"I spent thirty-three years and four months in active military service... And during that period I spent most of my time being a high-class muscle man for Big Business, for Wall Street, and for the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer, a gangster for capitalism... Thus I helped make Mexico and especially Tampico safe for American oil interests in 1914. I helped make Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues in. I helped in the raping of half a dozen Central American republics for the benefit of Wall Street. The record of racketeering is long. I helped purify Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in 1902-1912. I brought light to the Dominican Republic for the American sugar interests in 1916. In China in 1927 I helped see to it that the Standard Oil Company went its way unmolested... I was rewarded with honors, medals and promotions. Looking back on it now I feel I might have given Al Capone a few hints. The best he could do was to operate his racket in three city districts. I operated on three continents.*

- Major General Smedley Butler, Commander, U.S. Marine Corps, 1935

EDITOR'S NOTE

Militarism is important - Don't kid yourself; it makes your life! That's why there isn't much time to waste; we have got to get a hold of the situation.

We have put together this special issue of the Observer to bring to your attention a matter of grave importance, militarism - because you have got to act now before it's too late. Write to your Congressman, State Representative or to the Pentagon directly, today and with a clear, well backed up argument and demand that we triple the size of the defense and security budgets. We need more guns for the needy - the real needy, the military.

It's not enough to just sit back and watch it happen, get involved. You can promote militarism everywhere you go. Don't just see this as a national issue. It's not. It's global. Only an adequate military presence everywhere will the world be safe and peaceful.

This is being initiated by the United States but they need your support. Only then will we be able to battle the many problems in the world. Just think if there was military security everywhere, not just a few cops on the street, at the airport etc., but well defined security regiments everywhere. The advantages are immeasurable. No street crime due to complete coverage of all areas, also no graffiti, vandalism, or rape, no social decay due to complete surveillance (deviants could be spotted and reformed, the right way, before they could make any trouble); no pornography, or unhealthy criticism of ideas due to a strict and complete censorship of all publications, and what's more if the military ran all transportation, communication, medical facilities, construction, and industry, things would be run right. And at the same time with complete backing of a global military unemployment would be stopped due to an increase in weapon productions, reserves, and a military workforce.

Everyone knows the reputation of the military. A group that knows how to work and live together. It would solve all social problems like apathy, unrest and confusion if we all were part of the same force. We think you should take a closer look at the military. It's the only way to a better world; a world united against a common enemy. And that enemy is all those that oppose the state. And after the opposition is conquered on earth, we can face our real foes, the ones we must be prepared for with all the weapons and more, the aliens. ☮️

DEMILITARIZATION: THE REAL NEW DEAL

Lately, the American press has been saturated with the dogma of the Administration's "supply side" economic policy, which Reagan referred to during his campaign as the second coming of the Roosevelt era. A cruel irony has surfaced as a reality for many Americans who are seeing their dreams of a better education, a meaningful job, and access to medical services melt before their eyes in an all out and unsuccessful "fight against inflation." What is even more incomprehensible, however, is the simultaneous strengthening of the military. That the control of inflation is a high priority item for national economic policy receives little disagreement. However, we must not be deluded into believing that there is

(Cont. p.9)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy</th>
<th>April 8, 1981</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE MAJOR REAGAN CUTS (in millions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>$1,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Nutrition</td>
<td>$1,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</td>
<td>$520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>$1,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing and Rent</td>
<td>$535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Unemployment Insurance Benefits</td>
<td>$964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Adjustment Assistance</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistance</td>
<td>$1,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>$236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CETFA</td>
<td>$4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mass Transit Grants and Operating Subsidies</td>
<td>$1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Conservation</td>
<td>$677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy and Conservation Bank</td>
<td>$132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amtrak Subsidy</td>
<td>$431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Corridor Rail Improvements</td>
<td>$288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Land Acquisition and Conservation</td>
<td>$566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Consumer Co-op Bank</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institutes of Health</td>
<td>$197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Broadcasting</td>
<td>$943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE MAJOR REAGAN MILITARY ADDITIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Combat Aircraft, Research and Development</td>
<td>$2,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### U.S. INTERVENTION ABROAD

**Source:** U.S. Congress, Committee on Foreign Affairs: 91st Congress, 2nd Session, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899-Cuba</td>
<td>Protect U.S. interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899-1907-Philippines</td>
<td>Suppressor revolution for national independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-China</td>
<td>Military force to protect American embassy, remained until 1934; Protect American property, secure transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1943-Honduras</td>
<td>Protect American Consulate and steamship property during revolt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-Colombia (To Panama, state of Colombia)</td>
<td>Protect American property, secure transit lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-Syria</td>
<td>Protect American interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903-1914-Pakistan</td>
<td>Ensure success of revolt against British, protect American lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Protect U.S. interests during revolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904-5-Korea (twice)</td>
<td>Morocco, Panama: To protect U.S. interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-Cuba</td>
<td>To restore order, establish favorable government following revolt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909-11-Honduras (twice)</td>
<td>Nicaragua: To prevent building of canal by Japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-China</td>
<td>Approaching stages of Nationalist revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-Honduras</td>
<td>To prevent seizure of U.S. owned railroad by Honduran government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-China</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests during revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1941-China</td>
<td>5700 troops, 44 gunboats in Chinese waters, to protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-1925-Nicaragua</td>
<td>To promote stability of favored government, suppress revolutionary forces led by General Sandinista.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913-1914-Mexico, Haiti, Dominican Republic</td>
<td>Revolutions, U.S. forces held capital cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914-1917-Mexico</td>
<td>Revolution, protection of U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915-1934-Haiti</td>
<td>To maintain order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1925-Dominican Republic</td>
<td>To maintain order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1918-Europe</td>
<td>World War I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917-1922-Cuba</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests during insurrection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-1920-Panama, Mexico</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918-1920-Russia</td>
<td>7000 troops, Vladivostok: 5000 troops join Allied intervention at Archangel. To defeat Bolsheviks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-Honduras</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-22-China, Guatemala, Panama, Costa Rica, Turkey</td>
<td>1920-22-China, Guatemala, Panama, Costa Rica, Turkey: To protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-Honduras</td>
<td>To protect lives during elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25-China</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-Honduras</td>
<td>Further election hostilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-Panama</td>
<td>Strikes and rioting, forges link with &quot;Iowa.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-13-Nicaragua</td>
<td>Further activity against Sandinista revolt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-Cuba</td>
<td>During Batista revolt, provided naval coverage and support, no troops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45-Europe</td>
<td>World War II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-53-Korea</td>
<td>To protect U.S. interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-Brazil</td>
<td>To overthrow government of Juan Bosch, install army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-Cambodia</td>
<td>U.S. troops ordered in to Cambodia to aid &quot;Vietnamization.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to those cited by the U.S. Congress there are others attributable to covert intervention, fully documented in U.S. Congressional hearings:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-Iran</td>
<td>To overthrow elected government and install the Shah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-Guatemala</td>
<td>To reverse land reform program, overthrow elected government and install right wing military group headed by Castillo Armas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-Cuba</td>
<td>Bay of Pigs invasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-Brazil</td>
<td>To overthrow elected government and install General Franco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-Indonesia</td>
<td>To overthrow elected government of Sukarno, replaced with Gen. Sunarto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-Greece</td>
<td>To overthrow elected government, install junta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-Chile</td>
<td>To overthrow elected government of Allende, replaced with military junta headed by General Pinochet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENRAL AMERICA

