

Luciano Lama talks about terrorism

An exclusive interview with the head of Italy's largest trade union body

Recently this newsservice obtained an exclusive interview with Luciano Lama, the general secretary of the Italian general Confederation of Labor (CGIL), by far the largest and most important of Italy's three national labor union confederations and one of the largest in all Western Europe. Until a few years ago, Lama was a central committee member of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the dominant political force inside the CGIL. To this day Lama, who maintains his PCI membership card, is the leading spokesman for the trade union wing of the party. As such, the views he puts forward in this interview are expressive of some of the best and the worst of an entire strata of Italians whose political vehicle is the Communist Party. This holds true for Lama's discussion of terrorism and economic issues in the course of the interview.

Lama's repeated conviction that terrorism is a primary issue for the trade unions parallels the speech he gave at the May 1979 European Trade Union Confederation conference. The Italian government has been working with the PCI for the past few months to convict and jail the controllers of Italian terrorism. More recently this has led them into identifying portions of the Socialist Party leadership itself as tied into terrorism. The relevant police and magistracy, together with the PCI and the government, have also identified terrorism as an aspect of a broader operation aimed at destroying the Italian republic. In keeping with the highly politicized tradition of Italian trade unionism, therefore, Lama here responsibly identifies the fight against terrorism as a major task of the labor movement. This is particularly urgent in the case of the CGIL, where the terrorist-linked Socialist Party acts as the minority partner to the PCI.

Lama's stated views on economic policy, on the other hand, hardly seem to coincide with the expected views of an otherwise progressive European trade union leader whose stated aims are the economic development of the devastated Italian south or Mezzogiorno, solving the Italian unemployment problem, and generally restoring the country to minimally the levels of economic development it had enjoyed in the 1960s. When read attentively, Lama's economic views are an irrational

series of contradictions, with little emerging to indicate a coherent economic program.

From this standpoint Lama's interview is an excellent paradigm of crippling flaws of the best of Europe's trade union leaders. Typical is Lama's discussion of the nuclear energy question. On the one hand, he says that to give up nuclear energy development would mean to irrevocably renounce "certain of the most desired aspects of conditions of human life today" stemming from the economic development which only high rates of energy throughput will be able to ensure.

On the other hand, Lama is forced to pay lip service to the environmentalist movement—a movement which in Italy is controlled by the cited Socialist Party and the Caracciolo family, which the PCI knows very well to be involved in terrorism (in fact, the "Balck Nobility" family is one of the key controllers of Italian terrorism), as has been emerging from the recent antiterrorist investigations. On the issue of economic development itself, Lama voices the entire tradition of the CGIL when he repeats twice that it is a definite "aspiration" of the trade union movement, yet is careful to say in the same breath that he is of course not certain that "having available twice today's energy is an advantage for mankind." The logic of this capitulation finally leads him to formulate a vague plan for what amounts to a redistribution of wealth, which by implication rejects economic growth altogether.

Here Lama is exposing the very serious flaws of even the best of the PCI and trade union leadership, both of which he represents. The PCI has never formulated a theory of political economy consonant with the policy outlines of Lenin who is otherwise purportedly the major theoretical influence on the party. The reasons for this are complex, but essentially arise from the fact that Lenin himself never achieved an economic theory consonant with his own economic strategy. At the same time this flaw in the PCI's makeup has been well profiled by British intelligence, whose influence in Italy can hardly be overestimated. That influence has been felt both through the agent networks which have been grafted on to the party, and through the broader climate created by such institutions as the Socialist

Party which has become almost the exclusive province of British and Zionist intelligence.

All this is doubly true for the PCI's trade union movement. The CGIL in the postwar period was subjected to a series of combined Anglo-American operations that finally succeeded in creating splitoffs which gave life to the contending national labor confederations. The smallest of these, the UIL (Union of Italian Labor) in particular was the completely synthetic creation of Anglo-American intelligence under the aegis of George Meany and Irving Brown of the AFL-CIO, and particularly portions of the United Auto Workers under Doug Frazer. The UIL's forces are almost exclusively concentrated among the "metalworker" unions of the northern auto and related plants. It is the Keynesian

brand of liberal economics, with its hatred of economic growth and science and its offshoots which these networks have systematically fed into the CGIL, generating a climate thereby which functions to give credibility to such antirepublican notions as the free market economy, environmentalism, and other synthetic ideologies inherently antithetical to the innate but often inarticulate CGIL tradition.

