

The Coverage of Grenada Continues

FIGHTING GOES ON; 'WAREHOUSES OF WEAPONS' STORY DEBUNKED

THE PEOPLE OF GRENADA ARE NOT SURRENDERING. (Pravda, Oct. 31, pp. 1, 5. 1,100 words. Excerpts:) Resisting the Aggressors. Georgetown, Oct. 30—According to reports from Grenada, the island's heroic defenders, who have switched to methods of guerrilla warfare, are continuing to resist the American military who have invaded the country. The Voice of Barbados radio station reports that the occupiers are sustaining new losses in personnel. According to preliminary information, 10 more interventionists were wounded yesterday. A spokesman for the American interventionist contingent has acknowledged that, despite the large-scale invasion by US troops, the Grenadians have no intention of laying down their arms.

The number of American troops on Grenada—counting units stationed aboard the warships plying its waters—now stands at 15,000 men. In other words, there is one interventionist for every seven Grenadians.

With the help of P. Scoon, the former British Governor-General of Grenada, the occupiers are implanting a "new order" on the island. As of today, a curfew was imposed in St. George's from 8 p.m. until 5 a.m. During this time, Grenadians are forbidden to leave their homes. Scoon has demanded that the Grenadian Armed Forces and People's Militia lay down their arms and surrender "unconditionally." At the same time, the American occupiers have begun preparations for a "total combing of the island." ...

Washington, Oct. 30—A correspondent for the Washington Post has inspected the "warehouses of weapons and ammunition" on Grenada that, Reagan claimed in his recent televised speech, are "enough to arm thousands of terrorists." He discovered that three of the six warehouses contained no weapons at all. One housed engines and spare parts for automobiles, food was stored in another, and a third held clothing. The small quantity of arms actually in the remaining warehouses, as the correspondent saw for himself, is unsuitable for combat operations in modern conditions. It consisted of British-made rifles made prior to World War II. Some rifles bore the date 1870. "Such weapons were used to fight the American Indians," the newspaper says ironically. ...

REAGAN'S 'ESCALATING RECKLESSNESS' CITED

International Survey: NO RESTRAINTS. (By Yevgeny Grigoryev. Pravda, Oct. 30, p. 4. 700 words. Excerpts:)... The American aggression against the people of Grenada once again raises a very important question. Are there any restraints on Washington at all? Many foreign commentators are linking this bandit action directly to the US administration's failures in both foreign and domestic policy. The Times of India notes: "At one blow, President Reagan distracted attention from the deaths of the American marines in Lebanon as a result of the impasse of US policy." But what will happen if Washington decides every time to "distract attention" from its failures by resorting to international piracy?

And then there's this aspect. Washington has again presented its allies with a fait accompli. ...

American imperialism's adventures are turning into a boomerang. The New York Times acknowledges that the invasion of Grenada "has produced a new series of international problems for Washington, already faced with a difficult crisis in Lebanon. Launching the action without advance consultation with Congress and without the support of its key NATO and Latin American allies, Washington now has to defend itself against charges of acting irresponsibly. State Department officials are worried that

the Grenada invasion will not only worsen relations with Moscow but will also give the political left in Western Europe new arguments for actions against American missiles. ..."

The Reagan Administration's escalating recklessness is angering the peoples. It is even alarming Americans themselves, who are thinking about the abyss to which Washington's militaristic course and piratical habits may lead them. ...

REAGAN'S TV SPEECH SAID TO JUSTIFY 'PIRACY' IN LEBANON, GRENADA

A Political Commentator's Notes: SELF-EXPOSURE. (By Vsevolod Ovchinnikov. Pravda, Oct. 30, p. 5. 1,300 words. Condensed text:) On Thursday President Reagan delivered a televised address to the country. Having set as his goal the justification of the United States' military presence in Lebanon and its armed invasion of Grenada, he willy-nilly disclosed his political credo. Throwing off the mask of peacemaker, he laid bare his claims to the role of world gendarme and to the right to commit any kind of high-handed action to ensure a dominating position in the world for the United States.

It is this imperial spirit that permeates the concluding lines of his address: "There was a time when our national security was based on an army within our own borders and shore batteries of artillery along our coast. *** The world has changed. Today our national security can be threatened far from our coasts [Reagan actually said "in far-away places"—Trans.]. It's up to all of us to be aware of the strategic importance of centers from which a threat to us may be created [Reagan: "of such places"] and to be able to foresee [Reagan: "identify"] them."