En route to Nicaragua, I am for the time being in San Jose, the capital of Costa Rica, just in time for some very interesting political developments. Costa Rica has been for the past few years experiencing economic difficulties which are really only recently beginning to be felt by the population. Witness; only two or three months ago the official colon-dollar exchange rate was around 8.50 colones to the US $1, while the current rate is officially 14.50. This is a devaluation of close to 50%, a major problem for a country exporting bananas, cocoa, coffee, and other raw materials. The devaluation of Costa Rica’s currency has, of course, brought with it a surge in inflation. As a result, costs of goods, prices of rents, and salaries of workers have risen sharply, while production has slowed. This has led to a decrease in the standard of living for many Costa Ricans, who are feeling the effects of inflation in their daily lives.

In contrast, the US dollar has remained relatively stable, which has made it attractive for Costa Ricans to invest their money in US dollar-denominated bonds and other financial instruments. This has had the effect of increasing the demand for US dollars, which has further contributed to the devaluation of the Costa Rican currency.

The US dollar has also become a more attractive investment option for US investors, who are seeking to diversify their holdings in a low-inflation environment. This has led to an increase in the demand for US dollars, which has also contributed to the devaluation of the Costa Rican currency.

The devaluation of the Costa Rican currency has had a significant impact on the country’s economy, with inflationary pressures rising and the cost of living increasing. This has led to a decrease in the standard of living for many Costa Ricans, who are feeling the effects of inflation in their daily lives.

Alice Knapp

an understanding of the economic structure from which any political movement must necessarily develop. With a deteriorating economic situation, the citizenry here, as is usually the case in a situation with a relatively high standard of living, is easily swayed into embracing mistaken positions on the nature of itsills. Blame it on the communist.

There were two bombings in the city last week, the first time in years that Costa Rica had a direct contact with a terrorist incident. Popular sentiments, heralded by the conservative press, attributed the incident to the infiltration of leftist terrorist elements from politically unstable regions nearby. It is not until you begin talking to people in the United States, that you begin hearing a different perspective on the incidents—namely that the bombings were a right-wing, pro-US plot to foster just such a reaction amongst the citizenry, perhaps even the work of the CIA. I have long wondered why people are so quick to scoff at theories that tie CIA activity to politically destabilizing incidents around the world. Such activity has been more than adequately documented for years, particularly in relation to Central America. Again one need only open one’s eyes to American foreign policy in the region, past and present, to see our dismal record toward fostering “human rights” and “democracy” in the region. At any rate, there occurred today a “Silent March”, several thousand strong, along the Avenida Central to show solidarity versus terror in the country.

EL SALVADOR: I cannot stress enough the importance of striving to understand the reality of the political situation in El Salvador, a country in which 10,000 people, mostly civilians, have been killed in political violence, most of which is attributable to the military/ oligarchical power complex which holds political and economic control in the country. I attended a presentation by three El Salvadorian professionals, currently in exile, on the situation in their country. The most important points made were:

- that there is absolutely no question that the country is controlled by the “fourteen families”, an oligarchical dictatorship, no less tyrannical and brutal than the recently ended Somocas dictatorship, which controlled the military. The so-called “moderate junta” that the US purports to support again in the name of democracy, has no power whatsoever other than to exist as a US puppet pawn. b. the country is in no way divided into political camps of “left” and “right”, with an unfortunate civilian population caught in the middle. There exists only the military and the oligarchy it represents on one side, and the people united in opposition to this tyranny. This includes student groups, teachers, peasants, and a whole spectrum of political organizations, of which the Marxist movement is a small minority. US involvement on the side of the military will only lead to a greater slaughter of the El Salvadoran peoples. The US press is lying to its readers, not to mention what comes out of the state department and the lips of our illustrious new president who not once but twice declared that Cuba was in the Mediterranean Ocean. It can only be in the interest of the American people to understand the reality of the “state of the world” today. This does not mean the more identification with problems such as poverty, starvation, and political repression, but the understanding of the underlying causes of these problems.

Well enough said. I’d, however, like to leave you with something I dug up from the Oct. 29, 1975 issue of TIME magazine. From the front editorial page leading the work of this reporter, Sider, who pulled together a special report on the Pentagon in this issue:

"There’s a certain affinity that reporters and military folks have for one another," Sider observes. "I guess anybody who wears a uniform or who carries a pen and paper his whole professional life is a Peter Pan by trade, we want to keep our youth and adventures. It makes for an understanding relationship."
IRELAND
PRISONER STATUS
BOBBY SANDS AND THE HUNGER STRIKE

Tom Kelly
The observer May 6, 1981

After about eight hundred years of misrule in Ireland, the British Crown still does not recognize the Irish people will never submit themselves to British control of Irish destinies. That only by the extermination of the Gaa, not only in Erin, but also in America or any other land of exile, will the crown rule in peace over any part of Ireland.

That no matter how many Irishman die or flee Ireland, as long as one remains, the day is not far off when the Saxons into the sea. This has been the history of British tyranny in Ireland. In the past, Britons have rebelled against the foreigner, and they are bound and suffer harsher retaliation by the British empire. Yet they know that with each defeat they are also making progress toward freedom, and they battle on.