Lama's propitiation of these theories in his interview are therefore par for the course, and typical of much of the PCI leadership even at their best, even when specific tactics and strategies adopted by them contradict their own mouthings.

—Vivian Zoakos

Organized labor must combat terrorism

This exclusive interview was given to Executive Intelligence Review by Luciano Lama, general secretary of the Italian trade-union confederation CGIL. The interview took place during the conference of European trade unions in Munich, West Germany, this past May. Mr. Lama was the only trade-union leader at that conference to identify terrorism as the most important enemy of the working class.

EIR: *How do you think the fight against terrorism can be brought into the program of the ETUC (European Trade Union Confederation); and what forces do you think are behind terrorism?*

Lama: I am convinced that there are national forces behind terrorism and probably also forces organized internationally, who wish to destabilize the political

the conquests made by democracy in our countries. It cannot be ignored by the trade unions. We in Italy are conducting a sharp fight against terrorism—which is not the case in other countries where terrorism also exists. Above all, it is not the case on the part of the ETUC. I think that the ETUC, as its first commitment in the battle against terrorism, must open a debate among Western European workers, so that they become conscious of the gravity of the danger they face, and so that they will prepare themselves to actively fight, to repulse, to expel from within the working class and the workers, the forces of terrorism—which are small if one thinks of the "armed struggle," the violence. But, they are not very small at all if one thinks of the sympathizers and the moral support, and of that even larger group which refrains from taking any position, thus lending passive assistance.

We must act in such a way that the labor movement, even at the international level, becomes a force that brings together the workers, the population, public opinion, against terrorism; otherwise fear and inertia will spread, and terrorism will be victorious, if our people allow themselves to be overcome by fear and passivity.

EIR: *What possibilities does the CGIL see for the realization of Moro's strategy of a DC-PCI government?*

Lama: I don't know; it is difficult to respond to this question because we are on the eve of an election campaign in our country, a campaign whose results are naturally very uncertain. I think that the problem of a new political leadership for the country is a problem of very great importance, not only for the workers, for the labor movement, for the encouragement of the most advanced socio-economic policies. Also for another

EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

situation in various countries on an international level. They want to deliver up these populations, these states, to authoritarian powers which are almost always rightwing—even if occasionally the passwords, the slogans of those who support the terrorism seem to be of a revolutionary left character.

The true end of terrorism is to create authoritarian regimes and a state of civil war, in which the majority of the population, who desire peace and order and reject violence, end up supporting a rightist leader who will at least assure them tranquility and order. This is the strategy of the terrorists, at least, in Italy, Germany and other Western European countries.

A phenomenon of this kind presents a danger for

reason: a government of national unity would have the possibility of combating terrorism more effectively and this is the danger threatening our society that we spoke of before.

The point is that in Italy we have a situation of grave emergency. In emergency situations the democratic political forces must find the capacity not to eliminate differences, but to set them aside for a moment and give more weight to the fundamental reasons which unite them. And the basic reason today is the defense of democracy and liberty on the one hand and the fight against the economic crisis for an effective economic recovery in Italy on the other, with the aim of developing jobs and of fighting underdevelopment in the Mezzogiorno.

These two related objectives require an agreement among the major political forces, above all between the DC and PCI and then among the PSI and the other democratic parties, in order to get out of this situation. Afterwards, naturally, the free play of democracy, of majority and opposition, etc., can fully develop themselves. But I maintain that today a government that is not representative of all the most basic forces in the sphere of labor would be a *weak* government and therefore incapable of fighting effectively to emerge from this emergency situation.

EIR: *What contribution can the European Monetary System make to the development of the Third World?*

Lama: Even in Europe there exist profound differences from the point of view of economic development and the financial situation (in terms of the rates of inflation) among the different countries. It is thought possible to confront this situation of disparity with the establishment of this European Monetary System, which will reestablish a semi-fixed exchange system, in the sense that currencies can oscillate only within determined limits, between one European currency and another.

