

HUMAN RIGHTS

Klan upsurge along the border

By Bill Ritter
SAN DIEGO—The court martial proceedings against 14 black Marines accused of attacking a group of white Marines mistakenly thought to be members of the Ku Klux Klan at Camp Pendleton are about to draw to an end, nearly one year after the initial incident took place.

Soon after the attack on Nov. 13, 1976, it was revealed that the Klan had been quite active at the giant Marine base, home for some 32,000 Marines—18 percent of whom are black. Additionally, it was disclosed that incidents of racial violence had been almost commonplace in recent months.

The Marine Corps issued a steady flow of denials, but stories of racial tension and of known and open Klan activity soon overpowered the Corps' stonewalling.

Of the 14 Marines who faced charges stemming from the incident (charges ranged from assault and conspiracy to attempted murder), four chose to be defended by military counsel. Of the four, one received total immunity in exchange for his testimony, two were convicted and received small sentences and one was acquitted for lack of evidence.

Of the remaining ten defendants, represented by civilian lawyers, two pleaded not guilty and were subsequently convicted, and seven have made pre-trial agreements, resulting in confinement (ranging from one to ten months), bad conduct discharges and fines. One other is scheduled for trial sometime in November.

To date, the defense team has yet to hammer out a collective appeals strategy for those sentenced to confinement.

In purely legal terms the results are seen by some as a modest-to-solid victory, given that many of the defendants faced up to 21 years in the brig. (Although other organizers feel that anything less than total freedom was failure.)

Political confusion.

In political terms, the outcome is less clear.

Controversy surrounding an ACLU lawsuit on behalf of the Klan alleging that the government violated First Amendment rights by transferring known Klan members away from Camp Pendleton took its political toll on the Pendleton defense by making it more difficult to raise defense funds and by precluding strong ACLU involvement in the defense effort.

For example, defense sources report that the Playboy Foundation, which has in the past donated money to civil liberties-type cases, was approached for funds for the case. The foundation rejected the proposal on the grounds that the constitutional and legal issues of the case "do appear to be somewhat confused."

Additionally, the debate within the ACLU over the KKK lawsuit, while a healthy internal question, had its negative impact on the case. In many cases people caught in the middle of the debate often did little for a defense they might otherwise have strongly supported.

The inability of coalitions comprised of radical and progressive organizers to avoid splits over questions of politics also played a key role in hampering the development of political and legal strategies.

The other side of that coin is that, despite the splits and factionalism, there was substantial political work around the case. This resulted, according to one organizer, "not only in an awareness of the legal battle, but a marked rise in consciousness around the issue of racism in the military and the Klan's role in the Marine Corps."

Renewed Klan activity.

While the debates continue and the defendants wait out the lengthy legal appeals process, the Klan continues to thrive. They have spread their campaign of racial hate at Camp Pendleton to San Diego and the Mexican border, 60 miles to the south.

Cross burnings and vandalism have plagued the homes of a handful of Chi-



The Klan has spread its campaign of racial hate from Camp Pendleton to San Diego and the Mexican border, 60 miles south, where they claim to have initiated their own border patrol to catch illegal immigrants. Their presence has been met by renewed community opposition, like the San Diego march above.

cano activists, and the Klan has gone into the free-lance security industry, hiring themselves out to white families who complain to the Klan about their brown-skinned neighbors. The Klan's "surveillance" has so far yielded a number of terrorist acts, including at least one shooting.

Throughout the entire Pendleton 14 case, the Klan relished the media attention it had captured and quickly expanded its operations. It was a classic case of the media making an organization viable simply by covering it.

The Klan's biggest media coup was to announce plans for a Klan "Border Watch Patrol," involving Klansmen and some 1,000 miles of U.S./Mexican border land. Under the Klan plan, KKK members would ride unmarked cars along the border, and report to the Border Patrol any "movements of illegal aliens." National Klan leader David Duke claimed that the patrol units would be unarmed.

We've been had.

The proposal brought down a torrent of protests from Chicano, human rights and other progressive groups via marches, de-

monstrations, rallies and meetings with various officials.

