



Peter Hannan

## Mutual dependence

By Diana Johnstone

B O N N

It has been a "bitter year" for the peace movement in West Germany, Antje Vollmer told the main rally in Bonn on October 20 as rain clouds gathered. Last year there had been sunshine, millions of people and, above all, hope—hope that this extraordinary protest movement might make a difference and stop the deployment of new nuclear missiles.

All that was gone this year, so it was really no wonder that the October 20 actions apparently brought out little more than the hard core of the peace movement, even though it is a very large hard core, probably numbering in the hundreds of thousands.

To buck the inevitable current of discouragement after failing to stop Pershing II installation, organizers made a bid to link up with the labor movement by stressing the connections between the arms buildup and unemployment. To symbolize the connection, they decided to build a human chain between Hasselbach, a cruise missile base site in the Hunsrück hills south of the Mosel river, and Duisburg, an industrial city at the confluence of the Rhine and Ruhr rivers, whose 16 percent unemployment rate is the highest in West Germany. The trouble was, the two sites were 130 miles apart. To build the chain, at least 200,000 participants were required, and not even half that number showed up.

Demonstrations were held simultaneously in Hamburg and Stuttgart. Estimates of the total turnout varied wildly. The big gaps in the chain allowed much of the media to interpret it not as the symbol of the link between the arms race and unemployment, but as the sign of the decline of the peace movement.

But while the overly ambitious fall actions were totally successful in terms of mass mobilization, they did achieve a *de facto* union of the left. Social Democrats, Greens, trade unionists and Communists shared the speakers' podiums, agreeing that environmental protection and job creation are the twin goals that the left must champion in the effort to build a political majority able to take West Germany out of the arms race. Recent studies and experiences are showing that environmental protection, far from being the hobble to economic activity it is considered by big polluting corporations, can be a new sector providing job and technological development opportunities. But to grow it must compete with military appropriations, which the conservative government of Helmut Kohl is increasing, under pressure from the Americans and, no doubt, the Christian Democrats' generous patron, Friedrich Flick.

Flick's steel baron father, also named Friedrich, befriended Heinrich Himmler, financed Hitler and, as a result, largely controlled Nazi arms production as well as the coal and steel industries in the Nazi-occupied countries. At the Nurnberg war crimes tribunal he was sentenced to seven years in prison but was out in three. Since the elder Flick died in 1972, his son has been following in his footsteps as head of a vast financial empire, including new weapons sectors. It has recently been disclosed that Flick arranged a multi-million-mark sinécure to get Rainer Barzel, who was considered ineffectual, to resign as leader of the Christian Democrats (CDU) in 1973, opening the way for the present chancellor, Helmut Kohl, who has a much more marketable good-guy image.

In late October the Kohl government decided to lengthen obligatory military service from 15 to 18 months. Of course, this brought strong protests from peace movement leaders, who also accused the government of scandalously playing down its simultaneous decision to adopt a "Bundeswehr Plan 85" calling for the procurement of a "third generation of weapons." Budget experts calculate that the share of arms expenditures in the overall budget will mount from about 19 percent at present to about 37 percent by 1994. Peace movement leaders said this means sacrificing social benefits and also adapting the Bundeswehr to the war-waging concepts outlined in the AirLand Battle manual that is endorsed by U.S. and West German army officers.

Two days before the peace demonstrations, a sharp clash in the Bundestag illustrated the way political conflict is turning. In a speech commenting on Chancellor Kohl's recent trip to China, Green Jurgen Reents said Kohl went to China as "traveling salesman for German industry" and promoted sales of harmful and useless technology (including nuclear) whose disadvantages were mostly not yet recognized in developing countries. But, Reents concluded, there was nothing else to expect from a chancellor "whose way to the top of his party was bought clear by Flick."

Some time later, after receiving the official transcript, the presiding officer, Richard Stucklen of Franz-Josef Strauss' right-wing Bavarian Christian Social Union (CSU), announced he was expelling Reents from the Bundestag's current plenary session for his "outrageous" reproach. The shocked Greens' request for a recess was cut off. Protesting from the floor, Green Walter Schwenninger called Stucklen an "authoritarian buffoon" and Green Joschka Fischer yelled things like, "Now it's started, exclude everybody," whereupon he was excluded as well. At that Fischer shouted to the chair, "With permission, you're an asshole, Herr President!" This was not in the official record, but nevertheless Fischer immediately wrote Stucklen an elaborately courteous apology, explaining that he had been overwrought.