In short, whatever conflict the United States takes it into its head to get involved in, wherever it may resort to force of arms, and no matter how much blood, including American blood, is shed as a consequence, there is supposedly a plenary indulgence for all this—that is, a complete remission of sins, since any military interference can be justified by reference to the US's omnipresent "vital interests."

It's from these positions that the President tries to answer the question: Why should Americans die in Lebanon? He says: "The Middle East is vital to our national security and economic well-being. *** If that key should fall into the hands of a power or forces hostile to the free world, there would be a direct threat to the United States and to our allies."

Reagan tries to claim that he sent the Marines into Lebanon in the role of peacemakers, who are awaited impatiently in that much-suffering country. What, in his view, is obstructing peace in the Middle East? The President refers to the fierce enmity among the various Lebanese communities. This, he says, reflects in miniature all the difficulties and conflicts from which a large part of the region is suffering.

It seems that the whole trouble is that the Lebanese can't get along with one another. ... He [Reagan] didn't say a word about the fact that a direct act of aggression was committed against that state [Lebanon]—first by Israel, and then by the United States. ...

To back up his unconvincing arguments concerning the internecine strife in Lebanon, Reagan threw a marked card on the table, calling it the ace of trumps.

"Can the United States," he exclaimed, "or the whole free world, for that matter, stand by and see the Middle East incorporated into the sphere of the Soviet bloc?" [Reagan's text omits "the sphere of"—Trans.]

That's a real revelation! It seems that since 1967 all the Israeli expansionists have been doing is "incorporating

the Middle East into the sphere of the Soviet bloc." But, leaving the content aside, let us call attention to the form of this bombastic declaration. Doesn't it smack of plagiarism? Judge for yourselves: "We do not intend to sit idly by and allow Communists to establish a government in any country of the Western Hemisphere." This is the statement that President Johnson used in trying to justify the US intervention against the Dominican Republic in 1965. But, in general, the roots of this really messianic anticommunism lie still deeper—in the fanatical vocabulary of Goebbels's propagandists.

But let's return to the address. Eventually, Reagan put the same marked card on the table in connection with Grenada. ...

For several days the island's defenders put up a truly heroic resistance to the interventionists. Washington had to urgently send to Grenada reinforcements from the 82nd Airborne Division, which is a part of the Rapid Deployment Force. This unexpected rebuff did enormous moral and political damage to the aggressors, to say nothing of the physical losses. The President had to reorganize his arguments as events developed, putting emphasis on the claim that, in addition to the protection of the Americans on the island, the main objective of the landing on Grenada was the protection of the Western Hemisphere against the Communist threat.

"Grenada, we were told, was a friendly island paradise for tourism. Well, it wasn't," Reagan exclaims. "It was a Soviet-Cuban colony being readied as a major [Reagan adds: "military"] bastion to export terror and undermine democracy."

On what does the President base such sensational conclusions? In his words, "Soviet advisers" were found on Grenada (in fact, there have never been any such advisers). In addition, Cubans were found there. They were participating in the construction of an international tourist airport, which, according to Reagan, "looked suspiciously suitable for military aircraft, including Soviet-built [Reagan adds: "long-range"] bombers." From all this, the President drew the profound conclusion that "a Cuban occupation of the island had been planned."

"The events in Lebanon and Grenada, though oceans apart, are closely related," Reagan concludes. This is, perhaps, the only thesis with which one can agree. In both cases, the United States is playing the role of world gendarme. In both cases, behind the screen of "multinational forces" US marines—covered in both areas by American squadrons looming offshore—are engaging in piracy. ...

U.S. CHARGED WITH 'WILD WEST' METHODS

'URGENT FURY.' (By Staff Correspondent G. Vasilyev. Pravda, Oct. 31, p. 5. 1,100 words. Excerpts:) Washington, Oct. 30—... The cowboy assault on tiny Grenada, carried out according to all the rules of a dashing cavalry attack by white settlers, armed to the teeth, against a "redskin" village a century and a half ago, has focused world attention on the manifestations of the current US administration's foreign-policy course, which is aggressive, hegemonistic and built on a cult of force. It has called to mind the CIA's criminal, undeclared war against Nicaragua, and it has made people look with acute alarm at the impending deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe. With special clarity, as if through a magnifying glass, people have seen Washington's whole policy of a feverish arms buildup. ... Above all, the attack has highlighted the political and even psychological mentality of Washington's current leaders—people who see the world in a black-and-white version of fanatical anticommunism, who refuse to reckon with the facts, who are seeking to pull the knots of international conflicts even tighter and to transfer to the sphere of international relations the methods of America's "wild West," where all problems were "solved" with a shot from a Colt.

