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The Voice of the Angry Dove

We are going to spoil your picnics. Because if we don't spoil them the masses will.

Ronald Reagan will be re-elected next November, and the chances of nuclear war will become even more certain. Yet PND continues its attempts at winning the hearts and minds of the Kremlin and the Pentagon by showing them that millions of people are scared stiff of the coming nuclear war.

The job of the generals is to keep people scared. A terrorised and passive population is precisely what keeps the government criminals (at least guilty of premeditated mass murder) in power.

The Chileans fear the secret police. We fear the nukes.

But the bombs are not going to disappear simply by having us tell Reagan we don't like them. Everyone knows the Chileans people dislike their cops. They still have them.

The only thing that will eliminate the nukes is if we start fighting for this goal. The governments know we are against them, now is the time to make them feel it.

Time is on their side. It may be too late to stop the last war. But we have to try.

Palm Sunday picnics to increase the already enormous PND support group will not scare or pressure Reagan into eliminating the Cruise and Pershing II.

We will have to stop the picnics and try: demonstrations, as a first step in a long struggle to devise new methods that will let us win.

First Strike is a publication which will discuss such new strategies. First Strike is produced by the left wing of the nuclear disarmament movement. A section of the movement which is not afraid to propose new actions apart from the yearly ritual of begging for peace with a million voices. A section which is not afraid to initiate new actions.

Our aim is to win this fight against the superpowers, and we must use realistic tough policies to do it. These are socialist policies developed in the knowledge that our present condition is a struggle, and that we are the underdogs.

Hopefully the movement will be successful. We will do our best in First Strike and through our actions, to improve the ability of the movement to fight back.

This means that First Strike will be published, and will reach the movement and beyond on a regular basis (every month). It also makes the left presence felt.

Sexism and Disarmament

On many previous occasions the issue of sexism has been raised within the disarmament movement, every time by women. I've heard it said that the nuclear threat doesn't affect men and women in any different way - both men and women are equally vulnerable because a nuclear weapon doesn't distinguish its victims. Despite the bomb being a great equalizer when incinerating millions, the threat of nuclear war is very directly linked with the oppression of women.

Although many women are involved in the world-wide disarmament movement and the contributions they make are immeasurably valuable to its cause, the links that many of these women make between the nature of patriarchy and the nuclear madness have neither been recognised nor understood. Women are not only exposing the sexism rampant within the disarmament movement, but the fundamental connections between the oppression that women suffer in patriarchal society and the threat of nuclear war that results from the nuclear arms build up. These connections mean that women have a particular interest, as women, in the success of the disarmament movement.

Women argue that the rise of the nuclear industry is a logical extension of male thought and male values. Dorothy Green wrote in the "Age" last year, "A handful of powerful men, destitute of any moral sense, took it upon themselves to decide the fate of humankind, and other powerful men have been arguing about these decisions ever since, without any reference at all to more than half the world's population." The nuclear arms race from its very beginnings, stems from a particular attitude towards competition, technology, territory, militarism, war, aggression and destruction. These are the characteristics which patriarchy holds in high esteem - they are attributed as natural to men and through socialization determine the values not only held individually, but collectively by the men that control both society as a whole and the nuclear industry.
Nuclear war embodies violence on a massive scale, but violence is not something foreign to male thought or action. In a paper presented to the Symposium "The Consequences of Nuclear War for Australia and Its Region" held at ANU in May 1983, Nancy Shelley claimed that: "The issue is . . . the structure of men’s thinking and the dominance of white male culture . . . In our society, it is men who have developed science and technology whose ultimate products are nuclear weapons, it is men who have been made invisible by the dominance of male thinking, who sometimes have been defined out of existence, and who are commonly objects of violence."

SEXISM AND MILITARISM

Betty Reardon, in "Millitarism and Sexism: Influences on Education for War," notes that: "Millitarism and sexism complement, reinforce and help to perpetuate each other. They also constitute major obstacles to overcoming war, largely as they affect the education and formation of generation after generation."

"Millitarism has been a significant aspect of the socialization and socialisation of boys and largely determines what qualities society deems masculine attributes. These attitudes challenge the rationalization of war that militarism is based on. It was considered a "defilement" of the memory of the "brave men" who died to save us. Nancy Shelley, in a paper referred to above, notes that: "We are familiar too with the identification and often open violence that accompanies attacks on those who would define these concepts (the values of militarism) otherwise. The most significant of these is in Australia in recent times has been the reaction to the marches of the Women Against Rape at Anzac Day Parades. Those women were remembered. All Women Raped - All Wars - thus introducing a part of the remembrance of war that is not to be countenanced. The women’s action brings such a remembrance because it touches the nerve of so much latent militarism within our society. It dares to reveal something of the accompanying aspects of war—things which are constant, dismissed as irrelevant and unimportant—and it lays bare the contempt with which women are held, in the eyes of militarism, nonmale held."

