. To the tunes of children's songs familiar to every Finn they sang lyrics about the hazards of nuclear energy, and on the pavement they wrote slogans about closing the plant. Officers arrived and arrested them. They were detained in a bus two or three hours, then released.

By this time the sun had set, but the women hadn't finished their work in the little village of Eurajoki where the plant is located. "We took black bags," said one of the women, "with plutonium, cesium, etc., written on them and left them with the village mayor and other public officials, saying that, since they think this radioactive material is so safe, they should put it under their beds. Then we went to the houses of four people in local government who had taken stands against nuclear power and presented them with red roses."

One of two nuclear power plants in Finland, the Olkiluoto plant was designed and built by Swedish engineers, with some parts from the US. The plant is 40% government-owned, 60% owned by a consortium of corporations in Finland's huge paper pulp industry. Almost the whole of the electrical energy produced by the plant goes not to the homes and workplaces of typical Finnish citizens but to the pulp industry, an industry which consumes more energy than all other industry in Finland combined. This industry also stands out for its destruction of the environment and its refusal to recycle paper.

Two-and-a-half months after the Father's Day protest, the women were invited by the plant manager to return to Olkiluoto for a tour of the plant. "The plant, in relation to the village of Eurajoki," commented one of the women, "is 'Big Brother', so they are very paternalistic." When the women arrived at Olkiluoto for the tour, the plant's chief executive, a man with three children of his own, took them around. Pointing out how clean everything was, he told the women that *they* were more of a danger to the plant than it to them.

He ushered them into an auditorium where they were to hear from the company's environmental expert. "The nuclear industry wanted a PR success story," said one of the women, "but we made them look silly. We asked this expert a lot of hard questions. He became flustered and unable to answer us."

Another of the women continued: "We held our own public meeting in the village. Sixty or seventy people showed up. The vicar of the local Lutheran congregation was in the audience. He told us we should attack 'big problems' like nuclear weapons and apartheid, not nuclear power." The women weren't surprised. "We had heard rumors that money went from the company to the church."

The women were to stand trial in November. "For what?" asked one of them. "Their crimes are worse than ours." The women were charged with trespass and with committing violence against the watchman. The watchman already had testified in court that the protesters did him no harm, so that charge was likely to be dropped. But the women expected to be found guilty on the trespassing charge. As they emphasize, they went with the intent to trespass, in order to call attention to the dangers of nuclear power. Several declared outright that they were prepared to go to prison, if need be. (At Resist press time we were unable to learn the outcome of the trial).

I asked about Chernobyl. Didn't Chernobyl awaken Finns to the dangers of nuclear energy? "No. People prefer to forget Chernobyl, to deny it. Our government says there has been no serious radiation over the border as a result of Chernobyl."

"But in Scotland, which is much further from Chernobyl than is Finland," I countered, "lambs are not allowed to be sold for food. And the same holds for reindeer in certain sectors of Norway. . . ." I couldn't complete my question before I was told that the reindeer herds of Laplanders in Finland's far North are also contaminated and cannot be butchered and put on the market. This deeply hurts the Laps, for whom reindeer are the center of their way of life. "Nevertheless, the Finnish government tells the rest of us that no significant radiation has resulted in our country from Chernobyl."

"Besides all the lies," someone else asserted, "ordinary people think they can do nothing. So it's easier to deny the hazards of nuclear power." Obviously the women who went to Olkiluoto to sweep away the nuclear plant do not accept such fatalism. They believe something can be done, and they are doing it. A loosely organized

*continued on page seven*

*continued from page six*

group of mothers, housewives and working women, they variously call themselves "Mothers For Peace" and "Mothers Against Nuclear Power," and they are the Finnish part of a far-ranging European network of "Women for Peace."

They have no officers, no hierarchy, and they have been meeting weekly since the late '70s. Their meetings are brief and informal, and their activities are quite varied. Previously they helped arrange three peace marches for nuclear disarmament, one from Copenhagen to Paris, a second one from Oslo to Minsk via Moscow, a third from Washington to New York. They are now preparing to take Finnish-made windmills to Mali.

Earlier this year they attended the opening day of Finland's Parliament as "weeping women". Dressed in black, they sat in the galleries overlooking the chamber. At one point they began to keen and to cry and to toss handkerchiefs with peace messages written on them onto the floor below, one for each member of Parliament. They were reviving the ancient custom of wise women who foretell danger and weep, a folk tradition known from Scandinavia to Greece and beyond.