"Urgent Fury"—this, according to the newspapers, is what the Pentagon has christened its piratical operation against Grenada. This is a name that deserves attention! In assessing it, let us say that fury is not the best of advisers in international affairs, nor is spontaneity of action—an especially dangerous quality in our nuclear-missile age. Many people understand this. The well-known American commentator Joseph Kraft writes: "The adventure in Grenada, coming right on the heels of the tragedy in Beirut, points up a dangerous quality that is characteristic of the Reagan Administration—namely, its inability to confront the facts and distinguish petty irritants from vitally important interests." ...

IZVESTIA: WHITE HOUSE HAS TAKEN DANGEROUS PATH OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

(Editorial)—WASHINGTON'S TERRORISM. (Izvestia, Nov. 1, p. 1. 900 words. Excerpts:)... "Operation Grenada"... is not just another link in the long chain of Washington's aggressive actions. What we have here is a new twist in the positions-of-strength policy with which the present US administration, headed by President R. Reagan, has armed itself. It's as though it were dragging out into broad daylight a new edition of the Monroe Doctrine, which was invented in former times to justify American piracy south of the Rio Grande. But whereas at that time Washington elevated the principle of "America (both North and South) for the US" to the status of a law, now the White House is thinking in terms of the entire globe for American imperialism.

But the world isn't the same as it was; it is developing according to objective laws, not as the White House incumbent and his "team" would like. It's about time they learned this!

But no, Washington just keeps right on going, heedless of obstacles. The principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries, which is written into the UN Charter, "doesn't suit" it, you see. It shows little concern for legality at home, and in the international arena the US administration has, in general, conceived the idea of acting like a bandit, cynically flouting all principles of law and morality.

For the White House, there is just one law—the imperial ambitions of the most reactionary forces of American imperialism. President Reagan, intoxicated by these ambitions, is, in a mad desire for world domination by the US, elevating international terrorism to the rank of his official policy.

Washington has still not cleansed itself of the shame of the "dirty war" in Vietnam, and the bloody traces of new US crimes keep appearing in various spots on the globe. Yesterday it was Chile, Lebanon, El Salvador. Today it's Grenada. And tomorrow?

The US's piratical attack on Grenada is a sinister embodiment of the adventuristic plans of the American claimants to the role of arbiters of the world's destiny. Washington is trying to increase its sphere of influence and is seeking to dominate important parts of the world. With its brazen invasion of Grenada, the White House cynically shows that, for the sake of achieving its goals, it is prepared to try anything—from covert CIA operations to overt armed invasion. The terrorists in the White House are throwing out a challenge to the whole world—tremble before the US, which is permitted everything.

This new stage in the White House's adventurist course is designed to intimidate peoples who are fighting for freedom and independence. The American press points out that now, after the attack on Grenada, the threat that Washington will directly interfere in the affairs of Nicaragua and will suppress the national-liberation movement in Central America looms more and more. Grenada is another serious warning that the US administration is increasingly inclined toward the military solution of political problems.

The path the White House has taken—the path of international terrorism—is extremely dangerous in our nuclear age. ...

U.S. BOMBING OF HOSPITAL REVEALED

ONE MORE CRIME.—American Interventionists Shelled a Hospital. (By Staff Correspondent A. Tolkunov. Pravda, Nov. 2, p. 5. 750 words. Excerpts:) New York, Nov. 1—... According to the Canadian Maclean's Magazine, a large number of patients in a hospital near the Richmond Hill prison [in Grenada] were killed as a result of "accidental shelling" by ships of the American squadron. A correspondent for the magazine was told that about 50 of the hospital's patients died.

An hour before this dispatch was transmitted to the magazine's editorial offices, the Pentagon issued official confirmation that there had been a direct hit on the civilian hospital. "Only" a week after the crime!

Trying to make some kind of an excuse, the Pentagon strategists could find nothing better than to say that they had "slipped up"—because, so they said, the invasion forces had been supplied with tourist maps rather than military ones.

Thus, after squandering the lives of more than 200 of their marines in the ruins of Beirut, the Pentagon bosses then "flexed their muscles" on Grenada. Thus, in "rescuing" Americans, they killed patients in a civilian hospital. ...

