By Zoltan Grossman

EITHER way, it's a terrifying prospect. Scenario one: the Soviet hierarchy ordered the ill-fated experiment that precipitated the meltdown and subsequent explosion at Chernobyl's reactor four. Scenario two: plant supervisors initiated the step-by-step safety system shutdown that led to the worst accident in the history of nuclear power. As In These Times went to press, contradictory clouds of explanation still hung over Chernobyl, but the following details seem indisputable.

The purpose of the experiment, which began at 2 p.m. on April 25, was to determine how long turbine generators would run emergency equipment in case of a loss of coolant from the reactor. Unit four's staff began running the reactor at very low power, something its safety systems would normally interpret as a shutdown if they hadn't been bypassed. First, they turned on the number 7 power turbine. Then, at 2:00 p.m., the emergency cooling system was deliberately disabled to prevent a shutdown. By 11:30 that night, the automatic control system was likewise disabled.

At 1:22 a.m., in what proved to be the fatal move, the operators reduced the water coolant to the core. A minute later, the reactor's power output shot up by a factor of seven. Thirty-six seconds later, the operators tried to reinject control rods to tame the core and still the runaway chain reaction. Halfway down, the control rods failed, and a local fuel was hung. It was only a matter of seconds before steam and hydrogen built up in the reactor. At 1:24 a.m., a steam explosion ripped the top off unit four, followed by a billowing fireball of burning hydrogen. The core's graphite liner quickly ignited, belching radioactive smoke high into the atmosphere. At least part of the reactor's uranium fuel source melted down.

As dawn broke, police entered the area and washed the radioactive debris off the roads leading to the nuclear plant. Residents near Chernobyl received radiation equivalent to 1,200 chest X-rays. On April 28, 180,000 people living in the 300-square-mile area surrounding the plant were evacuated.

Within days, cleanup teams entered the area to wash the contaminated buildings and to strip off the irradiated topsoil—replacing it with imported earth. The cleanup continued for 12 days, until it was wrapped by sand, long and boron dumped from military helicopters. The blaze briefly re-ignited on May 23 and radiation levels in the center of the zone remained 2,500 times the normal levels.

In the Ukrainian capital of Kiev, 70 miles south of the plant, radiation levels were 80 times higher than normal a week after the disaster. Kiev was still waiting for autumn leaves to fall from its chestnut trees; when they do, they will be trucked off as radioactive waste.

Death toll estimates dispute

The Soviets have predicted that 6,300 will die of cancer in coming years as a result of the explosion. They made their estimate at an International Atomic Energy Agency conference in Vienna last month, and they provided the above details in a "spirit of openness."

Interpretation of the data varied, however. Western and Eastern nuclear experts eventually suggested that between 26,000 and 40,000 people would die of cancer, nearly all within the western Soviet Union. But two days later, they backed down from those numbers, claiming that they had been based on "maximum radiation release figures," rather than average figures. Their new minimum was closer to the Soviet estimate: 26,000 because of their new maximum.

Yet other scientists accused the two experts of minimizing Chernobyl's effects to protect nuclear power programs, pointing out that the highest estimates did not take genetic defects into account. Some claimed the ratio that was used—zone death from every 10,000 years—was too low. Dr. Robert Gale, the celebrated American hematologist who treated Chernobyl victims, said that public health experts expect up to 75,000 cancer deaths worldwide. So far, Soviet officials say that 31 have died from the 2,900 deaths estimated in hysterical post-accident Western news reports. But with radiation exposure still high, short-term body counts are likely to change drastically. Not only do thyroid and other cancers have a long-term gestation period, but many potential victims may abnormally fare better than those who have died. For a graphic depiction of genetic damage to plants, see below.

The Western nuclear industry has long envied the expanding Soviet nuclear industry. Cold warriors had interpreted this expansion as accelerating an "energy race" with the Soviets. In a 1978 radio broadcast on nuclear energy, Ronald Reagan alleged that the "Soviet Union is racing toward the demonstration of nuclear power plants." The Western nuclear power oppositions were thus "warming victims of Soviet design."

After the Chernobyl disaster, American officials tried to placate public fears, claiming that the Soviet plant lacked an American-style concrete containment structure. A claim later proven false. Yet even before it was, a New York Times poll showed that seven out of 10 Americans saw such a catastrophe as likely.

