

MAY, 1986

EDITORIAL

Stop Reagan's Acts of War!

Acts of war by any other designation — and Ronald Reagan chose to christen the bombings of five cities in Libya as a "right of self-defense" — are acts of war. The middle of the night 2,800-nautical-mile journey of Air Force F-111 bombers from bases in England to the shores of Libya brought death to over 100 Libyans. Among the dead was the fifteen-month-old daughter of Col. Muammar Qaddafi; among the injured, two of his young sons. Was one purpose of this raid an attempted assassination of the terrorist Qaddafi, even if it meant the lives of dozens upon dozens of innocent Libyans?

Ignoring the warnings against such military actions by almost all of the European NATO members, finding a cohort for the long distance bombing scheme in Britain's Prime Minister Thatcher, informing Congressional leaders well after the F-111 bombers were on their way and only shortly before the actual bombing raid as his lip service to the War Powers Act, Reagan had his 20 minutes of state terror bombing carried out, and then sanctimoniously spoke to the American people about our "duty" to carry out such a deadly mission.

The outpouring of opposition to the bombing, most especially in Europe, was immediate. Not only were there large demonstrations in a number of countries, among them Italy, Greece, France and especially West Germany, but in England, Thatcher was subjected to attack both in mass opposition and within the halls of Parliament. Here in the United States there have been small protests and certainly much questioning.

The leader of one nuclear behemoth, Reagan, has now clapped down the Libya of Muammar Qaddafi. But its implications are global. Ronald Reagan, Commander-in-Chief, seems determined to be in command of a war. Was this act alone aimed against Libya, or is it preparation for war against Nicaragua? Was the message directed to Qaddafi, or to Russia's Mikhail Gorbachev, who the U.S. now appears prepared to challenge throughout the Third World, not excluding nuclear dueling? Was this a testing of weapons for global distances needed to wage war, even nuclear war, if one has no allies?

It is precisely because of the global implications, including those here at home against the American masses, that we must make our opposition to the terrorism of a Reagan unequivocal. We cannot allow the unpopularity of a Qaddafi to impede the necessity of a full opposition to Reagan, especially here in the U.S. To oppose Reagan in Libya and globally is inseparable from opposition to the despicable acts of Qaddafi's regime. We need to stay the nuclear, imperial, terrorist hand of Reaganism ideologically and by mass activities. Only then can masses everywhere, including in Libya and here in the U.S., open doors to full freedom.

11060