U.S. NAVY CONSIDERS SCUTTLING OLD NUCLEAR SUBS

Reactors on decommissioned vessels must be disposed of as radioactive waste; burial at sea is one alternative.

The US Navy is considering disposing of the dangerously radioactive power plants of decommissioned nuclear submarines by scuttling the submarines at sea over deep ocean bottom areas that would be chosen off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. No radioactive waste has been dumped off US coasts since 1970, and for the past 8 years the Environmental Agency (EPA) has issued no permits for such dumping.

The Navy has only two practical options for ultimate disposal of defueled reactors of decommissioned submarines, either scuttle the subs or remove and bury the reactors on a government reservation. Both options are under review.

One submarine reactor could contain 50,000 curies, or better than half as much as all of the radioactivity disposed of offshore during more than two decades of active dumping.

The effects of past ocean dumping of radioactive waste have in general been poorly monitored. From existing information, EPA cannot say either that such dumping is harmful or that it is innocuous.

The land disposal alternative that the Navy has under review would involve moving the entire reactor compartment from the submarine, putting this large structure (weighing several hundred tons) on a barge, and towing it to a government installation for shallow burial. The government has only two installations in mind: the Hanford reservation on the Columbia River in Washington, and the Savannah River Plant reservation in South Carolina.

Sea disposal of entire submarines might be much the easier and cheaper of the two options. But if this is the alternative proposed, the Navy may well provoke controversy in the United States and perhaps other nations, such as those around the Pacific basin where radioactive waste disposal has become an issue of extreme political sensitivity.

“My gut reaction is that it is not a smart idea,” Thomas Cochran, staff physicist with the Natural Resources Defense Council, commented to this reporter.

Cochran observed that there are already well over a hundred nuclear-powered naval vessels in the US Navy, another sizable number in the navies of the Soviet Union, France, and the United Kingdom, plus several hundred research and commercial power reactors in service or under construction around the world. If, he added, sea disposal becomes the thing to do every time a reactor is decommissioned, “pretty soon you are talking about a thousand hulks down there.”

Cochran said that he would not want definitely to oppose the sea disposal of reactors without reviewing the environmental analysis the Navy must prepare before deciding on the sea disposal versus land burial alternatives. “But my initial reaction is that land disposal would be better,” he said.

The Navy has already disposed of one submarine reactor at sea. This happened in 1959 when, without any public announcement, a barge bearing a sodium-cooled reactor from the Seawolf was towed 120 miles off the coast of Delaware and scuttled over the so-called 2800-meter site commonly used during the post-war period for radioactive waste disposal.

As a consequence of US-Soviet arms control agreements, the Navy is under immediate pressure to decommission some of its old Polaris submarines before seven Trident subs, which will each house 24 missile launchers, come into the fleet over the next 4 years. Compliance with the strategic arms agreements can be achieved by removing the submarines’ missile-launching tubes, but, with this done, the Navy will still be left with the radiologically hot reactors and the question of what to do with them.

Nuclear submarines can be decommissioned, defueled, and laid up in Navy shipyards, and five times over the past 13 years this has in fact been done. This year the Polaris submarines Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt were decommissioned.
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PEACE

AN ADDRESS GIVEN BY THE REV. JOHN CURNOW* EXECUTIVE OFFICER FOR THE N.Z. CATHOLIC COMMISSION FOR EVANGELIZATION* JUSTICE AND DEVELOPMENT ON JULY 28th, 1980.

Throughout history peace has been one of mankind’s dreams. But this has been an elusive dream. People have gone to war, the strong have wielded power for their own ends, strife has brought suffering and death to our history.

Over the centuries we have seen force as the usual way to gain advantage over others. Theories were worked out to justify war. Even the Church was compromised on the side of violence. Today, however, the Church teaches that modern war, nuclear war, would be a horrible crime against God and man.

Indeed, Christians should be among the first to work for peace. The Christian Church teaches that all people make up one human family, that Christ blessed peacemakers and promised the gift of peace. This teaching is one that Christians should cherish and work for. Peace is not just one compartment among many for a Christian. Peace must not be seen in a narrow political or sectarian way. Peace is a compelling moral challenge.

Today, the reality of war is such that all people of goodwill must begin to see the work of peace as a compelling imperative.

We have seen a glimpse of the destruction that nuclear arms can bring and we know the terrible consequences of such a war.

It is true that a modern nuclear war could destroy most living things. Warmakers have in their power almost unlimited destruction. One hydrogen bomb is equivalent to 24 million tons of T.N.T. — that is 12 times the explosive power of World War 2 in one bomb.

In the “Press” on July 10th, 1980, it was stated that the combined destructive capacity of the world’s nuclear arms amounts to around 13 thousand million tons of T.N.T., the equivalent of one million Hiroshima bombs, or about 3 tons of explosive for every man, woman and child on earth.

In a nuclear war ordinary people, young and old, are the targets. One bomb can kill millions of people, depending on where it is dropped.

Nobody knows about the long term results of nuclear pollution. The threat of nuclear war surely is an insane option. Yet military leaders say that the present balance of terror is a deterrent and a realistic military option. These same people now plan for first strike capacity — preparing to destroy the world in order to save it.

This is an option that we must firmly reject. We must: oppose it and plan a campaign against this sort of war. When we come to work for peace, there are certain things we must understand.

1. The first major obstacle to peace in the world is injustice. Millions of people live in desperate poverty. The powers spend $450 billion a year on weapons of destruction. “The arms race is not making people safer, only poorer”, says the Brandt Report. Hunger and the violence of injustice assist their preparation for war. The present so-called “world order” is in fact systematized inequality. The enormous self-interest of the powerful promotes this waste on war while people die. Do we need so much power to contain the poor? Peace comes as a fruit of justice.

