



Heidi Rand

Regents divest \$3.1 billion

The decision is a victory for militant student direct action and as such, signals not the end but a new beginning for the use of such tactics to achieve further goals. The struggle is not over.

By JOHN HURLEY

The decision by the regents to divest the university of its stockholdings in companies doing business in South Africa is the first major victory of the reborn students movement at the university. The Campaign Against Apartheid wishes to stress that divestment is not the final goal of radical activism on this campus, and that the recent victory must not be seen as the final victory of the movement. Divestment gives us proof that the tactics of direct action that the movement has employed are effective in achieving the goals of the movement. The campus movement has many more struggles to fight, in the university and elsewhere. We have won a significant victory, but we must keep in mind that apartheid has not been overthrown in South Africa. The people of Central America or the Middle East are not safe from our country's military machine, nor has America itself become an equitable society as a result of the university's change of heart on divestment.

This divestment, the largest so far by any American institution, represents a blow to South Africa's economy, and is a small but significant aid to the liberation forces there. It will nudge American companies toward disinvestment in South Africa. Perhaps of equal importance is that just as people in South Africa read of our shantytown (which was front page news in South Africa), freedom fighters there will read of our victory at UC Berkeley and can only be encouraged by the knowledge that progressive people here support their struggle.

Through the use of militant mass actions, the anti-apartheid movement was able to force a concession from a university administration traditionally contemptuous of student interests and wishes. Divestment was

won by a movement that worked independently of the institutions of authority that govern the university. The efforts of former Student Regent Fred Gaines could not bring about a serious consideration of divestment by the regents. On the other hand, a year and a half of confronting the university with blockades, sit-ins and the oddly threatening tactic of shanty building forced the regents to ponder the cost of maintaining the explosive situation their insistence on support of apartheid had created on the campus. The magnitude of

the possible confrontation awaiting the university in the next school year must have been truly frightening to the regents.

In the struggle for divestment, many students have discovered that the regents' recalcitrance was symptomatic of a fundamental lack of democracy in the university. We have found that the university is governed by authorities who have no interest in the beliefs and wishes of the academic community. Last year, the regents were unmoved by the Academic Senate's hedged support for divestment; neither were they swayed by the strong support of the students for divestment, as long as that support was expressed in words and not in actions. A few days before the building of the first shantytown, the regents refused

Continued on Page 4

UC holds 11 responsible for demo

By Jim P., Ben P.

Eleven Berkeley students who opposed official university policy have been indicted by the administration and now face possible punishment. The eleven demonstrated against the university's investments in corporations dealing with the apartheid government of South Africa. The dissenters advocated divestment of their school's funds from those business, by participating in the first "shantytown" protest outside California Hall, the building housing the chancellor's offices. Activists erected the shantytown to dramatize the intolerable conditions of the black South African majority which the U.S. corporations tacitly accept.

Ten of the eleven were seized by police late Monday night, March 31, along with 50 other students and their supporters. Within thirty-six hours after they were taken into custody, over 2000 students and activists returned to California Hall to rebuild the shantytown protest. That night police from a dozen different departments netted 91 persons in a nighttime

raid on the protest site. Hundreds of others slipped away clustering on either side of the arrest scene.

By morning the shantytown lay in ruins again. The ever growing throngs, however, prevented a quick police exit. With the day's first classes only an hour away, material and human blockades held the officers and their prisoners until the police forced a path clear for the sheriff's buses. Police smashed their way through the wall of human bodies, swinging clubs and kicking those who fell to the ground. The wounded streamed across the Sproul Plaza while the two buses loaded with arrestees crept to Bancroft Way. Armed guards occupied campus until the end of the week, waiting to clamp down on any further dissent.

The chancellor later issued a pro-divestment statement in an attempt to place himself on the side of his opposition. The Alameda County district attorney who zealously prosecuted previous anti-apartheid protestors with little success in court, deferred and

Continued on Page 2

News Flashes

The upcoming generation

According to an Associated Press story (which apparently has not been picked up by any major press), on March 27 about 150 students at the Bonneville Junior High School in Salt Lake City held a protest of U.S. military actions against Libya.

