

AP 2. N 2

LO39FE82584 DEPT 60
LIBRARY OF THE WEST INDIES
UNIVERSITY OF KINGSTON
JAMAICA

The National

November 5, 1983 \$1.25; U.K. 65p

NOT TO BE TAKEN AWAY

AMERICAN IMPERIUM

'ANY PART OF THE EARTH'

The deaths of the Marines in Beirut and the brutal invasion of Grenada dramatize President Reagan's determination to establish an imperial presence in global politics. His raw rhetoric and past posturing can now be seen as prelude: no more "peacekeeping mission," no more warship diplomacy, phantom dogfights, military advisers, covert counterrevolutions, war games behind friendly borders. This is the real thing: the aggressive campaign to assert American authority and secure control around the world. From Nicaragua to Namibia, the opponents of that authority and the subjects of that control should fear the worst.

The massacre of the Marines destroyed the delusion that American troops could stay in Lebanon merely to separate warring factions. America *is* a warring faction; even more than that, it appears to be the superpower that plans a military colonization of the region, that seeks a permanent beachhead to defend what Reagan has called "that vital and strategic area of the earth, or for that matter, any other part of the earth." Whatever its intent, the dispatch of the Marines became an intervention by other means, the slow deployment of a force that is designed to outflank—and, if necessary, destroy—potential enemies of American power.

The Administration names those enemies as the Soviet Union and
(Continued on Page 419)

CONTENTS.

Volume 237, Number 14

LETTERS

418

EDITORIALS

- 417 American Imperium:
"Any Part of the Earth"
- 420 Passion Play *Andrew Kopkind*
- 422 *Minority Report* *Christopher Hitchens*

ARTICLES

- 423 Israel's Palestinians:
"Al-Fajr"—Hope for a New Day *Amos Oz*
- 429 There's Work To Be Done:
Fair Trade, Free Trade, Full Trade *Lance Compa*

- 434 The "Model" Shattered:
Brazil, the Banks, the Third World *Penny Lernoux*

BOOKS & THE ARTS

- 437 Dovlatov: The Compromise
Simis: USSR: The Corrupt Society: The Secret
World of Soviet Capitalism
Kaminskaya: Final Judgment: My Life
As a Soviet Defense Attorney *Karen Rosenberg*
- 441 Music *Linda Sanders*
- 442 Films *Katha Pollitt*
- 444 Verona, 1973 (poem) *Nicholas Christopher*

Drawings by Bill Logan

Editor, Victor Navasky

Executive Editor, Richard Lingeman; *Associate Editors*, Andrew Kopkind, Janet Gold (*Copy*); *Assistant Editor*, Eric Etheridge; *Literary Editor*, Katha Pollitt; *Assistant Literary Editor*, Richard Kaye; *Poetry Editor*, Grace Schulman; *Assistant Copy Editors*, Judith Long, Art Winslow, JoAnn Wypijewski; *Editorial Secretary*, Louise Tallmer; *Carey McWilliams Fellow*, Jane Oski; *Interns*, Anthony Borden, Nicolas Gouede, Seth Grodofsky, Kathy Parrent, Christopher Plourde, Micah L. Sifry, Marjory Wentworth. *On leave*, Kai Bird.

Departments: *Dance*, Mindy Aloff; *Films*, Robert Hatch; *Lingo*, Jim Quinn; *Music*, David Hamilton; *Correspondents*: *Washington, D.C.*, Christopher Hitchens; *Latin America*, Penny Lernoux; *Europe*, Daniel Singer; *London*, Raymond Williams; *Paris*, Claude Bourdet; *Defense*, Michael T. Klare; *Columnists and Regular Contributors*: Calvin Trillin (*Uncivil Liberties*), Stephen F. Cohen (*Sovieticus*), Kai Bird & Max Holland (*Dispatches*), Thomas Ferguson & Joel Rogers (*The Political Economy*). *Contributing Editors*: Blair Clark, Herman Schwartz, Gore Vidal. *Editorial Board*: James Baldwin, Norman Birnbaum, Richard Falk, Frances FitzGerald, Philip Green, Elinor Langer, Robert Lekachman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Aryeh Neier, Elizabeth Pochoda, Marcus G. Raskin, A.W. Singham, Roger Wilkins, Alan Wolfe.