If peace means the absence of violence then women are in a situation of perpetual war. Rape is an accepted characteristic of war. If this is so, then the war against women never stops.

Not only are the values of militarism implicated in men as the basis of their much-treasured masculinity, militarism either ignores the existence of women at all, or views them only as deriving any value from the provision of services to men, or as disposable, clerical or sexual. Women are treated as they are by patriarchy in general—obviously as militarism stems from patriarchy itself. A woman’s role is either that of cook, cleaner, typer, etc., when employed by the military, or as providing men with entertainment for men on leave. Women are expected to be invisible when not serving these functions.

When women break out of these traditional, accepted roles, all hell breaks loose. No better example can be found than the outcry over attempts by women to commemorate women raped in war on Anzac Day. These actions challenge the glorification of war that militarism is based on. It was considered a "defilement" of the memory of the "brave men" who died to save us. Nancy Shelley, in the paper referred to above, notes that: "We are familiar too with the identification and often open violence that accompanies attacks on those who would define these concepts (the values of militarism) otherwise. The most significant of these is in Australia in recent times has been the reaction to the marches of the Women Against Rape at Anzac Day Parades. Those women were remembered. All Women Raped - All Wars - thus introducing a part of the remembrance of war that is not to be countenanced. The women’s action brings such a remembrance because it touches the nerve of so much latent militarism within our society. It dares to reveal something of the accompanying aspects of war—things which are constant, dismissed as irrelevant and unimportant—and it lays bare the contempt with which women are held, in the eyes of militarism, nonmale held."

Another aspect that needs to be considered is that men and women differ aged attitudes toward war based on their quite distinct and differing experiences. Men have experienced combats of "manliness"—the coarseness and coarseness between men based on their shared lives, and death struggle. In many cases, male experience of war is a sensitizing, violent and destructive form of necessary part. Women, moreover, are the victims of war. Husbands and sons, for many women their life’s work, provide the fodder for the cannon.

Women are the paces of war for men. They are captured, raped, sold and stolen. Men receive the glory of war, they plan and fight wars, they receive the rewards. Men instigate and continue wars - women suffer the consequences.

Men and women also experience and participate in violence from different sides both during war and "peace-time". Violence is inflicted on men and other men and women. Women are the victims of violence and pornography— they are raped, abused, beaten, drugged, ignored, exploited at all times. If peace means the absence of violence then women are in a situation of perpetual war. Rape is an accepted characteristic of war. If this is so, then the war against women never stops.

Women are beginning to demand that the peace movement take up these issues, or else it leaves itself open to the attack that it is only concerned with war of violence as it affects men. My argument is that the disarmament movement will fail to achieve its potential while it ignores these demands. It cannot succeed without altering the conditions which make it thinkable to contemplate nuclear war. These conditions include not only the development of the technology, but the ideology that makes war acceptable. A militarist ideology, an acceptance of violence and destruction on any level is a precondition to the development of a nuclear ideology. The removal of one cannot happen without the other.

The answer to those sceptics who argue that it is pointless to dismantle the bombs when we have the technology and knowledge to reproduce them is that they are right. It is futile to believe that disarmament will be successful in preventing nuclear war unless we remove the drive for war and dominance. This involves a broad range of fundamental changes, most basically those which eliminate war and violence in all its forms - and the war and violence inflicted upon over half the population is the most basic of all. To quote further from Nancy Shelley: "There are two points to be made here: first, women link the increase in violence towards them with a growing attitude within our society which will tolerate war, ie. as part of a process which brings citizens to accept that total violence when the "leaders" of the world decide the time is right for them to initiate it. If the peace movement therefore ignores this, failing to see the symptoms of a malaise, it will be inept in its attempts to prevent war, and in particular, nuclear war.

Secondly, men who are genuinely and passionately desiring to stop the madness will be less capable of bringing about their intentions if they fail to understand the extent to which they are personally predisposed to violence by the socialisation they have been subjected to.

What is clear is that it is totally absurd, and structurally impossible to bring about world peace when aggression and conquest are considered with manliness and masculinity."

And, I would add, when such men are in positions of power and control.

Many people may argue, however, that it is wrong to bring up all this business about sexism. The disarmament movement should be concerned only with nuclear bombs and their direct consequences and if it becomes involved in other issues it will lose the "middle ground". To these people I say you are wrong. To ignore the other issues is to fail. A movement cannot succeed unless it is able to reach the very foundations of the problem. To argue that the bombs themselves are the problem is to come up against the reality of the elements but the men who have controlled them. To those who would say that to view the struggle along male vs. female lines is divisive, and we should concentrate on maintaining our unity, I say that to ignore that which is so fundamental is to do ourselves and our aims a disservice. It is only by confronting and overcoming the preconditions that have allowed our society to reach its present state of doom, that we have a chance to successfully develop a truly human society not bent on annihilation.