"Students raised their fingers in peace signs and shouted at parents and bystanders during the demonstration," according to the AP. The principal of the school complained that "some students were shouting obscenities and tearing up the lawn."

"I think some students were concerned about the Libyan situation and others just wanted a break and to get out of classwork." His main concern, however, was obviously order in school; he called in the county sheriffs who arrested three students. Forty others were suspended from school.

Environmental cups used

Sufficient Grounds, a Berkeley Coffeehouse, has discontinued using styrofoam cups because they are not biodegradable. They have been replaced with thick paper cups which reportedly cost the store about three times as much as the styrofoam cups. A sign has been added explaining the reason for the change.

Washington Divests

The University of Washington regents voted August 23 to divest all funds in companies doing business in South Africa after years of student protest there. The 6 to 3 vote contradicted an earlier 7 to 1 vote against divestment in January. The regents reported that "recent events" had changed their minds.

Nuke free cheese

The Cheeseboard cheesestore collective on Shattuck in North Berkeley is featuring New Zealand Nuclear Free Cheese. New Zealand has been taking heat from the United States since it started refusing American ships access to its ports. The barred U.S. ships has refused to tell New Zealand if they were carrying nuclear weapons.

New Zealand is a nuclear free zone and does not allow nuclear ships in its ports. Recently, the U.S. and Australia excluded New Zealand from the ANZUS defense treaty because of its nuclear free status. A girlcott (opposite of a boycott) has been called by peace activists on all New Zealand products.

Contra money from drugs

In a precedent certain to be noted by drug smugglers around the globe, court records recently uncovered in San Francisco document that the U.S. government will return cocaine profits to drug dealers if the criminals share President Reagan's avid identification with the Nicaraguan contras.

According to federal court documents obtained by the San Francisco Examiner, the U.S. government wrote out a \$36,000 check to Julio Zavala, an arrested smuggler, after Zavala produced letters from contra leaders attesting that the drug money was being used for "the reinstatement of democracy" in Nicaragua. Zavala and cohorts had been caught unloading cocaine from a Colombian freighter off San Francisco's Pier 96.

The U.S. government has denied knowing anything about this kind of activity, but certain facts have surfaced to cast doubt on the veracity of this claim. In a sealed declaration, one of the drug traffickers's attorneys stated that "agents of the U.S. government" had "either sanctioned use of cocaine trafficking to raise funds for contra revolutionary activity" or had led the defendant into believing it was sanctioned. City officials and Congresswoman Barbara Boxer demanded an investigation. Even President Reagan felt obligated to note in his compromise proposal to Representatives preparing to vote on contra aid that "no group shall

The Reagan team has tried to tie high Nicaraguan officials to the trafficking of drugs reaching the U.S. "Every American parent will be outraged to learn," Reagan has proclaimed, "that top Nicaraguan government officials are deeply involved in drug trafficking." The U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), however, says it has no information implicating Nicaraguan government officials. On the contrary, ample evidence in the San Francisco case implicates the contra rebels as the "narco-traffickers."

Contra commanders in Costa Rica also claimed noble intention in another drug case. An Associated Press story (LA Times, December 21, 1985) described cocaine dealing as a main contra activity. From clandestine air strips in Costa Rica, FDN and ARDE members ship the white powder into the United States. A portion of the profits from these activities is reportedly used to buy sophisticated armaments for the rebel bands.

A contra collaborator and former Panamanian official, Hugo Spadafora, had blown the whistle on the coke dealing to DEA agents in September 1985. His headless body was found inside a mail bage in Costa Rica the day after he spoke to the U.S. officials. In March, 1985 Costa Rican authorities arrested contra commander Sebastian Conzalez Mendiola on charges of Cocaine trafficking. A "CIA-Miami connection" was apparently involved in both the San Francisco and Costa Rica incidents.