2. The second problem we face is that almost total blindness exists about the possibilities of nuclear war. It seems that people do not want to know about this. Maybe we have become used to the threat of war and think it will not happen. Around us there is a vast apathy and fatalism. For example, action for peace is not in the mainstream of Church activity. Churches have still to get their teaching on peace out of the statements and into the life and ministry of Christians.

We have been socialised into accepting inequality, racism and centralised power as normal. We have been kept in the dark about the arms race and the threat to use nuclear arms. Our ignorance comes partly from those who use the language of deception.

So, what are we going to do?
First of all we must believe we can do something. After all people did finally stop the war in Vietnam. It took 10 years of intense activity, but it did succeed. Ordinary people want no part of war.

Let us begin by raising awareness in all the ways we can. Get information moving as well as we know how. We must work towards reducing defence spending and make disarmament a goal of our campaign.

We must move away from alliances with militarism and break with the culture of war. Could these be political issues in an election year?

Sooner or later we will have to examine and confront the whole value system and power structure that imposes violence and inequality on people, a system that accepts war and terror as a means of retaining advantage. Such a campaign will require great faith and courage. We may have to change life styles, challenge concepts of national interest, question male-dominated values and contest certain accepted ways of acting.

It is certain that we will have to reject a concept of power that sees people in the abstract and manipulates them for its own ends.

Aggression on the global scale today could destroy us all. We must declare “No more war, never again” (Paul VI), and dedicate ourselves to the goal with renewed commitment.

PEOPLE

It was with considerable sadness that PNNZ learned of the death of Father John Healion, at Turangi on July 29th.

Toby Truell, general secretary of Corso said “John Healion was a leading figure in Corso throughout the 1970s. He became Chairman in July 1976, at a time of great turbulence in the organization. The annual appeal had been at its lowest ever, and there had been three Directors within three years.”

He helped to clarify Corso’s change of direction from support for the poor to working with the poor.”

He was completely committed to justice, and the fight against poverty and oppression.”

Father Brendan Keegan, who succeed Father Healion as the Chaplain of the Wellington Young Christian Workers said “As a result of his work, a lot of young people have become involved in social issues throughout the country.”

Visitors:
Pat Dodson — first Aboriginal to be ordained a Catholic priest in Australia. Presently researching land rights etc. at a Melbourne University. He has wide experience of the plight and problems of Aboriginal people, in all parts of Australia including reserves, urban situations, and in land struggles involving multi-national operations etc.

Itinerary:
Christchurch, 8-15 August — local contact person Fr John Curnow, Catholic Commission, Phone 64-002.
Wellington, 15-23 August, local contact person Toby Truell, National Corso Office, Phone 859-586.
Auckland, 22-29 August, local contact person, Rev. Michael Elliot, Ecumenical Secretariat on Development, Phone 774-433
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**EUROSTRATEGIC WEAPONS**

The spotlight has recently fallen on so-called Eurostrategic weapons. Defining these weapons is extremely difficult. By and large, Eurostrategic weapons could be defined as nuclear weapons located in or targeted on Europe and having a range longer than that of the existing short-range tactical nuclear weapons, but shorter than that of the intercontinental strategic nuclear weapons. A heterogeneous array of missiles and aircraft are contained under the rubric 'Eurostrategic weapons'. Often referred to as 'grey area systems' these weapons are not covered by any of the current international arms control negotiations.

The current debate on Eurostrategic weapons is focused on the newest generation of US and Soviet medium and intermediate range nuclear weapon delivery systems. The Soviet SS-20 missile, which can carry three independently targetable nuclear warheads to ranges of up to 4,000 km, substantially increases the Soviet Union's nuclear potential in Europe. This missile has been deployed and is still under production, as is the other controversial Soviet Eurostrategic weapon, the Tu-22M Backfire bomber. It should be noted that under certain conditions, the Backfire bomber is capable of carrying out intercontinental missions. This bomber was therefore a contentious issue during the SALT II negotiations, but was finally excluded from the treaty limitations. However, the USSR pledged not to produce more than 30 Backfires a year and not to upgrade the Backfire so as to carry out intercontinental missions.

Two new US Eurostrategic systems, under development, are planned to be deployed in a number of NATO countries. These will be ground-launched cruise missiles and the Pershing II ballistic missile (replacing the Pershing I of shorter range). In December 1979, NATO decided to base 464 ground-launched US cruise missiles and 108 US Pershing II missiles in Western Europe. The reason given for this decision was that the Soviet SS-20 missiles and Backfire bombers posed a new threat to NATO. Both types of NATO missile will be capable of penetrating a significant distance into the Soviet Union and will possess exceptional accuracies. Furthermore, the flight-times of Pershing II missiles from their bases in FR Germany to targets in the Soviet Union will be extremely short — only a few minutes — affording virtually no warning of attack. The cruise missiles, although considerably slower, will be able to fly zig-zag flight paths at 'tree-top' altitudes to avoid air defences. Although the protocol to the SALT II treaty prohibits the deployment of ground and sea-launched cruise missiles with a range exceeding 600 kilometres, it does not prohibit their development. In any event, the protocol is due to expire at the end of 1981, that is, before these missiles will be ready to be deployed.

These new Eurostrategic weapons, on both sides, must be seen as increasing the risk of nuclear war in Europe, which would amount, in fact, to the destruction of Europe. This risk could be reduced if both sides exercised restraint and if negotiations were to be initiated as quickly as possible to limit and eventually remove the threat posed by these weapons.