I must say that this is not a solution to economic problems, precisely because it is only a financial and monetary solution. If you want to unify the economic-financial and social management of different countries, it is necessary to begin with economic policy. That is, it is necessary to create the conditions for the progressive convergence of the economic conditions which underlie monetary policies. Monetary policies are an instrument, they are not the object of political action in the economic field, whether national or international. I think, therefore, that currency unification in Europe does not resolve the problems of economic unification.

In certain ways, then, one can say that the linking of the Western European economic systems with the Third World will be more difficult, rather than easier, as a consequence of the establishment of the European Monetary System. The reason is that the natural tendency which will be created through the EMS will be to

consider this zone of the world as a zone in which there exists a monetary system that is closed with respect to the rest of the world; with an inevitable temptation to utilize this closed monetary system not to support links with the weaker and less developed economies, but to utilize it as a force acting in an authoritarian way, in terms of hegemony and in terms of the economic and financial burden weighing on the underdeveloped countries.

I fear, therefore, that without strong action by the labor movement and the democratic forces of this country, who are most sensitive to the problems of justice in economic and financial relations on a global level, sensitive to the problems of the Third World and underdeveloped countries outside of Western Europe, we could even have as a consequence of the EMS a closing-off and not an extension, not a tendency to openness, of these economies with respect to the countries of the Third World.

EIR: *How do you evaluate the significance of nuclear energy and advanced technology?*

Lama: I think we are in a phase where the interest in technological development is certainly not ended, but where it is more necessary to evaluate the consequences of certain innovations: the consequences for workers' jobs, the consequences for the natural environment, the ecological consequences, therefore, of a degradation of the natural environment due to the application of certain technologies and due to excessive consumption of raw materials and nonrenewable energy sources. This problem is a problem that humanity has never confronted until today, because the relationship between man and the environment was very favorable to the environment; demographic growth had not reached the exponential increase we see today, and the levels of consumption of individuals has never reached the rates we see today.

So, throughout the whole history of the tens of millenia it took to develop civil society on the earth, we were always in a situation where the problem of the availability of products necessary for the life of mankind was not under discussion. Now it is, because the necessity is much greater and because the population has grown tremendously and it grows, I repeat, with a demographic dynamic that is very considerable.

I think that we are in a phase in which science will probably find other forms of energy sources that can replace those which are not renewable. These alternative energy sources could be hydrogen, could be the sun, could be the light, but until this moment the practical techniques for utilization of these sources have not been found. For any one of these sources, the theoretical solution has been found, but not the technical basis. Until we have that, we must utilize all those sources that are available, *including nuclear*, providing that in

the utilization of nuclear energy we guarantee safeguards for the health of the workers and the citizens.

Those who maintain that we must renounce this energy source—and maybe they are right, they are certainly right if there are no guarantees for the safety of human lives, or if these are not sufficient—those who say we must drastically reduce energy consumption, must say at the same time that *men's lives* must be changed. There is mass-consumption today that must necessarily be reduced or even eliminated. I find that something *negative* is done by many of those who, for example, preach, saying perhaps with reason and certainly in good faith, that we must renounce the use of nuclear energy. But they *never* say that that means to renounce certain of the most desired aspects of conditions of human life today. This must be said because if we find in the course of a few dozen years that per capita available energy resources are 20, 30, 50 percent less than what we have today, there will be *traumatic* consequences on people's conditions of life or at least on people's life-styles. I am not saying that having available twice today's energy is an advantage for mankind. I say, however, that it is an *aspiration*.

Thus, people's choices must be oriented in other ways. Things being the way they are, we must anticipate a reduction of consumption. Energy consumption is growing at 6 percent per year, while we have energy production which instead is growing is *falling*. These two divergent curves will not converge in view of the fact that one cannot increase energy production beyond certain limits. Thus, the quality of life must change, not in abstract terms, in hippy terms, in terms of the cave men.

We must do it in concrete terms, reasoning with the American citizen of today, who has such high levels of consumption and of life, with the German citizen of today, or the British or Italian, who have a living standard which in terms of consumption must be reduced. We must also reason with the citizen of the Congo, or of Indochina, whose living standards must on the other hand increase. Certainly, their energy consumption, if one wishes to realize a minimum acceptable living standard for today, must be neither that of Detroit or, for example, Frankfurt, nor that existing today in India or in any underdeveloped country of Africa.