

Drive to overturn sovereignty in Haiti

by D.E. Pettingell

An emergency meeting of the Organization of American States (OAS), held on Dec. 7 in Washington, rejected proposals for a Grenada-style invasion of Haiti in the name of "democracy." While arguments for an invasion, either of U.S. Marines or a supranational force, had first been couched as necessary to "save Haiti from itself," in the week before the OAS vote, spokesmen for the U.S. Eastern Establishment had made clear that their goal in Haiti, is to overturn the concept of sovereignty itself.

Proposals that the United States lead the way in creating a supranational military force to police Haiti have swamped Washington since violence forced the Haitian government to cancel the Nov. 29 national elections. That angered the agents of the "Project Democracy" secret government in the United States, who had pumped \$8 million into setting up the machinery for the elections in Haiti, an operation centered around the Provisional Electoral Council.

The international press immediately charged that the military was behind the violence, and demanded the resignation of the head of the provisional government, Gen. Henri Namphrey.

When the Haitian government disbanded the Provisional Electoral Council, charging that it had sought foreign interference in Haiti's internal affairs, Project Democracy screamed that *Haiti's* military is the problem, and must be replaced by *foreign* military forces!

Rep. Stephen Solarz (D-N.Y.), a strong supporter of the National Endowment for Democracy, Project Democracy's public arm, led the campaign to call for the invasion of Haiti on Dec. 1. Solarz demanded that the OAS form a military "regional peacekeeping force" to be sent to Haiti to "restore order and allow elections to take place." The United States would be a "key component" in the multilateral force, a spokesman for Solarz explained.

On Dec. 3, Brian Atwood, president of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, the Democratic Party's side of the NED, demanded that the OAS act to restore order in Haiti, if necessary sending in "an international peacekeeping force" to do so. Atwood had just returned from Haiti, which he had visited as the head of a 30-man international delegation invited in by the Provisional Electoral Council to observe the elections.

U.S. congressmen quickly lined up behind the proposal. District of Columbia congressional delegate Walter Fauntroy organized the Black Caucus to issue a statement on Dec. 2

calling for "the establishment of an international peacekeeping force." When House Majority Leader Jim Wright cautioned, "If there were any intervention, it ought to be done by the OAS," Fauntroy assured the press that he had lined up bipartisan support for a draft resolution requesting every supranational agency in the book to send in troops: the U.N., the OAS, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, and the Caribbean Economic Community.

By Dec. 4, the *Washington Post* could editorialize, "Rumors are circulating in Haiti about an American military invasion, like the Marines' landing there in 1915. . . . While the Marines aren't going back to Haiti, continuing bloodshed there might well result in an international peacekeeping force to see the country through an election."

OAS warning

On Dec. 7, the OAS called an emergency meeting, to discuss the Haitian crisis. When it came to intervention, OAS member states voted "No," and issued a condemnation of any attempts to intervene in the internal affairs of Haiti, or any other member states. The OAS Permanent Council resolved, "To affirm that states have the fundamental duty to abstain from intervening, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State," reads the five-point resolution, adopted by broad consensus. The resolution also called on the OAS secretary general "to provide to the Haitian people the fullest possible assistance of a humanitarian nature."

Haitian Foreign Minister Herard Abraham, traveled to Washington to be present at the OAS session. "His presence helped avoid the inclusion of any interventionist reference in the resolution," an Ibero-American diplomat commented. Abraham explained the position of his country and pledged that elections would take place as soon as possible. So far, they are scheduled for Feb. 7, 1988.

The OAS resolution was the result of three hours of debate where there was no disagreement among member states on the issue of non-intervention. The strongest defenders of the principle were Mexico, Peru, and Argentina. Mexican OAS Ambassador Antonio de Icaza expressed his "deepest concern" over "opinions, widely reported in important news outlets, in favor of a unilateral or multilateral intervention in Haiti." He said he was surprised to hear that those who "advocate intervention, or even aggression" dared to "express their hope that the OAS would participate in such reprehensible actions."

Peruvian OAS Ambassador Luis González Posada echoed his Mexican colleague and called for Haitians to decide their own electoral schedule without "pressures or interferences of any kind." Others reiterated that the principle of non-intervention is and must continue to be the cornerstone of inter-American relations.