An example of this battle occurs today in a British concentration camp called Long Kesh (the same). It is a man named Bobby Sands, an avowed freedom fighter of the Irish Republican Army, who recently was elected a member of Parliament, lies near death from a hunger strike which he and several of his comrades have been carrying out for 56 days at the time of this writing. Each day the newspapers report that he gets closer and closer to death, and he is slowly dying, all of Ulster comes closer to an explosion. Many people in this country are confused by the situation and ask "Why?" The answer to this question is both very simple and very complicated.

Unlike the hunger strike of the Long Kesh inmates a few months back, the main objective of Sand's hunger strike is the elimination of a special category of prisoner -of-war status to the inmates. Originally Britain agreed to the demands of the first hunger strike. However, as soon as it ended, the British government, being true to its characteristic, reneged on its promise. Giving the captives special category status would mean nothing more than allowing them to associate freely with each other, not forcing them to do prison labor or to wear prison clothes. You may ask, "Why doesn't Britain concede to the demands and save a man's life?" This is the complicated part.

For the past ten years the I.R.A. has been waging a war of liberation against the British in Northern Ireland, and only against the English government. (The propaganda of England makes this war a second World War.) Yet, in Ireland itself, it is not just British citizens, but Irish as well, who are being killed by a group of "common criminals." (If the I.R.A. can be said to stop nothing more than "common" for England, it does not say much for British democracy.) Yet, the British government has accepted over 120 million pounds since 1970 into the support of an army whose main objective is to crush these "common criminals." Yet, 11 years later, they still have not succeeded. The reasoning behind the British denial of I.R.A. goals is far too long to write about here.

BOBBY SANDS

Joanne LeDoulis
Tom Kelly
"Murder and bombing and terrorism are crimes; they are not acts of political resistance. These people will never be granted political status. Never."

Margaret Thatcher's comment on her refusal to grant Bobby Sands and his comrades political status, lends one to question the nature of his detention. Her very statement, denying his political role and referring to it as a criminal one instead, raises important questions: What does it take to be a political prisoner? Is it necessary to be a Native American to apply? Should Bobby Sands have pled insanity for his defense, since he was, according to Thatcher, not committing political acts against the British government?

The time for anger and political action (or whatever they choose to call it) has come. Now realizes how little of a chance Bobby was ever given. First convicted for a bank robbery, then for illegal possession of arms, and finally for the simple fact of being an I.R.A. member. He spent one third of his life in jail, but as he was elected to Parliament, his hunger strike "came in handy" for the British government. This might explain Margaret's unwillingness to negotiate the demands. Indeed, according to her, the I.R.A. is a terrorist group which is not innocent of any crimes at all, except, in the eyes of the Crown, for being Irish. It is rather ironic how the innocent are in jail and those who are the criminals are free to rule.

Third, all of these political prisoners in the North of Ireland were sentenced by special courts, without juries and with very questionable evidence. Most of these court officers, or prisoners, have become military prisoners of war. This makes them special prisoners since they did not stand trial in a common court. A "common man's life" (i.e. in a war crime). Second, many of these political prisoners were tortured by British Special Forces (an equivalent of our Gadsden snakes) into giving incriminating confessions. This use of torture has already been approved not only by Amnesty International, but also by the World Court and the European Court. Most of these political prisoners are supported by the Irish People. Yet Sands was elected to the British Parliament, while in jail.

The shame that should result from the British actions should only be shared by the American Government. The least we can do to illustrate this is to mention the U.S. policy towards Irish Immigrants; No person suspected of belonging to the I.R.A. is to be admitted into the United States. President Reagan made his position clear after hearing the Rev. Ian Paisley, leader of the Loyalist terrorist group to his inauguration. When Margaret says about the I.R.A. leader Bobby Sands: "A crime is a crime is a crime," "Terrorist acts are terrorist acts, a crime is a crime...but yes..." As for the American Press, the truth is that the right to print that Bobby Sands died for the right to wear his own clothes. In my view, McCarthy does not go that far. As we all know at bard from Raphael Cancel Miranda's testimony, being a political prisoner means a lot to the British Government, since, if it admits to this fact, it would be forced to abide by the Geneva Convention which guarantees the rights of prisoners of war, and which British officials, if it were of course, would collide with the reports about the actual treatment given to I.R.A. prisoners, which Amnesty International referred to as "torture, in some instances.

Murder and bombing and terrorism altogether, may well be acts of political resistance. They are acts of rebellion against an oppressive regime. As for the status of political prisoners, I know that in America it doesn't take murder plus bombing to become one. If Margaret wants to see the same thing happen, she should ask old Honnie how he deals with political prisoners; and if according to her, the I.R.A.不可通. on page 10.
AFRICA

WHY RETAIN CLARK AMENDMENT?
(From The Washington Office on Africa)

During the Angolan civil war in 1975-76, the congress and senates gradually adopted the "Clark Amendment" to cut off funds for CIA covert operations and required explicit Congressional approval for any future U.S. military involvement in Angola. There were strong security and foreign policy reasons for taking this action. Senator Percy pointed out at the time that the "only rational will" for the United States to make an all-out effort in Angola. Senator Cranston asserted that Congress would not pass a "Gulf of Tonkin Resolution opening the way to a Vietnamese-type disaster in Angola." Senator Pell lamented that America's relations with all of Africa have been severely damaged by "guilt by association" with South Africa's invading troops in Angola.

These reasons for refraining from intervention in the civil strife in Angola are as compelling today as they were in 1975. Lifting the Clark Amendment is not merely an abstract issue of Congressional restraint on the Executive Branch's control over the CIA. There is every indication that the Reagan administration will interfere in both the direct war and the civil war in Angola. President Reagan stated in a May 6, 1981 interview with the Wall Street Journal that he favors providing weapons to UNITA. Secretary of State Baker, too, believes that the United States should not have stopped its support for UNITA in 1975. A vote on the Clark Amendment in Congress will be the only way for the Congress to prevent what could be a major foreign policy blunder.