Law enforcement agencies involved with border activities issued a rash of statements condemning the Klan's role at the border. But each agency was forced to concede that there is nothing as yet illegal in it and that law enforcement would be hard-pressed to prevent the rightists from carrying out their plans.

While the Klan claims they have reported groups of Mexicans crossing the border on numerous occasions, officials remain adamant that the KKK have had nothing to do with any apprehensions.

Reporters covering the story have yet to spot a Klan vehicle along the border, causing some to wonder if such a Klan patrol even exists. Offered one reporter, "We've been had. A complete hype."

The link between the KKK incidents of a year ago at Camp Pendleton and the current border hoopla is more than circumstantial.

Tom Metzger was the head of a small band of ineffective white power rightists in northern San Diego County when the Camp Pendleton racial violence publicly flared up last year. After capturing the

spotlight by defending Klan activities at the Marine base, Metzger eventually rose up the organization ladder and is today "KKK California State Director." (The title represents a shift in presentation for the Klan, choosing to cast aside their "Grand Dragonese" for the more suit-and-tie images of coordinators and directors.)

Another Klan member thrust into the inner circle is former Marine Private Dennis Campbell, who was discharged from the Corps and Camp Pendleton for his KKK activities. Campbell is now San Diego Coordinator for the KKK and a key organizer of the "border watch."

The Klan's involvement in the "illegal alien" issue is not being taken lightly in San Diego. The KKK campaign plays upon the fears and anxieties of many people along the border.

And Mexicans crossing the border into the U.S., hoping to find employment and escape their own poverty, must now contend not only with an insensitive and fearful society who would take away their income, but with a terrorist group of racists who could easily take their lives.

Bill Ritter is a San Diego free lance writer

THE CAMPUS

Tufts tiffed by Marcos grant

By Peter Drier
MEDFORD, MASS.—Faculty and students at Tufts University here are protesting the university's acceptance of a \$1.5 million grant from the Ferdinand E. Marcos Foundation of the Philippines. The grant is to establish a chair in Asian Studies at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts, a training ground for many State and Defense department officials.

More than 100 faculty members signed a letter of protest to Tufts president Jean Mayer, a well-known nutritionist and former White House advisor, following a controversial visit by Imelda Marcos, wife of the Philippine president, to Tufts to present the award Thursday, Oct. 27.

The faculty expressed particular concern over a "Citation for Distinction" awarded Mrs. Marcos at the lunch. The citation praised "her determination, persistence, and ingenuity... in advancing the cause not only of her people but also the cause of the developing world in every corner of the globe."

"In partnership with her husband," the citation continued, "Mrs. Marcos has

been instrumental in establishing the Republic of the Philippines as a leader in the Third World and as an elegant spokesman in the New Economic Order."

The faculty letter, drafted by biology professor Saul Slapikoss, cited the condemnation of the Marcos regime's widespread use of torture by Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists.

Mrs. Marcos' visit to the campus was well orchestrated by State department officials and the local news media. Acting on the request of the university's public relations director, the *Boston Globe* withheld the story of the Marcos visit from its first (morning) edition.

Harry Zane, the PR director told the Tufts student newspaper that the State department had asked the university to "give as little advance notice as possible" since Mrs. Marcos had been spat on during a demonstration in New York in 1974.

Nevertheless, word of the visit leaked out and a hasty demonstration outside the Fletcher School brought together approximately 50 students, faculty and members of the anti-Marcos Friends of

the Filipino People. University police and State department security agents whisked the Marcos entourage away from the demonstrators before direct confrontation could develop.

At a faculty meeting on Nov. 7 President Mayer defended the university's acceptance of the grant. He claimed that the grant had "no strings attached." Several faculty members, however, noted that the \$1.5 million gift was to be allotted in three installments and wondered if this might not be a means of controlling its use.

The Marcos protest comes amidst a renewal of political activism on the Tufts campus after a five-year slumber. The same week more than 100 students and faculty participated in a Mobilization for Survival teach-in against the arms race and nuclear power, while another student group, the Tufts Political Action Group, began a campaign to get the university to withdraw its investments in corporations doing business with South Africa.