After the OAS vote, the Eastern Establishment screamed, "The OAS was too timid yesterday in backing free elections in Haiti without endorsing an inter-American force to guar-

ante the process," as the *New York Times* decried in its Dec. 8 editorial.

Instead, the *Times* argued the need for a new definition to the principle of non-intervention. "Compelling circumstances can justify armed infringement of national sovereignty. Those circumstances prevail in Haiti today." Accusing the Haitian government of permitting "chaos and terror," the *Times* argued, "Haiti is a special case, not one of civil war but of anarchy," and said that the country will "descend into deeper tragedy . . . without inter-American intervention."

Next target: Panama

Panama is the next target of this theory of non-sovereignty.

Speaking at a forum on the "Crisis in Panama" held at Georgetown University on Dec. 8, Panamanian opposition leader Roberto Eisenmann called for foreign intervention, not excluding a military invasion, into Haiti. The concept of "sovereignty of the State" is outdated, Eisenmann said. Today it must become subordinated to the concept of the "sovereignty of the individual." Haiti should be the test case for this doctrine, he stated.

Sharing the podium with Eisenmann was an old foe of Panama's, Dr. Norman Bailey, former National Security Council official. Bailey demanded that a similiar "democracy" be installed in Panama, which, he claimed, requires both that the commander of the Panamanian Defense Forces, Gen. Manuel A. Noriega, be removed, and, "getting rid of the institution" of the military entirely in Panama.

General Noriega, a nationalist, telephoned Haitian leader Gen. Henri Namphy to express "Latin American understanding and mutual solidarity between their two armies and governments," according to the *New York Times* Dec. 5. Both referred to the "disinformation campaigns skillfully orchestrated by powerful foreign interests as well as strong internal movements of destabilization."

Signor Antonio Stradivari made instruments
Unequaled by calipers, lasers or meters.
Modern Audio is a similar artisan-form
Employing proprietary crafty skills.
Still, no one knows, how far music reproduction can go.
Money should be spent to find out: Let's
Fund a crash program of research and development,
Encase results in attractive wooden cabinetry,
Advertise our accomplishment to the world
And take the market over!

The Listening Studio

23 Stillings Street
Boston MA 02210

For the Love of Music and Technology

Runcie adversary found dead in U.K.

by Mark Burdman

An important political-theological adversary of Queen Elizabeth's beloved Archbishop of Canterbury Dr. Robert Runcie has been "removed" from the British scene. In an event reminiscent of some of Edgar Allan Poe's short stories, New College, Oxford University don Dr. Gareth Bennett, now identified as the author of an attack on Runcie in an official Church of England publication, was found dead at his Oxford home during the evening of Dec. 7. Police are claiming that "all the indications" were that Dr. Bennett had taken his life, although no suicide note was found. He was found dead in his garage, his body lying in his car with a tube leading from the exhaust to the interior of the car. Before his body was found by a friend, Dr. Bennett's cat had been found dead in his house. An inquest into his death was opened on Dec. 9.

After Bennett's death, two high-level Church of England officials, Derek Pattinson, secretary general of the General Synod and James Shelley, secretary of the Church Commissioners, held a press conference Dec. 8, and stated that Dr. Bennett had been the author of a harsh attack on Runcie's leadership, which had appeared in the church's "Who's Who" publication, the 1987-88 *Crockford's Clerical Directory*. Previously, the identity of the anonymously authored *Crockford's* article had been kept secret. Pattinson and Shelley decided to announce this, after the Oxford coroner had indicated he was going to launch a police investigation to find out the author of the *Crockford's* piece, in an attempt to discover the motives for Dr. Bennett's death.

On Dec. 4, the *Daily Mail* of London had headlined, "Attack on Runcie Upsets the Queen," noting: "The personal attack on the Archbishop of Canterbury in the preface to the new *Crockford's* has offended the Queen, who is head of the Church of England." The *Crockford's* preface accuses Runcie of elitism, of being an ineffectual leader, and of overseeing the moral decline of the church. It had been published out of the London headquarters of the church, at Lambeth Palace, and, therefore, with official authorization, even if behind Runcie's back.

According to reports from the U.K., Bennett had been coming under extreme pressure in the days before his death, from pro-Runcie liberals in the church hierarchy. The *Daily Express* reported Dec. 9 that Bennett was to "face a fierce inquisition" called by church officials for Dec. 10, to answer for his actions.

It can be surmised that the mobilization against Bennett