So today the White House, the military, ultraconservatives and anticommunists are attempting—to the point of kindling a chauvinistic campaign—to "unite" America. They immediately label anyone who speaks out against the Grenadian adventure as a "red" or a "betrayers" of national interests. At first, many deceived and confused Americans believed the cock-and-bull story about the monstrous schemes of the Grenadians and Cubans. Others obviously are rather afraid of neo-McCarthyite persecution.

For the administration, however, this is truly a Pyrrhic victory. After all, no lies or misinformation can save the organizers of this bloody adventure, who flouted all the norms of international law. ...

The State Department is spreading lies about "secret treaties" entangling Grenada that were supposedly discovered on the island, about "warehouses of Soviet and Cuban weapons," etc. The President is going on and on about some sort of expression of the Grenadians' will, saying that they ardently wish an "American-style democratic process." At the same time, however, US Adm. W. McDonald, who is in charge of the intervention, has said that mass roundups and arrests of supporters of the people's government are under way on the island. Only after this did Washington give the "go-ahead" to "free and democratic" elections!

The truth cannot be hidden. America is beginning to open its eyes. More and more people are sharply criticizing the Grenadian adventure. City councils in Washington, Detroit, Santa Cruz and other cities are adopting resolutions stigmatizing the aggression against Grenada.

'CUBAN INTERNATIONALISTS' EXPLOIT' HAILED

THE COURAGE AND PAIN OF GRENADA. (By Staff Correspondent Yevg. Bai. Izvestia, Nov. 2, p. 5. 1,500 words. Excerpt:) Havana—... Through its military intervention against Grenada, Washington wanted to intimidate the peoples of other Central American and Caribbean countries as well. It has, as it were, given them to understand what awaits them if they are insubordinate. The effect will be the opposite. The Grenadian patriots' steadfastness and courage will give new strength to the insurgent movement in El Salvador, will make Nicaragua still stronger and more united in the face of the external threat, and will immeasurably increase the prestige of socialist Cuba.

The exploit of the Cuban internationalists—construction workers, engineers, physicians—who heroically resisted crack units of American marines has evoked fervent solidarity with Cuba the world over. In this skirmish with imperialism, Cuba has again won an enormous political and moral victory. Even in the military area, the Cubans showed their superiority: For more than 24 hours a handful of men armed only with rifles held off attacks by American troops who were several times superior to them in numbers. The United States wanted to demonstrate its strength to the whole world, but what it showed was its weakness. ...

U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONDEMNS INVASION

RESOLUTE PROTEST.—UN General Assembly Demands That the Aggression Stop. (By Staff Correspondent V. Soldatov. Izvestia, Nov. 4, pp. 1, 4. 650 words. Condensed text:) New York—The UN General Assembly has approved a resolution, introduced by Nicaragua and Zimbabwe, concerning the US's armed aggression against Grenada. Last week the United States vetoed this resolution in the Security Council.¹ The American veto was one of the reasons that made a number of countries demand a discussion of the situation in Grenada at a plenary meeting, where decisions are adopted by majority vote.

The resolution points out that this armed intervention is a flagrant violation of international law and of Grenada's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. The resolution calls on all countries to show the strictest respect for Grenada's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity, and it calls for an immediate cessation of the armed intervention and the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Grenada.

These points of the resolution drew an irritated reaction from Washington. The American delegation to the UN worked vigorously behind the scenes trying to oppose the discussion of the Grenadian invasion. As a result of its efforts, the General Assembly was presented with a second draft resolution on the situation on Grenada. It was introduced by the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago. This draft spoke in general terms of the need to respect the independence and territorial integrity of states. In essence, the draft's author confined himself to this general appeal. This draft was not submitted for a vote.

A total of 108 states voted for the resolution introduced by Nicaragua and Zimbabwe; 27 countries abstained, and nine delegations voted against it. Besides the United States, the resolution was opposed by six countries from the eastern Caribbean, plus El Salvador and Israel. Several NATO countries—including Belgium, Britain, the FRG and Canada—abstained from voting. The remaining NATO countries—including France, Denmark, Italy, Greece, Norway and the Netherlands—supported the resolution.

Thus, the United States, despite all the maneuverings of American diplomacy, found itself isolated. The world community condemned Washington's unprovoked armed intervention against Grenada. And, although the General Assembly's resolution has no binding force, its moral authority is great.

In supporting the resolution adopted in connection with Washington's armed intervention against Grenada, O. A. Troyanovsky, the USSR's representative to the UN, said that the US and its accomplices have been unequivocally convicted of committing aggression against a small, non-aligned country. These actions are a gross violation of the principles and goals of the UN Charter.