Lyne Winter
Making Peace Sell

It is simply a fact that the revolutionary left has very little weight in the western liberal democracies these days.

While it is still noticed, very little is achieved by its input into political life. Politics today seems to be played out by quite conservative social democrats (such as our own ALP) against reactionary forces that are becoming daily more aggressive, bigoted and dangerous.

We state of the nuclear disarmament movement is another example of the deep problems the left is encountering.

Today the anti-war, anti-nuclear movement is growing enormously. But their strategies, policies and goals are nothing to be happy about from a left point of view. The movement is quite obviously dominated by middle-class mobilisers and values. Unavoidably this has translated into very modest aims and even minimal tactics.

There is very little attempt at educating the public about issues other than arms exports and radiation risks. Questions of the importance of capitalism to the arms race, of the level of popularisation of the imperial policies of the US or USSR are carefully avoided. No PND-backed demonstrations have been attempted outside Australia. East Timor or unemployment, or even Grenada, is a particularly serious issue, but these issues have little to do with disarmament, even if the lack of these issues with questions of peace should not escape activists.

And even when protesting about nuclear weapons, PND avoids the uncompromising political demands that must be made if we are to get rid of the bomb. Instead a general sense of peace and happiness is encouraged. As the official face of disarmament to the public.

The marches that the left decries as "Sunday Picnics in the Park" are two so going to be "in harmony with" pets, all things short of getting it clear that, if things are different as present, making peace is a different kind of life that will have to be achieved.

If we really think about it, this strategy has little or no chance of success. Strange as it may be, we do not have to accelerate this process is to preach the gospel and to be living examples of this coming bright future.

Leftists know that this form of political change does not occur. Not only are there people quite happy to continue the arms race (for reasons of profits or ideology) but those who oppose us make up essential parts of the media, which is the channel we are using to produce new converts.

So the media can and does hinder our attempts at publicity. The Roxby Blockade was an obvious example of this, where the press were denied or described, but the political question of uranium mining was hardly mentioned.

Common in England. After all, what is the meaning of laying down on the road singing "I like the flowers, I like the vegetables, I want to live in a nuclear-free society" in front of a missile base, if there is no audience out there who will somehow be affected by seeing all this?

Surely even the central committee of the anti-nuke groups, and even the most ardent greenies do not believe that peace songs by themselves will prevent cruise from flying? Because if they do, then all they have to do is sit at home (or at a local park) and sing. There is no need to actually go to the base.

The unstated strategy is one of marketing: the yet unconverted populations will see our massive numbers and moral strength on TV, and they will start to question the nukes themselves. The next time, or the next, or the next, they too will be singing in.

Eventually nearly everybody will be out there, and even Thatcher could hope to win against the enemy. All the product look good and more will be bought. Make it less specific and more will try it.

Yet when people read these stories, the widely differing treatments are not totally recognized. But it should be reminded to those in the movement who serously see our TV image as a long term way of producing activists.

As the peace movement grows and it threatens the power of our rulers, they are beginning to experience increasing resistance. A movement that relies solely on those channels for communication with the outside world is going to find itself isolated.

Unfortunately to understand the danger of heavy reliance on the bourgeois media, the people in the movement would have to accept that not everybody is with them, and that those in power will not abide by the liberal democratic process. If people start to seriously oppose an important part of their rulers power base (the missiles) in massive numbers.

In Europe this process is now quite advanced, and the mainstream media will not even mention any peace protest unless they are really happy about course the many many activities the peace committees conduct (educational talks, displays, stall blockades, regional protests, public statements) are completely ignored.

The Europeans are now starting to understand this, as they find themselves unable to even marginally shift their government's pro-nuke policies. This is not to say that they have not only literally millions of activists, and demonstrably the majority of the populations on their side, but after they have talked about the number of "socialists" parties to government, which have all promptly turned around and joined Reagan's trail.

In addition the reporting of the mainstream media is hopelessly biased against our side. For example the US invasion of Grenada did hit the front pages, all the papers reported the official story by the US and generally condemned it in editorials. But the "invasion" of the sacred perimeter of the Olympic Base in Victoria was achieved the front page. And the official line was one of outrage that people had taken action outside the law.

So in fact both "invasions", by the US Marines and the Melbourne PND leftists received almost the same derogatory treatment (the US wasn't condemned in much), but for different crimes. The US took over a downed public government and replaced it with a military force and a military base. The PND activists nearly opened a gate at a military base.

Having our own disarmament news in left papers is the answer of course, but one that is so far from the potential of the Australian left today that I am reluctant to mention it, yet eventually it will have to be achieved.

The question of militancy links up intimately with the issue of PND and the media, in pointing out the distance of PND from any class analysis and an attainable goal of radical change.

The stated reason PND cautions (or forcibly prevents) activists from taking steps of civil disobedience at demonstrations is that it will be played up in the media. That is very true. But again it is a problem of allowing bourgeois and opposing forces to dictate PND strategy. If the media will distort disarmament actions, that is the reason new ways of reaching the public should be attempted. And if the movement realized that the media always distorts what it tries to say, that is even more reason to proceed with the civil disobedience and ignore what is after all just another powerful group opposing disarmament goals.