The CIA-drugs-insurgency nexus is not new. During and after the Bay of Pigs operation against Castro in 1961, the Miami CIA station became the largest in the world, and drug trafficking developed in part from an influx of untraceable money. In Vietnam and Laos, where the CIA's Air America operated on a grand scale, the fabled Golden Triangle heroin trade dominated world crime. A 1970 study by the U.S. government stated that 70 percent of the heroin then flowing into Europe and the U.S. was originating from areas controlled by CIA mercenaries. According to a report provided to Congress by a field officer of the Agency for International Development's Office of Public Safety in 1972: "even though the CIA was, in fact, facilitating the movement of opiates to the U.S. they steadfastly hid behind the shield of secrecy and said that all was 'in the interest of national security.' Much of the information given by them to the various committees who studied the narcotics problem was inaccurate."

Can You Recognize A TERRORIST?

Do You Know The Difference Between:



A Terrorist.

and...

A Freedom-Fighter?



receive assistance from the United States if it...engages in...drug smuggling."

But apparently, while the President demands that Congress deliver \$100 million, the contras themselves have become steadily enmeshed in criminal activities that run contrary to their alleged struggle to "build democracy."

Responsible continued

eventually dropped his legal charges. Yet the university bureaucracy continues to challenge the eleven, demanding these arbitrary few to appear before the administration's Student Conduct Committee.

The chancellor established the committee to advise appropriate punishment for misbehavior. He names the chair yet is not tied to the findings or recommendations of the committee. He retains veto power over unfavorable results and may arbitrarily punish students. Students have four seats on the committee.

Legal Arguments

The university legal team claims that safety and obedience violations are the issue here, not the free speech rights of students. The legality of the committee remains in dispute. In their brief for this case, university prosecutors stated that the committee has no jurisdiction to decide First or Fifth Amendment matters, or selective prosecution. They declared the committee a fact-finding body within the framework of university regulations and that it must consider all university orders and actions valid. Therefore, they say it can only advise on possible sanctions against the students. They also say that the commission can hear no constitutional or legal challenges, and that it exists only to discover the answers to six yes-or-no questions:

- 1) Was the student present?
- 2) Was the student asked to leave?
- 3) Did the student refuse to leave?
- 4) Was the student told the consequences of refusal?
- 5) Did the student leave only after being arrested?
- 6) Did the student go peacefully or resist?

According to this brief, only the accusation (the arrest itself) would be allowed into evidence. Instead of first determining whether a crime had been committed and then whether the defendant was responsible, the committee could consider punishments on the basis of whether the students were at the scene of the alleged crime. This is a denial of due process of law. Instead of being a place of even greater free speech protections, the Berkeley campus would appear outside of U.S. Constitution purview.

Right to Learn

The shanty protest was not in violation of campus regulations and was a protection exercise of symbolic Free speech. The police order to disburse was therefore improper and in addition an infringement on free speech. People certainly need not obey police officers who are acting on the whim of unelected administrators when they know they are not violating any law. Students had a moral obligation to resist the improper efforts of the police to halt the political statements that the shantytown made. What were these statements? Why were they so offensive? What are the ramifications if the eleven students receive sanctions? University lawyers don't attend national conferences in Washington, D.C. on quelling campus dissent for nothing. The conscious goal of the administration in it's prosecution of these students is to quell free speech on this campus and on universities across the U.S. who will follow suit if the administration is successful. There is much more at stake here than a semester's suspension for eleven students. This is everybody's fight. Everyone has the right to hear speakers of differing viewpoints without prior restraint or interference from the administration. Why did the administration have such difficulty finding faculty to serve on the disciplinary committee? And why did they take the unprecedented act of appointing an obscure administrator, known for his obedience, as the committee chair?

The right of free speech is unquestionably more important than the university claim of some minor inconvenience, the pretext for calling out over a 100 club-welding police officers. The timing of the arrests also undermines the inconvenience argument and the police use of deadly force in less than life threatening situation is uncalled for and condemnable. At 1 a.m. not many students or administrators are working and obviously not many witnesses to the injustice and brutality necessary to silence thinking-people's free speech. The administration was afraid they would be heard. Chancellor Heyman simply represents the

interests of the regents on this campus. Now that they have displayed some commitment to divestment, both sides of Heyman's mouth, just for a second, are saying the same thing. But are they?