On the other side, right-wing Christian Democratic speakers did not hesitate to compare Green "methods" to those of Nazi extremists who destroyed the democracy of the Weimar Republic. The right-wing tactic is to distract from the Flick scandals which have led to militarization and unemployment—by creating an atmosphere of panic around the "chaos" supposedly introduced into German democracy by the Greens. Thus to "save democracy," authoritarian measures will be required. Another objective is to harp on the image of the Greens as chaotic and destructive (with the essential help of the right-wing media, of course) so that the midstream as well as the conservative wing of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) will balk at the prospect of a "red-green" governing coalition—the only possibility of an eventual real left alternative to the various coalition combinations that may be worked out among the older established parties.

A leading champion of an eventual red-green alliance is Jo Leinen, chairman of the peace movement coordinating committee and of the big Citizens' Initiatives environmentalist confederation. Leinen is earmarked to be named Environmental Minister of the Saarland by Oskar Lafontaine, the dynamic 41-year-old mayor of Saarbrücken, if Lafontaine leads the SPD to victory as expected in elections in the Saarland next March. Lafontaine, who has a degree in physics, has been a pioneer in energy-saving measures and urban environmentalism and has even managed to balance the budget in an old industrial city hit hard by unemployment. He won re-election in June with an absolute majority for the SPD, convincing many of his party's leaders that the "Lafontaine method" is the way for the SPD to get back in office. He competes electorally with the Greens, yet at the same time urges them to share government responsibility in coalition with the SPD if they want to be taken seriously.

As main speaker toward the end of the Bonn rally, Lafontaine had to cut his speech short when a downpour struck. The one point he managed to get across was that "we don't count on arms control negotiations which have always been the background music to arms buildups. We want one-sided disarmament." Lafontaine said that promises to do something about unemployment were lies on the lips of politicians so long as arms spending continued to rise. Earlier, Leinen declared that "the political morality of this government has reached rock bottom. This government has been bought—not only Barzel but Kohl too must go." Introducing Antje Vollmer, speaker of the Greens in the Bundestag, Leinen stressed the Greens' "contribution to a new political culture" in West Germany.

Indeed, the success of the left SPD strategy, represented by Lafontaine and Leinen, depends on the vigorous survival of the Greens and their political culture, as a pole of attraction countering the conservative tug pulling much of the SPD to the right. All this depends in turn on the vigorous survival of the movements

## THE STORY INSIDE

that gave rise to the Greens, especially the peace and ecology movements. Thus leaders had cause for concern on October 20 that, although the outlook for an eventual red-green coalition is, on the whole, improving, the mass movement that sustains such a hope is in danger of receding.

Vollmer voiced this concern. She noted the danger of discouragement and resignation. A potentially even greater political danger, she said, is to think that "the growing peace movement in the SPD or the Greens' work in parliament could take care of what we have to do. The peace movement belongs in the streets and should not dwindle down to the narrow channels of SPD or Green local clubs."

Vollmer then made four suggestions for a long range perspective and strategy. First, "this peace movement must at all cost remain independent and extraparlamentarian." Second, Vollmer said that "we are opposing Pershing and cruise missiles as the spearhead of a NATO strategy and must thereby also prepare for withdrawal from NATO. But we don't want a substitute NATO. When Helmut Kohl and Francois Mitterrand stood hand in hand before the graves in Verdun, I could not simply see the picture of reconciliation of two men. We are not combatting Pershing and cruise missiles as American strategy just in order to put in their place a German-French *force de frappe*. Nor are we combatting nuclear weapons on our soil in order to have a conventional arms buildup.... We want radical disarmament in Central Europe!" Vollmer also called for a peace treaty with both German states to finally conclude World War II and a long-range combat against all forms of internal militarization.

IN THESE TIMES

## IN THESE TIMES

The Independent  
Socialist Newspaper

Published 41 times a year: weekly except the first week of January, first week of March, last week of November, last week of December; bi-weekly in June through the first week in September by Institute for Public Affairs, 1300 W. Belmont, Chicago, IL 60657, (312) 472-5700.