### Major Eurostrategic nuclear weapons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Weapon designation</th>
<th>Year first deployed</th>
<th>Max. range (km)</th>
<th>No. deployed in 1979</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Weapon designation</th>
<th>Year first deployed</th>
<th>Max. range (km)</th>
<th>Nuclear weapons aircraft</th>
<th>No. deployed in 1979</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>SS-4</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Tu-16 Badger</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>SS-5</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Tu-22M</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>SS-12</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>~600</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Backfire</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SS-20</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>~129*</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>FB-111A</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>SS-N-5</td>
<td>1964*</td>
<td>~1200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>F-111/LF</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Pershing IA</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>~750</td>
<td>108*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Vulcan B2</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Pershing IA</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>~750</td>
<td>108*</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Vulcan B2</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Pershing II</td>
<td>1963*</td>
<td>~1600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Mirage IV/VA</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLCM</td>
<td>1983*</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Polaris A-3</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4600</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>M-20</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>M-20</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW TYPES OF STRATEGIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

More ominous than any other weapon development is the continuing emergence of weapons with distinct nuclear war-fighting capabilities. Among such weapons being developed in the USA is the MX missile system (ICBM) and a related mobile basing scheme to reduce vulnerability. The MX will carry 10 warheads, the maximum allowed by the SALT II treaty. Each warhead will have substantially greater accuracy and explosive yield than warheads on current US Minuteman III ICBMs. Furthermore, a laser or radar system may be introduced to guide the warhead onto its target, giving it hitherto unattained accuracy. The first MX is expected to become operational in 1986, and the full force of 200 MX missiles by 1989. From then on, the MX will significantly increase the capability of the USA to threaten the Soviet fixed ICBM force.

While current submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) do not possess the necessary combination of accuracy and explosive yield to pose a real threat to hardened targets such as missile silos, the USA is developing a new type of SLBM, the Trident II, which will probably have a definite capability against hardened targets. This new missile will eventually be deployed on new Trident submarines. A variety of sophisticated guidance mechanisms are under consideration for use on Trident II; thus Trident II may be more accurate than any strategic missile in operation today.

The USA is not alone in developing new generations of strategic nuclear weapons. The USSR has in operation and under continued production a series of multiple-warhead ICBMs capable of destroying a high percentage of US fixed ICBMs. The new Soviet ICBMs — the SS-17, SS-18 and SS-19 missiles are ostensibly a response to the US deployment, in the early 1970s, of multiplewarhead ICBMs — the Minuteman III force. In turn, the US MX is heralded as a response to the new Soviet ICBMs, and the USSR is likely to react to the deployment of the MX. Thus, the strategic nuclear arms race continues.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 1980
EAST AND WEST PAY HOMAGE TO FATHER OF MILITARY THEORISTS

THE 200th anniversary of the birth of Carl von Clausewitz on June 1 was commemorated throughout the world — in East and West. The Prussian major-general did not become famous through battles won but through his classical work, 'On War'. This work does not deal with war as such but with war as the ultimate instrument of politics.

Clausewitz breaks down war ("conflict of major interests which is resolved in blood") into three component parts, in order of priority,

1. The political objective
2. The aim of the war itself
3. The military means

But he says that politics is the major factor in all three parts: even the armed forces are a political instrument above all — an instrument used by politics to secure peace.

He is the only classical military man recognised, used and quoted time and again in East and West. Accordingly, the anniversary of his birth will be commemorated by both power blocs — a most unusual situation in our divided world.

It is one of the many paradoxical traits of German history that the politically minded Clausewitz was not discovered by the German military brass.

It was instead, Friedrich Engels, the founder of militant world communism, who deserves credit for this.

In a letter which the "general" and military expert of the first communist movement wrote to Karl Marx, Engels termed Clausewitz a "star of the first order".

The consequences could not be foreseen at the time. Many decades later, Lenin also became interested in Clausewitz and studied his On War in 1915 while in exile in Switzerland.

He wrote down excerpts and made notes in the margin of the book — notes which have meanwhile become part of the dogma of Leninism.

"For politics is nothing in itself. It is only the administrator of all these interests vis-à-vis other states. The fact that they have taken a wrong direction, that they serve ambition, private goals and the vanity of those in government is of no interest here.

"For it is never the art of warfare that must be regarded as preceptor; and we can in this context see politics only as representative of society as a whole."

Of middle-class background, Clausewitz entered the Prussian Army in 1792 and was admitted to the War College in Berlin in 1801.

He studied under Gerhard von Scharnhorst and became an aide to Prince August. He served with both the Russian and the Prussian armies in the Napoleonic wars.

In 1818 he was made a general and administrative head of the War College. In his 12 years at the War College he wrote, among other works, his famous On War.

Wilhelm von Schramm

(Kieler Nachrichten, 29 May 1980)

Wilhelm von Schramm, is generally recognised as one of Germany's foremost Clausewitz scholars.

The German Tribune, 8 June 1980, (edited)

APRIL 20th 1980, LETTER FROM LORD PHILIP NOEL-BAKER, PUBLISHED IN "THE GUARDIAN" (WEEKLY)

IN JANUARY the veteran US Ambassador to Moscow, Mr George Kennan, the "father" of the policy of "containing" Russia warned his nation of the danger of their "war hysteria" over Iran and Afghanistan. He used significant words:

"Thought and discourse in Washington are more militarised today than at any time since 1945."

The present frenzied arms race is militarising thought in many countries. The British Government's Defence White paper, which you report today, forecasts the expansion of armaments for decades to come, and discusses new weapons for the nineties: a reversion to poison gases and germ warfare, both banned by treaty long ago; and the arming of women.

But the continued expansion of armaments is not a policy; it is a drift, a paralysis of thought and reason; an acceptance of the unacceptable.

After the first World War a great Foreign Secretary, Lord Grey of Falloch, wrote of the arms race before 1914: "The moral is obvious: it is that great armaments lead inevitably to war... The nations must disarm or perish."

The Government rely on nuclear deterrence to prevent the present arms race from ending in a nuclear war. But our two greatest authorities, the late Lord Mountbatten, and Lord (Solly) Zuckerman both reject reliance on deterrence. Even the White Paper itself appeared to be preparing opinion for the breakdown of deterrence — that is, for war.

And what war? On Radio 4 on March 16 the Minister for Civil Defence said: "In the war we can expect to have, there would be 15 million survivors, if it happened today; 30 million if all the Civil Defence precautions were carried out. At best, 25 million Britons would be killed."