Although the Board of Regents voted 14-9 in favor of divestment in their July meeting, the administration chooses to press disciplinary action against the eleven dissidents. Why does the university continue to prosecute these activists when it has acceded to their principle demand?

Because it wants to send a clear message to the campus community about what type of protest is permissible. Since the Free Speech Movement of the 1960s the administration has made certain concessions on this issue. They allow campus groups to reserve Sproul Plaza from 12 to 1 p.m. on weekdays and to table along the walkway of upper Sproul Plaza.

As the protestors developed a new symbol, the shantytown, the university responded with a memorandum on shanty permits and regulations. Because the protestors aggressively asserted their constitutionally guaranteed right to demonstrate without prior bureaucratic approval, the administration failed to channel shantytown into their category of "legitimate protest." But when 15 shanties went up at California Hall, the administration responded instantly to crush the demonstration. The university attempts to portray itself as an impartial arbitrator of right and wrong, or criminal and legal behavior, and as an accuser of students who have crossed some line into "illegal protest."

Critics of this procedure point to the inevitable conflict of interests in making the university prosecutor, judge and punisher of the student. This is how Chancellor Heyman can call out the cops against anti-apartheid activists, bring them before student discipline hearings, and still claim to personally support divestment.

Jim P. and Ben P. are both shantytown 11 defendants. John Doe contributed to this article.

Big Mountain

BIA continues war of attrition

An editorial in last week's Chronical asks "why the SF Supervisors who have plenty of local problems would rather plunge into the murky worlds of national, international and Indian disputes." It is clear that the Bay Area and the world still consider Big Mountain a global issue, but what is happening now that the July 7 deadline has passed? Do people feel cheated that a violent TV-style dead-line did not occur? It may be that many have tabled the question of repeal as did the city of SF, but the urgency of the war of attrition still remains. There have been no congressional extensions which guarantee the safety of the people on the land, although several legislative carrots have been lowering for months. Officially, there have been only "assurances" from the BIA that the people will not be forceably removed until houses are build for them by the end of 1987.

On May 20 the head of the BIA confirmed via the Navajo tribe that there has been "on-going harrassment of elderly Navajo families awaiting relocation." In response he wrote that he would order "all field personnel, including law-enforcement officers, and fence-crews to halt their activities" admitting that they were unnecessary. Later on June 16 the BIA was pursuing fence maintenance activites and construction

of water diversion projects in the Teesto area when Navajo traditionals asked the rangers to leave. When the BIA returned again on June 17, a large confrontation ensued, during which the ranger drew his gun, at which time he and his partner were disarmed and sent away.

The Berkeley Big Mountain Support Group has on two occasions approached the BIA in order to procure written statements that would lend more confidence in their previous verbal statements. We were greeted by the "BIA shuffle," an historical tactic of vague to non-existent accountability to both Indians and non-Indians. Nevertheless, director Ross Swimmer has recently made a rare visit to the land, in response to the contineud ressure on his agency. For the first time they came prepared to address the people on the land directly, as opposed to the usual office visits with Tribal Councils. The result has been the stressing of their usual assertion, that they will continue enforcing the U.S. law as decreed, as well as initiating new investigations into the situation. This amounts to a flagrant rebuff of all new possible compromises and solutions, such as a moritorium measure that could allow for new congressional insights. Instead, the BIA is on the land daily qesitoning and counting people,

looking into windows and generally seeking to persuade and intimidate those who might be pushed into "voluntarily" relocating. The people are also harried nightly by supersonic jets that graze the tops of their windmills.