Eastern bloc protests

In the months since the catastrophe, it has become evident that an anti-nuclear movement would be slow to develop in the Soviet bloc. Nonetheless, Polish demonstrators and signed petitions against the planned start-up of the Soviet-built Zaporozhye plant. They also accused Polish-Soviet friendship can be "measured" with a greater counter. The most dramatic example of resistance took place among reactor design of Soviet army reservists. Hundreds of Estonian men were ordered—some in the middle of the night—to help with decommissioning the evacuation zone. They worked 14-hour shifts in a highly irradiated environment with insufficient water rations and suspect radiation protection. Mental stress was heaped upon physical danger, as the cleanup foremen routinely joked to the Estonian conscripts about their impending sterility.

In June, the weary Estonians were told that their Chernobyl duty had been extended for another year. This last straw led to a long and bitter strike. According to the Estonian Communist Youth League daily newspaper Soviet Youth, most of the conscripts were then sent home.

Some graphite-modulated reactors have since been shut down pending new safety measures. Officials now describe Chernobyl as a serious setback for their nuclear program—a stunning admission in light of the recent drop in oil prices. The Soviets had been hoping to conserve oil and natural gas—four-fifths of their foreign exchange dollars—by using nuclear heat reactors near cities. Chernobyl may turn out to be a Soviet economic disaster as well.

Our heroic technicians have made whatever minor and trivial adjustments were necessary...

On August 3, a Joint Group member was detained, along with four Western anti-nuclear supporters, who were handing out leaflets on Chernobyl in Moscow. The protesters were released within an hour. (See article in next issue of In These Times.)

The Russell language leaders, led by American members, are now issuing a "declaration of solidarity with all citizens of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," calling for the release of all political prisoners and for a meeting in their press—drawing mainly from documentation of radiation hazards at U.S. nuclear weapon factories. The leaflets bear a "free speech" slogan: "No more Chernobyls! Hundreds of the gompheshchiki—embroidered with peace signs—were confiscated in five minutes at the entrance to Gorky Park.

Chernobyl's impact on nuclear power worldwide remains to be seen. According to Dr. Gale, the drifting radioactive cloud may give fatal cancer to as many as 35,000 people outside Soviet borders—mostly in Europe.

The political fallout has affected different countries in different ways, however. While strengthening nuclear opposition in Sweden and West Germany, it has barely dented the pro-nuclear monarchies in France and Czechoslovakia. Perhaps Chernobyl's greatest effect outside the Soviet Union will be in Third World. Brazil has put its program on hold, while strikes and sabotage have prevented a Philippine reactor from starting up. Countries, such as Argentina, China and Cuba, which had been looking to the Soviets for nuclear assistance, may begin to question the wisdom of nuclear proliferation. It should be noted, however, that similar delays took place after Three Mile Island, only to be further forgotten. (After that accident, a U.S. nuclear official was quoted as saying that there was "no scrupling on protective measures" by the Soviets.)

Both the Eastern and Western nuclear industries have gotten themselves stalled in Chernobyl's web. The more they try to limit discussion of its implications to experts, retard and reactor designers, the more they expose their high-stakes decision-making process. The more they try to depoliticize nuclear power, the more they end up politicizing it. The irony of the new Soviet policy of "openness" is clearly apparent. The more people hear of the worst nuclear plant accident in history, the less they want to be saddled with the dangers of nuclear power.

Zoltan Grossman is a Chicago-based freelance journalist who has traveled to nuclear communities from Hungary to the Philippines.
By Zoltan Grossman

IT COULD HAPPEN "ONCE IN A MILLION YEARS." That has always been the stated opinion of Soviet officials on the chances of a major accident in the 32-year-old Soviet nuclear power program. The official fantasy, however, has been shattered by the radioactive cloud that settled over Russia's Ukraine region, Scancavina and much of Eastern Europe after a fire and possible meltdown at Chernobyl plant near Kiev destroyed one of the Soviet Union's 46 operating reactors.

Prodded by the self-described "disaster," Soviet officials based their optimism on their reactor designs. When asked if a Three Mile Island accident could happen in the USSR, Yuri Markov, the deputy chief of the Soviet Energy Ministry agency said, "even if there were some problem at a Soviet station, it would not be fraught with such dangerous consequences because Soviet-designed steam generators can carry a far greater load of boiler water."