Manuscripts: All work submitted will be read by the editors. The magazine cannot, however, be responsible for the return of unsolicited manuscripts unless they are accompanied by self-addressed stamped envelopes.

Publisher, Hamilton Fish 3rd

Associate Publisher, David Parker; *Advertising Manager*, Carole Kraemer; *Business Manager*, Ann B. Epstein; *Bookkeeper*, Gertrude Silverston; *Art/Production Manager*, Jane Sharples; *Circulation Manager*, Stephen W. Soule; *Subscription Manager*, Cookee V. Klein; *Classified Advertising Manager*, George Monaco; *Receptionist*, Greta Loell; *Mail Clerk*, John Holtz; *Administrative Secretary*, Shirley Sulat; *Nation Associates*, Claudine Bacher; *Nation News Service*, Jeff Sorensen.

The Nation (ISSN 0027-8378) is published weekly (except for the first week in January, and biweekly in July and August) by Nation Enterprises and © 1983 in the U.S.A. by the Nation Associates, Inc., 72 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011. Tel.: 212-242-8400. *Subscription Mail Address*: Nation Subscription Service, P.O. Box 1953, Marion, Ohio 43305. Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y., and at additional mailing offices. International Telex: 667 155 NATION.

Regular Subscription Price: One year, \$35; two years, \$65; six months, \$17.50. Add \$7 per year postage Canada, Mexico; \$13 per year other foreign. All foreign subscriptions must be paid in equivalent U.S. funds. Claims for missed issues must be made within 60 days of publication date; back issues available \$3 prepaid (\$4 foreign). Please allow 6-8 weeks for receipt of your first issue and for all subscription transactions. Subscription orders, changes of address and all subscription inquiries should be sent to: *The Nation*, Subscription Services, P.O. Box 1953, Marion, Ohio 43305.

EDITORIALS.

'Any Part'

(Continued From Front Cover)

its client Syria, as well as Iran, always a useful bogey. It identifies American interests, at various times, as gulf oil, open sea lanes and strategic ports and positions. But the obvious foes are not the serious ones, and the stated interests are secondary. The dangers for America—Reagan's America—in the Middle East arise from nationalist and revolutionary movements, which are motivated by internal imperatives and not directed (at least not consistently) by external forces. And the interest they threaten is imperial sway, America's capacity to control the tides of history, to influence events and work its will. The illusion that many make to Vietnam is not facile. Reagan has said we are in Lebanon to prevent Soviet-Syrian domination. Successive American

Presidents said we were in Vietnam to stop China, the Soviet Union or "international communism." They talked about strategic deposits of tin, of Russian lust for warmwater ports, of tottering dominoes. But American military might was sent to extend American command and control as an end in itself.

No good can come of such a bad business. The bombing of the Marine headquarters at the Beirut airport is not the first such incident, nor will it be the last. Pressures on Moscow, threats against Teheran or moves against Damascus will not stop them, because the problems America has in the Middle East do not originate in those places. The source is difficult to find because it is woven deeply into the texture of the political life in places where the American soldiers have intervened.

Fouad Ajami, the eminent Middle East specialist whose prescient analysis of the situation in Lebanon appeared

recently in *The Nation* ["The Partitioning of Lebanon," October 1], said last week that the United States is "on a fool's errand" in Beirut and should get out at once, before the foolishness becomes even more tragic. That is the only sensible strategy. Concern about a possible "bloodbath" after withdrawal is hardly germane: the bloodbath has clearly been drawn.