As for the fate that the occupiers have prepared for the people of Grenada, the USSR representative said, one can judge from certain photographs. Concentration camps; barbed wire; a bombed-out hospital; men and women, hands tied behind their backs, under the sights of sub-machine guns. This is the kind of democracy that the

¹CDSP, Vol. XXXV, No. 43, p. 8.

occupiers are propagating in Grenada, the kind that they're threatening to establish in other countries as well. ...

The current US administration is attempting to conceal this flagrant act of international terrorism—which it has elevated to the rank of state policy—with a fig leaf. The American representatives to the UN tried to prove that the United States all but has a legal right to unleash aggressive wars against sovereign states whose domestic or foreign policies for some reason displease the White House. In flouting the clear-cut provisions of the Charter, which prohibit aggression, the US is trying to ensure itself a free hand for interventionist actions.

The United States is trying to arrogate to itself the right to invade any country in which, in Washington's opinion, "no responsible governmental authority exists" or an event is taking place that affects the safety of American citizens or the US's so-called "vital interests." Washington's adventurist policy, which pursues the goal of refashioning the world to suit itself, is evoking legitimate alarm among all peoples.

The aggressive policy of the United States and the armed intervention against Grenada have been condemned by the representatives of many countries who spoke on their reasons for voting the way they did.

NATO COUNTRIES REACT NEGATIVELY

International Commentary: FIFTEEN AND ONE. (By V. Ardatovsky. *Izvestia*, Nov. 4, p. 4. Complete text:) How have the NATO countries reacted to President Reagan's unceremonious decision to occupy Grenada—a tiny, but independent, state? According to Agence France-Presse's correspondent in Brussels, this action "has given rise to a certain disarray in NATO circles, although it has not created the threat of a split."

"Disarray" is putting it mildly, though it is indeed too early to talk about a split. But the sharpening contradictions between NATO's leader and its followers and the growing understanding that the interests of the US and of the alliance's other member-countries do not coincide are readily apparent. In the 15 NATO countries, reaction to the swallowing up of Grenada has varied from half-hearted reproofs to sharp protests.

To begin with, many NATO countries supported the resolution condemning Reagan's aggression that Nicaragua and Zimbabwe introduced in the UN General Assembly.

In a statement, the French government called Washington's action "a startling act, from the viewpoint of international law." Great Britain's representative in the Security Council abstained from voting. All the same, in recent years it's been a long time since anyone has heard from the British Isles such open condemnation of their "senior partner." Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe said that it's impossible to justify the operation on Grenada. M. Thatcher's Cabinet was especially irritated by the fact that the White House had ignored its negative attitude toward the plan for invading the island. However, the US's actions concerned a state that is considered a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. But, as the *Financial Times* noted, "Reagan had no intention of heeding opinions of the British government that differed from his own."

It so happened that American aircraft bombed a facility on Grenada that was being built with the participation of the British Plessey Company and with financial guarantees from the government. This facility was the same airport that American propaganda has proclaimed to be a "secret military construction project" of Cuba and the USSR. The Plessey firm, which drew up the design and possesses complete documentation, has categorically rejected these fabrications. But the fact remains that the bombing caused not only moral but also material damage to Britain.

Bettino Craxi, the Chairman of Italy's Council of Ministers, who gave his blessing to the construction of a missile base in Sicily without a murmur, this time demanded in the Senate that the armed invasion of Grenada be halted and the American troops withdrawn. The Greek and Spanish governments condemned Reagan's action in no uncertain terms. An official statement from Ankara said that Turkey "can only subscribe to the opinion of others who have voiced concern."

Doubts as to the advisability of the US's actions have been voiced by Canada. Danish Foreign Minister U. Ellemann-Jensen, on behalf of his government, has expressed "deep distress" in connection with the events.

The Grenadian adventure has drawn a mixed response in the FRG, but even there it has not met with any outright support. Foreign Minister Genscher said that "the recent events affect us***in a political and psychological sense." As for the opposition, H.-J. Wischniewski, a Deputy from the Social Democratic Party of Germany, said in the Bundestag: "The day that American troops invaded Grenada is a dark day for our commonwealth"—"commonwealth" meaning NATO.

Belgium's Ministry of Foreign Relations expressed a desire to familiarize itself with the US's "circumstances and objectives" before taking a position. This was perhaps the most favorable reaction that the US received in any NATO country. But the problem is that each day brings to light "circumstances" and unseemly objectives that expose the US more and more; if a change in the opinions of Washington's allies is possible, it won't be in Washington's favor.

