

# Yankee go home

analysis by Oscar Amar

Eighteen years ago the U.S. invaded the Dominican Republic under the pretext that the country was in "political turmoil" and it was a strategic link in the chain of Caribbean Islands. The U.S. also claimed that American lives were in danger and interference was necessary. Today history repeats itself nearby in Grenada.

American forces, together with a token three hundred troops from various Caribbean countries, have invaded Grenada - in the words of Ronald Reagan, to "restore order" and "protect American citizens."

This invasion is a criminal act and completely unjustified.

Here are some reasons for the invasion:

- To restore U.S. prestige lost in the aftermath of events in Lebanon.
- Bring down a socialist system and impose one more favorable to the U.S.
- Stop a Cuban "military build up" in Grenada which is being used as a base for military shipments to Central America, presumably Nicaragua.
- Protect U.S. citizens and guard national security.

The first two reasons seem valid - the latter two are absolute crap.

First, the deaths of over two hundred and twenty marines in the Lebanon are a reflection of the shift of the American role in that war-torn country from "peace-keeping to war-making." The attack on the marines demonstrates very clearly that the U.S. presence is resented by many since they play a partisan role. Unable to retaliate in the Lebanon, the U.S. has invaded Grenada to restore good old American "prestige" - I can assure them that they have little, if any, prestige left.

Secondly, the U.S. seeks to put in place a provisional government which will ultimately and predictably hand power to elements friendly towards the U.S. These friendly elements would presumably be equal to such freedom-loving people as Chile's Pinochet - an expert in torture, El Salvador's 'D' abbaion - specializing in Death squad lotteries - and Nicaragua's Somoza - the author of

"procedures for transferring a nation's income to a Swiss bank in forty-eight hours."

What the U.S. seeks to establish in Grenada is a government which will provide it with a free hand in Grenadian economic, political and social affairs.

Thirdly, while insisting that Grenada is a base for exporting arms to Central America, the Reagan administration has failed to provide any evidence to this effect. In fact, the U.S. suffered a great deal of embarrassment at the United Nations General Assembly several months ago. After displaying pictorial "evidence" of shipments of arms, supposedly channelled from Cuba through a friendly nation into Nicaragua and on to the guerillas in El Salvador, it was discovered the illustrations under question were five years old and belonged to the Somoza period.

Lastly, protection of U.S. citizens could have easily been secured through political means rather than by gunboat diplomacy. As for national security, I would venture to say that Cuba and Grenada were not about to invade the U.S. So, the statement made by Reagan, "we got there just in time," does not make much sense.

Clearly, there were armaments in Grenada - so what: Does a sovereign nation not have the right to obtain arms for self-defense? If not, then how does the U.S. justify supplying "peace-loving" Israel with the most sophisticated weaponry available? Why does it supply Honduras and Guatemala with military aid and personnel? How does it explain aid to the military junta in Brazil? The list goes on.

What the U.S. fails to recognize is that Grenada, however small, has every right to purchase anything it pleases to secure its borders - the same goes for Cuba, Nicaragua and any other country fighting to maintain its national sovereignty. The sooner the U.S. accepts this the better. The sooner Latin America and in this case, the Caribbean, cease to be viewed as a ground for fighting "Soviet expansionism," the more possible it will be to achieve a political solution to conflicts such as the one in Central America.

Let Reagan not think that Grenada serves as an example Central America. I hope the Bay of Pigs has not been forgotten. Nicaragua will not be as easy.



Peace demonstrators who think nuclear war is bad.

photo Bill Inglee

## Trudeau warlike

by Neal Watson

NDP defense critic Pauline Jewett says Prime Minister Trudeau is only paying "lip service to the cause of peace."

Jewett said Trudeau should be playing a more positive and vocal role in the disarmament debate. She also said that Trudeau should be pushing for a postponement in the testing of the cruise missile.

Jewett said that Canada has the resources and the stature to assume a leadership role in the struggle for world peace.

"Canada must be more assertive in the councils of NATO and the United Nations."

Prime Minister Trudeau's "suffocation" speech is an example of an earlier initiative that Canada has failed to promote.

Calling the Prime Minister a "summit-oriented fellow," Jewett said that Trudeau "grandstands" too much for the international community and does not really seem committed to the idea of arms reduction.

## Arms race robs the poor

by Ken Lenz

"We can go into world development or we can proceed with the arms build-up, but not both," said Larry McDermott at an IDC sponsored forum last Friday about the "Implications of the Arms Race."

The forum was one of several organized to promote United Nations Disarmament Week.

McDermott, who is the director of "Plenty" (a non-governmental international development organization), referred to the UN's first special assembly on disarmament.

He says, "The unanimous conclusion was that if the arms race continues we are faced with inevitable annihilation."

"There are presently about 45 military conflicts going on today; the USSR supplying armaments for 19, the United States for 20."

But McDermott noted, "Canada is also in the top ten for armament production and sales in the world."

And the times are changing, "during the second World War the military spending actually enhanced the economy - today this is not so," says McDermott.

The unemployment problem is related to the arms race as well. McDermott commented, "if our arms budget were recycled into the economy we could get 48 per cent more jobs for the same cost. This is because military spending is very cost-inefficient."

McDermott says the arms race affects developing countries as well.

"Third World countries are often forced into buying arms instead of aid. Arms are predominating both the imports and the economies of many developing nations."

The 80s were declared by the United Nations the "Decade of Water," its mission to bring sanitary water throughout the world.

Says McDermott, "a very small part of the money spent on arms could accomplish this goal."

"It gets back to a cheque book balance - if you only have so much money you can either spend it on arms or on development."

The forum was summarized by a quote from former United States President Eisenhower, "every dollar that goes to the military is a dollar robbed from the poor."

## Cold-war tension

by Ken Lenz

"Every cold war speech hurts the unofficial peace movements in the Soviet Bloc countries," said author and European peace movement leader E.P. Thompson in a recent telephone interview.

The interview, sponsored by the East European Solidarity Committee, focussed on the current state of the unofficial peace movement in Eastern Europe.

"In the last three years there has been an establishment of certain spaces in Eastern Europe where unofficial movements can organize," said Thompson.

"The places were the churches in East Germany, and the

universities in Hungary."

Thompson said the dialogue in Czechoslovakia and Poland has been virtually non-existent because of the tension created by missile deployment in Europe," said Thompson.

The cold-war politics which the US is using to justify their invasion of Grenada is also adding to the pressure that these governments put on their indigenous unofficial peace movements, charged Thompson.

Thompson says, "The East European peace movement (in order for it to be successful) has to be able to open up discourse without being confrontational."

## Typing service plans

by Lois C. Dayes

It started out as an election campaign promise but nobody really thought VP Internal Peter Block would follow the plan through.

The promise was to set up a Students' Union typing service. Last Tuesday, Council approved Block's proposal.

Proposed prices for the service are \$1.25 per page, or if a student wishes to rent a typewriter, the charge will be \$1.00 per hour.

The start-up date for the service is tentatively slated for January 9, 1984. Currently, the SU is seeking a location for the service.

The major options are Room

280 or the area across from the University Bookstore basement.

The typing service's final home will "depend on the renovations that are currently going on in SUB," said Block.

The SU will buy ten electric typewriters to kick things off. A project co-ordinator, though, has yet to be hired for the service.

Block has a \$5000 monthly budget to work with; of that total, \$1250 has been allotted to the project coordinator. Revenues for the typing service have been projected at an average of \$1787 per month for the first four months. The typing pool, that is rental of the typewriter for one dollar an hour, is expected to bring in \$1200 per month.