Member: Alternative Press Syndicate

Editor

JAMES WEINSTEIN

Senior Editors Managing Editor  
JOHN B. JUDIS SHERYL LARSON  
DAVID MOBERG

Culture Editor

SALIM MUWAKKIL

European Editor

DIANA JOHNSTONE

Contributing Editor

PATRICIA AUFDERHEIDE

Staff Writer

JOAN WALSH

Assistant Managing Editor/

Books Editor

EMILY YOUNG

In Short Editor

BETH MASCHINOT

Editorial Assistant

SHERYL OLSEN

Correspondents

JOHN B. JUDIS, Washington

TIMOTHY LANGE, Denver

DANIEL LAZARE, New York

JAY WALLJASPER, Culture

DAVID MANDEL, Israel

CHRIS NORTON, Central America

Art Director

MILES M. DE COSTER

Associate Art Director

NICOLE E. FERENTZ

Assistant Art Director

PETER J. HANNAN

Production Manager

PAUL D. COMSTOCK

Composition

JIM H. RINNERT

Publisher

JAMES WEINSTEIN

Assistant Publisher

FELICITY BENSCH

Acting Business Manager

GRACE FAUSTINO

Circulation Director Advertising Director  
BILL REHM CYNTHIA DIAZ

Office Manager

KATHLEEN GALLAGHER

Assistant Circulation Director

LEENIE FOLSOM

Circulation Assistants

ADELIA PRICE, GEORGE GORHAM,  
GREGORY KILBANE

Development Assistant & Product Sales

BRUCE EMBREY

Fulfillment Assistant

PAUL BATITSAS

Typesetting Sales

JUDY SAYAD

Typesetting

DIANE SCOTT SHERYL HYBERT

Production

LISA WEINSTEIN

Sponsors

Robert Allen, Julian Bond, Noam Chomsky, Barry Commoner, Al Curtis, Hugh DeLacy, G. William Domhoff, Douglas Dowd, David DuBois, Barbara Ehrenreich, Daniel Ellsberg, Barbara Garson, Emily Gibson, Michael Harrington, Dorothy Healey, David Horowitz, Paul Jacobs (1918-1978), Ann J. Lane, Elinor Langer, Jesse Lemisch, Salvador Luria, Staughton Lynd, Carey McWilliams (1905-1980), Jacques Marchand, Herbert Marcuse (1899-1979), David Montgomery, Carlos Munoz, Harvey O'Connor, Earl Ofari, Seymour Posner, Ronald Radosh, Jeremy Rifkin, Paul Schrade, William Sennett, Derek Shearer, Stan Steiner, Warren Susman, E.P. Thompson, Naomi Weisstein, William A. Williams, John Womack, Jr.

(ISSN 0160-5992)

The entire contents of *In These Times* is copyright © 1984 by Institute for Public Affairs, and may not be reproduced in any manner, either whole or in part, without permission of the publisher. Complete issues of *In These Times* are available from University Microfilms International, Ann Arbor, MI. All rights reserved. *In These Times* is indexed in the Alternative Press Index. Publisher does not assume liability for unsolicited manuscripts or material. Manuscripts or material unaccompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelope will not be returned. All correspondence should be sent to: *In These Times*, 1300 W. Belmont Ave., Chicago, IL 60657. Subscriptions are \$29.50 a year (\$40.00 for institutions; \$35.00 outside the U.S. and its possessions). Advertising rates sent on request. Back issues \$2.00; specify volume and number. All letters received by *In These Times* become property of the newspaper. We reserve the right to print letters in condensed form. Second class postage paid at Chicago, IL. Postmaster: Send address changes to *In These Times*, 1300 W. Belmont Ave., Chicago, IL 60657. This issue (Vol. 9, No. 2) published Nov. 14, 1984, for newsstand sales Nov. 14-20, 1984.



