The war against Iraq has degenerated into a quagmire, as more and more GIs and Iraqis are fed into the meat grinder. It’s a combination of imperial religious crusade and gun-slinging treasure hunt, like the Spanish Conquistadors wiping out the Aztecs and making off with a mountain of gold. Raids and detention camps are higher priorities than restoring water and electricity for Iraqi families. These crusaders are doling out Iraq’s resources to corporate cronies like Halliburton and Bechtel. The Iraqis have enough oil to fill the Grand Canyon, but the Americans are too busy trying to figure out who’s shooting at them to get it flowing again, resulting in a gas shortage. A Halliburton unit is now shipping in gasoline to Iraq at $1.62 a gallon (more than twice the going rate in the Middle East), and the Bush administration’s Occupier-in-Command, Paul Bremer, is paying $250 million a month for it, all with Iraqi oil money.

This endless “war against terror” spans the globe. In Colombia, those who speak out against injustice are brutalized by a death-squad regime armed, trained and financed by the United States. In Venezuela, the Republicans and Democrats both conspire to oust the government of Hugo Chavez because he demands that the poor have a right to the nation’s wealth. The Palestinians have been abandoned to the regime of terror Israel inflicts upon them daily. In Asia, Bush is heaping weapons on autocratic regimes that desperately want to portray homegrown conflicts over poverty and repression as battlegrounds in the terror war.

Americans are wondering why we’ve dished out more than $160 billion for the Iraq War and are spending more on social programs in Iraq than back home. But that’s the way of the Bushies. They’ve got trillions for the ultra-rich and a smack upside the head for the rest of us. We have been saddled with a declining economy and a massive federal deficit that the Republicans gleefully proclaim will “starve the beast”—bankrupt government.

But hope too is on the rise. The World Trade Organization was dealt what may be a terminal blow by people power in Cancun. Labor is shaking off its lethargy and organizing alongside activists to topple the Free Trade Area of the Americas summit next month in Miami. Venezuelans have just tossed out a president who answered more to the IMF than his own people.

Here at home, from the Battle of Seattle in December 1999 to the millions in the streets last Feb. 15 opposing the war and the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride, we’ve seen the greatest outpouring of dissent in a generation.

Come next November, it’s payback time. Bush’s poll numbers have fallen faster than Saddam’s statue. But King George and his court of crooks and charlatans are afraid of the power of dissent, and are shredding the Constitution to suppress it. They may still find a way to steal another election, with a little help from their friends who own the electronic voting machines. We can’t afford that. But at the same time, we don’t want to install a Democrat who offers me-too Republicanism.

For three years now, The Independent has been proud to be part of this growing independent people’s movement. We know Americans are hungry for the truth and solutions, and not for celebrity politics and tabloid scandals.

Together, our collective power can create the tipping point for when the Bush presidency finally crumbles. We invite you to subscribe and join us for what will be an exciting year.
A QUAGMIRE BY ANY NAME

By AK GUPTA

Welcome to the “West Bank on the Tigris” as this is how residents of Baghdad’s Al-Tashree’s neighborhood greet visitors these days. They’ve watched as Paul Bremer and other occupation officials have settled into the nearby Republican Palace and U.S. forces have enclosed the two-square-mile neighborhood in a 10-foot-high, 20-inch-thick concrete barrier, according to Agence-France Presse.

Traffic is funnelled through a single opening where everyone and everything is searched by Iraqi police while a GI mans a machine gun atop a 60-ton tank keeps watch. The rationale is security, which is also supposed to explain the 10-foot-high mounds of dirt ringing Baghdad’s center and why demonstrations cannot come within half a kilometer of military and occupation facilities.

Dina Saleh, an 18-year-old resident of Al-Tashree, fumes at the restrictions. “We are held captive. The Israelis surround Palestinians by a net to draw on Israeli experience…”

Some of that Israeli experience include importing cheap labor from Asia to replace Palestinians who are considered a “security risk.” The Financial Times revealed on Oct. 16 that U.S. contractors are shopping in “South Asia to implement contracts from prison-building to catering for U.S. troops.”

