

EXCLUSIVE

Environmentalists Promise Terrorism

The so-called radical ecology movement in the USA is moving from professed non-violence into a terrorist phase. A copy of an internal memorandum circulating inside the New England-based Clamshell Alliance and supplied to this news service reveals that the anti-nuclear group which led the recent highly publicized demonstration at Seabrook, N.H. is now functioning as an integral part of the international terrorist network coordinated by the Institute for Policy Studies (IPS).

An independent investigation confirms that the group has been bankrolled by IPS-linked funding conduits from its outset.

As the memorandum (reproduced below) makes clear, the group's training for non-violent civil disobedience at their April 30 occupation of the nuclear power station construction site at Seabrook was a tactical ploy to gain widespread recognition and support from the liberal mass media. Now, it is said, "The Clam" must recognize "the eventual necessity, in some battles for human rights, of armed resistance."

Labor party investigators traced the financing of the Clamshell operation to Boston's Haymarket People's Fund, a recently established conduit which underwrites nearly every terrorist operation and front group in New England.

Through its board of directors the Haymarket fund interlocks with the New England branch of IPS, the Cambridge Policy Studies Institute. Board members include: Maria Garcia, a member of the Institute-founded Cambridge-Goddard Graduate School for Social Change; Ann Froines, a long time anti-war activist who formerly worked with the Indochina Peace Campaign, among other Institute projects; George Pilsbury, David Crocker and others who are all part of various Cambridge Institute projects. The entire Cambridge operation is sustained from the Rockefeller Family Fund.

Other terrorist credits of the Haymarket Fund include various branches of the New England Prisoner's Association, a recruiting ground for the terrorist Jonathan Jackson-Sam Melville Brigade which claimed responsibility for bombings of several new England court houses last year.

All the necessary evidence now exists to open full congressional investigations into this domestic terrorist apparatus; this information is in the hands of relevant public officials. In Italy similar investigations by the Andreotti Government are underway against the Institute-run terrorist networks.

Such investigations should go into the root of the radical ecology terrorism, to its controllers in the Washington, D.C. offices of the Institute for Policy Studies. This criminal network includes not only IPS staff but related terrorist controllers in the Carter Administration including: Rand Corporation terrorist planner Brian

Jenkins, now a paid consultant to the State Department's Cabinet Committee for Combatting Terrorism; Anthony Lake, designer of the Institute's "Tar Baby" race war scenario, a leader of the Institute's international branch, the Transnational Institute, and currently the State Department's Director of Policy Planning; David Rosenbaum, a top MITRE Corporation terrorist planner specializing in nuclear terrorism, and now operating in the General Accounting Office as an energy advisor.

Issues For Discussion For Clam Coordinating Committee Meeting

The Seabrook Occupation is a matter for celebration — especially for the Hard Corps that worked in the Portsmouth Office all winter to make it such a victory for all of us. If we are to believe the media, we have helped revive the activist movement in this country even as we were fighting nukes. In the coming weeks we can see the Clam come to maturity by refining and developing our positions on critical issues that we have so far been too busy to address. We need no longer be afraid of conflict and struggle — we now have the strength and mutual respect for the principled struggle that is necessary for growth. The following are some initial points for discussion.

1. So far the Clam has confined itself to a simple opposition to nuclear power, without any analysis of the causes of the rise and abuses of such an unsafe technology. To confine ourselves to the reform of symptoms without taking a stand on causes may well be to repeat the mistakes of the movement in the 60's. For many of us, a stand must be taken recognizing that these abuses are inseparable from the system of monopoly capitalism, which is a socially irresponsible system because it is based solely on the accumulation of profit rather than on planning for human needs. Nothing could be deadlier than nuclear power in the hands of such a ruthless system.

2. Although we have attended to alternative sources of energy, we have not considered opposition to the economic, health, safety and environmental abuses inherent in capitalist management (sic) of other sources of energy — oil, coal, even conservation and solar energy. Certainly we are not willing to simply exchange radiation sickness for black lung disease, nor the destruction of the environment by thermal pollution for that by oil spills, nor breeder reactors for the plundering of South

Africa's uranium supplies. We must develop a political and internationalist position on energy generally.

3. Some believe that nuclear power managed by a different political system such as socialism could be developed safely (see, for example, *The Guardian*, 5-18-77, p.22) While most of us would probably not agree, the issue should be addressed.

4. While we have gained national attention in the media, and broadbased middle-class support, there is virtually no working class base in the Clam. This is something that has concerned us all, and can no longer be glossed over without hypocrisy, (sic) or at least contradiction, by those members of the Clamshell who are socialists. We do not really understand thoroughly the reasons for this. The best place to go for an analysis of the situation is to workers themselves. If working class involvement is of serious concern to Clamshell, a committee or all interested members should address themselves to meeting with working people, not so much to "educate them" — though some information on jobs and energy, etc., undoubtedly should be made available — but rather for the purpose of inquiry and dialogue, which hopefully might lead to alliance.

5. Non-violence has now become more than a tactic in the Clam. The media, and we ourselves, have featured non-violence as one of our distinguishing principles. We have been quoted repeatedly to the effect that non-violence is the best and most successful form of political struggle. The Clamshell is now recognized as a *pacifist* group (in all the media — *Guardian* 5-4-77 editorial especially comes to mind. Community people see it this way too) For some of our membership this is just as it should be — pacifism is a religious (sic) principle that must be witnessed to in every direct action. Others of us do not share this religious background and never intended non-violence to be anything more than a tactic for this particular event. I think most agree it was a good tactic in this case, though some feel we might have had a chance of holding the site had we been a little less willing victims. However we did not see the issue itself as serious. What harm could the ideal of non-violence do?

I think it is a very serious issue now, and may in fact be doing harm that I am sure none of its adherents would

have wanted. The response I have had from community people involved in labor struggles, and others concerned with international struggles like those in South Africa or Chile is that by our rather self-satisfied upholding of the ideal of nonviolence as the only proper way to conduct political action, we are degrading the sacrifice and heroic resistance of those involved in struggles that of necessity have reached the point of arms or self-defense. To a friend who has had loved ones killed by the Chilean Junta, we are naive and reactionary in our refusal to recognize the eventual necessity, in some battles for human rights, of armed resistance.

Perhaps we have not yet exhausted our potential for non-violent action, as Chileans, or South African blacks, or Harlan County miners have. But to continue to claim righteousness for being at one, early stage of political struggle should be called into question. Perhaps nonviolence itself should be. Some suggest that it proved bankrupt and destructive in the civil rights movement and that we should not repeat the mistakes of the '60s.

Our well-bred backgrounds and legal resources, as well as our principled behavior, assured us civilized dialogue with Doyon, the armory guards and even Meldrim. Workers in Boston are right now having to go armed to their jobs because of the use of force in certain labor disputes there. An inmate at Salem (Mass) Jail, who last week collected money to help free his fellow prisoners in the N.H. armories, had himself not had the privilege of friendly dialogue with his jailors. He had several months earlier been handcuffed to the bars for 36 hours and beaten by 7 guards. Are we going to continue to discretely isolate ourselves from these brothers and sisters, and in the same dedication to human rights that underlies the ideal of non-violence, *drop that* and unite in principle with them?

These and other issues should be refined and struggled through until, one way or another, they became part of a clear statement that people can unite around or withdraw from — a set of Clamshell Principles of Unity. Only by being willing to struggle, and even to diminish our ample numbers if necessary, will the Clam develop the maturity and strength of a principled stand that it owes to those who are looking to it for leadership in Left mass actions.