The Congress should continue to prevent U.S. intervention in Angola for the following reasons:

1) UNITA is not a viable party deserving of United States military backing. If the U.S. intervenes in Angola UNITA's behalf, it will be pulled into a quagmire from which it will be difficult to escape -- back to a group which can only destabilize the country and main control over it. Angolan support for Jonas Savimbi of UNITA's movement has declined sharply during the last year. Reports of Angolan support on Angolan Basil Davidson reported last April that UNITA's claim to control one-half of the country is grossly exaggerated. It's "control" in cold facts applies to mountainous pockets of two provinces out of sixteen, and even there they were hard-pressed. Evidence of UNITA's dwindling popular support came from a London Times report of July 26, 1980: "Hundreds of thousands of former UNITA supporters are returning from the bush to areas of government control. They are emaciated, diseased and in rags. It is clear UNITA cannot provide basic services for the Angolans."

A recent startling revelation of UNITA's dependence on brutal South African military backing helps to sustain its pressuring image in support. A British former mercenary who had fought with a secret South African army group called "L5 Battallion" told the Manchester Guardian on January 29, 1981, "when Battalion 32 was taking over, two representatives of UNITA were actually leading Afrikaners down the road -- one white intelligence officer and one black soldier. When the battle was over, they came up to claim the cash for UNITA. The point is that UNITA hangs around in the South-east where their tribe is and they can probably defend themselves, but they can't go out and take somewhere like Savimbi. We do it for them because it improves their bargaining position." "Battalion 32's regular job is to go into the Angolan bush and ... clear a designated area. ...that's what we are told. We just keep them, cut them, burn them. As soon as we're finished with them, we kill them."

2) Lifting the ban on CIA activity in Angola would identify the United States with the apartheid South Africa's increasingly devastating relations with independent Africa. In 1975 South Africa openly invaded Angola in support of the UNITA movement, and re- mained a major player in the country for the remaining years of the CIA's shared intelligence with South Africa and collaborated with South Africa in its invasion. This open U.S. identification with South Africa and with UNITA's increasingly devastating to U.S. relations with Africa, and was one of the main reasons the Congress adopted the Clark Amendment.

In 1980, South Africa significantly expanded its military activity in Angola. On June 13, 1980, a South African Prime Minister Botha left more than 200 dead. Jonathon Steel reported in the February 10, 1981 Washington Post after visiting Angola that "there can be no doubt that the broad thrust of Angola's complaints that it is facing South African aggression is true, despite South African denials." It would be impossible for the United States to remain neutral in Angola to aid UNITA without collaborating with South Africa in doing so. Supporting UNITA will therefore put at risk positive U.S. relations with all of Africa, particularly with Nigeria, America's second largest source of oil.

By repealing the Clark Amendment the United States could have serious negative repercussions for the three-year-old negotiations that the United States and four other western nations have been conducting with the Angolan and Namibian governments. The United States has been the most important frontline state in these talks, and has played a major constructive role in what progress has been made so far. In 1979 the last Angolan President Augustino Neto came forward with a new proposal for a demilitarized zone along the Angolan/Namibian border which broke a deadlock in the discussions on how to implement and monitor the cease-fire between the forces. South Africa has agreed to participate in United Nations-supervised elections in Namibia, but South Africa has refused to go along with the plan. Lifting the ban on CIA activity in Angola is certainly to create a chill in relations with the frontline states and SWAPO, dashing the hopes of a negotiated settlement and extending the violence and destruction of the Namibian war.

4) intervening in Angola would isolate the United States from the majority of African allies and damage the position of American companies operating successfully in Angola. All of our European allies have recognized the Angolan government and many are seeking to expand their private investment and trade. For example, the French Foreign Minister visited Angola in January 1981 to expand commercial relations with the country. American companies operating in Angola are concerned that U.S. support for UNITA will damage their good working relations with the Angolan government and place them at a disadvantage with European companies.

Melvin Hill, President of Gulf Oil, testified before the House Subcommittee on Africa in September 1980 that the Angolan government has been "responsive and supportive as a business partner" and has not interfered in the production or exploration of Gulf's share of the 48,300 barrels of oil being produced daily in Cabinda.

5) Renewing CIA operations in Angola will not decrease the influence of Cuba or the Soviet Union in Angola; it will increase their influence to Angolan President Regan sent Liberia 100 Green Berets to Libya for a month of joint maneuvers and a basic infantry training program. The troops arrived in Monrovia, Liberia capital city, in time for a patricipation with South Africa and Shuwarin of the South African on the Cape town South Africa and Eastern Europe. Angola has made numerous diplomatic overtures to the United States, rejecting them and forcloser relations with Cuba and the Soviet Union.

RONNIE SENDS 100 GREEN BERETS TO LIBERIA

April 12, 1981 marked the one year anniversary of Liberia's military coup. The final gift President Regan sent Liberia 100 Green Berets of the Army's Special Forces for a month of joint maneuvers and a basic infantry training program. The troops arrived in Monrovia, Liberia capital city, in time for a patricipation with South Africa and Shuwarin of the South African on the Cape town South Africa and Eastern Europe. Angola has made numerous diplomatic overtures to the United States, rejecting them and forcloser relations with Cuba and the Soviet Union.

...
EUROPE
NATO RAISES NUCLEAR ANTE

Guardian

The governments of leading Western European nations were apparently determined to confront their respective disarmament movements rather than challenge U.S. plans for a nuclear build-up by NATO.

That was the general assessment of peace activists here following last week's meeting in Bonn of the 13 Western defense ministers who comprise NATO's Nuclear Planning Group. In an April 8 statement, the military strategists unanimously reaffirmed the December 1979 decision to station 572 U.S. nuclear missiles in Western Europe at the end of 1983.

The ministers also reiterated their support for talks with the Soviet Union on weapons levies in Europe, but there was no public disapproval of U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's refusal to set any firm date for beginning such negotiations.

Instead, the Nuclear Planning Group expressly stated that the convening of any conference on nonnuclear missiles was now contingent upon Soviet behavior toward Poland. Should the USSR intervene to crush the Solidarity labor movement in Poland, the West would not even consider arms discussions with Moscow, the ministers declared.

Weinberger left no doubt about Washington's stance upon his arrival in Bonn April 7. The Reagan Administration, he said, views a massive military build-up by the West as taking precedence over any talks in the near future on arms control. The Pentagon boss then told his colleagues in the Nuclear Planning Group that they had better take the same position.

SPACE
U.S. EMPIRE STRIKES BACK

By Jonathan Bennett (Guardian) - The possible military applications of the space shuttle are so tantalizing that NASA is going to be trampled to death by the Defense Department on shuttle use. Space, according to James Van Allen, one of the guiding forces of U.S. space exploration, "Why not be honest about it and call [the space shuttle] a military program?"