To rely on deterrence to avert such an unimaginable catastrophe is suicidal.

The only path to safety is the policy decided on by the Special Session of the UN General Assembly in 1978: General World Disarmament, conventional and nuclear, and the reallocation of the resources so released to the ending of world poverty and the promotion of social justice everywhere.

The World Disarmament Campaign has been organised to mobilise opinion in support of that policy, which was adopted unanimously by 149 governments in 1978. The campaign was launched at a Convention in the Central Hall, Westminster, on Saturday, April 12. The Convention proved to be the most memorable of its kind for many years.

If the campaign succeeds, Britain would become the leader of the nations for the salvation of mankind.

Philip Noel-Baker

House of Lords

THE BEGINNING...
US NAVY CONSIDERS SCUTTLING OLD NUCLEAR SUBS

Continued from page 1

and placed in protective storage in the Pudget Sound Naval Shipyard. But the laying up of more and more nuclear subs and surface ships as they reach the end of their useful lives of 20 to 30 years will, at some point, become clearly impractical.

The Navy says that, so far, about $1 million has been spent on the oceanographic research effort: it estimates that about a million more will be spent before the broad area studies are completed. But Heath believes that to do all the research required to identify and propose actual dump sites will cost more like $5 million and perhaps twice that.

Because the research will require several more years, the Navy is still a long way from deciding either for or against the sea disposal option. EPA needs more time too; its assessment of the environmental effects of past dumping of radioactive waste is not expected to be completed until 1985, and the agency may not be ready until then to decide whether to allow dumping to begin again.

— Luther J. Carter

From the Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (A.A.A.S.) — Science 2 — October 1980 p 1495.

IN BRIEF

ATOM SHIP IRKS NEW ZEALANDERS

WELLINGTON, New Zealand, Sept. 26 (UPI) — About 1,000 demonstrators marched on the American Embassy today and scuffled with policemen while protesting a weekend visit by the United States Navy's nuclear-powered cruiser Truxton. Maritime unions, which opposed earlier visits of nuclear-powered ships, struck and brought Wellington's port to a standstill.


The secondary source of the above item was an official US publication described below. We believe this demonstrates the concern caused by N.Z. opposition to visits of nuclear warships.

CURRENT NEWS
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PART II - MAIN EDITION - PUBLISHED AT 1130
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1980
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USA TO SPEND $1000M ON AUSTRALIAN BASES

The United States plans to spend more than $1000 million on bases in Australia during the next few years — with major developments at Darwin and at Cockburn Sound in Western Australia.

Pentagon chiefs regard Cockburn Sound as "top of the list" in their search for a suitable home port, but the first outlay in the beefed-up defence relationship could be made on a joint project with the Australian Government to upgrade air facilities in Darwin.

The Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, said in Darwin that he accepts the principle of nuclear-armed B-52 bombers flying out of Australia.

The Pentagon wants to begin flying B-52 surveillance missions into the Indian Ocean before Christmas, and a memorandum of understanding covering the use of the Darwin facilities is being drawn up to cover the sharing of costs and responsibilities.

The Darwin project, which would involve widening runways and installing support facilities, would be paid for by the US out of funds earmarked for such contingencies.

If Cockburn Sound is given the go-ahead as the probable base for a task force, in preference to Guam and the Philippines, it could house up to 7000 US personnel.

An additional project believed to be under consideration is the upgrading of facilities at Learmonth RAAF base in Western Australia. It is understood that the Pentagon considers the base suitable for use by USAF aircraft, including the KC-135 tanker planes which accompany the B-52s on long-range missions.

In Canberra, the ALP confirmed that it has rejected a request from the US State Department for an agreement in principle about the home port facility for US warships at Cockburn Sound.

While the Labor Party broadly supported the US policy and visits by US warships to Australian ports, it rejected the establishment of home-port facilities in Western Australia.


'CONTROLLING' THE SICK WILL MEAN SHOOTING THEM

Imperial College Health Centre held a conference on civil defence for the Health Service, called 'Après La Bombe'. Its assumptions alarmed John Gleisner.

I am not averse to planning, but planning not based on reality is both useless and dangerous. The overriding horror of the aftermath of a nuclear war not surprisingly evokes fear, anxiety, and revulsion in any sane person trying to imagine in a detailed and realistic way the possible range and nature of circumstances and events.

Maybe in our multi-megaton age the devastation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is out of date. But it is the only real and useful information we possess. Paradoxically, and sadly for those wishing to deal in realities, the extensive documentation of these tragedies was scarcely mentioned, let alone used as the basis from which to build realistic scenarios.

The BBC's production, The War Game, one of the few imaginative and realistic attempts to depict the aftermath of a nuclear strike (and still banned) was described as "a nonsense which we should get out of our minds".

The nonsense we must get from our minds is that created by self-delusion. True, grappling with the realities of devastation likely to be produced by nuclear war is phenomenally difficult.

Consider some of the known variables: the number and location of survivors; their degree of injury or radiation sickness; the amount and location of food and medical supplies; the attitudes of those in possession; the type and degree of control exercised by the police, the army, or by the emergency survivor control squads; the extent of structural damage, of communication disruption, of supplies of energy, water, or other basic resources.

One hint of reality at this conference, which medical people will find worrying, was the underlying theme which stressed the need for pretraining in order to get "hardened". The argument runs something like this. Let us suppose there are 30 million survivors in Britain. Of those accessible to residual medical services some will be dying, some seriously ill, some will appear to have minor injuries and others will appear well. Because of the very serious shortage of medical personnel and facilities it will make public health sense to ignore the dying and the injured and focus all available aid and protection on the well. What will happen to the sick and injured survivors?