Meanwhile the Relocation Commission, a close relative of the BIA, is sponsoring tours of the "so-called" new lands, dubbed the "Disney land approach" by some. This new campaign features a deceptive look at proposed cluster housing in which sheet-grazing time is rotated around the limited range-lang perimeter. People were not even told in one place that they will have no water until 1999. Futhermore, Ivan Sidney the Hopi Tribal Council Chairman, is rumored to express interest in a plot of land somewhere Katherine Smith and Roberta Blackgoat's land, two stalwarths of the resistance. This confrontational prospect would be part of a horrible precedent in which new Hopi "homesteaders" file to acquire disputed land while simultaneously demanding they be "protected." These developmetns supported by U.S. law prove that U.S. policy favors property rights over human rights, while the foundation of almost all similar land-ownership disputes are based on long-term occupancy, but obviously not this critical case of Indian rights.

COOP provides responsible food

By Joe Blackburn

As well as protesting what we don't like in this world like apartheid, homelessness, military intervention and nuclear terrorism, we need to create a viable alternative to the corporate oligarchy that occasionally seems to rule our lives.

Coop Connection Underground Food Store in the basement of the Martin Luther King ASUC building between the bowling alley and the textbook store is an obvious step in the direction of building a peoples economy. The products the store buys and makes available to you are primarily from small environmentally aware farmers.

Anyone can use the store. Non-members pay a 10% surcharge (still cheap basic foods) and members experience the ecstasy of responsibility by paying a \$5 refundable share, a \$5 annual membership and working 50 minutes a week or 4 hours per month on any coop project, like writing this article.

Join us. Experience the real rich taste of foods grown by quality conscious farmers without the use of pesticides, herbicides and petrochemical fertilizers the effects of which are either known to be harmful or are as yet unknown. Every dollar you spend is a more valid vote for the kind of world you want than the choices you have in the electoral system.

Site 300 protested

By Joe Blackburn and Max Ventura

With the smell of victory in the air the August 6-9 Actions at Site 300 began. In collaboration with the Nonviolent Direct Action movement ranchers refused to be used to build a trillion watt, free electron laser for Star Wars research and testing. One of those ranchers gave us land for a peace camp.

To the beat of a Japanese drum, the 41st anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was remembered with a vigil, a rally and civil disobedience. On August 6, 40 people were arrested while blockading the road and entrance and another 6 were arrested that day at the Lawrence Livermore Labs.

The 1985 environmental monitoring report put out by the Lawrence Livermore Nuclear Weapons Labs, listed such high levels of plutonium, uranium 238, Beryllium, tritium and trichlorethylene (TCE), that most people would not even consider occupying the site this year as has been done past years to put a sort of people's moratorium on testing.

The action was publicized as an occupation so guards, CHP's and governemnt helicopters were out in such force that our \$950 action is known to have cost the government many thousands upon thousands of dollars (one activist said he believed it was probably close to \$100,000).

Because of actions at Site 300, ranchers and other local residents have learned about the toxic dust

blowing onto their land, the toxic chemicals seeping into the ground water and they are coming to question how the quality of air and land is affecting their health. Many local people are forming a broad coalition, doing grassroots organizing in their communities.

To see the rapid metamorphosis consciousness that has occured with the conservative ranchers and farmers around Site 300 makes hope prevail. During the eight prior occupations to stop open air testing at Site 300, the ranchers had allowed the labs to come onto their property to search for protestors. This time they welcomed us and one rancher, Bernard Ellisgery, let us use his land for a peace camp throughout the action. Another, Bob Connolly, put up a billboard on a tiny chunk of land he owns on the Lab's side of Corral Hollow Road. The Lab's sleaziness came into full view when in the middle of the night August 6 they stole the billboard which said, "Save our children's future."

Site 300 is managed by the University of California, for the Dept. of Energy. It is located about 50 miles east of Berkeley. Bombs and warheads are exploded about 300 times per year. About half the shots are underground and half are in the open air. In the 1950's (the site operations began in 1955), they used plutonium in their open air tests but stopped because of the health hazards. Now they blow up weapons that contain Uranium 238.

CAA may face forced relocation

The Campaign Against Apartheid along with SAICA and the Berkeley Students for Peace are once again under attack. But this time it's not from Chancellor Heyman or the regents. Believe it or not the latest attack comes from student government itself (ASUC). They want us out of our offices at 613 Eshleman.