"It is imperial arrogance," Ajami said, to suppose that American Marines can resolve ancient disputes and active animosities in an alien culture. And it is also arrogant to think that an imperial colony of Marines can hold the fort, surrounded by a population that wishes them ill.

The invasion of Grenada provided an immediate illustration of Reagan's promise to intervene at will in any part of the earth. Only the flimsiest pretexts of international law and a baseless concern for the safety of American students on the island were offered in the way of justification. Britain's Prime Minister Thatcher, who hardly shrinks from throwing her own light imperial weight around, was appalled by the attack on a Commonwealth country where the Queen and her Governor General still serve as sovereign. (She might have noted that it was the first American invasion of a nation under the crown since the march on Montreal in the War of 1812; that one, however, was repelled.) Senator Daniel P. Moynihan, who used to enjoy bullying Third World mini-states when he was ambassador to the United Nations, was quick to charge that Reagan had violated both the U.N. Charter and the Articles of the Organization of American States. Reagan's solemn invocation of the 1981 Treaty of the Organization of East Caribbean States—little more than an antismuggling protocol between Club Meds—was at once cynical and ridiculous. The United States is not even a party to it, and acted without the unanimous consent of the signatory nations.

The chancellor of St. George's University School of Medicine in Grenada, Charles Modica, turned up in New York City and for two days made life difficult for the State Department and the complaisant network news anchors by contradicting Reagan's story that the students were in grave danger. He insisted that the U.S. Ambassador to Barbados, Milan Bish, had instructed him to lie when asked about the students' safety. Then, in midweek, he went to Washington, and to no one's surprise, recanted his previous assertions. St. George's Dean of Preclinical Studies, Dr. David Brown, had apparently not been given the line; he arrived in South Carolina with the report that his charges had not been imperiled by the Grenadian coup. Sources in Jamaica confirmed the dean's report—and Modica's original story.

As we go to press, the Administration has launched a propaganda campaign, complete with a triumphant Presidential address, which it hopes will justify the invasion. All sorts of rumors may be broadcast—of a Cuban military buildup on Grenada, of a hostage scenario, of a secret request for intervention by Grenada's Governor General, of Soviet involvement in the week's events—which the press blackout on the invasion allowed the Administration to float freely.

Reagan's twisted rationalizations and outright lies obscure the main point, which is the meaning of his interventionist policy. The Grenada landing has broken through the political and psychological obstacles that have blessedly restrained Presidents from pursuing military adventures since Vietnam.

Nixon's "winding down" of Vietnam took half a decade, but the popular reaction to the disasters created by that last great American imperial war kept the peace for years afterward. It kept us out of Angola in 1975, it prompted Jimmy Carter to accept the independence movement in Zimbabwe in 1979 and to encourage the liberation of Nicaragua in 1981. We may never know how many other potential invasions, interventions or interdictions the "Vietnam syndrome" restrained. On several occasions Reagan seemed eager to strike but refrained at the last moment because of uncertainty about the domestic political consequences.

Then came Grenada. What was surely a ghastly internal power struggle between Bishop and ambitious rivals within his New Jewel Movement provided the excuse for Reagan to militarize the Caribbean and orchestrate an ideological confrontation with global implications. One can only speculate at the secret machinations that preceded the landing, the provocations and destabilization operations, the pressures on weak and dependent island governments.

And it has been, at first glance, a famous victory for Reagan's America. That is to say, for the superpower that seeks to export and impose counterrevolution wherever independence is vulnerable. But the triumph may not last. Intervention creates its own antagonisms, and it makes hardened enemies of those who might otherwise shrink from a fight. The empire, as the Vietnamese proved—and as the Iranians, the Lebanese Moslems and others have reiterated—is most exposed when it is most extended—to "any part of the earth."

