

students of South Korea, against the government, is increasing. The regime is squeezed. I would say this regime is finished by the end of the year." The WCC is planning an "International Gathering on Peace, Justice, and Unification of the Koreas" for the second week of November 1987, to escalate the agitation. It will include participants from the leading American and Korean churches, and the West German EKD which has led agitation in West Germany for neutralization and reunification of Germany on Moscow's terms.

And the United States?

The United States is carrying out a dual policy toward South Korea. On the one side, the Pentagon is absolutely committed to the defense of the South Korean peninsula, a commitment backed by the presence of 43,000 American troops in the Demilitarized Zone. Whereas the Pentagon acceded to the overthrow of Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines in 1986, it has not given a similar green light for U.S. withdrawal of support from President Chun. An amendment presented in May by Rep. Robert Mrazek (D-N.Y.), phased withdrawal of U.S. troops met with little success—only 60 votes in the House.

However, the State Department and the networks of Project Democracy encourage the opposition, as it encourages the traitors of the Social Democracy and the Green Party in West Germany. From the top of the U.S. foreign policy-making establishment, in May members of the Asia Society and the Council on Foreign Relations met with opposition leaders. Leading the delegation to South Korea was Kenneth Dam, former deputy secretary of state and Richard Holbrooke, former assistant secretary of state. In Seoul, U.S. Ambassador James Lilley, who replaced Richard Walker last year, meets consistently with the opposition, playing the same guiding role that Stephen Bosworth played for the Aquino forces in the Philippines. Speaking before the Korea Bar Association on May 3, Lilley declared that the "work of the Korean Bar Association in investigating the human rights abuses, publishing its human rights reports, and voicing its opposition to such practices plays an important role. . . ."

The National Endowment for Democracy, an official arm of the State Department's Project Democracy, is supplying funds to the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs for work on Korea, according to the NED's Linda Pochek. The funds were for a 1986 seminar with the opposition party on "basic party-building techniques, coalition building."

However, democracy is not the issue. Soviet strategic aims are. As the World Council of Churches source stated: "Korea is becoming more and more an issue on the global scale. It is not isolated internationally. We are receiving reports of unofficial U.S.-Soviet agreements, to allow for the U.S. to push for normalization of the Korean peninsula, with the help of openings into North Korea made through the Soviets."

United Kingdom

Thatcher wins national mandate on defense

by Mark Burdman

In Britain's June 11 national elections, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has done what no other prime minister has done since Lord Liverpool in 1828, what such hallmark figures in British politics as Palmerston, Disraeli, Gladstone, Lloyd George, and Churchill failed to do: She has won a third consecutive term in office.

And she has done so resoundingly. With almost all votes counted, Mrs. Thatcher's Tories were credited with 376 seats, while the Neil Kinnock-led Labourites had 229, the Social Democratic-Liberal Alliance 22, and small parties 17.

This would give Mrs. Thatcher a majority of around 100 seats, once all the tallies are in. That is one of the two noteworthy features of the results. The other is the smashing defeat of the Alliance, which had been hoping to do well enough to force a "hung Parliament," by denying Mrs. Thatcher a big majority. The Alliance did so badly, that even some of its top leaders, like former minister Shirley Williams, lost their parliamentary seats.

Unquestionably, Mrs. Thatcher's winning point was defense. Britons, who pride themselves on never having been occupied and on having emerged undefeated from World War II, were aghast at the proposals by Kinnock, that Britain should drop its nuclear deterrent, and rely on a policy of resistance-to-occupation, in the event of war.

In the last days of the campaign, Thatcher associates, including Defense Minister George Younger, Interior Minister Douglas Hurd, and Tory party chairman Norman Tebbit, made defense the top issue, with dire warnings that a Labour victory would mean British surrender to the Russians. This campaign struck a positive chord in the British population. Also helpful to the Tories were leaks in the British press, that most former British defense chiefs were privately ex-

pressing horror at the prospect of a good Labour showing on June 11.

Yet another factor that can by no means be discounted, was the visit to Britain by U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger during the week of June 1. In an important speech before the English-Speaking Union on June 3, Weinberger stressed the need for "preparedness" in the face of the Soviet threat, and castigated those forces within NATO who sought to weaken the "moral bonds and shared values" which had kept the Western alliance together in the past four decades. This latter point was interpreted as a strong implicit attack on Labour.

Weinberger also had a series of private meetings with British officials. Among crucial areas of discussion, were maintaining a strong Western nuclear deterrence, and the flashpoint situation in the Persian Gulf.

The economy

When it comes to the matter of the economy and economic policy, the election results are murkier, and it is obvious that real danger lies ahead.

Doubtless, Mrs. Thatcher will see her victory as a mandate for her policies of "privatization," "free-market economics," and "fiscal responsibility." It was not simply election-eering, when she declared June 10, returning from a short trip to the Venice summit, that the summit was an endorsement of her economic policies. She may pay dearly for being so proud of the debacle in Venice.

The election reaffirmed a division within Britain between the north and south of the country. This is most noticeable in Scotland, where the Tories only won 8 seats, out of 67, about a 50% drop from the last elections in 1983, and a precipitous fall from the 1940s and 1950s, when the Tories were the majority party in Scotland. Inclusively, this means Labour municipal control over cities like Glasgow and Edinburgh.

But it is not only Scotland. Labour controls Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, and other municipalities. Without exception, the situation in these cities, extending from parts of the Midlands into the north of England, is hellish. Unemployment is often as high as 40%, hunger and disease are spreading, and workers often have to commute back up to the North on weekends from the south, where jobs are more available. These are areas which were once industrial centers (ports, shipbuilding, manufacturing, mining, etc.), but which have been devastated by 25 years of "post-industrialism," including Mrs. Thatcher's own breed of post-industrial economics.

To the extent that Mrs. Thatcher's "making Britain Great again," and claims of "prosperity" under her rule, make any sense at all, this is in the south, especially in and around London, where a boom in services, real estate, and financial activities of the City of London, give an aura of "prosperity." Here, the Tories scored their biggest electoral majorities.

Labour shadow Foreign Secretary Denis Healey's warning on election night should be kept in mind. He said that,

within 12 months, the Tories' "illusion of prosperity" would dissipate, and the economic collapse of the U.K. would become paramount in people's minds.

Labour, despite the Tories' large winning margin, has actually been strengthened as a party under Kinnock, relative to its devastated state after a tremendous electoral defeat in 1983. The party has been re-formed and consolidated into an opposition political machine. At the same time, some of the most extreme, left-radical Labour candidates, such as London's Ken Livingstone and Bernie Grant, have won seats in the Parliament. A growing left-right polarization is a real danger.

One other cautionary note: As we pointed out last week, AIDS was not even *mentioned* as a campaign issue. This electoral make-believe cannot sustain itself, under conditions of an estimated 100,000 Britons infected with AIDS, with panic just below the surface in many parts of the country, and with regular reportage in the British press about the AIDS disasters in the United States, Africa, and other parts of the world. Thatcher's government has an abysmal policy on AIDS, and has specifically rejected recommendations from British experts, that a full range of public health measures be employed. In one form or another, she will pay a high political price, at some point in the future, unless she decides to use her received mandate to launch a real "war on AIDS."

CONSULTING ARBORIST

Available to Assist in

The planning and development of wooded sites throughout the continental United States as well as



The development of urban and suburban planting areas and

The planning of individual homes subdivisions or industrial parks

For further information and availability please contact Perry Crawford III

Crawford Tree and Landscape Services

8530 West Calumet Road
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53224