Now why would they want to put the most successful activist group of the last 15 years into a poky little office that would make 3 people seem like a crowd when the CAA regularly has meetings of 30-60 people? Last year everybody was "against apartheid." Even the Young Republicans. So why the renewed attempt to throw the progressive organizations out of the office that has been theirs since the Vietnam Day Committee? The same moves were going on 5 years ago to oust Berkeley Students for Peace.

To talk about the groups is to talk about the work we have planned for the upcoming year.

- We want the ROTC off campus as part of a broad-range of tactics aimed at thwarting the Pentagon's military ambitions in Central America and around the world.

- We are working on making the campus part of the sanctuary movement to save political refugees from the clutches of Latin American death squads.

- We are in touch with the Crossroads squatters' camp in South Africa and will be putting on a huge benefit in the spring for the reconstruction of the camp

following the massive destruction of the squatters' shanties led by the South African Defense Force.

- Discrimination in faculty hiring as well as the low minority student enrollment continues to be a concern of CAA. We remain committed to building the anti-racist movement on and off campus.

- This paper, *Between the Lines*, cannot be run out of a shoe box. We need space.

- We were successful in stopping inbound ships from South Africa to the Port of San Francisco. However, outbound ships continue to load cargo for South Africa, as though this was somehow a less disgusting activity. We don't rule out the possibility of returning to the dockside.

- In November, Berkeley will no doubt pass a referendum declaring itself to be a nuclear free zone. The likelihood of the UCB dismantling its on-campus nuclear reactor in accordance with the wishes of the students and community are nil. It is the kind of pressure exerted by progressive groups like those in room 613 that will lead to the kind of change we demand.

Of course, this is early in the school year, and we cannot predict all that the 3 groups will do through the next 9 months, but what is clear is there is much to be done. Back to the original question: why is ASUC interested in throwing 3 very busy organizations faced with such important work into such miniscule space that it would be impossible for them to operate. The fact that the organizations are continuing to grow,

that first year students have shown a great deal of interest in our recent open house and that people are readily signing our petition to keep the offices suggest that the ASUC is out of touch with the student body.

CAA meets in room 613 of Eshleman Hall on Sundays at 1:30. SAICA meets at the same place, Mondays at 6:30. We look forward to your input.

Staff Box

Jesse Palmer
Ed Swain
Neal Shimizu
Maxina Ventura
Dave Lucas
Daphne
Joe Blackburn

Andy Brodie
Polly
Steve Biko
John Doe 121
Dave Campbell
Al Miller

Congrats & Thanks To:

John H.
Eddie Y.
Neal's lawyer
Quack, the duck
Our friends on the 6th floor
Steve Ganz (Hint, hint)

Campaign Against Apartheid Phone:

(415) 642-4136

613 Eshleman

Circulation 6,000

Published September 3, 1986

"Raise Hell and Duck"

Time, Place and Manner

September 3

Rally to celebrate divestment, sponsored by United People of Color and the U.C. Divestment Committee. Noon, Biko (a/k/a Sproul) Plaza, UCB.

Disciplinary hearing for 11 students selected for prosecution after last semester's shantytown protest. 7 p.m. in 101 Morgan, UCB. Rally at 6 p.m. on Biko Plaza.

September 4

Max Ventura opens for English political singer Frankie Armstrong at Castle Folk Club, 950 Geary St. SF at 8 p.m.

Politics and spirituality. Margo Adair, author of Inside Out: Tools for Change. Performance art/ritual by women from BEEF magazine. Long Haul, 3124 Shattuck, Berkeley, 848-6466. Begins 7:30. \$2.

Free movie: El Teatro Campesino & Mexico: The Frozen Revolution. 7:30 at La Pena.

Hutch Brown of Central American Research Institute presents slides from his recent trip to Nicaragua.

Discussion about the contras and Nicaragua. 7 p.m. at Tildent Room, MLK Student Union, UCB.

September 8

Benefit dinner for Latin American Support Community. 6-8 p.m. at La Pena. \$4.50. Advance reservations required. Call Raymony or Astor at 540-0457.