— Guardian Weekly
SUPPLEMENT:
FOCUS ON THE PHILIPPINES

The Facts:
Population: 43 Million
Life Expectancy: 56
Pop. growth rate: 2.3%
No. of TV Sets: 750,000
Motor Vehicles: 402,000
Political Prisoners: up to 50,000 (approx.)
Regime: Martial law (since 1972)
G.N.P. per Capita: US$380 (but 80% of pop. below this figure)
(Source: Asia Yearbook, 1978).

Statistics of Poverty
1971 - 56% of population inadequately fed
1975 - 68% of population inadequately fed
1 in every 600 children in Cebu City is blind due to Vitamin A deficiency.
70% of children + 78% of pregnant women are anaemic.
75% of population has intestinal parasites.
50% of children's deaths due to malnutrition.
300,000 children mentally retarded due to hunger.

Why Poverty?
- It is because of injustice.
- It is because 2% of the population owns 70%-80% of the land and resources.
- It is because the martial law of President Marcos is a repressive regime that denies basic human needs and human rights to the people.
- It is because multi-national corporations reap high profits which are not put back into helping those whose labour creates them.
- It is BECAUSE OF INJUSTICE

Who Benefits?
Multinationals produce beer, ice-cream, soft-drinks, etc., which have high profit margins, rather than staple nutritious foodstuffs; despite the fact that the Philippines is a major exporter of SUGAR, BANANAS, PINEAPPLES, COPRA, etc. and New Zealand sends bilateral aid to the Marcos Government.

Corso and the quest for Justice in the Philippines.

The Philippine Situation
The Philippines' socio-economic political history parallels that of other underdeveloped former colonies. The 400 years of Spanish occupation, the 50 years of American imperialist "benevolent assimilation" and 3 years of Japanese occupation have left a deep dent in the present economic, political and cultural life of the Philippines.

Like many other former colonies there is a grave inequality in the distribution of economic resources and power. Those who wield the economic power in the Philippines are those who own the great bulk of the means of production, distribution and exchange; namely the controlling interest of foreign multi-national corporations mostly of American and Japanese origins and their local partners: the 1% local economic elite composed of the large landowners of quasi-feudal estate and big bureaucrat-capitalists. This economic power breeds and enforces and in turn is supported and perpetuated by political, legal, military and socio-cultural and even religious power. The long colonial heritage has given rise to an educational system that domesticates rather than liberates, that propagates and subjugates the values, tastes, customs, viewpoint and standpoint of the dominant class. This monopoly of resources and power in all areas of social life is used under the present system for the further increase of the power of the wealthy elite to the detriment, oppression and exploitation of the great majority of the Filipino people.

This unjust and oppressive situation has brought about the growing momentum of protest of increasing number of workers, peasants, students, intellectuals, and progressive elements in the church against the present economic and political system.

Sr. Mary John Mananzan O.S.B.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN

I. INTRODUCTION - In the Philippines, the question of women's right is so far not a burning issue because Filipinos generally take pride in the high status women have in their society. They claim her relative superiority of the position of the Filipino women compared to her Asian and even Western counterpart. Atty. Irene Cortes writes about this attitude:

The not unusual reaction to the subject of women's liberation in this country is the facetious remark: "It is the men who need liberating." In support of this, it is pointed out that in the Filipino family, the wife holds the purse, husbands hand over their pay checks and get allowance in return and the wife manages the affairs of the household. The high position of the women in

Philippine society is also pointed out, as well as her activities in political, civic, social, religious, education and other fields. The achievement of individual woman in the professions, in government service, in business, in politics, etc. is also cited. And the famous statement attributed to Governor General Leonard Wood is repeated: "In the Philippines the best man is the woman."
This view of the Filipino women has some validity and can muster evidences, historical and actual, in support of itself. However, this obscures certain facts of the role of Filipino women that are in fact unequal compared with their Filipino male counterpart or are incompatible with a really liberated status of women.

II. THE ISSUES
1. Limited Sphere of Work
Women's roles are circumscribed in the domestic sphere while men's role are directed toward the public sphere.
Where women participate, a substantial portion of their involvement are concentrated in the fields of employment that are extensions of their traditional and domestic roles. Thus a considerable amount of human potential for the economic progress of the country is undeveloped.

2. Low Wage Level
Census data point that men earn more than women regardless of occupation and industry grouping. This low level of wages is detrimental to the overall income because this has an effect of depressing the general wage rates.

3. Insignificant Role in Public Policy Making
Empirical data show that women do not exert significant influence as decision makers in local and national government, in economics, in the professions, even in education which employs more women than men. Especially in the lower strata of society, women's involvement in socio-civic activities and in labour unions is insignificant.

In business, administrative and managerial posts are predominantly occupied by men.
(These are conclusions of a study made by the Institute of Philippine Culture - published under the title: Filipino Women or Partners of Men in Progress and Development - A Survey of Empirical Data and A Statement of Basic Goals Fostering Male-Female Partnership ICP, 1976).

Other Issues are:

4. The Prevaling Double Standard of Morality which is reflected not only in social customs as the quid pro quo but also in legislation for example on legal separation:
"A husband has cause for legal separation in a single proven act of infidelity of his wife. But a wife cannot leave a cause for legal separation even when her husband's machismo is such that acts of infidelity are his life style as those acts do not fall within what the penal laws define as "concubinage."" (Rev. Penal Code Act 334). A double standard long existing in Philippine society permits men much more freedom from conjugal commitment than it is ready to concede to its
2. Aside from the inequality of status between the Filipino men and women, among Filipino women, there is also inequality of opportunities between: 1) the rural Filipino woman and the urban Filipino woman 2) the lower class Filipino woman and the upper class Filipino woman 3) the married woman and the single woman.

3. The emancipation of women in the Philippines cannot come about by mere legislation but by multi-dimensional reorientation: political, social, economic, educational and cultural.

4. In the forces of opposition to the present system there seems to be a significant participation of women which is a departure of the trends in the present establishment. In fact in the underground movement policies regarding men-women relationship especially with regards to male-female roles show a decided trend towards equality and partnership.