On another occasion some of these same women went to Finland's other nuclear power plant, located at Loviisa, along the coast, east of Helsinki. The Loviisa plant produces power for public consumption. Operated by IVO, a state corporation, it was built by Soviets, though its "safety systems" are Western. There are allegations that sub-contractors gave bribes so that cheaper, inferior components could be used in construction. Quality-control of the Soviet components is regarded as a serious problem, especially since the 1985 Chernobyl disaster.

The island where the Loviisa reactor is located is a high-security area. Some of the Women For Peace went there via boat, armed only with their belief in the Finnish tradition that it is "everyone's right" to walk on the land in the countryside. They walked to various parts of the island, leaving signs of their presence here and there. Then, from inside the plant, they arrived at the front entrance to welcome a large group which was approaching from outside. Baffled authorities arrested no one. The women then went to the Loviisa town-market square where

they performed a skit based on their fears for their children. "It's crazy," they said, "not to be afraid."

On the first anniversary of Chernobyl, some of the Women For Peace went to IVO headquarters for a meeting with company officials and experts. The women arrived with stones, on each of which was written the name of a place where nuclear waste might be buried. (As in the US, the Finnish government is scouring the country for a permanent site for nuclear waste). One such stone was given to each IVO official or expert. While they stood awkwardly holding their burden, the women spoke of nuclear waste and the dangers of food contamination.

From the public at large, the women get some applause and some encouragement, and, especially since Chernobyl, a few newcomers to their group. But they also meet opposition, hostility, and, mainly, indifference. Finland is a newly urban, newly rich country, with a highly developed consumer economy. Finnish people do not easily question authority. "We try," say the women, "to show that it is the obedience of the people which is the real threat to us all."

After Chernobyl, after Three Mile Island—moreover, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki—Finland's Women For Peace, her "weeping women", seem wise indeed. □

---

*LeRoy Moore is an associate of the Rocky Mountain Peace Center, P.O. Box 1156, Boulder, CO 80302. (303) 444-6981. The Women For Peace can be contacted at Bulevardi 11A 1, 00120 Helsinki, Finland.*

**Detente** *continued from page five*  
foreign policy, and by vigorously campaigning for this policy, peace activists in this country could achieve fresh legitimacy and discover a way of reaching out to the vast majority of their fellow citizens.

There are several organizations and periodicals in this country working on building detente from below through promoting cooperation between independent peace and human rights activists across Cold War barriers. The groups have an informal network and often work together. Following is a brief description of these organizations and publications, and how to get in touch with them:

## **The Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East and West**

Founded in 1982, CPD/EW brings together members of the peace movement, trade unionists, environmentalists, feminists and minority rights activists in this country around the perspective of independence from both superpowers. The Campaign has close ties with East-bloc activists, and has contributed, through discussion and in written form, to the ongoing East-West dialogue about the foreign policy of the US and USSR and the relationship between peace, human rights and related issues. The Campaign has launched several major campaigns to defend imprisoned and harassed independents in the East bloc; it has also sponsored campaigns critical of US foreign policy in Nicaragua and Chile for which it has enlisted dozens of East-bloc activists. (These protests have appeared in *The New York Times*, *The Congressional Record*, *The New York Review of Books*, *In These Times*, *The Nation* and elsewhere.) The organization works to foster communication and mutual support among movements for peace and social change in the East, West and Third World. CPD/EW has written articles for a range of publications, provides speakers, and acts as a resource for the media. The Campaign has succeeded in placing articles on various aspects of detente from below in a number of publications. Its own publication is *Peace and Democracy News*, which appears twice a year and costs \$10.00. Campaign for Peace and Democracy/East West, P.O. Box 1640, Cathedral Station, New York, NY 10025. Contact: Joanne Landy or Thomas Harrison.

## **Helsinki Watch**

The US Helsinki Watch Committee was founded in 1979 to monitor domestic and international compliance with the human rights provisions of the 1975 Helsinki Accords. The organization has documented the activities and harassment of all independent peace groups in the Eastern bloc, and has provided information to US individuals and organizations wishing to visit independent peace activists in the East, particularly in the USSR. It has just published a comprehensive report entitled *From Below: Independent Peace and Environmental Movements in*

*continued on page eight*



continued from page seven

**Eastern Europe and The USSR.** Single copies are \$10.00; there is a 10% discount on 10 or more copies, and a 25% discount on 25 or more. Helsinki Watch, 36 West 44th St., 9th Floor, New York, NY 10036. Contact: Cathy Fitzpatrick or Janet Fleischman.