"The Defense Department started booking space on the shuttle a year after the program began in 1972, more than three years before the first concrete expression of private commercial interest in the venture." The Defense Department is asking for $500 million for shuttle research and development in fiscal 1982, after having already prevailed to enlarge the cargo bay of the civilian shuttle to accommodate military payloads.

"More than a third of the flights scheduled for the next five years are for security, military purposes. At the same time, the Office of Management and Budget has trimmed the NASA budget and eliminated several of the shuttle's civilian missions.

On one reason for not calling the shuttle a military program is a 1971 treaty barring weapons of mass destruction from outer space. The U.S. will not violate the letter of the treaty if it avoids putting atomic warheads in orbit. There is little doubt, however, that some of the military missions will violate the treaty's spirit, since they will test the feasibility of putting the weapons in space and using them if necessary."

MID EAST
PLO ETC

BY ROBERT NEDELECKOFF

The immediate Middle East problem is the Lebanese situation. Palestinian refugees in camps wanted to live on their old land and govern themselves. Toward this end, some of their number, the PLO, presented their case to sympathetic Third World nation. That was the "Palestine Liberation Organization." The other business was terrorism. The Israeli government retaliated by bombarding the Palestinian settlements in Lebanon. The unruly Palestinians made the right-wing Christian Lebanese angry. Since they'd arrived, the Palestinian birth rate had started to make Muslims outnumber Christians in Lebanon. Since the Christians traditionally governed, they didn't care for this. Civil War resulted in 1975 and 1976. It was bloody. Tal al-Zaar, a Palestinian outpost besieged and conquered by Israelis, became the PLO's answer to the Alamo.

The flight was resolved only when Syria stepped in with a peacekeeping force, which held the two sides at bay; the Palestinians in their camps, and the Christian Lebanese in an Israeli-supported semi-autonomous state in the south. The Christians didn't care much for the left-wing PLO Syrians; they went on some raids. The Syrians got even. The Israelis, in their regular attacks on Palestinian positions, hit some Syrian equipment. As a consequence, there is now what the Israelis call a "high-risk situation."

Who is to blame? As far as this writer can tell, Syria and Iran are to blame. Syria has sent armed groups to Lebanon, which has started some of the incidents. The Christians are behind most of them. It's an ugly game tic for tac. What wacks us in my mind is that Hafiz Assad of Syria, being a dictator, is not in immediate hot water back home. The Lebanese government hardly exists. Menachem Begin, though, is up for re-election shortly. Polls taken prior to the most recent incidents indicated that his Likud bloc would probably lose an election held now, and that Shimon Peres of the Labor Party, and some independents—preferably Ezra Weizman, who ranks with our former President in voter popularity, and Helmut Schmidt as the three most intelligent politicians around today—would for a new government. History shows that people generally prefer that an incumbent president or prime minister stay in office. Especially if victory is in sight but not yet obtained. Johnson proved this rule in 1964. He was bluffing, of course. Lincoln, in 1864, wasn't. Of course, with its top-notch management and technology, Syria would probably stomp the Syrians in case of an all-out war. But by election time it probably wouldn't be in Damascus just yet. Changing the man at the top would imply dissatisfaction and encourage the enemy. So Begin would be re-elected.

LIBERIA

cont. from pg. 5

In the early hours of April 12 last year Doe led a small group of enlisted national guardsmen in a raid on the presidential palace, where President William Tubman Tolbert, a 66-year old Baptist minister, was assassinated. The next day, 27 other senior government officials were rounded up and deposed without trial. Master Sergeant Doe announced that the coup was staged "to eliminate corruption" in the government. Immediately after establishing a cabinet, Master Sergeant Doe met with the U.S. Charge d'Affaires in Monrovia to pledge pursuit of "a policy of leadership towards the United States." Doe received his military training in the United States during the early 1970's. The coup marked the end of 133 years of Democratic rule in Liberia.
The controversy surrounding the proposed MX missile continues to expand along with the opposition to the first strike weapon. Here are some recent developments:

* A national campaign to stop the MX is finally getting underway. The address is: 105 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 546-2660. The campaign office has hired Chad Dobson of Salt Lake City as National Coordinator and Mike Mawby, on loan from SANE, as Legislative coordinator.
* Residents of Tonopah, Nevada, prevented the U.S. Air Force from testing the impact on the soil of an explosion. The Air Force proposed setting off non-nuclear explosions and the County Commissioners (Nye County, Nevada) voted unanimously to prevent the action.
* After appearing on the Phil Donahue show where the MX was the main topic of conversation, Representative Ron Dellums, D-Rich district of California, received 8,000 letters from throughout the country expressing their concern about the MX. A key fraction of the letters indicated support for the MX.
* The Congressional Black Caucus announced that they would keep the MX issue on their agenda in the budget fights. Recent statements by the Chairman of the Black Caucus, Representative Walter Fauntroy (D-District of Columbia), indicate that the Caucus views the MX as a major example of misguided budget and national security priorities. For more information, contact the Caucus directly: House of Representatives, Annex Room 104, 300 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20515 (202) 225-1691.
* On March 10, 1981, the Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, heard from the Congressional Budget Office of Technology Assessment (COTA). The COTA analysis asserted that the present basing plan would cause large-scale harm to the environment and to economic ventures in the affected states (Utah, Nevada, and potentially Texas and New Mexico). The COTA study went on to say that the MX missile from sophisticated sensors and detectors required the equivalent of a new technology. The obvious question is whether about whether the MX roadway system will work once constructed.
* Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger announced that a final decision on the MX basing mode will be made by midsummer of this year. The following independent advisory group set up to study the basing mode options. This advisory group was established last summer by Secretary Weinberger, after he assumed the reigns at the Pentagon. Their report to Weinberger is due on June 1. A General Accounting Office (GAO) report dated February 17, 1981, said that the ultimate size and cost of the MX cannot be predicted. The report also indicated that the perimeter of a rectangle around the proposed deployment area is equal to an area of about 48,000 square miles, about the size of the state of Pennsylvania.
* Clergy and Laity Concerned (CALC, 198 Broadway, New York, New York 10038 (212) 964-6730) is sponsoring a ten-city tour this spring on the MX entitled "CALC AND NEVADA TAKE THE CASE TO THE REST OF THE COUNTRY." The dates and places are: Los Angeles, May 4; San Francisco, May 5-6; Seattle, May 7-8; Eugene (tentative), May 9; Atlanta, May 16; Nashville, May 17; Rocheester/Buffalo, May 15-16; New York City, May 17; Baltimore/Washington, D.C., May 18-20; Chicago, May 21-22; Springfield, May 23-26. Specifics Include: Dr. Edwin Frimage, Professor of Law, University of Utah and prominent Mormon from the Salt Lake City area and the Sacred, Western Shoshone Sacred Lands Association; Rear Admiral John M. Lee (retired), Vice Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA) during the SALT I negotiations; Joe Griggs, Great Basin MX Alliance, and a rancher from the deployment region. For more information, contact Currie Burkhart, New York CALC office listed above.