5. Women's liberation in the Philippines seem therefore to be bound up with the economic, political socio-cultural liberation of Philippine society as a whole.

Sr. Mary John Mananzan O.S.B.

A POSITION PAPER ON PROSTITUTION IN THE PHILIPPINES

On the eve of May 24, 1978, 189 Japanese tourists checked in at the downtown Ramada Hotel in Manila. They were salesmen of the famous Casio Computer Company, who are selling more than their quota, earned this Philippine trip arranged by the company with the Kinki Nihon Tourist Agency. At 8:30 p.m. they went to a nearby Chinese Restaurant, the Leong Garden. At the end of the dinner a screen door leading to another room opened. There stood 200 Filipina hostesses with number tags pinned on their dresses. About a hundred Japanese picked out their partners and proceeded to their Ramada bedrooms. The sexual fare for such a night of pleasure is from $70-$100, though only about $20 goes to the girl.

This is a typical example of the exploitation of Filipino women by tourists. There has been a remarkable leap in the tourism industry in the Philippines from the 60's when it was a minor item in the nation's economy to its being fifth largest dollar earning industry in the 70's according to the statistics division of the Department of Tourism. In 1976, 937308 or 75.12% of the tourists in the Philippines came either for pleasure or to spend holidays, and of these, 70.15% were male. Annually about 200,000 Japanese came to the Philippines. And 90% of these are male. Bars, saunas, baths, nightclubs, have sprouted all over Manila and environs, and there is a corresponding increase in hospitality girls; club mistresses, service attendants, hostesses and prostitutes. Women are usually included in a package deal in tourist arrangements and usually the girl gets only 15 to 20% of the fee paid by the client. Aside from the economical exploitation, there is the moral degradation that prostitution brings to society. Thousands of girls from the provinces are headed to Manila and other urban centers for the trade. There is a spread of venereal disease especially in the vicinity of the night spots. Malpractices abound to an alarming degree.

Related to but not identical to tourism is the presence of foreign, mainly American, troops who open their recreation on the Philippines especially in places where there are military bases. Two of the most notorious of these places are Angeles and Olongapo, both in Luzon. The social cost of these bases in terms of corrupted and dehumanized lives especially on the part of Filipino women is very disturbing.

Olongapo, a town of nearly 200,000 people is the home of Subic Bay Naval Base, and is also the working ground of 16,000 prostitutes and several thousand illegitimate children of American servicemen. During the Vietnam war, Olongapo had the reputation of being a wide open area for GI recreation. But even today the demand for prostitutes has not diminished. Ten thousand girls are licensed but several thousand ply their trade illegally. Only a visitor who has seen the garish surroundings and the hardened wasted faces of the girls that are trapped in the dens of vice that line the main road, Magaysay Boulevard, and a side street, Harrison, will realize the corruption that continues in an atmosphere of institutionalized vice.

Aside from the obvious and economic and sexual exploitation, there are other untoward incidents that may happen during the transactions between customer and entertainer. Incidents of violence, of harmful sexual perversion and even deaths have been reported. Entertainers have been killed for refusing to do sexually perverted acts with customers. Customers can even inflict physical torture on the girls.

A side effect of prostitution which is seldom discussed is the fact that the prostitutes become exploiters themselves. Customers become victims of theft. This must be regarded by some as an advantage taken by the prostitute but actually this is a further degradation of her personality. Both customer and victim are caught in an organised system of exploitation, injustice and violence for economic ends for which the economic and political elites are responsible.

There is still another factor in the sexual exploitation of Filipino women and that is the presence of foreign industrial establishments.
in the country. The incentives to foreign investments has resulted in the mushrooming of industrial establishments all over the Philippines. Aside from ecological pollution they bring to the once pure air of the countryside, these establishments have given rise to moral pollution. In a province in the south, the director of a girl's school has expressed concern regarding the dangers to the female students who are lured to become the maids, laundry maids, cooks and mistresses of foreign workers. Women workers are not only exploited economically, they are often victims of sexual exploitation by their supervisors, managers, lured by promises of better pay, better working conditions, or promotion. This is especially true in places where the workers are mostly women — for example, in textile industries and electronic firms found in export processing zones.

In the face of these realities:

- WE DEMAND THE CESSATION OF SEX TOURS THAT ARE FREELY ADVERTISED ABROAD AS A BASIC PART OF THE TOURISM PROGRAMME IN THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES
- WE BLAME THE LACK OF PRODUCTIVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THIRD WORLD WOMEN FOR THE DIFFICULTY IN SOLVING THE PROSTITUTION PROBLEM
- WE CAN TOLERATE TOURISM THAT IS FOR GENUINE INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING BUT NOT ONE WHICH INCLUDES THE DEGRADATION OF OUR WOMEN
- WE CALL FOR THE DISMANTLING OF AMERICAN MILITARY BASES IN THE PHILIPPINES WHICH ROB OUR WOMEN OF THEIR DIGNITY
- WE RENOUNCE THE ECONOMIC AND SEXUAL EXPLOITATION OF WOMEN WORKERS IN INDUSTRY
- WE CALL ON ALL WOMEN OF THE WORLD TO UNITE IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST ALL FORMS OF EXPLOITATION AND OPPRESSION OF WOMEN WHEREVER THEY MAY BE FOUND

Sr. Mary John Manaszan O.S.B.

THE BANANAS YOU EAT

JAPANESE PEOPLE ON BANANA COMPANIES PLEASE EXPLAIN TO US

A group of Japanese consumers and workers issued the following statement last July on the banana industry of the Philippines and sent it to the companies involved.

As Japanese consumers and working people, we are gravely concerned about the activities of banana companies operating in Mindanao, including your company, and hereby ask the following questions.