### Peace Activists East and West

Based in Amherst, Massachusetts, PAEW first activity was to organize a 1985 regional conference featuring several Moscow Trust Group members and a Czech peace and human rights activist. In March 1987 the group held a conference comparing and contrasting East bloc and Latin American experiences. PAEW participated in this summer's national Green gathering in Amherst, where it organized workshops on "East-South Dialogue" in which several Latin American Green Party and ecological activists discussed possibilities for cooperative work with a representative of Poland's Freedom and Peace group. The organization produces a newsletter, a resource guide, and holds local meetings. For further information, write PAEW, P.O. Box 704, Northampton, MA 01061. Contact: Judith Hempfling.

### Fellowship of Reconciliation

FOR is an interfaith pacifist organization. Its US-USSR Reconciliation program seeks to build understanding between the people of the US and USSR, to eradicate "enemy im-

ages" and to create a climate where disarmament becomes possible. FOR works both with official Soviet groups and with independent groups and individuals. FOR has co-sponsored a New York City forum on Detente from Below, and provided assistance to emigres from the Trust Group who have arrived in this country. The organization's bi-monthly publication is *Fellowship*, and costs \$12 per year. Fellowship of Reconciliation, Box 271, Nyack, NY 10017. Contact: Richard Deats or Virginia Baron.

### Neither East nor West

This is a group of anarchists, libertarian socialists and others which formed in November 1986. The organization is an action group in support of peace, human rights and social justice. It has organized street demonstrations in support of draft resisters in the USSR and Poland, and has protested harassment of activists in various East-bloc countries. *Neither East nor West's* publication *On Gogol Boulevard* is \$5.00 per year, and its address is 151 First Avenue, #62, New York, NY 10003. *Neither East nor West's* address is 339 Lafayette St., Rm. 202, New York, NY 10012. Contact: Bob McGlynn.

### International Nonviolent Initiative

The East-West Project, a project of International Nonviolent Initiatives, began its work in 1984. (At that time the parent organization was known as the International Seminars on Training for Nonviolent Action.) The project aims to foster communication and contact between US peace and human rights activists and independent activists working in behalf of human rights, peace and democratic change in Eastern Europe. Its activities have included visits to Eastern Europe, the exchange of opinions and literature with activist groups and individuals in that region, support for activists East and West imprisoned or otherwise harassed for peace and human rights activities, support for emigre activists, and efforts to inform US peace groups and the public about independent activism in Eastern Europe through articles in newspapers and journals. A selection of these articles is available for two dollars postpaid. East-West Project, P.O. Box 515, Waltham, MA 02254. Contact: Beverly Woodward.

### Across Frontiers Magazine

An excellent quarterly with original documents and analyses from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, many appearing in English for the first time. The magazine places special emphasis on the democratic and working-class opposition, independent peace campaigns, ecological issues, East-West dialogue, and the dissolution of the bloc system. *AF* is an outstanding resource for peace groups wanting a deeper understanding of what's going on in the East. Subscriptions are \$10.00 per year. *Across Frontiers*, P.O. Box 2382, Berkeley, CA 94702. Editor: A. Winton Jackson.

### Sojourners Magazine

*Sojourners* is an independent Christian monthly magazine that has long been active in work for peace and social justice. The magazine has become increasingly concerned with East-West issues, and it has carried several articles on the questions of peace and human rights. The October 1987 issue contains an excellent and extensive section on Poland, including an eyewitness account of the May 1987 Freedom and Peace seminar and interviews with leading peace and Solidarity activists. The magazine appears 11 times per year; an annual subscription is \$15.00. *Sojourners*, Box 29272, Washington, D.C. 20017. Contact: Danny Collum, Associate Editor or Polly Duncan, Peace Ministry.

### New Politics Magazine

*NP* is an independent socialist magazine that hopes to strengthen currents seeking an alternative to capitalism and Soviet-type societies. Articles in the magazine cover a whole range of topics, but the editors have made a point of encouraging major contributions from socialists, Greens and others around the world on the issues of war and peace and the construction of a new radical-democratic internationalism. Individual copies are \$6.00. Subscriptions, which cover four issues, are \$20.00. *New Politics*, P.O. Box 98, Brooklyn, NY 11231. Editors: Phyllis and Julius Jacobson. □

*Thomas Harrison and Joanne Landy are directors of the Campaign for Peace and Democracy East and West. They are also both editors of New Politics magazine.*

### The Resist Pledge System

The most important source of Resist's income is monthly pledges. Pledges help us plan ahead by guaranteeing us a minimum monthly income. In turn, pledges receive a monthly reminder letter (in addition to the newsletter) which contains news of recent grants and other Resist activities. So take the plunge and become a Resist pledge!

Yes, I would like to pledge \$ \_\_\_\_\_ monthly to the work of Resist.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_