* One of the more revealing comments demonstrating the Air Force attitude towards the Environmental Impact hearings on the MX occurring this spring in the Great Basin area comes from Major Michael Henshaw, Pentagon MX Office (quoted in the March 12, 1981 edition of the Nevada State Journal). The Air Force is conducting the hearing and paying for the hearing and the Air Force will control the hearing.
* The legislative campaign to stop the MX, currently focused in the MX Task Force of the Coalition's Disarmament Working Group (DMW) needs volunteers to help organize pressure on members of Congress, particularly just before MX votes occur in the budget process in the late April through early June period, and then again in September. Letters, telegrams, phone calls, visits to local congressional offices are all needed on a massive scale. The MX is viewed as one of the few truly vulnerable missile defense items and many groups are agreeing to focus on the MX during the budget battle this year. Reagan is requesting $2.95 billion for the MX in the Fiscal Year 1982 budget. This is a $1.4 billion increase over the Fiscal Year 1981 figure. For more information, contact the new National Campaign office and/ or the Coalition.

IN DEFENSE OF UNBORN SUBMARINES

Jed Schwartz

Washington, April 30 -- Congressmen were taken by surprise this week with the high-powered introduction of legislation to prohibit the transfer of defense funds to military projects abandoned by the Federal government. Senator Jesse Unumb of North Carolina introduced the controversial bill this Wednesday, stating in his speech from the Senate floor that "it is time that human compassion be extended to all forms of life, be it human, animal, or military." Senate Republicans and the military-industrial complex have long favored the passage of such a bill, citing the S-41 Lancer and the MX Missile System as typical military life-forms put under murderous attack by past government officials.

An identical form of the bill was also introduced in the House by Representative Jack Rump of New York. HR-213, as it is known here in the House, was written entirely by Mr. W. German, although some doubt exists as to whether the MX roadway system would work once constructed.

Specifically, the two bills attempt to halt the cancellation of already conceived military projects by defining military projects as canceled when Congress votes against the continuance of conception in the minds of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Defense Department. Such a definition would most likely be interpreted by the Courts as a violation of Article I, Section 8, of the Constitution.

President Reagan has declared the total support for the bills, stating that although the adoption of his 1981 budget is his first legislative concern at present, the flight to protect "unborn defense projects" was immediately made second in priority because "the sanctity of military life is as precious as that of human beings." Reagan said at a hospital in Nebraska: "They're human beings just like other people, who are being treated here in Washington." After all, the President asked, "Where would we all be if communists in American government had destroyed the conception of the atom bomb during World War II?" Laughing with reporters at his bedside, the President suggested that the outcome of such a murder would be that "the exporting Datsun!" Reagan quipped. The President went on to express confidence in the economic wisdom of the bills, saying that the ability to ensure national security, which would mean cutting federal spending such as food stamps and aid to the elderly would ensure that no further military projects were aborted.
MILITARY EPIDEMIC IN SCHOOLS

The Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, the nation's largest draft and military counseling agency, warns that the influence of the military in our schools is growing at epidemic proportions.

Larry Spears, Director of CCCO's Pre-Enlistment Counseling Program, says, "The last few years have seen a tremendous growth of militarism in this country, and much of it has been centered in the high schools and colleges."

According to Spears, the military now lures students through many different programs, including:

—The Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) military aptitude test administered in 15,000 high schools by military personnel. The ASVAB test has been criticized in Congress as better at helping counselor and student exploring civilian occupations. However, the information obtained from the test goes to many offices around the country, and it is used by recruiters for years. Many schools never tell their students that this is an optional test.

—The Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC) and Junior ROTC. The college ROTC and high school (JROTC) programs exist in nearly 2,000 schools. The courses are taught by military personnel and are often of questionable academic value. They also impose values which are at odds with the goals of academic learning. And the programs cost the American public millions of dollars each year.

—The Delayed Entry Program. The DEP encourages students to sign enlistment contracts up to one year before starting basic training. Once student enlistees sign the contract, they are bound by it, and discharge under the DEP are rarely granted. Each year, hundreds of thousands of young people who are uncertain about what to do sign up under the DEP. Once students enlist in DEP they are given bonuses for recruiting other students, thus becoming a sort of undercover recruiter. However, if a student changes his mind a few months later because of a job offer, school or vocational training possibilities, or marriage plans, it is usually too late to get out of the system. Military counseling is sought through groups such as CCCO.

"One of the biggest problems," says Spears, "is that counselors and school administrators who become active helpers of military recruiters. The military often seems to be a way to a counselor to offer direction to a student, but the counselor or teacher is often unaware of the potential problems and disappointments facing many enlistees."

"Military recruiters are salesmen," comments Spears. "They have a quota to meet, superiors to please, and they certainly will not take the time to explain the possible problems to a potential recruit. Students who are considering joining the armed forces should have the benefit of seeing both sides of the story before enlisting."

"Counselors and teachers who are in a position to give advice on enlistment should be aware of the problems in the enlistment contract which put the enlistee at a distinct disadvantage, and in fact, offer any assistance they can. If the military should not come through with what the recruiter promised, the enlistee has no legal recourse."

Another problem encountered by enlistees is the fact that many important job titles (such as combat engineer) turn out to be dull, meaningless jobs with no application to civilian positions. Many military jobs have no civilian counterpart, and thus the training is often useless after you get out of the military."

