

This exclusive coverage of a press briefing by a high-level Administration official was provided by New Solidarity International Press Service, Washington, D.C.

Q: You say "work with Angola in more normal ways" — what's afoot?

A: In the Shaba crisis and Namibia, it is clear that Angola can have a key role in the solution of both. Other nations have realized that greater communication between Zaire and Angola are necessary to resolve the border problem. We are prepared to engage in more normal working relations with them. This does not mean diplomatic relations in the first instance....we have exchanged, in the Shaba crisis and, less directly, in the Namibia situation, communication with them.

Q: How much do you intend to increase development aid?

A: We are up to a FY '79 request of \$467 million. We would look for a further increase in '80.

Q: Any encouragement from the Angolans in our attempt to get cooperation?

A: On Namibia, Angolans as part of the front-line group have taken a supportive attitude towards front-line proposals and are supportive of the contact group. The front-line states are very supportive, especially the Angolans. We have seen a constructive attitude on their part — a willingness to be supportive of efforts the contact group have made.

On the Angola-Zaire situation, we do have indications from Angola of responsiveness to our and African concerns about the border. We are encouraged to believe that the government has a positive attitude about the need to stabilize the border.

Q: What is the Administration policy on establishing diplomatic relations with Angola?

A: We would like, as a matter of principle, to have normal relations with all states....If there is a reduction of Cuban presence, the question of normal relations could again come up. But there are problems....

New York Times, "An Ominous Silence," by James Reston, June 21:

...If I understand what is going on here, Mr. Carter is making a major reappraisal of his priorities. After concentrating on "human rights," Castro, Cuba, Angola and Zaire, he is now returning to the major questions of relations with the NATO allies, of arms control with the Soviet Union, and of U.S. relations with Japan, China, India and Southeast Asia. He is concerned about organizing what he calls a "world structure of peace," which means working with the NATO allies and Japan to control the trade and monetary chaos in the world; to encourage the European allies to use their influence to avoid racial and tribal violence in Africa; to urge the Chinese to come out of isolation....

New York Times, "Earning African Friends," by Jonathan Power, June 21:

...What should the West do if it is to stop giving points away to the Russians and Cubans in Africa?

First, it should stop behaving as if it believed the Cubans had some master plan for the takeover of Africa....

Finally, it must not let up its pressure on South Africa to strike a deal with S.W.A.P.O. in Namibia, and must persuade Ian D. Smith and his black acolytes in Rhodesia that they have no alternative but to subscribe to the Anglo-American proposals for a settlement.

If the West did this, within two years it would find it had a strong belt of Western sympathizers right across Africa with whom it wouldn't be ashamed to be friends.

U.S. Steel Unionists: We Need Capital Investment Like Japan's

As the following interview, reprinted from the monthly newspaper of the United Steelworkers of America (USWA), *Steel Labor Today*, reveals, the basis for forging an active political labor and industry alliance around policies of economic growth, nuclear energy

LABOR

development, and high technology investment exists as an immediate potential.

Entitled "Japan's Steel Industry: An Ultramodern Complex," the interview reflects a profound

commitment by steelworkers and key sections of the union leadership to what in actuality are "American System" policies of industrial development and technological progress. Interviewed are Robert J. Petris, Director of USWA District 38, and Al Marnati, President of USWA local 2869, Kaiser Steel, Fontana, Calif.

The Japanese, the two labor leaders assert, have taken what used to be American investment practice and technological know-how and applied it to the effect of building a powerful industrial nation, whose output in some cases, as in steel, exceeds even the U.S. in quality and tonnage. While not specifically locating Japanese practice in terms of the American System strategies laid

out by Alexander Hamilton and his intellectual descendant Henry Carey, the two union leaders demonstrate in their interview that the Japanese, by taking the American System as their own, have emerged, almost in the place of the United States, as the major political force and spokesman for the Hamiltonian principles of progress and technological development everywhere.

