

turned up seem to hope that the strategic phoenix will emerge as an odd hybrid: a cross between a parrot and a falcon. That is an unlikely combination, but it would fit Washington's objective of a Japan that echoes the United States yet has the strength and ferocity to strike a target on command. The genetic background of the Japanese phoenix probably precludes such a hybrid. My guess is that the phoenix will indeed be a hawk, but a chicken hawk. That is, it will be strong and capable but extraordinarily reluctant to exercise those resources. However, it will also be too powerful to countenance rote mimicry of the American eagle. The net result is likely to be a significant change in the pecking order of East Asian strategic affairs.

Looking to the future, one can be reasonably confident that each of the Japanese phoenixes will be high flyers, while the Chinese hermit crab will shuffle slowly between shells. No one should yet count out the plodding crab, nor rule out the fact that the Japanese phoenix might well make a crash landing. Nevertheless, Japan's strategic prospects are stratospheric, China's earthbound.

*Edward A. Olsen is Associate Professor of Naval Security Affairs and Coordinator of Asian Studies at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey.*

## EXCURSUS 2

### Mark A. Bruzonsky on FOOL'S PARADISE IN THE MIDEAST

The resemblance was uncanny, haunting. It was as if one had been propelled a decade backward to another war, in another land, over far different issues.

Then it was the young Asian girl, arms in the air, fright in her eyes, napalm covering parts of her body, fleeing from the battles in which America was so painfully entrapped. That single picture came to symbolize Vietnamese suffering and American guilt.

Now, on page one of the *International Herald-Tribune* as I flew to Khartoum in mid-July, it was a young Lebanese girl, hands in the air, tears in her eyes, fleeing from the fighting between the Lebanese Army, backed by the U.S. and Israel, and Muslim fighters in Beirut.

There are differences, of course, in the backdrops of these two photos. But the human misery is much the same; and American complicity is undeniable and escalating, although its precise nature is unclear.

No doubt inter-Arab sectarian struggle in Lebanon—as elsewhere in Arabdom—is largely indigenous and only partly stimulated by Israeli involvement in regional affairs. Still, last year's Israeli invasion of Lebanon has altered the very character of Lebanon's misery, transforming the conflict through a brutal assertion of Israeli hegemony that had American acquiescence. Furthermore, the U.S. aid and encouragement that buttress Israel's imperial aims, if sometimes reluctantly, have escalated dramatically since the Reagan administration took office.

There can be no real doubt that, at minimum, it was an American wink that preceded the Israeli invasion and an American nod that allowed the occupation to continue. Moreover, it is American involvement that today both masks and legitimizes Israel's hold on southern Lebanon despite a multitude of protestations last year that it would withdraw quickly from all Lebanese territory. And so long as U.S. Marines maintain their uneasy presence in Beirut, such pic-

tures as that of the terrified girl should have a desperate symbolism for Americans.

The Reagan administration-inspired "peace treaty" in Lebanon has now revealed itself to be hardly more than a temporary public relations fix through which the current Washington players may have hoped to sneak by next year's November election. It now appears an excuse for installing U.S. Marines as "peace-keepers"—though, in truth, they have always been partisans.

The "treaty" could in fact be termed a farce but for the magnitude of the dangers it holds. Having at first conspired in Israel's assertion of force in Lebanon, and then having no effective policy (and perhaps not even the desire) to stand up against Israel's relentless absorption of the West Bank in blatant violation of the Camp David arrangements, the Reagan administration has acted meekly at best. Some would say contemptuously, and others would add duplicitously.

Secretary of State Shultz, in effect, chose to cooperate with rather than confront the Israelis. But in return, and against American pleadings, the Israelis have moved their forces out of the major fighting zone, and Washington has become the protector of the Phalange/Maronite government. Unable to make real progress in solving Lebanon's problems or pushing forward the badly conceived "Reagan Plan," Shultz used subterfuge and diplomatic magic. He proclaimed a peace treaty that was in reality a plot by those who had conspired in war—Washington, Jerusalem, and the Phalange in Beirut—totally excluding Israel's actual enemies, the PLO and Syria. By doing so, he exacerbated tensions already existing between Lebanon's Christian, Druse, and Shiite communities, creating the conditions for a renewed civil war and for the American military intervention that began in mid-September.

These misguided efforts Shultz has sold to an often-gullible press and a befuddled public as an American accomplishment. But all the while Lebanon suffers de facto partition, the West Bank heads for the point of no return, and a Syrian-Israeli arms race threatens a wider war—this one with direct Soviet and U.S. involvement a more serious possibility than ever before. Even more ominous is the increasing U.S. military role. Between the time of writing this piece and its appearance in print, the likelihood of a major clash involving American arms will probably grow—a clash that may well be viewed as Washington doing Israel's bidding and Washington asserting its power against the Muslim world.

While American involvement further escalates the tragedy of Lebanon, it should be recalled that the Reagan administration has utterly failed in its responsibilities to push for full implementation of the Camp David Accords, including the "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people." It has been unable to assert American national interests ahead of Israeli imperial designs. And it has seriously eroded U.S. credibility throughout the Middle East, weakening a number of key client regimes—especially those in Cairo, Riyadh, and Amman. Trapping ourselves in Lebanon will hardly help the situation.

The Reagan-Shultz team has brought us to a diplomatic fool's paradise in the Middle East and could be heading us toward a major explosion, pitting American-backed Israeli and Phalange forces against Soviet-backed Syrian and Muslim armies. We are in the eye of the hurricane, impotent in our meek pretense that the worst is over. The only reasonable policy is to refuse to be drawn further into the Lebanese civil war on the side of the Phalange and Israelis and to return to the role of peace-maker in the Arab-Israeli dispute, building on the progress achieved at Camp David by firmly refusing to allow Israel to absorb the West Bank and cast itself as regional superpower.