Additional information on ASVAB, JROTC, ROTC, DEP, military recruitment, and other aspects of militarism in education may be obtained by writing to:

The Pre-Enlistment Counseling Program, CCCO
2208 South Street
Philadelphia, Penn. 19146

CCCO was founded in 1948 as the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, and is a national, non-profit agency counseling young Americans facing the prospect of military service, or those already in the military.

"I WOULD FEEL COMFORTABLE IN GOING TO WAR TOMORROW"

So said General Paul X. Kelly, Commander of the Rapid Deployment Force, on October 1, 1980. Since then, the Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) has grown in ranks. At the time of its conception in 1977, Pentagon drawing boards had the RDF set at 100,000 troops. Indeed, a corps of military SWAT team designed as a mobile "fire brigade" for extinguishing Third World conflicts quickly, before protests can be organized. General Kelly now has command over 300,000 soldiers, backed by several aircraft carriers, several squadrons of B-52 bombers, and more.

The mobilization of the RDF was kept in the closet until the Pentagon went public with its plans on December 5, 1979. The announcement of the RDF was followed by a White House policy turn to "the Carter Doctrine", which included the placement of a floating arsenal in the Indian Ocean and Carter's statement that henceforth any "militarist assault on Middle East oil supplies" will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States and will "be repelled by any means necessary, including military force."

These developments mark the end of a relatively quiet era for U.S. global intervention. After Viet Nam and the citizen's pressure on the Military to cool their jets, the United States adopted a program of stockpiling the "surrogate gendarmes", those countries, especially Latin America and Africa, that are seen as "potential receptors of an attack". The theory is that by arming these countries, the United States is building its own defense system. This strategy proved risky. The Shah fell, Nicaragua ousted Somoza, trouble brewing in Southern Africa, El Salvador, and with it, the United States assertion of control, all this plus the NATO alliance voicing hesitation at letting a black race left the United States in a very lonely void.

The many changes in the global balance of power after the defeat in Viet Nam has left the U.S. military leadership with the notion that there is a need for a complete overhaul of our "defense" system, to include not only a capable Rapid Deployment Force but also enormous increases in military spending, weapons development, (an MX missile system), and more. As Michael Klare (Institute for Policy Studies) observed,

"For the world is a very different place than it was in the 1950's, when the slant of a few Marines was thought sufficient to force any guerrilla organization into surrender or annihilation. As a result of the international arms race - in which the United States is the number one supplier - many Third World armies are as well-armed as those in NATO, graduates of West Point and other U.S. military academies. (Between 1959 and 1979 the United States trained over half a million foreign military officers and combat personnel.) Thus, as one Pentagon official noted, 'When you begin looking at the mid 1980's, we aren't talking about barbarians armed with spears. Because Third World
DEMILITARIZATION (cont'd from pg. 1)

but one route to its solution.

Inflation is blamed upon many things by many people, but unfortunately, most retreat from pointing the finger at the single most inflationary factor in our economy, the enormous and unproductive Military Industrial Complex, and the staggering deficits that have accompanied it.

According to Robert McNamara, the rise of the American military is the story of the most phenomenal assemblage of "raw power" and technology in the history of mankind. But for him it was purely a management challenge.

Since 1951, the U.S. has spent $2 trillion, over 40% of Gross National Product for that period, on direct expansion. Considering the many service industries dependent on the military (e.g. subcontractors) the figure is probably closer to 20%.

For Fiscal Year '81, the Reagan administration intends to add 10% of the entire Federal budget to the Department of Defense.

These expenditures represent the massive devotion of the nation's resources to the military economy whose produce offers little economic reward. Whereas investments in innovation in industries such as automobiles and computers make a dramatic contribution to the advancement and growth of the domestic economy, massive missile procurement programs have only a spot effect creating jobs for the short run while the equipment becomes antiquated and deserted unequipped.

The jobs created unfortunately are short term, usually highly specialized, limited and well paying. Consequently we continue to experience massive levels of unemployment at the peak of the economy's prosperity.

Furthermore, the drain on the world's natural and human resources limits their availability and continues driving up the cost of living for the civilian. The tremendous need of the military's procurement programs for the world's energy and mineral deposits has been a primary contributor to the recent rise in the price of oil.

The supply, demand and balance of payments crisis is further exacerbated by the vast amount of military expenditures abroad. The authoritative Center for Defense Information (CDI) notes that "about 70% of the military budgets spent on the defense of our allies and projects overseas. Many of these same observations have lead many to conclude with Clayton Pritchety of the Washington Post that "it is a pipe dream to keep on talking about linking inflation and balancing the budget as long as military spending continues unabated." Yet it is precisely the military budget that is being expanded "to bring inflation under control".

For the past 30 years it has been the civilian economy which has had to pay second fiddle to the tax gouging demands of the Military. That under the tremendous burden of the military, the heart of America's institutions have had to labor increase their budgets in this "era of prosperity" is undeniable. When cities, colleges and health care institutions become unable to maintain their physical plant and provide the level of services they were designed for while NASA constructs a returnable space craft anddesigns for the deployment of MX missiles are seriously considered, the usefulness of the vote in the welfare budget is dramatically witnessed.

Only the devotion of America's wealth and natural and human resources to the maintenance of these institutions which contribute to well being and improvement of the human condition will bring real prosperity to the American economy.

The trade off that favors military expenditures at the expense of social programs is the same trade off that favors economic crisis for stability and natural economic growth that insures prosperity.

Anne Lintner

It has become common knowledge that it was the anti-war movement that finally made Vietnam too expensive for the United States to pursue. Popular dissent towards the actions of this "democratic" governing state inhibited the ability of our leaders to justify their actions. They turned instead to a more subtle form of global intervention, removed from the public eye. This was accomplished on one hand, through a masking of direct intervention by the use of Multilateral Banking and Developmental institutions, Multinational investment and the maintenance of puppet regimes; and on the other, by the use of the media to rehash the national vision of the "virtues" of U.S. foreign involvement. With a double-edged sword, the United States government launched programs of massive transfers of armaments to "supportive" third world minor powers, and a complex system of loans designed to create dependent junkies out of the developing world.

At the same time, the U.S. government created a buzz word out of "Human Rights" and cried "violation" against other countries not within the U.S. sphere of influence, while remaining partially blind to our allies, among them, some of the worse violators history has ever seen. Our government and our corporate economic system are structured such that they are so completely without a code of conduct that includes human rights, all the while insisting that we, the people, have achieved freedom and liberty.