U.S. nuclear experts today echo Markov when asked if a Chernobyl catastrophe could happen in this country. They reply that most U.S. commercial reactor cores are moderated by water, not graphite, and have air- or partial-concrete domes to contain radioactive leaks. There are two graphite reactors among the 99 nuclear power plants currently operating in the U.S. The only commercial graphite reactor in Colorado, differs considerably from its Russian counterparts and supposedly poses less risk. The U.S. Energy Department also operates a graphite reactor in the state of Washington for military purposes. Regarding the potential for a major accident at such plants, the word from both Washington and Moscow has been reassuring: it can happen over there, but not here either.

Much as the Pentagon is trying to break the public's "Vietnam syndrome," the nuclear industry has been busy to recycle a "Three Mile Island syndrome" that began with the nuclear accident at this Pennsylvania site in 1979. Chernobyl may be a major blow to these efforts. Neither U.S. nor Soviet reactors could survive an explosion or severe meltdown (in which radioactive steam ruptures through the ground around the reactor). The day after the Chernobyl accident was made public, the nuclear industry stocks plummeted. Investors switched to grain and livestock futures during the furor trading sessions that immediately followed. Many analysts assumed the Soviets would need to augment their own agricultural stores due to the contamination of an area known for its farm and livestock production.

Chernobyl is one of the flags of the Soviet nuclear industry. In four reactors, commissioned between 1977 and 1983, provided one-seventh of the country's nuclear generating capacity, which makes up 11 percent of the total electrical grid.

History of Soviet accidents

The Soviets experienced their first nuclear disaster in 1957—the explosion of a military waste dump near Kyiv was blown through the surrounding mountains. According to enigmatic scientists, Zhores Medvedev and Leo-Turner, the high-enriched material was extruded into a wasteland. The army destroyed houses in 30 evacuated villages to prevent their inhabitants from returning. At the time, local citizens complained that only Communist Party members were given radiation detection badges and choice relief supplies. Different amounts of radiation entered quickly into the food chain, causing damage to the environment. Some experts theorize this pattern of low-technology was repeated again around Chernobyl, possibly spreading throughout the Ukraine and parts of Europe.

The Soviets opened the Chernobyl in 1982. In 1983 a reactor experienced a malfunction. The Soviet nuclear plant caused a second accident in 1986. An American reactor has leaked radioactive iodine, the Soviet authorities minimized the effects to the Soviet public. For two decades after the USSR declared emergency, the United Nations, the United States and the Soviet Union observed the accident. The nuclear industry now acknowledges the Chernobyl disaster was an accident that lingered on.

Nuclear power's credibility meltdown

In the years that followed, the nuclear industry continued to develop nuclear reactors that were more powerful and more efficient. The Chernobyl disaster, however, showed that the nuclear industry was not immune to the problems that had plagued the Soviet Union. In the years that followed, the nuclear industry continued to develop nuclear reactors that were more powerful and more efficient. The Chernobyl disaster, however, showed that the nuclear industry was not immune to the problems that had plagued the Soviet Union.
Marcos and the Atom Besieged

Some 25,000 Filipinos march in a 'people's strike' to protest a Westinghouse nuclear power plant.

MANILA
It is night on the highway north of Mariveles, an industrial and fishing town at the tip of the Bataan Peninsula, west of Manila. More than 5,000 residents, mostly women employed at the nearby Export Processing Zone, are carrying torches in a march. Bataan has seen many marches, particularly during strikes against the low wages and poor working conditions in the multinational industries of the Zone, but this one is different.

As the torchbearers wind their way up the coastal highway, the women begin chanting: "Anong sagot sa planta nukleyar? Welga, welga, welga bayan!" ("What is the answer to the nuclear plant? Strike, strike, people's strike!")

This is the kick-off for a three-day general strike in June against the nearby Morong nuclear power plant. After fifteen years of controversy and delay, the reactor is being prepared to go online. The core is to be loaded and the fuel tested within two months, and full-scale operations could begin as early as December.

During the march, local villagers applaud, hand out water, and join the ranks (which swell to 25,000). Fishermen set off firecrackers, while church bells ring in greeting. Alongside the usual graffiti condemning the U.S.-Marcos dictatorship, walls now carry such slogans as LAKAS NG BAYAN HINDI LAKAS NUKLEYAR (People's Power Not Nuclear Power).

Heavily armed military personnel accompanied by a tank plow through the demonstration, and officers conduct body searches of thousands of marchers.