Assertiveness training for women. For information contact UCB Rape Prevention Education Program, 642-7310, 201 Bldg. T-9. 11 a.m. - 1 p.m.

September 9

Forum on health rights in Nicaragua. Slide show and meeting. Committee for Health Rights in Central American. 7:30 p.m. at La Pena. \$2 donation.

September 10

Film: Battle of Chile I and II. La Pena. \$2.

September 11

Slide show and eyewitness reports from Chile on anniversary of coup overthrowing Allende. Sponsored by Casa Chile. 8 p.m. at La Pena. \$5.

"Sanctuary: the new Underground Railroad." Speaker Phillip Willis-Conger, convicted in Arizona Sanctuary trial. 7 p.m. at 145 Dwinelle, UCB.

Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Alliance presents Kiss of the Spider Woman. 7:30 p.m. at 4 Dwinelle, UCB.

September 12

Steven Biko Commemoration. Featuring an AZAPO representative with firsthand info on Azanian revolution. Sponsored by Pan-Africanist Congress. 7:30 p.m. in 145 Dwinelle, UCB.

September 13

Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual Alliance Fall Dance. 9 p.m. at Berkeley Hillel. \$4. For info call 642-6942.

September 13-14

Gathering of grassroots activists from across the USA. Conference on nuclear facilities issues, sponsored by Moilization for survival. Register 9/12 6-9 p.m. Trinity United Methodist Church, Bancroft/Dana Berkeley. \$15. 531-8581.



Stop U.S. aid to El Salvador

By Max Ventura

To the horrified screams of women in white scarves, clad in black to signify their mourning, women representing the Mothers of the Disappeared in El Salvador were dragged off by people in military uniforms bearing machine guns during a guerilla theater August 28. One was thrown in a truck and taken away, now disappeared. Another was dragged off of the plaza and into a building in full view of hundreds, retrieved later, dead. She was carried in a funeral procession, blood-splattered as she was, to Callaghan Hall, the building housing ROTC (the Reserve Officer Training Corps) on campus.

"Asesinos! Asesino!" The Madres yelled at the military personnel, "murderers all!" "¿Donde están los niños? Vivos los llevaron. Vivos los queremos."

"Where are our children? You took them away alive. We want them alive."

Women read testimony from some of the madres in El Salvador. A Salvadoran refugee gave her own testimony of having her husband taken away from her one night at dinner, for no apparent wrong doing. The next time she saw his body was in a morgue with signs of torture inflicted upon him. In that same morgue, she saw the battered body of a pregnant woman and a man decapitated, his abdomen ripped open and the head placed inside.

The women, protesting in solidarity with the Mothers of the Disappeared, drew connections between the University of California and ROTC and the U.S. bombing of civilians in El Salvador, backed by millions of U.S. dollars.

Regents continued

even to consider divestment, claiming the issue had been covered in their farcical meeting of June 1985. Only after the two Campaign-initiated shantytown actions, and the subsequent United People of Colored blockade of California Hall, did the regents begin to move toward a new stance. Only when faced with the prospect of a student insurgency when classes were again in session (and in the fall of an election year) did Gov. Deukmejian reverse himself on the issue, bringing his supporters among the other regents to vote for divestment.

The regents have long refused to consider the concerns of the academic community in their governance of the university. To cite one newly topical example, their response to a 1970 Academic Senate vote to withdraw academic credit from ROTC and a strong student vote that year in favor of abolishing ROTC was to expand that ignominious program, and withdraw the Academic Senate's authority over ROTC. Another topical example is that of the previous divestment movement in 1977-78; they employed the traditional bureaucratic ploy of agreeing to 'study' the issue until the movement dissolved. As everyone on this campus knows, the regents' employee Mr. Heyman used a more direct style of authoritarianism against the current movement, employing police violence, as well as arrests, disciplinary charges and at least one infiltrator (Police Aide Leo Lin).