Most dangerous of all for the Middle East, the U.S. has deferred to the Revisionist government in Jerusalem, which is implementing its scheme for a Greater Israel oblivious to the costs to Israel's soul, to the Jewish people as a whole, and to U.S. and Western interests in the Arab Middle East. Sooner or later the United States will pay, and the price may well make the "loss" of Iran seem insignificant.

*Mark A. Bruzonsky, an Associate Editor of Worldview, has recently returned from a visit to Khartoum and Cairo.*

## EXCURSUS 3

### Richard O'Mara on CELLULOID AND REVOLUTION

Rarely do Americans learn the truth about events in Latin America. Perhaps they have never cared enough to demand it. And in fact there have been very few people around capable or desirous or influential enough to bring the truth home. Worse, there have always been those in high places bent on concealing it.

*Missing* was the first film in recent years to tell a believable story about events in a Latin American country—here Chile. Beginning with the kidnapping and murder by General Augusto Pinochet's soldiers of a young American expatriate following the coup against Salvador Allende in September, 1973, it lays open the connivance of American diplomats in Santiago in that deed. Jack Lemmon was the star.

Now we have a second film—*Under Fire*—which relates some of the events of the war in Nicaragua that succeeded in overthrowing Anastasio Somoza. Here, Nick Nolte is an itinerant press photographer with faint allegiance to anyone or anything and only the vaguest notion of journalistic objectivity. The weakness of his professional detachment is almost immediately obvious, for the film shows us his ready abandonment of objectivity in favor of deploying his considerable talents as photographer on behalf of the Sandinista revolution.

*Under Fire* has more excitement, *Missing* more suspense. But both films convey with great accuracy the ambience in which the historical events of Chile and Nicaragua took place. And though I don't know where *Under Fire* was filmed, I can report at first hand that the towns and villages it recreates—just so many piles of rubble—are to be found all over Nicaragua and El Salvador. Furthermore, these films indict quite openly the apparatus through which the United States asserts its hegemony in Latin America. This is, in fact, what sets them apart from other American-made films with a Latin American setting, and it is why they merit attention. They are, then, *political* films—actually, finely wrought propaganda. But to characterize them in this way is not to say they do not portray an accurate overall picture of events, even if they are occasionally less than accurate about specifics.

I think such films are needed—and in the United States needed more than ever before. They will, one hopes, offer a corrective to the attitude and simplistic worldview that linger even after the demise of John Foster Dulles—the sort of approach to Latin America and U.S. interests there that led to the CIA-inspired coup against the government of Guatemala in 1954.

It is easy to point the finger of blame at the man at the helm in Washington today, someone ignorant of Latin America yet—to borrow from Yeats—"full of passionate intensity"

about the place. But this is to miss the point or conceal it. In reality, the president has a constituency for the big-stick policy. As a candidate he received a feverishly favorable response when he laid a new claim to the Panama Canal, and he appears to have a constituency for an all-out assault against the Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. Many in the United States, it seems, continue in their contempt for the little brown people south of the border and consider it perfectly correct to order their affairs for them. President Reagan is merely the heir of Teddy Roosevelt, who "took Panama," and of Woodrow Wilson, who vowed he would teach the Mexicans "to elect good men." When Ronald Reagan steps down from office, we might find ourselves with a leader who is less inclined to treat smaller, weaker nations with abandon. But sooner or later another in the Reagan mold may well be pushed forward—for the simple reason that many Americans look upon matters in the same way.

Still, there may have been progress. Twenty years ago such films as *Missing* and *Under Fire* would not have been made—at least not as competently or with such established performers as Lemmon and Nolte. Those films would not have been accepted by other than an audience of anxious ideologues seeking intellectual reinforcement of their views. And they certainly would not have succeeded as entertainment. *Missing* and *Under Fire* most surely do.

*Richard O'Mara, Foreign Editor of the Baltimore Sun, writes frequently on Latin American affairs.*

## EXCURSUS 4

### Franco Ferrarotti on TERRORISM & THE CATHOLIC ETHIC

There is something unique about Italian terrorism. Certainly there are terrorists in Northern Ireland, in Corsica, in the Federal Republic of Germany. But the goals of these individuals and groups are fairly clear: national independence, regional autonomy, political opposition in a country excessively centripetal. In Italy, on the contrary, terrorism is at once ruthlessly active and purposeless. And it includes certain distinctive features that cannot be perceived anywhere else.

Italian terrorism possesses a religious connotation. It does not seem to be concerned with immediate political negation; it does not serve a practical goal. Rather, it appears to believe that only through blood and total sacrifice can the sins of the world be purged and purified. True, this is fairly universal as far as terrorism is concerned. But certain characteristics do appear exclusively Italian-Mediterranean and are typical of a Catholic culture. The *repentant terrorist*, or "Red Brigadier," is one such example—someone who not only confesses his crimes but gives names and places and, by cooperating with the authorities, is forgiven. In fact, examination of family background has revealed that terrorists come not only from the traditional Left but from all ideological "directions." Even more alarming is the discovery that many terrorist leaders are the product of a strict religious education, the scions of Catholic, rather archaic families with a conservative social and political outlook. Mario Moretti, indicted as the master-mind of the infamous murder of Prime Minister Aldo Moro, had been a protégé of a priest and was a religion instructor in a technical school.

For all terrorists, a great success involves a great danger.