A faculty-student committee has been formed to continue the protest against the Marcos Foundation grant.

Peter Drier teaches sociology at Tufts.

NEWS ANALYSIS

Factionalism splits Chicano movement

By Mario Barrera

Two major issues are currently agitating the Chicano and Latino communities — undocumented immigration from Mexico and other Latin American countries and the Bakke case. The first of these issues was the focus of a major Chicano/Latino conference held in San Antonio Oct. 23-30 (*ITT*, Nov. 8).

The conference had two major objectives. One was explicit: to criticize the Carter plan on immigration, to organize against it and to come up with some alternative proposals.

The other was implicit but generally known: the revitalization and unification of the Chicano movement, which has been in a state of decline since 1972.

The first objective was partly achieved, but the second clearly was not.

The pulse of the Chicano movement

Chicano conferences are convenient events for taking the pulse of the Chicano movement at a particular point in time. The last major Chicano conference was the 1972 El Paso conference that was supposed to project La Raza Unida party on to the national political scene.

Instead, the conference was marked by a split between followers of Texas' Jose Angel Gutierrez, the founder of the party, and Colorado's "Corky" Gonzalez. Attempts to paper over the split failed, and La Raza Unida was never able to unify across state lines. Shortly afterwards the party withered in California and other areas, and its base has been steadily shrinking in its stronghold, Texas.

This year, as in 1972, factional politics was in the air long before September. In a series of regional and planning conferences prior to the main event, the issue of participation by the Socialist Workers party surfaced repeatedly.

The strongest objections were raised by a group of activists from southern California, and an editorial in a San Diego Chicano newspaper called for a boycott of the conference unless the SWP was expelled. Also highly vocal in their opposition to the SWP were representatives of CASA-General Brotherhood of Workers, a Mexican-based Marxist group that has been organizing for several years around the issues of undocumented workers.

But the SWP remained in the conference coalition. With La Raza Unida party disorganized and internally divided, Jose Angel Gutierrez, who had issued the call for the conference, had come to rely on SWP activists and resources to organize the conference.

The SWP, which ironically enough had been banned from the 1972 El Paso conference, was eager to associate itself with the widely-known Gutierrez and to gain further entrance into the Chicano movement.

The conference itself began on an optimistic note. The attendance was estimated at 2,600, large for such a conference. The presence of delegates from Mexico gave the meeting an international dimension that had been absent in other years. The list of speakers on Friday night and Saturday morning spanned the spectrum from the LULACs (League of United Latin American Citizens) to the GI Forum to the Texas Farmworkers to La Raza Unida to MALDEF (Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund) to the SWP to CASA, with various public officials, priests, and others thrown in for good measure.

An impressive show of unity and a broad-based coalition seemed to be in the making. Jorge Bustamante of the Colegio de Mexico presented some alternatives based on employment and development

Chicano conferences are convenient points for evaluating the state of the movement and the San Antonio Conference on Immigration revealed a movement that had moved to the left, but one that was also divided and lacking leadership. Nationalism is the biggest point of unity and appeal. Many problems remain to be solved.

efforts in Mexico, and Vilma Martinez of MALDEF and the University of California Board of Regents made some legalistic critiques of the Carter plan.

The appearance of unity was soon broken, however. The extent of SWP predominance became readily apparent in the Saturday afternoon workshops, as their organizational efforts began to bear fruit. The conference almost dissolved in bitter acrimony in the Sunday plenary session, which was marked by a CASA walkout (later rescinded) and denunciations of the SWP by numerous delegations. A spokesperson from the remnants of "Corky" Gonzalez' Colorado organization bitterly condemned all parties to the dispute. It was only with great effort that the conference was able to finally pass its long list of resolutions.

A leadership gap.

Much of the conference's aftermath has focused on the role of the SWP. Many delegates left the conference embittered at what they saw as manipulations and attempts to infiltrate and control the Chicano/Latino movement by the SWP. It seemed clear that many delegates would not carry through on a Nov. 18-20 national mobilization, which was proposed and pushed through by the SWP. In a highly emotional post-conference meeting of the northern California delegation in Oakland Nov. 3, the SWP was ejected from the local organization formed around the immigration issue.