Passion Play

Like everything in the long history of the Rosenberg case, the debate between opposing authors (and between members of the audience) in Town Hall on October 20 was noisy, quarrelsome, rancorous, inconclusive—and fascinating. The minutiae of the Rosenberg record and the monstrosities of repression in the 1950s still have the power to agitate the mind and stir the soul, three decades after the fact. The case itself has become the defining epic of the American left after World War II, a political passion play which continues its intermittent run at random locales, performed by a repertory company of participants who repeat old lines, ad-lib inspired ripostes and often simply shout and scuffle. But it is a serious show, and it always draws a crowd, not only because of the inherent drama of the plot but because the message really matters.

Town Hall exaggerated the theatricality of the latest performance by adding some Broadway glitz to the proceedings. Outside on 43rd Street, some of the sellout crowd of

DISPATCHES

KAI BIRD AND MAX HOLLAND

fied, the Defense Ministry attempted to censor it because of its disturbing implications for Bonn's military posture. According to the poll, more than 73 percent of the enlisted men questioned agreed with the statement "Nothing can justify a war that uses means of mass destruction." Only 19 percent agreed without qualification to the proposition that the "Federal Republic must be defended even if nuclear weapons have to be used on her territory." Moreover, less than half the members of the officer corps who were asked the same questions unqualifiedly supported the use of nuclear weapons.

The Defense Ministry was appalled by the publicity the study received. "If I could, I'd close the place," said Hans Rühle, head of the planning staff, referring to the Bundeswehr office that produced the report.

* * *

It's common knowledge that Bonn and Washington often synchronize their foreign aid policies, so we weren't too surprised to learn that scarcely two weeks after the T.W.A. hostages were freed and President Reagan decided that Syria no longer supports "international terrorism," Bonn ended a five-year freeze on economic aid to Damascus. On July 16 the Ministry of Economic Cooperation announced it would release nearly \$26 million in low-interest loans pledged before 1980 but suspended because of Syrian antipathy to U.S. policy in the Middle East.

■ PACIFIC ISLANDS: Now It's Nerve Gas

Future generations of Marshall Islanders will no doubt bear the brunt of Congress's recent vote to resume nerve gas production. Inhabitants of the U.S.-controlled Pacific territory, who still haven't recovered from the ecological effects of U.S. nuclear testing in the 1950s, may become neighbors to a new arsenal of chemical weapons.

The Army plans to spend \$67 million for the storage and disposal of chemical weapons already at tiny Johnston Atoll, which is upwind and upcurrent of the Marshalls. The proximity of the atoll to Hawaii's military bases makes it a superb location.

The Johnston Atoll Chemical Agent Disposal System and a related construction program will include \$21 million for permanent storage facilities for stockpiling chemicals deemed too dangerous to store in the continental United States. According to Owen Wilkes, writing in the New Zealand newsletter "Peacelinks," the Army admits that the facilities, to be built on land that averages less than ten feet above sea level, will be "subject to flooding under certain conditions."

Once a bird sanctuary, Johnston Atoll has been a U.S. military facility for the past fifty years. Administered by the Defense Nuclear Agency, it is used as a dumping ground for unwanted residue from America's nuclear and chemical programs. For almost a decade after World War II, it was an atomic test site, and radioactive dust from the blasts fell throughout the Marshalls. In the late 1960s, leakages of nerve gas from a U.S. facility in Japan prompted the Pen-

tagon to transfer more than 12,000 tons of the substance to hastily constructed facilities in Johnston which were soon damaged by hurricanes.

The island's humble role as a garbage dump may soon be eclipsed, however. From 1964 to 1975 Johnston Atoll hosted a launching site for missiles adapted to destroy Soviet satellites. It is likely that ground-based facilities for Reagan's Star Wars program would be located on the atoll.

■ GRENADA: Embassy Blacklist

"Dispatches" has learned that the U.S. Embassy has compiled a blacklist of Grenadians who served in the government of former Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. It is standard practice for the State Department and A.I.D. to run security checks on nationals they wish to hire directly in other countries. In Grenada, however, Roy Haverkamp, a career Foreign Service officer and the ranking diplomat in the embassy, uses the list to bar individuals from government-related jobs.