Iraqis are a security threat, says a Pakistani manager in Baghdad for the Tamimi Company, which is contracted to cater for 60,000 soldiers in Iraq. “We cannot depend on them.” The company employs 1,800 Pakistanis, Indians, Bangladeshis and Nepalese in its kitchens, and uses only a few dozen Iraqis for cleaning. (Tamimi, which also pays workers only $3 a day, is a subcontractor for Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg Brown and Root.)

Overall, the Pentagon is employing the Israeli operational strategy of raids, wall-building, checkpoints, detentions and informants. And like the Israelis, U.S. forces are alienating the population. The difference is that Israel has so far been willing to sustain the costs of occupation because its very existence is based upon the theft of Palestinian land. The U.S. occupation is mainly about securing profits for Bush’s corporate buddies and cheap oil for road-hogging Hummers.

So it would be a mistake to think that the U.S. occupation of Iraq is just a reenactment of the Israeli occupation. In many ways the debate over the conflict centers on the most appropriate historical analogy for the U.S. conquest. Initially, White House officials promoted the “liberation of Iraq” as akin to the U.S. occupation of Japan, which is that U.S. contractors are shipping in “South Asia to implement contracts from prison-building to catering for U.S. troops.”

Iraqis are a security threat, says a Pakistani manager in Baghdad for the Tamimi Company, which is contracted to cater for 60,000 soldiers in Iraq. “We cannot depend on them.” The company employs 1,800 Pakistanis, Indians, Bangladeshis and Nepalese in its kitchens, and uses only a few dozen Iraqis for cleaning. (Tamimi, which also pays workers only $3 a day, is a subcontractor for Halliburton subsidiary Kellogg Brown and Root.)

Overall, the Pentagon is employing the Israeli operational strategy of raids, wall-building, checkpoints, detentions and informants. And like the Israelis, U.S. forces are alienating the population. The difference is that Israel has so far been willing to sustain the costs of occupation because its very existence is based upon the theft of Palestinian land. The U.S. occupation is mainly about securing profits for Bush’s corporate buddies and cheap oil for road-hogging Hummers.

So it would be a mistake to think that the U.S. occupation of Iraq is just a reenactment of the Israeli occupation. In many ways the debate over the conflict centers on the most appropriate historical analogy for the U.S. conquest. Initially, White House officials promoted the “liberation of Iraq” as akin to the U.S. occupation of Japan, which is part of a people to resist an occupation. The question in Iraq is how long — and how many are willing to die — will it take for the U.S. military and political establishment to come to that realization.
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By John Talbott

Debbie Rauth’s husband Jeffrey was activated by the Army Reserves in September of 2002. They live in the Middle East in April. While she has stayed home in Marshall, Missouri, to raise their five children, he has helped the 129th Transportation Company haul golf carts, motor boats and SUVs (as well as M-1 Abrams tanks) across Iraq’s dan-gerous highways.

Rauth, 40, who voted for Bush in 2000, is now one of the leaders in a hugely vocal online campaign to bring her husband’s unit home.

“Our husbands’ and our soldier’s lives are being tossed around like a ‘Away of the Century’ movie. And they don’t see any reason for that except greed.”

As the United States first long-term occupation of another country since Vietnam, the military becomes bloodier and more chaotic, military family members like Rauth are beginning to raise their voices in the belief that supporting the troops ultimately means ending the war.

“I think it has a tremendous impact in how the anti-war movement is received by public and Congress,” says Ben Chittie of Vietnam Veterans Against the War. Family members and returning vets provide political credibility.

“It (the military families movement) is relatively small right now,” adds Professor Robert Brueggemann, author of Making of War. Military Dissent and Politics in the Vietnam Era. “But as more reserves get called in and more soldiers get killed, it can only get worse.”

Buzzanko notes that President Lyndon Johnson repeatedly refused to call up the reserves at the height of the Vietnam War for fear of the social disruption it would cause. After Vietnam, the Pentagon set in place a political tripeart by reconfiguring its forces so that it would be impossible to carry out a military occupation without quickly resorting to large numbers of reserves to carry out day-to-day tasks – the engineering, policing, medical support, transportation, public relations and civil administration.