That local and regional organizations will continue their work on undocumented immigration is evident, but the extent to which that work could be pulled together into a national effort is still questionable.

The conference reflected much about the Chicano movement. One of the points underlined was the evident decline of La Raza Unida party as a political force in the Chicano movement. The Partido appeared weak and divided, and did not function as a bloc at the conference in the same sense that SWP and CASA did.

The SWP has gained in influence in the Chicano movement since 1972, but its temporary advantage may turn into a Pyrrhic victory as the backlash to its role sets in.



the PILGRIMS

ILLEGAL ALIENS?

Carol T. Martin

CASA was the only new and important force in the Chicano political arena, but both the size and composition of its delegation seemed to indicate that it still lacks a broad base in the Chicano and Latino communities.

Still, the fact that the only sizeable blocs at the convention were both Marxist groups indicates a significant ideological shift in Chicano politics since the early 1970s. While it's true that most Chicano activists do not identify themselves as radicals, the movement is certainly much more tolerant of radical activity than it was a few short years ago.

Another aspect of the movement that was rather striking at this conference was the decline of the recognized Chicano "leaders," and the fact that virtually no one has come forth to take their place. Jose Angel Gutierrez, now judge of Zavala County and planning to run for Congress, does not even control Crystal City, his original political base, and he has been disowned by many former followers.

Reies Tijerina of the New Mexico land-grant movement has completely faded from the scene, and both he and "Corky" Gonzalez, prominent spokesmen at the El Paso conference, were not even present this time around. Bert Corona, another long-time activist and former spokesman for CASA, was also nowhere in evidence.

Peter Camejo of the SWP and Antonio Rodriguez of CASA, who both played a leading role in San Antonio, do not command the same type of broad following that these other leaders did in the past.

Nationalism and the racist upsurge

A number of broader issues were raised by the events at San Antonio that go beyond the question of specific leaders and organizations. Clearly Chicano political activism is still marked by approaches and ideologies that range from several varieties of liberal to several varieties of radical. Still, nationalist appeals evoked the most enthusiastic response at the conference.

When Edward Morga of the LULACs stressed the artificiality of the U.S./Mexico border, when Peter Camejo spoke of the Southwest as a Mexican homeland, and when Antonio Rodriguez of CASA asserted a Mexican territorial claim to

the Southwest, they were greeted with the loudest applause of the day.

Chicano nationalism continues as the broadest common denominator, and its relationship to other ideological appeals remains very vague.

The attention being given the immigration issue also raises the question of whether we are simply going through another phase of the importation-deportation cycle, as most of us have assumed, or whether this time there is a fundamental shift in American policy.

A few years ago the historian Arthur Corwin, in a memo to Henry Kissinger, warned of the political consequences of continued large-scale immigration from Mexico, and raised the specter of a possible "Chicano Quebec" in the Southwest. If indeed it is true that American policy-makers are concerned about the growing concentration of Chicanos and Mexicanos in the Southwest, then Carter's proposals should be seen as an attempt to strike a balance between the continued desire of southwestern capitalists for cheap, exploitable labor, and the fear of future political consequences.

At the broadest level, of course, the campaign against undocumented immigrants is part of a much more general wave of racism and backlash that is sweeping the country, and which is manifested in the anti-busing movement, the Bakke decision, the resurgence of the KKK and in many other ways.

The strength of this trend is sufficiently great to have thrown the Chicano movement on the defensive, and the current attempts to mobilize around Bakke and immigration are essentially reactive in nature. In this sense, the key issues in the Chicano/Latino community are still being determined from the outside, rather than on the basis of a coherent and well thought out strategy for change.

Until such a strategy is created, along with the organizational base to carry it out, the Chicano and Latino movements will continue to be marked by the fragmented and stop-and-go characteristics that are so evident today.

Mario Barrera is a professor in the Ethnic Studies department of the University of California at Berkeley.