There are people in the US who have decided to proclaim the seizure of Grenada an outstanding military triumph for their state. But on the other side of the scales one will have to put the outburst of indignation throughout the world and the obvious discontent in the North Atlantic camp itself.

Ustinov Gets Award on 75th Birthday

DECREE OF PRESIDUM OF USSR SUPREME SOVIET—(Pravda and *Izvestia*, Oct. 30, p. 1)—awarding the Order of Lenin to Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitry Fyodorovich Ustinov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Minister of Defense, on his 75th birthday for his great services to the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

Dec. 14, 1983

Western Hemisphere

HAVANA RALLY.—F. Castro's Speech. (Pravda, Nov. 16, p. 4. 3,100 words. Excerpts:) Havana, Nov. 15 (Tass)—Fidel Castro, First Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba and Chairman of the republic's Council of State and

Council of Ministers, angrily condemned the US's criminal aggression against sovereign Grenada. He spoke in Havana at a memorial rally to honor the 24 Cuban internationalists who perished heroically on Grenada. ...

The US government despised Grenada and hated [Prime Minister M.] Bishop. It wanted to thwart the process that was under way on Grenada and to destroy its achievements that served as an example to others. The United States developed plans for the military invasion of the island—M. Bishop exposed them a good two years ago—but it could find no suitable occasion for carrying out its objectives. ...

Today no one can yet say for sure whether the discord within the Grenadian leadership was internal in origin or was sown at the bidding of imperialism. The possibility that it was the work of the CIA cannot be excluded. Who were the people who plotted against Bishop within the ranks of the party, the army and the state security service? Were they a group of extremists that had succumbed to doctrinaire political intrigue or were they simply a group of opportunists with excessive ambitions or even enemy agents who wanted to put an end to the revolution on Grenada? History alone will give the final answer to those questions. ...

Grenada has already increased the patriotic conviction and fighting spirit of the Salvadoran revolutionaries, the Nicaraguans and the Cubans. Grenada showed that it is possible to fight against crack imperialist troops and not be afraid of them. The imperialists should know that they will meet stiff resistance whenever they attempt to carry out aggression against any revolutionary people. The Pyrrhic victory on Grenada should not intoxicate them or lead to new, irreversible errors.

In Nicaragua, the US would clash with a highly patriotic and revolutionary people—united, organized, militant and armed—that will never allow themselves to be subjugated. As far as Cuba is concerned, if the US needed a crack division to wage war against a handful of people who were surrounded and in undefended positions thousands of kilometers from their homeland, how many divisions will they need against millions of fighters defending their own land and people?! ...

✓ Western Hemisphere

Notes to the Point: POISONERS.—US Chemical Weapons Used in Vietnam, Afghanistan and Grenada. Who's Next? (By A. Kuvshinnikov. Izvestia, Dec. 9, p. 4. 500 words. Condensed text:) When invited to head Grenada's provisional "government," A. McIntyre refused on the grounds of "poor health." In the political and diplomatic circles in which this high-ranking UN official moves, such an excuse is as transparent as a child's tears. He didn't want the job. He didn't want to share responsibility for the blood of those gunned down, for the tears of orphans, for the island battered by America's "Sudden Fury," or for the maimed lives of his fellow countrymen.

The tracks left on Grenada by the US 82nd Airborne Division are not only bloody but poisonous as well. According to the influential Mexican newspaper El Dia, the Pentagon, in an attempt to introduce "democracy" on the island as quickly as possible, used chemical weapons against the peaceful population. A tragic fate befell 2,000 people, among them many women and children: They were poisoned. The interventionists cold-bloodedly filmed their suffering and deaths and, to cover their tracks, shipped the bodies to the US for "further study." ...

At one time the US's chemical testing ground was Southeast Asia, then it was Afghanistan, and today it's Grenada. Where will it be tomorrow? ... A total of \$124.4 million will be allocated [in the US] during the current fiscal year alone for the production of a new, especially barbarous type of chemical weapon—binary nerve-gas munitions. It is possible that Grenada was the American special services' proving ground for this weapon's latest tests—in conditions that come as close to a combat situation as possible. After all, for the Pentagon, women and children are the same as an opponent's soldiers. ...

The tiny poisoned island in the ocean is a symbol of contempt for the norms of universal morality, a symbol of the terrorist methods being used by Washington to achieve foreign-policy goals in its maniacal attempt to block the winds of social change that are gaining strength not only in the Caribbean, but in other regions of the globe as well.