## IN THESE TIMES



# Republican wins lead party a step closer to realignment

By John B. Judis

WASHINGTON

**I**N THE FACE OF TWO IMPORTANT Senate victories and fewer than feared losses in the House of Representatives, many Democrats are minimizing Ronald Reagan's landslide victory over former Vice-President Walter Mondale. While attributing Reagan's victory to his personality—Rep. Tip O'Neill speculated that Reagan may be "the most popular politician ever"—they are contending that the congressional results show no significant shift from the Democratic to the Republican column. Any talk of a Republican realignment, they say, was premature at best.

In the Northeast, Midwest and Pacific Northwest, the Democrats seem to have a good case (see story page 5). Several vulnerable House members like Connecticut's Bruce Morrison, New York's Bob Mrazek, Pennsylvania's Robert Kostmayer, Ohio's Marcy Kaptur and Illinois' Lane Evans withstood strong Republican opposition and the president's coattails. And in Senate races, Illinois' Paul Simon, Iowa's Tom Harkin and Massachusetts' John Kerry ran against the Reagan tide. Except in a few pockets of conservatism like New Hampshire, the Democrats still have an important political base in the so-called Frost Belt and the Pacific Northwest.

It can certainly be argued that in 1986, when a recession is likely, when the Republican Class of '80 will be up for re-election to the Senate, and when Reagan will be a lameduck surrounded by feud-

ing pretenders to the throne, the Democrats will be able to widen their lead in the House and perhaps regain the Senate.

But the election results in the South—both in the presidential and in the Senate, House and gubernatorial races—must give the Democrats pause before rejoicing. In the South, once the bedrock of the Democratic Party, Reagan won every state from Texas to Florida—many by almost two-to-one margins.

In the Senate races, the Republicans won closely contested races in Texas, Mississippi and North Carolina between conservative Republicans and "New South" Democrats. They won an upset victory in the North Carolina gubernatorial race. And they won important House races in North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi.

Republican gains were particularly striking in North Carolina and Texas—the two states targeted for registration drives by the New Right and the Moral Majority's American Coalition for Traditional Values. In both states, about 25 percent of the electorate described themselves as "born again Christians."

In Texas Reagan won 64 percent of the presidential vote and Republican Phil Gramm won 59 percent in the Senate race. In North Carolina, where turnouts increased 3.4 percent, the largest increase of any state in the nation, Sen. Jesse Helms won 52 percent of the vote, underdog Republican gubernatorial candidate James Martin won 54 percent and Reagan won 62 percent. In addition, three incumbent Democratic House members were defeated by Helms-backed challengers, and two others barely

escaped defeat.

By their successes, the Republicans still have not become the dominant party in the South. In most rural areas, there is little Republican organization, and not one Southern state legislature is Republican controlled. But they have shown that on the presidential level they are the majority party and that they are becoming so on

DECISION

# 84

Republicans have shown that on the presidential level they are the majority party and are becoming so on the Senate and gubernatorial level.

*In 1984, the Republicans were the party of Reagan and Helms and Democrats the party of Mondale and Jackson.*

the Senate and gubernatorial level. Indeed, the conditions appear to exist for the Republicans to mount a challenge to the Democrats' control of the statehouses.

Reagan's and the Republican's gains in the South have national significance. If the Republicans can count on the South as well as the West in presidential elections, then the Democrats will have difficulty, short of a depression, electing a president. And if they can win a majority of Senate and eventually House seats in the South, then they can achieve the majority realignment that the Democrats so much fear. In 1984, Reagan and the Republicans may have taken an important step toward such a realignment.

## Secret of success.

Reagan's success in the South this year was attributable in part to Mondale's writing off the South. He broke tradition by not choosing a Southerner as his running mate; and he and Geraldine Ferraro barely campaigned in the South. On the other side, Reagan campaigned extensively in the South and his appeals to patriotic pride and moral fundamentalism were bound to strike a receptive chord in the South.

But the underlying factor in Reagan's and the Republican's success was a marked racial polarization in the electorate. If the Republicans in 1984 were the party of Ronald Reagan and Jesse Helms, then the Democrats became the party of Walter Mondale and the Rev. Jesse Jackson.

The polarization showed up dramatically in opinion polls taken during the election. Throughout the South, Reagan was reported to have won 75 percent of the white vote (compared to 64 percent nationally). In Mississippi, he won 85 percent of the white vote, while Mondale won from 90 to 95 percent of the black

*Continued on page 6*