But another reason the left is often admonished not to break laws, is the possibility violence will occur.

This is a much more persuasive reason than the previous, because we all know that if violence occurs it will be done unto the protesters by the cops, and no one likes that. It is especially important these days as PND demonstrations now have a tradition of being the place even for children and pet dogs, and many people would be caught unaware and defenseless if an action provoked a police attack.
KANAKS
MOVE CLOSER
TO INDEPENDENCE

A storm is brewing eighteen hundred kilometres off the coast of Queensland. The islands of New Caledonia are in for an explosive year, as the country moves towards independence.

The Independence Front of New Caledonia has set 1985 as the target date for independence from France, which has controlled the islands since 1853.

Captain Cook Strikes Again

The indigenous people of New Caledonia, the Kanaks, are culturally similar to the people of Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands. But unlike many other Pacific peoples, the arrival of Captain Cook in 1774 started a process of colonization that continues today.

Although Cook was the first recorded European to land in New Caledonia, and named the country, the territory was seized as a French colony on September 24, 1853 - an anniversary now marked as a day of mourning by the Kanak population.

New Caledonia was originally a penal colony like New South Wales, but the discovery of nickel in 1870 created new reasons for France to maintain control. By 1967, nickel accounted for 97.7% of the value of exports and from 1969-1974, France mounted a campaign of immigration from its other Pacific colonies - Polynesia, the Wallis and Futuna islands to work the mines.
These figures have been used as a fill against the indigenous Melanesian population. The fear has been promoted that their jobs will be lost with the granting of independence.

France regards New Caledonia and "French" Polynesia as territories - an integral part of France (you've probably seen the TV ads for Air Caledonia inviting you to visit “the little bit of France in the South Pacific”). There is extensive French government involvement in the islands, and a regular military presence which is supplemented in times of crisis.

As France's empire has crumbled this century, the original colonists, or settlers, have been supplemented by others from French colonies which have gained independence: Algeria, Indo-China and, more recently, Vanuatu. Many of these colonists are mobilising against minor reforms in New Caledonia, let alone real independence.

Independence in the Wind

And independence is in the wind. The Kanak people have long resisted the theft of land and resources, and two major uprisings in 1878 and 1917 challenged French rule. This tradition of resistance was maintained in the Fourth Republicans student movement of the 1960s and has been revived as nearby Pacific countries have gained their independence over the last decade.

In 1979, five political parties joined together to form the Independence Front of New Caledonia: Union Gaullienne, the oldest political party in New Caledonia; Front Uni de Liberation Kanak (FUKL) and Union Progresiste Melanesienne, two parties with a strong following among Protestant Loyalty islanders, Liberation Kanak Socialiste (LKS) made up mainly of young, educated Kanaks, and the Parti Socialiste Caledonien, a party of trade unionists and socialists, including some Europeans.

The five parties came together around minimum demands for cultural, economic and political independence, and specified the importance of the return of stolen Kanak land. Although the Front stresses that the Kanak people are the only indigenous population of New Caledonia, and therefore the only truly colonized people in the country, it does recognize that other ethnic groups who have been there for several generations have a legitimate interest in the future of their homeland.

The Front stresses the importance of Kanak socialist independence - a return to some traditional Kanak values (such as communal land holding and cooperative work), but also recognizing the need for modern forms of organization. The platform of the Independence Front states that development must be led and approved by the people and all imposed development plans that strengthen multinational corporations and local privileged elites must be rejected.

The Front has made major gains in elections for the Territorial Assembly (the local governing body) and has gained parliamentary support from the centrist political party. However, the situation in New Caledonia is growing more polarized as the colon population mobilizes against independence.

The election of the Mitterrand government in France raised some hopes that there would be reforms to the political and economic structures of New Caledonia. The French Socialist Party pledged itself, before the elections, to support New Caledonian self-determination - a promise it has failed to maintain.

A July 1993 meeting in France brought together the Front and the FNCS and RPR (the centrist and rightwing parties in New Caledonia) to fashion a “consensus” for the colony's future.

The statute which resulted has failed to address the key concerns of the Independence Front. Even though the French government has recognized the "right and active right to independence of the Kanak people", it has failed to set a reasonable timetable for independence. More importantly, it has made no provision for electoral reform.

With the massive immigration from France and Polynesia, the Melanesian population now only makes up 43% of New Caledonia's population. Without electoral reform, the right-wing parties may win this year's elections for the Territorial Assembly.

The Independence Front has proposed gradual autonomy leading to independence in 1995. But when Lemoine presented the statute of autonomy, he showed that France plans five years of autonomy, and a referendum of self-determination in 1989. The Front has refused the plan.

