

# CHUCK STONE

## Look Who Agrees With Farrakhan

President Ronald Reagan and Nation of Islam Minister Louis Farrakhan joined in wholly unanimity?

You got it.

Impossible, you demur.

But on a program for black economic self-determination, Reagan and Farrakhan are as close as 99.9 is to 100.

The two putatively irreconcilable ideologues even manage a cozy consensus on the means.

Oral hygiene.

"Blacks spend about \$1.1 billion on toothpaste and mouthwash each year," Farrakhan told 7,000 enthusiasts in Philadelphia.

"With all the blacks coming out of colleges with business skills, why can't we produce toothpaste?"

No disagreement from Reagan. Burnishing bicuspid is big business.

"Between \$130 and \$140 billion is spent by the black community," he told me in an interview five years ago at his California home.

"If you're going to buy a toothpaste," he said with a grin, "why not buy it from a black-owned drugstore?"

But there's more than similarities in the Reagan-Farrakhan economic theory.

Farrakhan went on to lavishly praise the president whom 72 percent of black Americans in a poll recently rebuffed as a down-home, cotton-pickin' racist.

"Mr. Reagan is looking at the nation as a whole. He says you get what you can take out of America and if you can't, that's tough. I like his attitude," thundered Farrakhan, sounding like a theoretical cross between Jack Kemp and Calvin Coolidge.

"I think his attitude is best for us. I think Mr. Reagan will turn out to be the best friend that black people have had in the White House since Abraham Lincoln."

If you can swallow that hyperbole without choking, the economic advice from Reagan and Farrakhan makes exceptionally good sense.

If black Americans could manufacture, produce, sell or manage just a one-tenth of the \$190 billion

they spend annually, they could part the waters of economic bondage and lead themselves into the promised land.

But too often, the nobility of the message is obscured by the obloquy of the messenger.

Despite Farrakhan's lifelong record of religious integrity, community service and economic uplift, he has yet to develop any significant followship among 26 million black Americans.

Nor has he persuaded many whites that he can be trusted.

I've covered him as a public personality and known him as a friend since 1958 and have admired his ideas on economic self-help.

Certainly, the overflow crowds his charisma is drawing on his 14-city tour attest to the magnetic logic of his ideals. But how many leave the halls to join the Nation of Islam?

As for Ronald Reagan, just his name symbolizes retrogression to blacks.

In the early months of his campaign, Reagan sent out code signals faster than a wireless operator to white America that his administration would cut back on civil rights and racial equality.

I don't think he intended to return the nation to *Plessy vs. Ferguson*. But he did seem to look wistfully at the merits of Woodrow Wilson's racial glaucoma.

Aided by the litigative belligerence of his assistant attorney general for civil rights, William Bradford Reynolds, his transformation of the U.S. Rights Commission into an apologist for *apartheid* and a publicly reserved attitude toward most egalitarian legislation, Reagan has communicated an unfortunate impression of vigorous hostility to blacks.

And they have responded in kind.

Yet if blacks were to incorporate Reagan's ideas on self-help into their lives, they could wreak an economic miracle.

Also deserving of their staunch support are his proposals for enterprise zones, job training, the Youth

(Please turn to page 45)

# WARNING!

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY H-BOMB TRUCK (for hauling nuclear weapons and parts)

### Identifying characteristics:

1. Unpainted, unmarked steel sides on trailer.
2. Square-rigged radio antenna atop cab; wind deflector behind.
3. Some trucks display "Marmon" manufacturing emblem.
4. Most truck cabs painted with parallel stripes, straight or zigzag.
5. U.S. Government license plates, starting with letter E.
6. Letters AM on front of trailer at right.
7. Parallel diagonal lines (not visible here) on back of trailer.
8. Usually escorted by one or more courier cars (e.g. Chevrolet Suburbans) fitted with radio antenna at left rear of vehicle.
9. Seen on freeways in all the lower 48 states.

Keep this picture in your car. If you should see a nuclear weapons convoy, jot down the vehicle colors and license plate numbers (if available), time and place of sighting, and direction in which it was going. Send the information as soon as possible to NUKEWATCH, 315 West Gorham, Madison, WI 53703 (608/256-4145). Nukewatch will relay your sighting to others.

Your participation can help make all of us more aware of the daily intrusion of the H-bomb into our lives.

**CAUTION:** Do not interfere with or harass these convoys. Operators are heavily armed. Be nonviolent in approaching these vehicles and their personnel.