1. The big agribusiness firms, including your firm, are all operating for production of bananas for export, mainly for the Japanese market. For this your firms altogether took more than 20,000 hectares of land in Mindanao, virtually depriving the local farmers of their farms and turning small landowners into adjuncts to your operation. This style of production has nothing to do with the needed type of agriculture, an agriculture which would cater to the Philippine population and enrich the Philippine economy. On the contrary your style of production is dedicated only to the promotion of private interests of your firms at the sacrifice of the Philippine land and resources.

How do define and justify the purposes of your banana production in Mindanao?

2. Your firm and other foreign firms are obtaining huge profits by banana production in Mindanao whereas you are paying only a little more than a dollar a day to the workers. We consider the wage too low and profits too high. For instance, we know that in 1975, the four of your firms, Castle & Cook, United Fruit, Del Monte, and Sumitomo, chalked up aggregate profits of $40 million and paid $4 million in wages. The total wages paid amounted to only 10 per cent of the profits gained. This means that you would still be able to take a profit even if you had raised the wages to nine times what they were.

3. We hear frequently that harrassments and even dismissals are being made by the management against those workers who engage in organizing banana workers into independent unions, and that such obviously unfair labor practice is conducted to obstruct workers from efforts to improve their conditions for themselves.

Has your firm made, or is your firm making, such interference in union activities? Would you explain to us your company's policy toward the right of workers to organize?

4. How do you explain the way you are using agricultural chemicals? Would you explain what kinds of agricultural chemicals are being used in what manner, and tell us what steps you are taking to protect your workers from the toxic effects of agricultural chemicals?

We would appreciate it if you would provide us with your replies on the above four points, all of which are of serious concern to us.

TO HUNGER AND THIRST FOR JUSTICE

I have never been this hungry before
pain burning my guts, searing my back.

Food is doubly delicious
tuyo1 or crispy pata2
corn soup and sinigang3
turn-turn4 meals and banquets.

To starve after justice
to ache for it, like food, frantic for life itself.

How long can men live without eating
two weeks or more, they say.
But would such be living?
Too weak to rise from sleep
to read bible and newspaper
while ponderously weigh issues
which are complex, we say, and take time
which cannot be rushed
because we fear to be one-sided etcetera?

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst after justice
for they shall be satisfied.

But when, oh Lord and how?

— Fr. Edicio de la Torre, Camp Olivas, Pampanga.

1 small dried salted fish, a staple food of the poor
2 pigs trotter (softened and deep fried)
3 sour stew, a Philippine favourite
4 literally ‘point-point’, meaning dishes at hawkers-style small eateries
where one points to one’s choice from the pots or serving plates.

LETTER TO A FOREIGN FRIEND

“To think that people from other lands would support our cause!
This is not simple friendship but a deeper kind of international
solidarity and unity.”

— L.B.S. from a Letter from Prison.

Printed — published by Resource Centre for Philippine Concerns, Hong Kong.

IMPRISONED FOR PEACE

Philip and Jesuit Father Daniel Berrigan are in jail with
6 others, after damaging with hammers Mark 12A nuclear
missile warhead cones. Two security guards at the General
Electric Co. missile assembly plant at King of Prussia
Pennsylvania testified that the demonstrators were ‘nonviolent
and peaceful’. If convicted, the eight could face sentences of
up to 64 years in prison and fines totalling $105,000 each.

Philip Berrigan related:

“We found a crated nose cone, removed it and began its
conversion into a ploughshare . . . we finally rested our
hammers on the floor after pouring our own blood over
re-entry vehicles, blueprints, desks and floor.”

MOTHER OF 6

A mother of 6 children was amongst those arrested. She
is Molly Rush, director of the Thomas Merton Centre in
Pittsburgh, Pa. Bail for her, as for 5 others, was set at
$125,000. The Berrigans were not allowed bail though
Philip has been subsequently released suffering from
degenerative arthritis of the spine complicated by ‘flu.

American Peace Activists, like many N.Z. conscientious
objectors and like many courageous New Zealand non-violent
resisters of injustice such as the jailed followers of Te Whiti o
Rongomai of Parihaka, have been paying high prices for their
powerful gestures.

Another great American ‘soul brother’ of Catholic
activism is author and theologian James Douglass. Veteran of
many jail sentences and currently in between two six-month
terms, Jim is a leader of the Seattle Washington resistance to
the monster Trident submarine home port development at
Bangor in Puget Sound.

‘a life put in jail for making peace is more powerful
than we can imagine in opening up a new world. Every time . . . as
a human family we take a further step into the kingdom of
God — into a country where thousands and eventually millions
of sisters and brothers will be crossing fences and going to
jail to stop nuclear war and affirm our unity as a family’.

George Armstrong 13-11-1980

PACIFIC CONCERNS RESOURCE CENTRE — Viola Palmer

An important outcome of the Hawaii Conference was the
establishment of this Centre to implement the action proposals
agreed upon. These included such issues as nuclear-free Palau,
militarization and nuclearization of the Pacific, uranium
mining in Australia and North America, nuclear power in the
Philippines, weapons testing, Trident, Peace Squadron,
RIMPAC military exercises, People’s Charter for a Nuclear-
Free Pacific, waste dumping, nuclear accidents and
independence movements. It proved an exciting challenge to
set up an international centre with the dual functions of
promoting the independence and anti-nuclear movements. It will
do this by communication of information, development of
educational resources and co-ordination of actions. The
Centre is to be located in Hawaii for 2 years at least, and the
intention is to employ 4 full-time staff. The centre will
be overseen by a steering committee composed of 7 regional
representative who will deliberate mostly by phone.

Communication from the centre will flow to interested
groups in each country via a contact person. New Zealand’s
contact is:

Hilda Haokiyard-Harawira
20 Firth Crescent
Otaara
AUCKLAND
Phone: 276-9816

The National Council
of Churches in N.Z.

October 20, 1980.