What Can We Do

Australia, as a major power in the South Pacific region, should be giving every possible assistance to the Kanak people's campaign to gain independence.

France's continuing nuclear testing program in Polynesia is only maintained through the military control of its Pacific colonies. Moves towards independence in New Caledonia are part of a wider process of decolonisation throughout the region, and moves towards the creation of a nuclear free and independent Pacific.

By gaining inclusion on the UN Decolonisation list, the New Caledonians will push their case into the international spotlight. But we can act now, to increase international awareness of the legitimate rights and demands of the Kanak people.

For further information contact the New Caledonia Support Group c/o P.O. Box 338, Fitzroy 3065.
Neutral Agents?

The Police Force is an organization created and sustained by the economic and political processes to enforce the dominant conceptions of public order. These dominant conceptions are maintained and enforced by the most powerful class in society - the propertyed class.

The fact that the police force is charged primarily with the prevention and detection of criminal behaviour and the maintenance of public order indicates their role and interests in maintaining a liberal democracy and laissez-faire capitalism.

Crimes include vagrancy, begging and sleeping in the park. The law enforcement machinery makes poverty a crime of itself and is deployed against the poorest and the most helpless people in the community. The police also have many other powerful vested interests to protect contrary to the popular misconception that they are here to protect all of us.

During the Commonwealth Games 1982, the police were all out to deny the civil rights of Aborigines and other protesters. The police force is a manifestation of a more encompassing political order, for example, the police, the middle class, the mass of public opinion, the police force. The police need to sell their image to the public as being "friendly bobbies" and they need the confidence of the public. Even if their powers are excessive, they have been justified in terms of necessity to maintain law and order, prevent and detect crime and preserve property and life.

The police need to sell their image to the public as "friendly bobbies". They have to win the support of the population for whom they are supposed to reflect. They have to be seen as identifying with the masses.

If their powers are seen as excessive, it may be justified as part of their "duty", after all their duty is to protect us.

To gain the support and confidence of the public, firstly the police force identify themselves not only as a law-enforcement agency, but also an agency of the public.

While this tactic may be appealing to those sections of the public who have minimal contact with police (e.g., the middle class) it glosses over problems of the lower socio-economic class, the minority groups such as Aborigines and homosexuals. These are the people with frequent run-ins with the police. Despite the fact that to the middle-class general public, they are "friendly bobbies", the police are not going to stop using excessive power, harassment and repressiveness in dealing with the minority groups. It only means all too insistently that the role of the police is going to be more acceptable to the vast majority.

Secondly the police are made accountable not only to the state minister but also to the common law practice. The state minister has his/his interest tied up with the politics of the day, so for instance when the ALP has a law and order policy, the police will continue to harry antiuranium protesters in the name of "duty". It is also no problem to make the police accountable to a Land Rights protestor to find that the Commonwealth Games Act (Qld) 1982, s F(3) of which provides that an authorized person can use as much force "as is necessary to carry out his functions". Not only are there no safeguards to prevent abuse of these powers, but under s42 of the Act, protection from court action is given to any authorized person who exceeds his/her powers under the Act.

The police have enormous discretion when it comes to deciding what constitutes an offence, whether or what or how many charges should be laid. It is not only limited to the substantive choice, but extends to procedures, methods, forms, timing factors. There is often a tendency among police to close ranks to protect their own kind should there be damaging complaints against the exercise of discretion by the police.

The police are agents of the system which strives to attack anyone who threatens its power base. The police force seem to take on an independent appearance. In times of deepening crisis, when the police take on a more authoritarian structure, the vast majority see the police in enemies. We have to keep in mind that it is the capitalist system we have to attack. In just identifying the police as the antagonists we are excusing the structure which permits them. However police interests are not neutral.

Mary-Kathleen
The Only Survivors?

"They have installed the missiles today, but we are not beaten. We will remain here and make sure they won't be able to drive the missiles out to fire them. We will stop them..." [Ann Thomas, peace protester at Gleenham Common, Dec. 1983] [interviewed by "B.B.C."]

"How much does it cost them? About $10,000 per day for each special division soldier in action." [Bill Brookes, Co-editor of "Soldier of Fortune", Dec. 83] interviewed by "Panorama"

The Soviet Union began training them in 1979. That was the year in which the go-ahead by NATO was given to begin work for the deployment of the Cruise and Pershing II missiles.

They are called Spetsnaz (meaning for special actions). Their rigorous training is designed for a particular task: to get into Western Europe in case of heightened tension, and destroy the mobile launchers and support vehicles for the nuclear missiles before they can be fired.

NATO also believes that the Spetsnaz are being trained for other action in Western Europe. Their task would be to find and kill quickly key military and civilian figures in NATO countries. To counter the perceived threat, the control over the Cruise and Pershing II will be given not to The European parliamentary governments or the local generals. Nor will it be controlled by the Politburo (in case of war) link with the US President. They will be under the direct control of US military, paratroopers, and Green Berets.