The general strike was considered 95 percent successful, as barricades paralyzed transportation and business. Since the protest, more than twenty-five towers carrying power lines from the plant have been dynamited.

In the midst of near-famine and civil war in some provinces, President Ferdinand Marcos is shelling out up to $2.6 billion for the nuclear power plant. The reactor, one of the four Westinghouse Corporations for the Philippines, is close to the U.S. military bases at Subic Bay and Clark Air Field, with power lines running directly to them.

To Filipinos, the Morong plant has come to symbolize the dangers of nuclear power. It sits near an active volcano and astride an earthquake fault. In case of an accident, the prevailing winds would blow radioactive contaminants toward the sprawling capital of Manila.

In Morong, nuclear power and military repression go hand in hand. To clear the site in the 1970s, the government forcibly evicted residents from their land; such evictions continue to this day. Between 1979 and 1981, the military assassinated four activists. One, a construction worker at the site, was found dead in a septic tank.

"The four persons were killed directly from their association with work against the plant," says Elmo Menapat of the Nuclear-Free Philippines Coalition. "It kind of dampened the spirits of the people in Morong. Instead of getting people to react in a much more militant manner, it caused fear in them."

The Coalition is a largely urban-based, middle-class organization. It includes in its ranks a network of women's groups called GABRIELA, which organized a 40,000-strong march from Manila to Morong last October. After trying a centralized form of organization, the Coalition opted for self-reliant autonomous groups of workers, peasants, professionals, and fishermen in Bataan.

Antinuclear activists in the developed countries often assume that workers are too concerned with their own immediate economic survival to rally against atomic power. Yet in Bataan, women who earn the equivalent of thirty cents an hour making clothes for Barbie dolls, and fishermen who cannot compete with corporate trawlers, have joined the campaign against the Morong plant.

"The struggle of Filipinos should be led by workers," says Ed Capuyoc of the Bataan Labor Alliance, the first regional workers' organization in the country. "If we don't open the fight against the nuclear plant, the people won't move."

Workers have carried out massive sabotage within the plant, rerouting wiring, cutting cables, wrecking vehicles, and destroying a turbine by blasting sand into its lubricant.

"This is how we show the people where we stand," grins a truck driver at the site. "With all the defects done by the Filipinos, the plant will be able to operate for two months at most."

"We are desperate," says one Bataan organizer. "We do not want nuclear waste for a quarter-million years. Marcos says he'll build the plant by all means possible. We say we will stop it by all means possible."

ZOLTAN GROSSMAN

(Zoltán Grossman, an antinuclear activist and free-lance journalist in Chicago, recently returned from the Philippines.)
Nuclear power and people's power in the Philippines
"People's power not nuclear power"

The situation in the Philippines is nearing crisis point. As President Marcos' brutal military dictatorship is being increasingly challenged, and the president's health is worsening, the threat of US military intervention grows. As Zoltan Grossman reported last issue (PN 2248) there has been a series of general strikes, and trade unions and opposition parties have been making alliances to oppose, and ultimately replace, the regime. In this article Zoltan Grossman, writing from Manila, reports on a violent (from a general strike to sabotage) against a nuclear reactor, and explains why for Filipinos workers the struggles against nuclear power and military oppression are inseparable. At the time of going to press we had not received an update on the situation, but we hope to be covering the struggles of the Filipino people on our news pages.

It is night in Mariveles, an industrial and fishing town at the tip of the Bataan Peninsula west of Manila. Over 1,000 residents, mostly women employed at the nearby Export Processing Zone, are marching in torch-lit marches. Mariveles has seen many marches and rallies, particularly during strikes against the low wages and poor conditions in the multinational industries. But this march is different.

As the torches dramatically wind their way to the central churchyard, the women begin chanting “Ahang sagot sa planta nukleyar! Weiga, weiga, weigang-bayan!” (“What is the power to the nuclear plant? Strike, strike, people's strike!”). This march is prepared for a Bataan three-day general strike (weigang-bayan) against the nearby Morong nuclear power plant. After 15 years of controversy and delay, the core loading and partial testing of the reactor is due within one month after the strike, with full-scale operations planned for late December. The anti-nuclear general strike on June 18-20 follows a similar strike last December 10, when 95% of the province's transport and business halted. Now with a door-to-door outreach campaign in the slums, the organisers feel they can paralyse the province, as well as block the road to the nuclear plant. Alongside the usual graffiti against the “US-Marcos Dictatorship”, a wall now proclaims “Lakas ng bayan hindi lakas nukleyar” (“People's power not nuclear power”).

NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY DUMP

The Morong plant has become world-famous for the blatant danger it poses to the Filipino people. The reactor is one of four planned by Westinghouse, the same contractor which built the Three-Mile Island plant, and is modelled on a plant in Puerto Rico that was never constructed because of popular protest. With the defeat or delaying of so many nuclear plants in the US, firms such as Westinghouse have found it necessary to accelerate their “dumping” of nuclear technology in the Third World. Lower construction costs, weaker safety and lax regulations, and authoritarian governments guarantee enormous profits. In the midst of near famine and civil war in some provinces, President Marcos is selling out up to 2.6 billion dollars for the plant.

The plant is close not only to the Export Processing Zone, but to US military bases at Subic Bay and Clark Air Field, with power lines running directly to them. One organiser asked, “Why did they build the plant in Bataan, and not elsewhere?” Nevertheless, most local people blame Marcos rather than the US for the plant, which sits not only near an active volcano but on an earthquake fault. In case of accident, the prevailing winds would be towards Manila.

In Morong, nuclear power and military repression go hand-in-hand. A series of forced evictions initially cleared the site in the 1970s, and still continue. In 1979-81, four activists were summarily executed by the military. One a construction worker at the site, was found dead in a septic tank. “The four persons were killed directly because of their association with work against the plant”, said Elmo Monapat of the Nuclear-Free Philippines Coalition (NFPC). “It kind of dampened the spirits of the people in Morong. Instead of getting people to react in a much more militant manner, it caused fear in them instead.”

MARINES TIGHTEN HOLD

Since 1982, a huge force of Philippine Marines, the Constabulary, Central Intelligence and Civilian Home Defence Force has tightened its hold on the area. What was the strongest movement in Bataan, carrying our protests and noise barrages, then became the weakest, and many guerrillas with the New People's Army (NPA) surrendered in the town. At the site itself, the Nuclear Security Guard has cordoned off a restricted area, shooting at least one fishing boat out of the water. Elsewhere in Bataan, militarisation has been stepped up—another torch parade the same night, plain clothes security personnel fired M16s at the ground. (Militarisation also rampant near the sites of other energy projects, such as a series of dams planned in a tribal area of Northern Luzon.)

IMPERIALIST SYMBOL

"For me personally, the plant is a symbol of imperialism," said Sr. Aida Velasquez of the Philippines Federation for Environmental Concern, a member group of NFPC. "What more tangible example is there?" Velasquez has promoted a Third World perspective on environmentalism, in which the multinational perpetrators of deforestation, erosion and contamination are clearly identified. She emphasised how workers and peasants have historically fought destructive projects in Bataan, such as a copper smelter, and who would fight a coal plant as hard as a nuclear plant.

MASSIVE BASED MOVEMENT

The NFPC is a largely urban, middle class organisation. Also in its ranks are women's organisations which organised a 40,000 strong march from Manila to Morong in October 1984, which was joined by local people. After trying a centralised form of organisation, the NFPC decided to start self-reliant activist groups among the workers, peasants, activists and fisherfolk of Bataan, which has resulted in an enormous mass base for the movement. "Other Third World movements can learn from us", said Elmo Monapat of NFPC. "We will be distinguished from other anti-nuclear movements because of the Third World setting, because of our being a neo-colony in which a revolution is taking place... the anti-nuclear movement is just a minute part of the liberation movement. We have a role to play, and we have to play that role within the context of the revolutionary atmosphere."

Each sector of the Nuclear-Free Bataan Movement has its perspective on the plant. Fishermen oppose it because of the radioactive and thermal pollution they say it would cause, or at least the public perception that their fish would be contaminated. They already report that a red
ooze from chemicals at the site has killed some fish. Peasants say the plant will lower the fresh water table, and a leak would forever ruin their rice crop. Workers in nearby barrios also fear an accident, and some are even selling property.