One victim of the blacklist is Jane Belfon, who served the Bishop government as director of tourism from 1979 to 1983. Since then she has been dismissed from three jobs shortly after being hired. In one instance, her contract with a U.N. organization was torn up after her name was checked against the blacklist. This summer she worked for an A.I.D. contractor as a low-paid office manager, a position with no access to classified material. But after a month on the job, she was fired by her American employer on the orders of William Erdahl, the chief A.I.D. representative in Grenada. Erdahl said it wasn't possible to give the specific reasons for her dismissal in writing, but her name was on one of three lists of security risks.

A State Department official, who wished to remain unnamed, said that although he had not heard of the Belfon case, "if she was a high-ranking official in the Bishop government, which we know to have been Communist, it would seem to me logical that we'd be under no obligation to hire her with U.S.A.I.D. funds."

Belfon's case was appealed through Grenadian government channels, but when it came to the attention of Prime Minister Herbert Blaize, he reportedly hit the roof. One of the first controversies his Cabinet dealt with was whether to rehire her as director of tourism. The Cabinet was evenly divided on the question, with many arguing that Belfon was effective in her job, was not an ideologue and should not be penalized. Sources in Grenada say the debate was so acrimonious that Blaize's decision to fire Belfon almost brought down his new government.

The blacklisting has institutionalized the political polarization brought on the island by the U.S. invasion of October 1983. Then, many civil servants, both career and political, were dismissed from their posts. A few have since been allowed back, but the majority remain unemployed or have been forced to emigrate for lack of a job commensurate with their training. Grenada's small educated class has thus been decimated by Caribbean McCarthyism.

ship work to legitimize Pretoria's rule rather than subvert it. This year's intern was sent to an overwhelmingly white school and so far has recommended that the program work closely with the South African government's fraudulent "black homelands" system—that interns, in effect, be assigned to play Sun City. Harvard has shown no interest in placing students with schools and organizations actively opposing the apartheid system and in fact is considering internships with schools in Namibia, which South Africa occupies illegally. Ultimately, the report asserts, the Harvard program "is part of a national effort . . . to contain protest and activism relating to divestment."

The report made a splash in Cambridge, and on February 15 twenty black South Africans joined scores of students in a vigil protesting the internship program. The spring season for divestment demonstrations is about to open. Dartmouth College is polarized over the destruction of the antiapartheid shantytown by rightist students, and other campuses are gearing up for the Weeks of Action starting March 21. Administrators at Harvard and other elite universities, worried that the era of student passivity which has held since the roaring sixties is coming to an end, will seek to divert their protesters. We can expect more *beaux gestes* and hope for more exposés.

Grenada Today

On the road from the airport to the hotel my companion, a former student at the American Medical School, could hardly contain his enthusiasm. "Why, the pavement is brand new," he kept saying. "You should have seen the potholes when I was here last time." The next day, when he repeated the observation about the newly paved road at a tourist agency, a Grenadian employee nodded. "That's right," she said, "the road from the airport is one of the few changes."

President Reagan may have been as impressed as the student when he took the same drive last week during his official visit. Unfortunately no one provided the President with a more realistic picture of the situation that exists two and a half years after U.S. marines ousted the Marxist junta that had overthrown the government of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop. In 1983 most Grenadians welcomed the marines as liberators, but any hopes they had for a prosperous future as a U.S. ally have now faded.

The Reagan Administration has completed some of the projects the Cubans left unfinished. The controversial airport has been built, the planned roads are paved, and American physicians from Project Hope have temporarily replaced the Cuban doctors. But the anticipated wave of U.S. investment never arrived. The Agency for International Development has poured more than \$60 million into Grenada's infrastructure to attract potential investors, and the government of Prime Minister Herbert Blaize has offered them ten-to-fifteen-year tax holidays and other inducements. But in 1984 only two U.S. firms came to the

island—a toy manufacturer and a nutmeg packager—and both went out of business in a matter of months. Last year four American companies opened restaurants and a scuba diving center, but Grenada's feeble economy can hardly survive on those kinds of enterprises. Indeed, Americans on the Spice Island are worried about a political backlash. "The infrastructure is not going to benefit the people directly," said one U.S. official. "More cars and roads could even exacerbate tensions. People who were employed under the Bishop government and now are out of work will be saying things are bad. The only solution is more jobs."