The Bush administration crisscrossed a threshold in mid-September when it announced that 20,000 reserves currently stationed in Iraq and Kuwait would have their overseas deployment extended from six months to 12 and that their total mobilization could be extended to a full 24 months.

Members of Congress were besieged with complaints from across the country as the Army of the 129th Transportation Company took their online petition drive received 8,000 signatures overnight. The military brass openly speculated that there would be a mass exodus of Guard and Reserve troops at the end of their current deployments.

“Extending arduous tours of duty in the middle of a deployment demonstrates not only poor planning, but a complete disregard for the families of our military families who are already making tremendous personal and financial sacrifices,” a former Navy Recruiter wrote on 129thbringthemhome.com. At home, Rauth tried to explain the situation to her five children. “They cried and they were angry. They don’t understand why the military and our president lied to them.”

Other military family members are also raising their voices.

Fernando Suarez del Solar of Exondido, California, started Fundación Guerrero Azteca this spring after the Marines refused to pay the full burial costs for his son Jesús, who was killed by an unexploded cluster bomb one week into the war. Guerrero Azteca assists other Spanish-speaking families with burial costs and with psychological counseling. Suarez has since traveled to Baghdad and spoken before Congress as a passionate critic of the war.

“We are there are no winners, only victims,” he says. “They [the troops] are the first victims of this crime.”

Kimberly Huff, 32, is one of the leaders of the 43rd Medical Company’s Family Readiness Group (FRG), which helps military families cope with the day-to-day stress of deployment. Military officials usually attend the FRG’s monthly get-togethers. They admonish family members not to talk about the war with the press lest they “compromise the mission.”

“I think the first reaction of most people is to obey,” Huff says. “I get all sorts of honks and waves of approval as I drive the freeways,” Huff says. “I had one woman approach me in the parking lot the other day and say, ‘I thought the war was over but I guess I was wrong.’”

Adelle Kubin, 50, writes letters constantly to local newspapers and to her elected representatives. Her daughter joined the Oregon National Guard five years ago. She already had wildland fire-fighting experience and needed money to finish college. When Kubin asked her daughter if she was sure she wanted to join, she replied, “Oh, Mom, there’s never going to be another war.” Now she finds herself stationed in the northern city of Mosul where her unit comes under nightly mortar and sniper fire.

A lot of those guys had never prepared for something like this,” Kubin notes. “They were supposed to build roads and fight fires in Oregon, not be killing kids or getting shot at all the time.”

Last November, Nancy Lessin and Charley Richardson started Military Families Speak Out (MFSO—www.mfsorg.com). The objective of their non-profit organization is to “bring attention to news stories that don’t make it into the mainstream media.”

“Families Speak Out is really just an extension of what soldiers are saying. We’re more angry than the generals who are making these decisions and who never hit the ground, and who don’t get shot at or have to look at the bloody bodies and the burnt-out bodies, and the dead babies and all that kinda stuff,”

– Spc. Anthony Castillo, Third Infantry Division.

The Army Times newspaper has become a soapbox for discontented troops. First Lt. Eric Rahman, writing from Camp Doha, Kuwait, states that “quality of life is at an all-time low.” One wife of a national guardsman deployed in Baghdad pleaded in a letter to the Army Times: “Please send our troops home.”

Both the Pentagon’s official organ, Stars and Stripes, has been forced to pay attention. It notes that of 200 letters it printed between June and September 2003 from troops in Iraq and Kuwait, about 60 percent “complained about various things, ranging from living conditions and problems with mail to redeployment dates back home.”

Stars and Stripes send three teams of reporters to Iraq to interview the troops and publish a seven-day-long series of dispatches. They also conducted a survey of nearly 2,000 troops about living conditions.

“Some troops live like princes, while others sleep in the sand.”

A number of letters have criticized officers who are rotating home while their troops remain in Iraq. One former GI writes, “This is the same stupid policy we had in Vietnam.” A frequent complaint is a lack of or poor-quality equipment. One sergeant writing from Germany states, “About 95 percent of my unit uses money out of his own pocket for special gear because basic issue doesn’t meet our expectations.”