In 1982 the British SAS and the US Rangers, already trained in countless special war situations (most recently in Granada) and who are the only groups considered reliable against the Spetsnaz and the AWACS plane, which is sent to the Mediterranean area.

What the new tactics for the protection of the missiles of course mean is that the real decision to launch the first NATO missiles is rapidly and necessarily going from the hands of the US President, to the European-based NATO generals and to American special troop commanders in dozens of locations in Europe.

With this great responsibility follows also a need to let field commanders make more and more snap decisions without consultation with superiors in the US and certainly not with the local European governments. US troops already have the duty to kill possible terrorists (demons of Communism) who may be threatening the missiles or the support vehicles. It is likely that the KAL 007 disaster occurred simply because of the new power of decision that has been granted to regional or base commanders of the Soviet as well as US forces.

To counter the threats to the missiles, and to be able to threaten the opponent's missiles, both the US and USSR are developing new techniques, and most importantly new soldiers.

To become a Spetsnaz what is needed is a degree in engineering, a deep knowledge of electronics, a detailed understanding of missile systems and the capacity to speak perfect Russian, English, and an African, Asian or European language. The Soviet Union, together with their other military powers is now basically mass-producing James Bond clones, capable of doing anything, anytime, anywhere, anyhow, as the Green Beret slogan goes.

These troops, highly mobile and totally reliable, are going to be used, not only in the starting (and final) phase of a nuclear war, but increasingly to give an emergency warning to one side in a local conflict.

In 1978 the French Foreign Legion rescued the 10,000 white capitalist from Zaire. In 1979 the airborne Blue Berets installed the Bechuanaland regime in Afghanistan within days. In 1982 the British SAS showed the potential of special troops by giving the winning edge to Britain, when it was outnumbered, outgunned and badly positioned and supplied in the Falklands/Malvinas war. And in 1983 it was the Marines and the US Rangers that quickly eliminated the local troops and Cuban advisers to invade and conquer Grenada. Today British and American special troops are ready to fly into the heart of Herzegovina in case of an Iranian brolactate.

"Only professional military experts can carry out a quick success to a government," explains Luigi Calgaro, an Italian military expert. "It is a direct consequence of modern conflict, that due to the possible escalation of a nuclear war, we cannot deploy large armies or use rigid command structures."

Regimes such as Israel and South Africa pioneered with spectacular success the idea of special forces. Israel now has 179,000 regular and 500,000 reserve soldiers. South Africa has 82,000 regulars and an additional 450,000 soldiers can be equipped and deployed in just hours. These countries are now turning their entire armies into special forces. When they fight they are quick, ruthless and they obliterate completely the opposition. The Six Day War in 1967, the Israeli raids on the PLO leadership in Beirut in 1973, the Entebbe raid in Uganda in 1976 and even this year's successful (if criminally brutal) special forces operation.

Israel and South Africa are so advanced in these new 'conventional' war tactics that they now produce some of the most efficient weapons available, now sought by more nations and right wing death squads all over Africa and South America.

Today the USSF has the Spetsnaz, the Blue Berets and special marine assault troops. The US equipped with armour, the US Rangers and Green Berets. Great Britain has one army and one logistics special division, plus the SAS and the SFOR commando for intervention in third world countries. They are making up the best legionaries, marines and the SAS from marine battalions and divers. Korea and South Africa is developing a special number of special troops. At the moment the public is largely unaware of these major developments in the military thinking of their governments. The peace movement worldwide seems unconcerned by the creation of these soldiers, even if they are now an essential element of the nuclear strategy and a dangerous link between conventional and nuclear strategy. And perhaps more importantly they are forces which tend not only to distinguish between foreign and 'national criteria' and local factors, as the quick successful mission in defense of the government is their only relevant consideration. Now the concept is being extended by US military schools which will train special troops for allies from Turkey to Malaysia, from Guatemala to Egypt.

"They come to us as men, we make them supermen," is the comment of General Joseph Lutz who trains Green Berets at the giant military school in Fort Wood, Texas. There future marines from all over the world receive a complete education. They learn to run for hours carrying their equipment, to fight in the dark and in hand to hand combat. They must pass "severe checks of their character."

Special troops are equipped with all that is needed to kill as many people as possible very quickly. They can go through local civilian protest, police called off, according to Robert Elliott, of the London Strategic Studies Institute.