The A.I.D. has essentially exported Reaganomics to Grenada, turning the island into a Third World model of laissez-faire capitalism. Thirty state farms that existed before the 1979 revolution, which deposed flamboyant dictator Eric Gairy, were sold to private interests. An importing firm established by Bishop's revolutionary government has been gradually taken over by private investors, as have two state banks that made cheap loans to small farmers. Price controls on certain food items have been lifted, and corporate taxes and tariffs have been lowered. "Rich people have regained their social status and the opportunity to live extremely well," former Deputy Finance Minister Lyden Ramdhanny told me.

Moreover, working people have lost many of the benefits they enjoyed under Bishop. Among the popular programs that the Blaize government has abolished are a housing repair project, the Center for Public Education, subsidized housing and distribution of free milk, oil, schoolbooks and school uniforms to low-income families. In addition, women have lost rights they gained after the revolution.

Grenada's weak manufacturing and service industries have been unable to provide work for thousands of people who lost their jobs in the state sector. The official unemployment rate has risen from 12 percent in 1983 to 27 percent last year. Unofficially, almost half the labor force is looking for work.

But the looming crisis does not seem to have given the governing elite any sense of urgency. Blaize's New National Party, which comprises three political parties, is paralyzed by factional strife, and the Prime Minister is ailing. Directly below Blaize in the party leadership, the ultrarightist Francis Alexis is waiting his turn. If Alexis were to outmaneuver his reform-minded rival, George Brizan, and become Prime Minister, the political situation on the island would certainly worsen. The Maurice Bishop Patriotic Movement, which garnered few votes in the 1984 elections, has lately been gaining support and would fight back against any repressive measures from an Alexis government. The ever-present threat of a comeback by Eric Gairy makes Grenada's political future even more precarious. But Alexis has behind him the island's absentee manager, the Reagan Administration, which seems ready to use dollars and ideology to prop up a succession of inept caretaker governments.

MARTIN BURCHARTH

Martin Burcharth is the U.S. correspondent of the Danish daily newspaper Aktuelt.

in that magazine's first major effort at historical documentation since its publication of the Hitler diaries in 1983, the Reagan revolution was betrayed almost as soon as it began. Veneal politicians, entrenched interests and a vacillating President prevented the Stockmanistas from gutting the structure of welfarism that supported the old liberal system, and thus from resolving the contradictions of late capitalism in favor of industrial expansion. George Bush, after all, was smarter than we thought. "Voodoo economics" made many millionaires, stood inflation on its head and re-elected the President, but it did not solve the paramount problem of growth, without which the Reagan program is just so much right-wing baloney. When Reagan "surrendered" on Social Security cuts, when he refused to raise taxes, pare Pentagon spending and dismantle the myriad entitlements of the beneficent state, the revolutionary effort was doomed.

Is Stockman bitterly right, or just bitter? With the regularity of alternate-side-of-the-street parking, Reagan presents a vastly different appearance from one day to the next. On Monday, Wednesday and Friday he is going great guns, cannonading at will, decimating liberal ranks, sending economic indexes through the roof and pushing his popularity to dizzying heights. On Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday he seems overwhelmed by events, lashing out violently but aimlessly, isolated in the world and reduced to dangerous but transparent demagoguery in the absence of a coherent strategy to achieve even the grotesque goals of his historic political project.

