

# SEAGA MUST

29 NOV 1979

# REPLY

IT IS ONE thing to make statement abroad, or to hold press conferences abroad. It is altogether another thing to be a source of 'intelligence' to a foreign government and its security service. While one may be objectionable or not, depending on the content of the public release, the other is always ground, in any country's Constitution, for the most severe penalties.

The issue right now, in line with this distinction, is not Mr. Edward Seaga's unpatriotic behaviour in talking down Jamaica every time he reaches the land of his birth.

In the eyes of many loyal Jamaicans, that is bad enough. And what they find repugnant is not only the damage to our good name and economic prospects but the very idea of making some foreign nation the arbiter of our internal affairs.

We are done with Mrs. Queen. Do we have to run now to Uncle Sam? And who is he anyway, with his record, to tell us about human rights or anything else?

## THE ISSUE

HOWEVER THE ISSUE I repeat, is not Seaga's lack of patriotism or association with the most reactionary forces in the United States or manifest support for North America's imperialist policies. The issue is Mr. Seaga as a source of 'intelligence' to a foreign nation. Mr. Bruce Golding's statement has underlined the questions rather than answering them.

For several weeks the press carried a report — which has not been denied — of Seaga having circulated in the United States "a list of Jamaican intelligence agents sent to Cuba for espionage training" and "a diagram of the liaison network between the Soviet KGB, the Cuban DGI and the PNP". These quotations are taken from the Conservative Digest in the U.S. to which Seaga recently gave an interview.

Now we have similar allegations appearing in the Latin American Weekly Report of November 16, which is no "scurrilous yellow rag" but a well-informed journal of good reputation. Mr. Seaga is supposed to have presented "national security officials with a most



HORACE  
LEVY

The issue is Mr. Seaga as a source of 'intelligence' to a foreign nation.

Mr. Bruce Golding's statement has underlined the questions rather than answering them.

unusual document — a chart which purports to connect 58 Jamaicans working in Manley's office to two KGB agents and a Cuban intelligence official". "More than one state department official", the article continues, "has admitted that Seaga is a major source of U.S. 'intelligence' on Jamaica."

## DAMNING

THESE ARE most damning charges if they are true. Mr. Seaga must reply. The National Security Council, to which the names were reportedly passed, is the body which governs the CIA, the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States. Public statements which can be used by hawks like Brzezinski to justify American gun-boats patrolling the Caribbean or American agencies cutting off loans to Jamaica are objectionable

enough. Passing Jamaican names to the CIA is an action which calls for some serious explaining.

The pressure being mounted on the Caribbean by the United States, through all its numerous arms and agencies, is massive.

Mr. Seaga must reply. And his reply must be made in Jamaica and to Jamaicans. Mr. Golding has "refuted" the allegation that Seaga is an "official" intelligence source. Has he not also admitted that the leader of his party may be "more on the ball than local American intelligence sources"?

## ANSWER

FOR MUCH the same reasons the Gleaner too must answer the charges of CIA connections rightly demanded by the Workers Party of Jamaica. Even Carl Stone (26-11), anxious no doubt that his own credibility not be impaired, has declared for the Gleaner's "responsibility to answer these charges and accusations in the fullest detail".

For the charges are well substantiated. Struggle, the WPJ fortnightly newspaper, printed last week the full list of 58 articles, with titles and dates, which appeared in the Gleaner and the Star between January 1, 1974 and June 1, 1975 and which were taken from Forum World Features. Struggle printed also several documents connected with the exposure in Britain of FWF as a CIA front. Forum World Features closed down of course the day after the exposure in mid-'75. But did the Gleaner then go on to tap other CIA sources?

What is the Gleaner's reply? Is it really taking so long to check out this list? And how does the Gleaner account for this use of material which it must have known was coming from an 'intelligence' source? Come, Mr. Hector Wynter, you became editor of the Gleaner at the time the FWF articles began to appear. Speak up, man.