

Monologue

Grenada invasion logical

By Doug Vaughan
Editor in Chief

The invasion of Grenada, a 21-mile island with a population of 120,000, to insure the security of 1,000 Americans seems ignorant at the least, and, more importantly, on the verge of danger.

Especially considering that the Grenadian Revolutionary Military Council made a pledge to the United States insuring the safety of the American residents. In fact, the message was reportedly received 24 hours before the invasion began.

But what always seems ignorant, often, is not.

First of all, Grenada is not a peaceful Caribbean island that the U.S. decided to try out some new military procedures on. Nor the place for a vacation at this time.

The little island has had internal problems for the last month, and the security of the Americans living on the island was endangered. A "shoot on sight" curfew that was imposed last Wednesday, and that is only one reason they were endangered.

Grenada was under the rule of Maurice Bishop, until his deputy, Benard Coard, organized the extinction of Bishop and his backers. Military leaders who are described as "hardline Marxists" took over the country. Since then, the threat of Marxism through the region has brought conflict.

About half the 1,000 Americans on the island are enrolled at St. George's School of Medicine, and they were the first ones to be rescued and returned to the States.

Many of them expressed their love for America and felt that the mission had saved their lives. It most likely did.

A question that does linger in my mind is: were the American residents in danger?

My answer: Why take chances? It is all right to answer a question with a question, right?

U.S. officials did not definitely know where the information insuring the Americans' safety originated. Better yet, why be ignorant and believe them?

Once the "shoot on sight" curfew was enacted, the medical students were restricted to their campus, without guarantees of safety from Grenadian forces. The students who resided off campus have not been heard from since the curfew was imposed.

Another problem that stemmed from the invasion was that democratic leaders on Capitol Hill charged that the Reagan Administration violated the War Powers Act.

The Democrats in both houses of Congress said they would push for legislation declaring that the act would cover the Caribbean island. If passed, Reagan would have to withdraw troops within 60 days unless Congress authorizes a longer stay.

Invasion does not quite go with the old theme "baseball, hot dogs, and apple pie," but due to the threat on American lives, it was needed. At first look, I frown on the United States action, but this situation needs a second look. That look opened my eyes to the truth.



WOULD SOMEONE PLEASE INVENT A CONDENSED VERSION?

Letter to the editor

United States attack 'face saving' act

To the editor:

Tuesday the United States invaded the tiny Caribbean nation of Grenada. The Oct. 12 coup that overthrew and then executed Prime Minister Maurice Bishop left a so-called leadership vacuum that threatened the security of Americans living in Grenada. Our leaders claim the invasion was necessary to ensure our

citizens' safety and to prevent revolutionary chaos from spreading throughout the region.

In my opinion this action was reckless, irresponsible, and engineered as a type of national enema for the beating Uncle Sam has taken recently on the international scene.

The prestige loss started with the tragic downing of KAL flight 007 and climaxed

with Sunday's Beirut bombing. Since the Sept. 1 airline incident, pressures have mounted for a U.S. show of strength somewhere in the world. The coup in Grenada provided a great opportunity.

Last summer Prime Minister Bishop visited the United States desperately seeking U.S. aid. His visit and subsequent letters requesting help were completely ignored by the Reagan Administration. Given this response it's easy to understand why Bishop sought aid from the Cubans and Soviets.

The Reagan Administration has acted swiftly in condemning the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and its pressures

on Poland. He sees the long arm of Moscow behind every political struggle in the Third World where the Left has a chance of winning. The Nicaraguan Sandinistas are consistently portrayed as nothing more than Soviet puppets.

But where are the voices of condemnation when we learn about atrocities in Honduras, the Phillipines, South Africa or some other U.S. ally? Reagan has shown that he would rather cozy up to the most despotic, reactionary dictator who remains friendly to American interests, than acknowledge that there are legitimate socialist leaders in the world committed to creating economic justice in

their poverty-stricken countries.

The rationale for invading Grenada to safeguard the Americans living there is a smokescreen. Americans live in countries all over the world that experience coups. Do we land the Marines every time a government is toppled somewhere in the world?

I am frightened by Reagan's increasingly aggressive foreign policy. His saber-rattling rhetoric has become real, and his apparent success in Grenada has wider applications. No doubt countries throughout the Third World are on special alert this week.

John Hushagen

THE PRINT, a member of the Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association, aims to be a fair and impartial journalistic medium covering the campus community as thoroughly as possible. Opinions expressed in **THE PRINT** do not necessarily reflect those of the College administration, faculty, Associated Student Government or other members of **THE PRINT**. Clackamas Community College, 19600 S. Molalla Avenue, Oregon City, Oregon 97045.