The polls do not yet reveal the similarity between this peculiarly popular President and that discredited leader in the days before the revolution. The failure of liberalism gave rise to an opposition that fought and won under the ideological banner of Reaganism. By rights, the betrayals, breaches of faith, hypocrisies and broken promises of the present regime—way beyond what Stockman mentions in his self-serving screed—should spark a new opposition and another revolt. It still needs a leader and a vision, but already the will exists to change a course that has failed not only on its own twisted terms but as a grand design for the future.

Rainbow's Beginning

Two issues dominated the founding convention of the National Rainbow Coalition, held from April 17 to 19 in Washington. But more significant than those issues were the individuals who gathered in a room to chart the movement's course. There were white farmers and black farmers from the South; rank-and-file unionists and their "natural" enemies, immigrant Haitians and Filipinos; black church ladies and lesbian activists; debt-ridden farmers from the Middle West who had foolishly voted for Ronald Reagan; urban leftists, tenants, preachers and college students.

The issues centered on democracy and Democrats. The nearly 800 delegates seemed intent on building a structure. But when the bylaws, which only one hundred delegates had seen, were placed before them, the preoccupation with structure gave way to a demand for more democracy. The majority wanted political endorsements and strategies to be decided locally, and the grass roots to be well represented in the national leadership. This debate produced a synthesis: the National Rainbow Coalition has the structure—bylaws and machinery for chartering state parties, a formal leadership body and a process for ratifying a platform—but it also has democratic checks up and down the line.

The convention's second issue was more important to the press than to the delegates: Will Jesse Jackson run for President as a Democrat or an independent? reporters asked. Is the Rainbow Coalition part of the Democratic Party or is it a third party? Jackson, with apparent conviction, and the activist delegates, with assurance born of experience, objected to the way the questions were framed. What matters, they said, is drawing up a progressive platform. There are candidates in Alabama, Vermont, Texas and elsewhere running as Rainbow Democrats, and there may well be an independent running for governor of Vermont on the Rainbow platform with Jackson's blessing. Although several Democratic officeholders attended the convention at Jackson's invitation, there was more Democrat-bashing than protestations of party loyalty.

The direction of the Rainbow movement will be determined more by grass-roots issues and organizing than by any single person's vision. If Jackson does not repudiate the progressive independent politics favored by his followers, he might just find himself carried along by their momentum.

Libya, Grenada And Reagan

Ronald Reagan believes might makes right. First elected to public office by appealing to the fear and hatred that flowed from the Watts riots of 1965, he consistently advocates violence as the solution to all problems. The death penalty, abolition of gun control, arbitrary use of police power, acceleration of the arms race, continuation of nuclear testing, escalation of research and development to achieve military superiority, and violent strikes against ostracized enemies are the hallmarks of his faith.

If his preference for violence is to prevail, he must gain public support by subverting truth and evading the law. When his desire to attack Nicaragua was frustrated in 1981, he began a propaganda campaign to create hostility toward Grenada, Cuba, Libya and the Soviet Union.

The April 14 bombing of Tripoli ought to have reminded us of the U.S. invasion of Grenada on October 25, 1983, which killed and wounded scores of the tiny island's people

and condemned the survivors to another generation of poverty. That action was Reagan's first venture into international violence.

The most notable and ultimately disturbing thing about the attack on Grenada is the near-total success the Administration has had in controlling and distorting information about what took place. The U.S. media acquiesced in the exclusion of reporters from the invasion. Few Americans have questioned the Administration's false claims that U.S. forces were invited to invade or that the operation was necessary to save the lives of U.S. medical students.

Little has been written in this country about the case of the nineteen former Grenadian officials and soldiers who have been charged with the murder of Prime Minister Maurice Bishop and six others. Their case has just been abruptly ordered to trial before the High Court of Grenada. The defendants include Gen. Hudson Austin and Bernard and Phyllis Coard. They face the death penalty. No member of the U.S. press has interviewed even one of the accused, and as of this writing, no stories have appeared in the United States about the months the prisoners spent in solitary confinement, the beatings they suffered and the statements they were compelled to make while in de facto U.S. custody. Instead, the accused have been vilified by U.S. officials, including President Reagan, and by the press, which depends completely on government sources. Their side of the case has been suppressed.