Well, we aren't buying it. The contradictions in the policies of our government are becoming more apparent with each day. Protests and demonstrations are being mobilized with increasing frequency. The organized Church (excluding the likes of the Moral Majority) is voicing its disapproval. Bard College managed to bus 80 students to Washington D.C. to the largest protest against U.S. involvement in El Salvador yet. If there is one lesson learned from Vietnam, it is that we, the people, stopped the intervention and won the war, and we can do it again.
symbolic value, adding Reagan's action "is oco-
ing to be the biggest shot in the arm for the intelligence community in a long time." Miller hailed the pardons as "a very fine thing for the present FBI" because they will encourage agents to "do their job 100%".

---

R. D. F. (cont'd from pg. 3)

armies have so much advanced military equip-
ment, we can't stabilize an area just by showing the flag." From "Beyond the Viet Nam Syndrome" Radical America Spring 1980

Keeping in mind the sophistication of to-
day's guerrilla opposition, the existence of the Rapid Deployment Force takes on a new meaning. As can be seen in the case of El Salvador, revolutionary "flare-ups" cannot be quelled just by boosting a junta. Nor could we chase the Russians out of Afghan-
istan with the thought of our-muscle. The RDF is viewed by the Pentagon as having two possibilities: 1) It can serve for a quick strike "trip wire" to hold the front doors open to a larger U.S. military commitment; 2) It can serve as a first strike force with a "pro-emptive" policy of beating the Soviets to the draw and jumping the gun with imme-
diate troop deployment at the first sign of possible Soviet incursion. In any case, the development of the Rapid Deployment Force sets us a signal that we are ready to preach peace-time conscription and the revi-

talization of the not-so-cold war with the

---

Anne Lintner

---

Eire (cont'd from pg. 4)

ers" have not broken any law created and ac-
cepted by a free and totally independent
Irish nation.

To sum this all up, these prisoners are political prisoners and, as prisoners of war, they are justified to demand and receives all of the rights provided for under the Geneva

The government in London knows these reasons only too well. Yet they will not concede these rights to the prisoners. Mrs. Mar-
gret Thatcher will allow Bobby Sands to die and they (the British Government) are responsible for renewal of the flagellation in Northern Ireland and for the deaths of hundreds of innocent bystanders. This will occur because the oppressor government and all of England's lackeys have not realized after eight hundred years, that an Irish hero is strongest when he becomes a martyr. And when Bobby Sands joins the ranks of other Irish martyrs, such as Father Murphy and Wolfe Tone in 1798, Padraic Pearse and James Connolly in 1916, he will shake the mighty throne of England. In his death, he will

give new life to the cause of Irish liberty.

---

**HUMMINGBIRD**

"where beauty and art"

---

DESIGNERS • GOLDSMITHS

specilizing in:

- DIAMOND SETTING
- REMOUNTING
- REPAIR WORK
- ANTIQUE RESTORATION

All Work Done on Premises

DISCREET DISPOSITION OF ESTATE JEWELRY

---

Ground Zero Club

WHAT WOULD YOU DO
IN THE EVENT OF
A NUCLEAR WAR?

It's not a pleasant thought, but imagine
yourself at work in the morning, or relaxing
after dinner. If the radio is on, the tone of
the Emergency Broadcasting System will
suddenly interrupt the music with instruc-
tions about where to obtain more information.
Once the sirens have been launched you
will have perhaps 30 minutes to live. What
will you feel... think... do...?

In the aftermath of a nuclear attack on
New York, it is said that the living will
enjoy the dead. Therefore, why not be among
the dead? Faced with the alternative of re-
mainance amidst piles of bleeding rubble and
screaming people, the master of the
Ground Zero Club want to be among the first
to be vaporized.

What about the Club's activities? First,
since everything takes practice, the Ground
Zero Club will sponsor Reverse Civil Defense Drills. At a given signal, members will pro-
cede quickly and flamboutantly to Ground Zero, there to participate in the joy and innocence of armed street theatre.

In addition to the drills, there will be
dances and social events (called "MTers"). Perhaps some members will wish to spread infor-
mation about nuclear war and its con-
sequences.

If you would like to join the Club, send $2.00, your name, address, and phone number
to the Ground Zero Club of New York, Box 1155
New York, New York 10028. You will receive a
Ground Zero Club button in the mail and be
sent information about the group's next
meetings and activities.
ADOLPH'S ANNANDALE HOTEL

OPEN EVERY DAY
12pm-3am
THURS SPECIALS
AND NOW LOOK FOR MONDAY SPECIALS
Food Served Uptown:
Sunday-Wednesday, 12pm-2am
Thursday-Saturday, 12pm-2:30am

Downstairs Bar Open:
Thursday- 10pm-4am
Friday- 10pm-4am
Saturday- 10pm-4am

RHINEBECK BICYCLE SHOP
BERKELEY ARMS BARN
RHINEBECK, NEW YORK 12572
914-676-4025

RALEIGH ★ ROSS ★ PEUGEOT
PANASONIC BICYCLES
We Service all Makes

★ BRAND NAMES FOR LESS ★
LEE & LEVI JEANS
BONJOUR JEANS
INDIAN SKIRTS,
SKIRTS & DRESSES & MORE
FOOTWEAR BY MIKE
DORAN, TIMBERLAND
HUDSON VALLEY DEPT. STORE
CORNER RT. 9, RHINEBECK
VISA
MASTERCARD
AMERICAN EXPRESS

RHINEBECK NEWS AND SMOKESHOP
2 E. Market Street
Rhinebeck, N.Y., tel. 914-676-4919

BEAT INFLATION!
WITH SAFETY AND LIQUIDITY
AV-6b Maripas
Verticle/Short take-off,
landing planes
6 million
A-10 Air Force
attack aircraft
$7 million
X-1 tank
$3.2 million

Friday-Sunday, between 10:30-11:30,
All drinks (except copurk) are 75¢
Mugs of beer 50¢ (pitchers $3.50)
Reduced prices for Bard students continues.

New bar menu;
Quality food, substantial portions, reasonable prices!
"Moonrocket" sandwiches come with fries
and can be served hot.

CALL FOR RESERVATIONS - 758-8600
Major Credit Cards Welcome
OPEN 7 DAYS

The Whaleback Inn Continues,
Across from the entrance to Bard College.
But the New "Nappy Hour" Begins!