The Australian Broadcasting Corporation reported receiving an email from a soldier in Iraq complaining that while the troops’ “look like hobos and live like pigs… those running Iraq are more concerned with ‘hooking up with nice-looking gals from U.S. and Iraq.’ He says for staff at the headquarters, their biggest problem is running out of Coke and Diet Coke to go with their steak and crab leg dinner.”
THE CONFESSIONS OF ST. BILL

Come unto me, my lost Democratic flock. For three decades you have wandered the desert, drinking the bitter nectar of Republican policies. Torment has been thy bread, fed by the wicked hands of King Dub-ya who worships only the false idol Mammon.

But do your eyes bear the mark of misty-eyed nostalgia? Do not exalt me nor yearn for my days among you that the faithfulness of "The Clinton Years." Forsooth, I deserve only your curses, for my heart is heavy with wickedness. I have sinned against you and I visit to deliver The Confessions of Saint Bill.

My transgressions were multiple even before I was inaugurated as your High Priest. I was creased the beginning of my sinful ways. I promised thee much, but flip-flopped like a great sea beast on land. I said, "Behold jobs programs!" but my hands were empty. I spoke of raising fuel efficiency standards, and watched them fall. I preached helping welfare recipients but pitched a million women and children off the rolls and into squalor and misery. I told labor their suffering was over, but did naught to lessen their wretched burden to gain new followers. I failed, my fortitude was lacking, my spirit weak. I said I would protect HIV-positive immigrants, but continued their persecution. I spoke mighty words for a Freedom of Choice but never fought for it. I said I would preserve the pastures and forests and waters and creatures within, instead I delivered them unto multitudinous tribes of developers. I was too covetous of my political capital to ever do anything with it. I recited the verses of Tough on Crime, Pro-Death Penalty, War on Drugs. My reign saw those in chains increase from 2 million to 8 million.

I preached Free Trade. I worshiped Wall Street. I have hidden my shame behind Dick Morris' polls too long. I counseled I had to assume the guise of Republicans to win the coveted "General Election," but then I would reward your patience. Instead, the only ones I rewarded were those of endless avarice and malice. I bore the Telecommunications Act that gave the media unto the richest few. I skulked in the twilight to deliver a death blow to the Glass-Steagall Act, allowing the greatest Ponzi scheme in history or what the wizards now name the "Tech Bubble."

I, Saint Bill, gave the government to the rich. Not the people. Do not be shocked my friends. You knew this all along. But there are even greater sins of which to speak. I joined the secret OIL of the Establishment and pledged to uphold the serpent's policy of "International Bi-Partisanship." I wandered to far-off lands and committed the wickedest of deeds. I let death squads slaughter the Haitians, then gave the criminal leaders sanctuary. My sins were multiplied a hundredfold in already sorrowful Africa. I destroyed a pharmaceutical factory in Sudan. I killed thousands in a "humanitarian mission" to Somalia. Most shamefully, I abandoned 1 million in Rwanda to a plague of wolves. I fashioned Plan Colombia. I bombarded Serbia. I let the Indonesians seek their vengeance on East Timor. I have to answer for their souls as well as the half-million Iraqi children who died from sanctions enforced by me, your once exalted leader.

I ask not your forgiveness, for I have no shame. Instead, I ask that in your righteous desire to cast out the perfidious and treachery of King Dub-ya that you do not follow another who would continue my shameful ways. – AK

ELECTIONS

THE WAR PARTY

DEMONCETS FAKE LEFT, RUN RIGHT

By Jed Brandt

The Democrats aren’t just a minority party; they have been effectively pushed out of every branch of government. Both houses of Congress, the majority of governorships—including such Democratic bastions as New York and California—the White House and the judiciary—all have Republican control. We have to have a reconstruction of Iraq with a greater role for the United Nations, with NATO, and preferably with Muslim troops, particularly Arabic-speaking troops from our allies such as Egypt and Morocco,” says Dean.

So he’s supporting internationalization as well? Not quite.

“We cannot have American troops serving under U.N. command,” Dean says. “But we can have American troops serving under American command, and it’s very clear to me that in order to get the U.N. and NATO into Iraq, this president is going to have to give the Iraqi people some hope that the allies, the way into Iraq, and hope that they will now agree with us that we need the occupation of Iraq.”