The Reagan Administration, which staged elections in Grenada in 1984, has never criticized the Grenadian authorities' failure, two and a half years after the invasion, to create a constitutional court system. The defendants challenged the legitimacy of the court, and in a decision issued on May 10, 1985, the Grenadian Court of Appeals agreed that the present system was unconstitutional but said it was justified nonetheless by the continuing emergency.

Pretrial proceedings have been marked by other irregularities, all unreported in the U.S. media, including the government's arbitrary hiring, under a three-month contract, of a special judge to hear the case; the appointment of a former member of the prosecution team as registrar, responsible for choosing 140 prospective jurors; the exclusion of the public and the defendants' families from the courtroom; the jeers of prospective jurors at the defense lawyers when the judge threatened the latter with contempt on April 11; the refusal on April 15 of all defense counsel to participate in the proceedings of an unconstitutional court, on the defendants' instructions; the forced removal of seventeen of the defendants from the courtroom; the selection of a jury in the absence of defendants and their attorneys on April 18. The trial is to take place without the defendants, their lawyers or any U.S. reporters present. These activities occurred after President Reagan visited Grenada on February 20 and with a U.S. government observer in court.

In addition, important defense motions questioning the fairness of the trial have not been considered, and the right to appeal to a Commonwealth court, the Queen's Privy Counsel in London, guaranteed in the 1973 Constitution, has been denied. The only review of the case will therefore

be made by judges appointed by the same Grenadian authority that seeks the death penalty.

We do not know what role U.S. informers and agents played in the events that led to and followed the death of Maurice Bishop on October 19. We do know that he was held in his home for six days, that he was released to a crowd of supporters and that he then moved with the crowd to Fort Rupert, where he was murdered. Unless the United States opens its secret archives, independent investigative reporters probe the matter, and all the evidence comes out at a fair trial, we will never know what really happened on Grenada prior to the invasion and what responsibility, if any, the accused bear for Bishop's death.

Now there are questions about the Administration's plans to overthrow Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi. Secretary of State Shultz and other Administration officials have openly supported an insurrection. President Reagan has used violent language, terming the Libyan ruler a mad dog. Although dozens of civilians were killed in the bombings, Reagan dared to smile on April 18 and say, "We weren't out to kill anybody."

As President, Ronald Reagan has violated every principle for which America stands. He denies the jurisdiction of the World Court; he acts without consulting Congress and in opposition to the advice of U.S. allies. Serving as judge, jury and executioner, he orders military strikes that kill civilians. He attempts to kill foreign leaders. He resorts to surprise attacks. He provokes a feeble Libyan action against U.S. ships in the Gulf of Sidra, falsely claiming to uphold freedom of the seas, so that his planes can kill and destroy with relative impunity.

Without legal authority he ordered U.S. support for the Nicaraguan *contras* knowing that they have murdered and raped their own people. When his mindless show of force in Lebanon cost the lives of 240 marines, he ordered the battleship *New Jersey* to lob 16-inch shells into Lebanon, striking villages and killing whoever happened to be in the area.

Ronald Reagan has committed these acts in violation of international law, of the Constitution and of the laws of the United States. The President has no legal power to order U.S. forces to murder indiscriminately and terrorize those he styles his enemies. Such acts constitute high crimes and misdemeanors.

Reagan's subversion of truth and the rule of law is the greatest threat facing the American people and indeed the world. We are responsible for our President's actions because we have the power to prevent them. If we care for the truth and for who we are, and if we want to restore the integrity of our constitutional system, we must demand the impeachment and trial of Ronald Reagan.

As Abraham Lincoln said on the eve of the Civil War, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it."

RAMSEY CLARK

Ramsey Clark, former Attorney General of the United States, is legal adviser to the Coard family and was in Grenada at the time of the Tripoli bombing.