Today the USSF has the Spetsnaz, the Blue Berets and special marine assault troops. The US equipped with armour, the US Rangers and Green Berets. Great Britain has one army and one logistics special division, plus the SAS and the SFOR commando for intervention in third world countries. They are making up the best legionaries, marines and the SAS from marine battalions and divers. Korea and South Africa is developing a special number of special troops. At the moment the public is largely unaware of these major developments in the military thinking of their governments. The peace movement worldwide seems unconcerned by the creation of these soldiers, even if they are now an essential element of the nuclear strategy and a dangerous link between conventional and nuclear strategy. And perhaps more importantly they are forces which tend not only to distinguish between foreign and 'national criteria' and local factors, as the quick successful mission in defense of the government is their only relevant consideration. Now the concept is being extended by US military schools which will train special troops for allies from Turkey to Malaysia, from Guatemala to Egypt.
Sledgehammer Approach – the A.L.P. and Unemployment

The slogan “Jobs not Bombs” has been raised often by not just the left within the Disarmament, but by conservative elements also. Unfortunately, the “connections” between the two supposedly separate issues have often been made superficially.

Whether at disarmament forums or unemployment rallies, whenever the left have raised the slogan they have omitted to mention that Australia has no arms industry to speak of.

Even in terms of a percentage of the Gross National Product (GNP), the proportion spent on arms production overall, not just arms hardware manufacture, is less than 10% between 1972 and 1978, and Australia only spends between 3% and 4% of the GNP on arms. Some comparisons are: US - between 5% and 10%; USSR above 10% and increasing.

Hence the relevance of the slogan for Australia is not so much in its economic involvement in arms production, but in Australia’s political alliance with the world arms production system.

Arguably, to sever Australia’s links with the arms race would make very little difference to the Australian economy, creating little dislocation, little unemployment, and providing no step towards a solution to Australia’s economic/unemployment crisis.

Small wonder then, that the slogan has gone down like an Indonesian satellite at such forums as the Coalition for Poverty and Unemployment’s “Jobs Not Bombs” rally last December.

A more conservative expression of the slogan was voiced in an article which appeared in the British disarmament magazine “Sanity” in January 1984. This article not only implicitly criticized workers who took jobs in arms factories (in this case workers on the Trident submarine project) but was used in a possible economic solution for the cessation to work on Trident, the development of “Labour intensive” industries (without being any more specific as opposed to “capital intensive” industries), thus leaving open the question of what the nature of productive technologies themselves as the villains in an “arms-created unemployment crisis” rather than the capitalist relations of production themselves.

The situation at the British dockyard which is producing “Trident” is that the only demand is for government sponsored military production. Britain’s economic recession, etc. have reduced demand for ships to nil. Military jobs are the only ones to be had.

The authors of the Sanity article, in common with a lot of proponents of “alternative technologies” eg. the fundamentalist wing of the recently-split German Green Party, Friends of the Earth, etc. are guilty of the failure to recognize that the fundamental principle in any discussion of technology, capitalism and unemployment - viz. that it is not the machines that are the problem, it is the system which operates for profit and which also operates for arms production to protect those profits.

The December 1983 issue of the UWU Newsletter continues: “With the coming 22,587 members and a General Meeting to be called, they were then invited to a meeting with a Senior Labor Parliamentarian, where he suggested that they could be employed through State Government funding if they dropped the call for a general meeting. This offer to individuals was rejected.”

It was after this that the eviction notice from the Northcote City council was issued. Four months later, the site of the old headquarters is still being used as a carpark, with the proposed use of the site being as an “energy showroom” for retailing electrical appliances through the Council’s electricity department.

Thus through the whole sorry episode the “progressive” ALP had:

*employed a Special Operations Squad against workers
*devised a union blackban by the B.L.F.
*used scabs to do their dirty work
*crossed a union picket line in the first instance
*stolen Union property
*pre-empted a meeting between the UWU, the Council and the B.L.F., which was set up by the B.L.F.
*arrested and jailed union members for picketing
*led continually about “offers” and “rumours”.

All this for the UWU refusing to remain co-opted into the Victorian ALP.

Such manifestations of social democracy as the ALP smash-up of the UWU headquarters are consistent with the strike against the Federal ALP, on East Timor, on the Middle-East, on Argentina, and as has yet to be decisively tested since ALP politicians have been generally successful in diverting the issues - US-Bases, uranium mining and disarmament generally, in the Australian context.

PND activists would do well to examine, in the light of the UWU’s experience with the Victorian ALP, the dangers of greater co-operation into the strategy of working with social democratic parties such as the ALP. For, when the pressure is on, they simply don’t tell you they refuse to accept any independent and opposing strategies to their own. In this way, the ALP serves the entrenched interests of patriarchal capitalism in two ways. Firstly, they cooperate the independent struggles for change and on matters of principle. Secondly, when that process of cooperation fails, they, in the service of the ruling class, attempt to stamp out the opposition.

Tim Humphrey

The history of the ALP smash-up reminds us of the UWU headquarters and the destruction of the UWU, and the Northcote City Council (long since taken over by Labor) but the control of the UWU by the people employed there and the State Labor Government and in the pockets of the ALP.
What a Disaster

Review: The Day After

It sounds suspicious for a big American film company to make a film about something as controversial as a nuclear war, especially when the film portrays the effects of a nuclear war on American people. The film doesn’t have a happy ending. The film is suspiciously like your usual American disaster movie and suspiciously devoid of any political comment or analysis of why we are threatened by “The Day After” or what we can do about avoiding being killed.

