

BOYCOTT SOUTH AFRICA, NOT NICARAGUA

WHY WE OPPOSE U.S. POLICY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

By pursuing its policy of "constructive engagement" the current U.S. administration has consistently provided political, economic, and military support to the *apartheid* regime in South Africa. It has consistently refused to take meaningful economic action against *apartheid* though it has long been clear that such action represents the last possibility of meaningful non-violent change in Southern Africa. In Angola it has been providing covert aid to UNITA, which continues random attacks on villagers and other civilians and is backed by no one else, except the racist regime in Pretoria. This Administration has provided no support for international efforts to obtain the independence of Namibia from South Africa. Meanwhile it permits U.S. companies to plunder Namibia's mineral resources in defiance of the United Nations. Through surrogate nations such as Israel the U.S. has continued to provide military aid to the *apartheid* regime in violation of a mandatory international arms embargo. Further, this Administration has consistently attempted to portray the liberation movements: the African National Congress of South Africa and the South West Africa Peoples' Organization of Namibia as communist organizations in an effort to destroy their credibility. Even the recent Congressional bill adopting token measures against *apartheid* perpetuated this fraud. These attempts are yet another example of red-baiting and violate the inalienable right of the peoples of South Africa and Namibia to choose their own institutions and forms of popular government.

WHY WE OPPOSE U.S. POLICY IN CENTRAL AMERICA

The Reagan administration and its Congressional allies continue to flout the will of the American people by subsidizing unpopular governments in Guatemala and El Salvador, and trying to subvert a popular government in Nicaragua. Over 100,000 people have died in these three small countries since the beginning of 1979. If the U.S. experienced casualties in proportion to its population equivalent to those of Nicaragua alone, more than a million Americans would die.

The Administration and Congress recently allocated \$100 million to the contras. The contras are a mercenary force officered by the same men who presided over the slaughter of nearly 40,000 people before the collapse of the Somoza dictatorship in July of 1979. Unlike the Sandanistas whose literacy crusade and medical programs have won awards from the United Nations, the contras follow a program outlined in the CIA-produced pamphlet "Psychological Operations in Guerilla Warfare", which recommends the "neutralization" of selected targets, such as judges and other community leaders. The \$100 million, in effect, will subsidize the premeditated murder of doctors, nurses, and teachers, in a deliberate attempt to thwart social development and terrorize the Nicaraguan population. The terrorist tactics of the contra forces, the use of torture, mass kidnapping, and mutilation underscore the contras' inability to maintain any civilian support or credibility inside Nicaragua. Accordingly, many observers fear that the Reagan administration will eventually push for an invasion.

The Administration's policy violates domestic laws, the Constitution, international treaties and international law. U.S. public opinion opposes contra aid 2 to 1. The U.S. government has repeatedly vetoed UN attempts to enforce the World Court decision which declared U.S. aid for the contras illegal.

The U.S. war policy also extends to other areas of Central America. The U.S. spends \$1.5 million daily to support Duarte's military-backed regime in El Salvador, a regime consistently criticized by international human rights organizations like Amnesty International and America's Watch. Despite massive U.S. aid and "democratic" elections in which 104% of the eligible voters allegedly participated, the Duarte regime has been unable to end the opposition's effective control of over 30% of El Salvador's territory.

The U.S.-sponsored "low intensity conflict" in Central America is a misnomer. Ask the dead if their deaths were "low intensity." Current policy is only a prelude to the intervention of U.S. troops in the conflict. U.S. military personnel "training" in Honduras, including the Illinois National Guard, have been building bases, airstrips, roads and other infrastructures for the sustained support of the U.S. ground troops in Central America. We must mobilize in opposition to this ongoing injustice and the imminent danger of an American invasion.

JOBS NOT BOMBS

WHY WE OPPOSE U.S. DOMESTIC POLICY

Inequality in the United States has increased significantly in the past decade. In 1973, the richest 20% of the population received 7.5 times more income than the poorest 20%. By 1985 they got over 9 times more. Most of this change has occurred since 1979 (Bureau of Census numbers). Unemployment has remained at or above 7% (excluding those not looking for work) for over six years. Employers have taken advantage of high unemployment to cut wages and break unions.

Except for South Africa, the United States is the only industrialized nation without a national health program. 22 million working poor have no public or private health insurance. In the face of this, Reagan's budget for fiscal 1987 plans continued cuts in health programs such as Medicare and Medicaid (Trib. 8/24/86). Meanwhile, health care is highly dependent on income. For example, Black women are three times more likely to die in childbirth than white women.

The distribution of education is also becoming more unequal. In the last ten years, Black enrollment at the University of Chicago has declined 27%. Enrollment of low income whites has probably declined by a similar proportion. These trends exist at other Universities as well.

The Reagan administration has cut aid to education across the board - not just to college students. By 1985, he cut Federal funds to elementary and secondary education by 20% from the 1980 level of services. He plans a further 18% cut in aid to education between now and 1989, according to Federal Budget figures.

A pattern begins to emerge: At the same time as Reagan fights a war against poor peasants in Central America and supports the apartheid regime in South Africa, he is also working against the gains of poor and working people here in the United States.

WHY WE OPPOSE REAGAN'S ARMS BUILDUP

Despite the media hype about summits and the superpower's "sincere desire for peace," the Reagan Administration has done more to destabilize the precarious balance which has delayed nuclear war than any in the past. Reagan's support for SDI and first-strike weapons, combined with a massive military buildup and a McCarthyist Cold War mentality, have made the probability of a nuclear war higher than it has been since the Cuban missile crisis.

The number of first-strike weapons, ICBMs of high accuracy designed to target other missiles, has increased dramatically during the Reagan presidency. Since these missiles are designed to weaken a counterstrike, they make nuclear war seem more "winnable," thus making an attack more likely and desirable. Moreover, even if neither of the superpowers intends to start a nuclear war, if one suspects that an attack is likely, it may choose to strike first, before its missiles are destroyed. Thus, first-strike weapons may actually reduce the security of the nation which possesses them. At best these weapons are useless--why build more nuclear weapons when only 2% of the existing weapons can already devastate the world?

The technical problems of SDI are too numerous to be listed here--please consult *Scientific American* (October 1984). The main problem, however, is the effectiveness of the weapons. If only about 2% of either power's arsenal is enough to destroy the world, then an antiballistic missile system must be more than 98% effective. No one is optimistic enough to think that SDI could ever work that well. Over 70% of the professors in the physics department at the U. of Chicago signed a petition in which they refused to participate in SDI research.

All of this represents only the latest chapter in the insane story of the arms race. Everyone knows that nuclear war is a bad idea. Why not act on that knowledge and try to prevent it?

This pamphlet was prepared cooperatively by the University of Chicago student groups: Students for Nuclear Disarmament, CAUSE, the Third World Political Forum, and the U. of C. Coalition for Divestment.