The media will be portraying divestment as the fruit of the work of the liberal politicians who pose as friends of the anti-apartheid movement. Before anyone congratulates Tom Bradley (who hurried to the scene of the meeting of the regents, a board he hopes to be a member of shortly), the campaign would like to urge the reader instead to ask why Mayor Bradley will not take back the key to his city that he gave to the South African ambassador. In this effort to move leftists toward the party that gave us the Vietnam war and the Bay of Pigs invasion, the surveillance of Martin Luther King and the installation of the Somoza regime, etc., Rep. Dellums has proposed a bill to ban trade with South Africa. A cessation of U. S. trade would, of course, be a crippling blow to apartheid, but Dellums saw his way clear to leave a loophole big enough for

an armored car; he exempted "strategic materials" for the U.S. military and industry from the bill. These materials include, for example, uranium, diamonds and chromium. Meanwhile, Senator Cranston attempts to use South Africa as a campaign issue. Yet he stands as the most reliable congressional friend of Israel, South Africa's major foreign supplier of ideological and military hardware.

The successful tactics the movement has used give us a tool in the continuing struggle against apartheid, as well as in other struggles. The university is hoping that students bury our heads in our textbooks now that the loudest demand of the anti-apartheid movement has been met. But, now that we have begun building an effective student movement, we must not fall back into passivity. The university still maintains multimillion-dollar contracts with the same apartheid-related companies it has agreed to divest from. It still sells IBM and Hewlett Packard computers. The university continues to recruit employees for such South Africa related companies as IBM, General Motors, and the napalm-manufacturing Dow Chemical. University disciplinary charges are outstanding against 13 students for participation in the shantytown actions. Six people face trumped-up felony charges for anti-apartheid work here in the spring. Twenty-one activists face the blackmail of deferred prosecution (in which the charges are to be dropped if the defendant is not arrested on other charges in a set period of time) for peacefully resisting university policy. These people were arrested by the University Police, and their prosecution would be impossible without the cooperation of the university. We regard criminal prosecution of people for their opposition to apartheid as support of apartheid. The movement must continue to fight these manifestations of UC complicity with apartheid, as well as to educate on this issue. We will also continue material aid activities in support of the South African Liberation groups, and continue fighting to close local ports to South African cargo through direct actions.

This university is located in a state whose population is nearly half third-world people. Yet blacks, latinos and American Indians are nearly completely excluded from the University. As financial

aid is reduced each year, this situation can be expected to grow worse if there is not a radical change in the University.

The current movement must broaden its horizons to include not only issues of racism in America and South Africa, but other issues as well. The condition of the American working class is rapidly deteriorating. The construction of a permanent wartime economy has led to a problem of massive, equally permanent unemployment. The CIA's war against Nicaragua has received a \$100 million boost from the Republican and Democratic parties. The movement must find a way to disrupt the staging of this war, locally perhaps by taking advantage of the fact that some of the Contras' supplies pass through the Oakland military bases. The movement must lay the foundation for a militant response in the streets of America if the U.S. government carries out its long-threatened full-scale invasion of Nicaragua. If the tide of battle in El Salvador again turns toward the popular forces there, we must be prepared for a growing U.S. combat role in that country. A grenada-style blitzkrieg against Libya, a U.S.-backed Israeli invasion of Syria and a conversion of U.S. raids in Bolivia into a war against leftists in that country or nearby Peru, are all strong possibilities for which the movement must prepare.

The ROTC installation here at Berkeley provides a training ground for officers to lead all of these possible wars, as well as for "advisers" now running the wars against Nicaragua and against the insurrection in El Salvador. The majority of U.S. officers in Vietnam were ROTC graduates. The time has come to divest ourselves of this training ground for killers. To force the removal of ROTC from our campus is the most direct help we can give the people of Central America and the Middle East.

Divestment has heartened the movement, and is a demonstration that militant, mass action can win victories that working within the ruling structures cannot. The Campaign Against Apartheid is determined to continue to fight UC and U.S. complicity in apartheid, and to fight racism at home. We are determined to bring the successful tactics used in the divestment struggle to other issues, and to strive to build a powerful, radical student movement.