“The Day After” caused a big stink in America when it was shown on TV, this mainly from right-wingers but also from psychologists worried about kids having nightmares if they saw the film. Basically the film was produced as a token gesture to shock people up, because people are beginning to know a bit about why we are threatened with World War III and want to know more.

The ruling class, through its big film companies, must jump in quickly with its shit films to toady people. The “Day After” really shows the immediate effects of nuclear war and it

probably exaggerates the survival possibilities. This information, which people should have had access to years ago, is then denied by the mass media as if its all there is to know about nuclear war.

“The Day After” deliberately avoids commenting on why the whole thing is happening and is particularly ambiguous about which side could have possibly started it. Set in its disaster film mould, the producers have tried desperately to reduce War III to another “Towering Inferno” (to pitty people) but still make the film “beyond imagining” so lots of people go and see the film and they make lots of money.

There is no mention of the disarmament movement or any strategies for removing nuclear weapons.

The hypocrisy of the film industry’s claims to be trying to inform people of an important issue is shown out clearly by the inadequacies of the film itself, but also by the fact that both the movie “the Day After” and “Silkwood” (another American Broadcasting Companies film) have no free lists.

David Paterson

---

Beyond the Backyard

BURN THE BOOKS

It happens in Australia, our free country, the political censors (cabinet officers) took away books belonging to a university student returning from a visit to Cuba. The books dealt with the Cuban Revolution and recent world events. These were apparently issues which might, according to some statute, incite or encourage terrorism. The event is typical of any capitalist state. Senator Gareth Evans was caught with his pants down. He insisted that it was a terrible mistake, especially under the ALP’s liberal democracy. He generously offered that books concerning revolution in the Third World are acceptable but books advocating revolution in this country are not. It seems that what is progressive politics for the Third World countries is terrorism to the “free world”.

13/2/84

ROXBY TRIAL PERIOD

Dramators arrested at the Roxby Downs Blockade in August last year were convicted on charges of assault and interfering with vehicles. Police prosecution portrayed the incidents as orchestrated conspiracies by affinity groups to provoke heavy police response. Also, in the first test case for the 200-odd demonstrators arrested on the quaint charge of “refusing to cease to loot”, the magistrate ruled that the Roxby Downs site was private property and the Police Offences Act did not apply. Those demonstrators stand a good chance of having their charges dismissed. Stand by for further details of the Roxby Blockade (sorry, “vigil”) in August this year.

6/1/84

A PALE SHADE OF GREEN

It’s now official. The Greens of West Germany are openly split and may lose its parliamentary seats. Trying to keep together a movement which could not agree on whether capitalism, the nukes or heavy industry was the true enemy of the people became too much even for the ideologically flexible Greens.

They did try to unite people in a common bond of belief in non-violence, respect for the environment and non-oppressive organisation.

Unfortunately the reality was that even massive mobilisation could not stop the installation of the Cruise. In addition, the greenies in the streets found that even their own environmentalist retired generals were not immune to seeking influence and power once elected.

13/2/84
**Activist Calendar**

*Sunday 19 Feb.*

*Wednesday 29 Feb.*
Special screening of ‘Silkwood’ 6 pm East End Cinema 1, Bourke Street, Bookings through FOMAUM, PND.

*Friday 24 Feb.*
Gary Foley and Rob Robotham present opposing views on civil defence. See Age Weekender under ‘Hear This’ for details.

*Monday 27 Feb.*
Victorian Association of Peace Studies meeting. For details of where and what time ring 541 2900.

*Friday Nights.*
Empress of India Hotel, Good bands - political music, organized by UWW, Nicholson St. Fitzroy. Artists wishing to perform (yes its paid) please ring 481 1155 on Thursdays.

---

**Melbourne Socialist Feminist Conference**

**Venue**
Princes Hill High School
Arnold Street, Carlton North

For further information contact the Women’s Liberation Switchboard (03 3298515).

Registration Fees
Employed: $20 for 4 days, or $7 per day
Low-income: $5 for 4 days, or $2 per day

---

**Programme**

**DAY 1 Saturday 3 March**
Theme: Women and the distribution of wealth, work, the sexual division of labour, equal pay, marginalization, unemployment, domestic labour, women and technology.

**DAY 2 Sunday 4 March**
Theme: Women and the Labour Movement, women and unions, organising unemployed and unemployed workers, part-time and outworkers, unions and technology, Working Women’s Charter, the Accord, the ALP and the Parliamentary system.

**DAY 3 Saturday 10 March**
Theme: Women and the State, equal opportunity and affirmative action, the social wage, education, welfare and health, working for the State.

**DAY 4 Sunday 11 March**
Theme: Organisation and strategy, strategies for change, working in political parties, an autonomous women’s movement, working for the government, new ways to organize.