Dear Readers of P.N.N.Z.,

The Christian Conference of Asia is doing a survey of
“Militarism in Children’s Books especially in Textbooks.”
They have asked if we have any information from the N.Z.
situation. I presume they are looking for references in children’s
books to war, soldiers, fighting, weapons etc. which
implant the attitude that war and soldiering is good, noble,
exiting, etc.

If you have any views or information on this subject which
could be useful in the CCA Survey I would be very happy to
receive it.

Yours sincerely,

Angus H. MacLeod
GENERAL SECRETARY

PROPOSED DEVONPORT NAVAL WHARF NOT WANTED

NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF WOMEN (DEVONPORT) AND THE PROPOSED NEW NAVY WHARF AT DEVONPORT

Since the proposal to build a large new wharf at the Devonport Naval Base was first made public, N.O.W. (Devonport) has been actively concerned about the possible consequences for the local community of such a construction. This concern has taken several practical forms:

- the making of submissions in support of the Devonport Borough Council to the Commission for the Environment.
- the circulation of information concerning the proposal to all households in the Borough. (see enclosure)
- the organisation of a public meeting with invited representatives of official bodies concerned. This meeting attracted 300 local residents.
- the organisation of a further meeting, to be held on 15th December, between the local residents and the Hon. George Gair.
- the organisation of a continuing programme of research and information of the local community.

N.O.W. is opposed to the wharf proposal on several grounds:

1. The wharf will mean a higher level of industrialization in the Borough, with an associated increase in noise, traffic, and pollution.

2. The wharf means that the importance of the Naval Base as a major military installation will increase; N.O.W. consider it irresponsible to place New Zealand's major naval installation, and therefore target in time of war, in the centre of New Zealand's major Centre of population, and resist strongly any moves to intensify military activity in Devonport.

3. N.O.W. considers that the question of the possible berthing of nuclear powered or armed vessels at the proposed wharf has not been resolved or answered satisfactorily by the Defence Department or the Government. N.O.W. is totally opposed to the berthing of such vessels at Devonport, both as a peacetime risk to the local community and as targets in the case of war. N.O.W. intends to establish Devonport as a nuclear free zone, in the hope that other Auckland Boroughs will do likewise.

4. N.O.W. has closely studied the Commission for the Environment's comments and recommendations on the proposal and finds them deficient and disturbing, particularly on two issues: the apparent lack of attention to the very large amount of local concern about the proposal, which the Commission attempted to dismiss by calling it "misunderstanding".

- the recommendation that the wharf proposal go ahead with no further recourse to local or regional comment. N.O.W. is confident that it speaks for the Devonport Council and Community when it expresses determination to press for Government recognition that the proposed wharf is not an asset but a potential hazard to the local community.

---

I would like to subscribe to Peace News New Zealand, and enclose $5.00 for this purpose.

Name

Address

I also enclose a donation toward the establishment of P.N.N.Z. of $...

Bulk rates, Airmail subscription rates etc. are available from the:

Subscription Secretary,
Peace News New Zealand,
P.O. Box 9563,
Courtenay Place,
Wellington, New Zealand.
COMING ATTRACTIONS
SUPPLEMENTS ON: MILITARISM, DISARMAMENT, MEDICAL EFFECTS OF RADIATION, NUCLEAR WASTE DUMPING, 'JUSTICE—NEW ZEALAND STYLE', KOREA, AFRICA, TRADE UNIONS FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE, AND MUCH MORE.

WHAT DO YOU THINK?
Please write to us, let us know what you think of PNNZ.
Tell us how this publication could be more useful, more interesting for you.

Thanks,
David Buller

IMAGES OF AFRICA

Many of our ideas about Africa are mental fossils which have somehow resisted the general debunking tendencies of recent times. They owe more to our ancient linkage with the British Empire than to any objective assessment based on present contact and communication.

Stereotypes of 'mud huts, coups and crocodiles' persist and seriously hamper efforts at closer understanding and political and economic co-operation.

Common misconceptions occur partly because of our isolation, but also through the deliberate campaign of anti-African groups to discredit African states, often so as to be able to justify white domination in South Africa.

Misconceptions are rife in every sphere — Africans lack conceptual skills, have no history, the flimsiest of cultures and can't cope with the modern world. ('Of course they're absolutely marvellous in their own place, such dignity and splendid teeth'.)

The irony is that people who 20 years ago were considered sub-normal, or at least sub-capable, by many Westerners, are now criticized for not being super-human. 'They should have got over all their problems by now, surely.' (Forgetting, conveniently, the external origin of those same problems.)

As Patrick Marham writes in 'Fantastic Invasion', Europe fears Africa, because when Africa is left alone it works.

We often hear about Africa's natural resources and wonder why it hasn't got rich through all that tea, coffee, cocoa and copper. Yet we rejoice when we hear that the international prices of such commodities have fallen.

Very little development happened in colonial times that wasn't related to the colonial powers improving their cache of cheap raw materials.

When countries demanded independence they also demanded the opportunity to 'develop'. They were given strong inducements to opt for a pattern that would do little to disrupt the flow of resources established by the empires. It seemed quite reasonable — continued colonial cash crops to finance expanded colonial imports of skills, technology and capital goods. A growing debt, but also growing opportunities and completed projects generating power for the local economy.

Looking back after 20 years of 'independence' must be a bitter experience for any 50's nationalist veteran who hasn't succumbed to the blandishments of elitist opportunities. Debt strangulation by international financial institutions; covert and overt political and military interference by big powers; tied aid that often gives more to the donor country; fierce discrimination against Third World goods by the powerful union of the rich; energy price rises of crippling proportions — the common litany of complaints that have sapped the will of many countries trying to pull themselves out of the mire.

Little wonder that a certain institutional fragility is not uncommon in Africa — that, as one Nigerian writer put it, 'sporadic handshakes with anarchy' occur. New Zealanders will do more good by trying to understand the reasons than by making shallow judgements — after all, we're part of the system.

— Rupert Watson, Director, Africa Information Centre
14/11/80