The drivel that the Japanese success is based on exploited, low-wage workers is just not true, the two steel labor leaders explain, pointing out that the Japanese steelworker enjoys a standard of living comparable to that of his counterpart in the United States. The interview, a remarkably frank acknowledgement by U.S. labor leaders of the grossly deteriorated condition of a basic U.S. industry, asserts in so many words that the U.S. must return to the American System principles by adopting the Japanese model for upgrading and modernizing its industry.

Its appearance in the recent issue of the Steelworkers' paper signals to American business and industry forces the possibility of building a visible mass-based constituency for policies of industrialization and high-technology exports.

What the two steel labor leaders propose, in fact, is diametrically opposed to the official trade war and protectionist ravings of the AFL-CIO. AFL-CIO Secretary Treasurer Lane Kirkland and Industrial Union Division head Jacob Clayman have repeatedly called for Smoot-Hawley tariff measures against particularly Japanese steel imports to "protect" American jobs and safeguard the American steel industry. As is indicated by the example of the Japanese case, the Kirkland-Clayman formula spells not prosperity, but disaster for the American worker and U.S. industry.

The publication of the Petris-Marnati interview signals an intensification of the bitter struggle between growth-oriented USWA forces grouped principally around Vice President Joseph Ordersich and sections of the USWA leadership, including President Lloyd McBride, which are manipulated by Kirkland. McBride, since his election last year, has become an increasing disappointment to especially those sections of the Steelworkers who supported his candidacy on the basis of his explicit commitment to industrial development policies. McBride's recent mouthings of Kirkland's protectionist and deindustrialization formulas,

exemplified by his public support for solar energy, is producing a crisis in the union's leadership.

The factional situation in the USWA parallels the fracturing of the allied Building Trades and Teamsters unions along the same lines. The factional lineups in these giant labor organizations are as sharply drawn as those inside the Steelworkers, with the major notable difference being that a greater portion of IBT and Building Trades leadership has moved publicly in favor of technological development and economic growth. USWA, IBT and Building Trades leaders have collaborated, albeit in a limited and unofficial fashion, on such important U.S. policy questions as nuclear energy development. The results of this allied activity, however, have been undercut by these officials' on-the-record endorsement of Kirkland's policy line.

In the USWA, McBride's backtracking is preventing the potentially powerful union from linking up with its allies in industry and among the American public generally. Under these circumstances, Vice President Ordersich, who has led the Steelworkers' fight for nuclear energy development and the Clinch River breeder reactor, has become increasingly vocal against Kirkland's policies. However, Ordersich has so far refrained from taking on the problem of McBride's misleadership, preferring to conduct his fight behind the scenes. If continued, this tactic will at best simply perpetuate the crippling stalemate between the AFL-CIO's Kirkland and the sections of the Steelworkers' leadership manipulated by him, and those USWA leaders committed to growth and modernization.

In the long run they will ensure defeat for Ordersich.

McBride is by no means committed to Kirkland's policies; his unseemly behavior on behalf of Kirkland is no doubt prompted by a considerable amount of armtwisting and intimidation. To get McBride back on the track of a sound Hamiltonian strategy, a position McBride is known to be personally committed to, requires a move by Ordersich and his allies outside the USWA to bring the policy struggle in the Steelworkers union into full public view where the full weight of the Steelworkers' membership and their allies in industry can be brought to bear. Under these conditions of support McBride can be forced to speak openly on behalf of his own personal commitment to growth, and in the broader interest of the trade union movement.

— Matthew Moriarty

Japan's Steel Industry: An Ultra Modern Complex

Following is the full text of the Petris-Marnati interview from the May 1978 edition of Steel Labor Today.

Los Angeles — By far, the most spectacular growth in steel-making capacity of the world has been attained in Japan, which now has an estimated 11.5 per cent of the world's steel production but which consumes just a bit more than one-half of this steel tonnage domestically,

relying heavily on export to nations like the United States. But it restricts most foreign products from its market.

Imports are a major concern of American industry and the USWA, whose members have experienced considerable unemployment and underemployment attributable to increased steel imports from Japan.

In March, a delegation of USWA officials and local union officers visited Japan as guests of the Tekko Roren