Bomb truck cards available from Nukewatch for \$1.00 each; 25-99, 50¢ each; 100-up, 40¢ each. Complete truck watch kit: \$5.00.



by Barbara Johnson

**t**

he Federal Dept. of Transportation (DOT) is discouraging local communities from regulating nuclear waste shipments.

The Materials Transportation Board (MTB), a division of DOT, issued a ruling that state and local restrictions on nuclear waste shipments were inconsistent with federal law and should be preempted by federal law.

The MTB's "inconsistency ruling" is merely interpretative, and is not legally binding in court. Still, a court could give great weight to MTB's interpretation of the law. Undoubtedly, the ruling will be used by utilities and the nuclear power industry to challenge local ordinances in court.

The inconsistency rulings were issued in response to an application made to the MTB by the Nuclear Assurance Corp. (NAC) which transports spent fuel from Chaulk River, Ontario, to a Dept. of Energy (DOE) facility at Savannah River, South Carolina, for reprocessing. One by one, the states through which the waste was shipped (Michigan, New York and Vermont) issued rules banning or restricting the shipments.

The MTB rulings deal only with truck shipments, not with rail. MTB preempted a rule requiring that trucks be accompanied by front and rear state police escorts and a radiation monitoring team.

In Oct. 1982, NAC was forced to suspend shipments, and applied for the inconsistency rulings. In light of recent MTB rulings, we can expect that NAC will soon resume shipments.

--Northern Sun News

# CRACKS IN THE ALLIANCE

## David Morrison

*David Morrison is a research analyst at the Center for Defense Information in Washington, D.C.*

When New Zealand's Prime Minister, David Lange, announced that a U.S. destroyer carrying nuclear-armed anti-submarine rockets would not be welcome at one of his country's ports, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's response was swift and sweeping. Lange's position, he said, "constitutes a serious attack upon the effectiveness of an alliance which is absolutely essential to the security of New Zealand."

New Zealand's security, however, is hardly hanging in the balance here. New Zealand faces no apparent external threats. What is at stake is a global U.S. security system, founded on the twin pillars of overseas bases and nuclear weaponry. The very fact that the administration is willing to threaten dissolution of the Australian-New Zealand-U.S. "ANZUS" alliance after 33 years in response to Lange's move makes it clear that the Western consensus on nuclear weapons policy is showing unprecedented signs of strain.

The United States today boasts collective defense agreements with more than 50 nations around the world. Standing behind those agreements are some 445,000 U.S. troops stationed at 335 major bases overseas. Almost 550 major warships serve to "show the flag" and project U.S. military power.

These forces are now nuclearized to a startling extent. Ranging from sub-kiloton landmines to 9-megaton gravity bombs, over 26,000 U.S. nuclear weapons are based at more than 200 U.S. sites and in nine foreign countries. Fully 84 percent of major naval combat units can carry atomic weapons, ranging from sub-kiloton depth charges to 200-kiloton Tomahawk cruise missiles.

Clearly, there is no tidy way for allies to accept U.S. military cooperation but reject nuclear weapons. "Love America," Weinberger might have said, "Love her nukes." Any military alliance with the United States is necessarily an atomic alliance.

New Zealand, then, promises to provide a first test of what happens when America's friends reject this pervasive nuclear component. Senior U.S. officials have suggested a menu of possible retaliatory options, from cutting off intelligence data to flooding the world market with dairy products, an important export for New Zealand.

This response may appear overwrought in light of New Zealand's seemingly minor strategic importance. In fact, the United States is embarked on a major "damage limiting" operation, striving to make an example of the most intransigent of its increasingly anti-nuclear allies around the globe.

- The same week as New Zealand's announcement, Australia's prime minister said he lacked political backing to follow through an earlier commitment to provide logistical support for full-range MX missile tests into Australian waters.

- In Europe, both the Dutch and the Belgians seem destined not to follow through on their 1979 commitments to play host to U.S. ground-launched cruise missiles.

- Last October, the British Labor Party adopted a defense platform calling for closure of all U.S. nuclear bases.

- Canada's agreement to allow U.S. air-launched cruise missile test flights across its territory has proved extremely controversial and could well not be renewed.

The ally that most worries US military planners, however, is Japan. The only nation ever attacked with nuclear weapons, Japan officially embraces three "Non-Nuclear Principles"—no manufacture, no possession and no introduction of nuclear weapons. Given that the U.S. has some 48,000 troops based in Japan, and that it is a major way-station and home port for U.S. naval vessels, the inviolability of that third principle seems questionable, at best.

Japan's officials have never insisted that the United States affirm each time one of its warships docks

(Please turn to page 45)