WORKERS TAKE LEADING ROLE

Why is the working class taking such a leading role against the nuclear plant? Anti-nuclear activists in the developed countries often assume that workers are too concerned with their own immediate economic survival to be concerned with nuclear issues. Yet in Bataan, women who make the equivalent of 80p an hour making clothes for Barbie dolls or fisherfolk who cannot compete with corporate trawlers, take time out to stop a nuclear reactor. The struggle of Filipinos should be led by the workers. If we don't open the fight against the nuclear plant, the people won't move," said Ed Capuyoc of the Alyansang mga Manggagawa sa Bataan/Bataan Labor Alliance (AMBABA), the first regional workers' alliance in the country.

GOVERNMENT NOT LISTENING

AMBA-BALA has organised about 80% of the workers in the Zone, shown them against the pro-government "yellow unions", and talked about instituting forms of workers' self-management. It also does not see a regional wu-lang bayan as enough. The June strike is one step towards a national wu-lang bayan in late 1985 or early 1986, in which the nuclear plant would be a top issue. "What is the use of these issues if we are all dead?" said Capuyoc. Public hearings are not going to get anywhere—the government isn't listening. The people themselves have the final decision. Perhaps the question should not be why workers lead the anti-nuclear movement in the Philippines, but why they do not in the developed countries.

Nearly all the information on hazards within the plant comes from the workers inside, as well as about 20 engineers and a few in management. Organisers have learned of a crack in the reactor vessel, a collapsed condense tank, a spring under the core, and rats chewing wiring in the control room. The majority of workers from the province, and of those in the "third-class" skill category, are against the plant; but the severe economic crisis forces them to take one of the few available jobs. After seeing a Westinghouse slideshow on the effects of radiation, one worker realised that "building a nuclear plant is harmful, especially for the children. But I had no choice, otherwise it was no salary."

WORKERS FEAR FOR SAFETY

Three strikes over economic issues have hurt the plant, but many workers also fear for their own safety. At least seven have died in accidents during the construction, and three have reportedly been exposed to radiation. Workers are not given the radiation detection badges which are mandatory for management. Any dissenter faces a network of company and military informers, and possible firing (as happened to one who sang the national anthem over the loudspeaker system), imprisonment or execution. Some workers have wanted to quit, but are urged by activists to stay in—it is better to have anti-nuclear or neutral workers in the plant than pro-nuclear workers.

GO SLOWS AND SABOTAGE

Besides giving out information, how do such workers reconcile their sentiments with their stated need for a salary? "Easy," said one former electrical worker, "you create a defect, fix the defect, and then create another one. That way you slow the operations and prolong your job at the same time." Workers have carried out massive sabotage within the plant—rewiring the reactor, cutting cables; wrecking vehicles, automatic doors and TV cameras; and destroying a turbine by blasting sand into its lubrication system. "This is how we show to the people where we stand," grinned a site truck driver, "with all the defects done by the Filipinos, the plant will be able to operate two months at the most." If the plant closes, the workers will go back to fishing or farming, or get a job in the Middle East with their new skill credentials.

Naturally, with this state of affairs, the management does not trust the workers. "My supervisor told me he was afraid to fire me," said the electrical worker, "because he thought I'd destroy the plant." Naturally, the NPA itself, perhaps mindful of an incident in Virginia where two workers protesting at hazards spread a harmless powder on the core, rendering it useless.

ANTI-NUCLEAR GUERRILLAS

Sabotage becomes less likely, however, as construction contracts end and lower-skilled workers leave. Ultimately, most of the activists say, if anti-nuclear action by workers inside and outside the plant fails, the responsibility for stopping the plant will be shifted to the NPA, the armed wing of the Communist Party of the Philippines. Already on May 31, the NPA carried out its first anti-nuclear action, when 40 guerrillas raided a camp and burned equipment used in building power lines to Pampanga province, site of Clark. No injuries were reported. In a May interview with this reporter, NPA leader Conrado Balweg, who previously had fought the dam project in the north, said "Nuclear power is inhuman."

INSTALLATIONS VULNERABLE

The Nuclear Security Guard is clearly gearing for an all-out attack on the site. The government brought in an early shipment of US-processed uranium in August 1984, reportedly to prevent the kinds of explosive assaults that have rocked nuclear power plants in France, Spain and South Africa. The popular NPA would not endanger the population by going near the reactor or fuel handling building, but other strategies are possible. Even the enormous site remain vulnerable. One Bataan organiser summed up the prevailing sentiment in the movement: "We are desperate. We do not want nuclear waste for a quarter of a million years. Marcos says he'll build the plant by all means possible. We say we will stop it by all means possible."

ZOLTAN GROSSMAN