In other words, the United States needs to enlist the United Nations to provide a political cover and get them to fight under American command while arguing that there’s no war. Instead, he’s supporting NATO; he wants to have a reconstruction of Iraq, not an occupation. This situation was created by Bush, who ignored the greater danger in Iran and North Korea and Al-Qaeda at home to do it. This was a mistake, this war.

That’s right. Dean thinks the United States invaded the wrong country. The Afghan occupation, however, he supports loudly without reservation.

But hold up! What about Kucinich? Isn’t he holding the working-man’s banner? Doesn’t Kucinich support a Department of Peace and want to end the war? Well, sure. Kind of.

“I think Senator Kerry described well the direction we should be going in.” That’s right, it’s “internationalization” again.

The Rev. Al Sharpton has opposed the war, even if no one seems to care. He has, however, promised to personally lead the crusade to capture Osama bin Laden. (Look out Geraldine Ferraro, the Rev is coming to town!) It’s easy to blame Clinton’s DLC cloning, but what do we have in its place? A spade? Yes, the war party is the Party of Spades.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

KERRY

“People keep asking, ‘What’s the exit strategy? The exit strategy is victory.’

DEAN

“We cannot lose the peace in Iraq.”

CONFESSIONS OF ST. BILL

THE NEW YORK TIMES
MONEY MACHINE: THE BUSH PUSH FOR A ONE-PARTY STATE

By Sanjay Kumar

Newsflash! The rich favor Bush over all the other presidential candidates. Okay, no one’s going to be surprised that his backers are mostly millionaires and Fortune 500 companies. It’s also no secret that the 2004 Bush/Cheney campaign’s goal is to raise $200 million prior to the Republican National Convention next August (an amount it will probably far surpass). But the fundraising juggernaut Bush has in place makes a mockery of campaign finance laws and is openly based on a cycle of soliciting contributions from the rich in return for lucrative paybacks for future contributions and more paybacks.

As of Oct. 15, 2003, Bush’s 2004 campaign reported to the Federal Election Commission that it had raised $84.5 million. Seventy-four percent of that comes from $29,789 donors who at least $2,000—a greater percentage than any of the nine Democrats running for president. In contrast Howard Dean, who is the leading Democratic fundraiser at $23.5 million, gets only 13 percent of his take from such mega-donors.

Virtually every sector of corporate America is giving far more to Bush and the Republicans than to the Democrats. And most of that money is funneled through the Bush campaign’s network of super-fundraisers—Pioneers and Rangers—that includes many of the wealthiest Wall Street titans and captains of industry.

The money is given for quid pro quos from the White House in the form of trillion-dollar tax cuts, elimination of overtime pay, corporate subsidies, relaxed pension fund rules, looser federal regulation, or outright gifts, such as mineral and timber rights on public lands.

Craig Aaron of Public Citizen’s Congress Watch calls the influence of corporations in campaign financing “perverse.” He says, “ Corporations are spending millions of dollars on trying to influence elections. The return on their investment is the influence of corporations in campaign financing.”

Another 49 Rangers and Pioneers are identified as lawyers and lobbyists and represent professional influence peddlers whose “job is to have access,” says Aaron.

Insurance and energy companies are also big supporters. Bush pushed through the terrorism insurance bill, which essentially has the federal government assume the role traditionally held by reinsurance companies, and he has relentlessly pushed “tort reform” that would benefit insurance companies at the expense of consumers by limiting class-action lawsuits and, ultimately, privatizing Social Security.

Many big donors are also the wealthiest Americans. At least 12 Rangers and Pioneers were listed in 2002 as being among Forbes 400 richest Americans. It’s not hard to understand why the rich support Bush: there’s the repeal of the estate tax, as well as the massive tax cuts skewed to the top tier.

“The tax policies that the Bush Administration has pursued directly benefit the wealthiest one percent,” argues Aaron. “The folks who can write those $1,000 checks are a very small and very wealthy portion of society.”

That the system is broken is undeniable. Aaron calls the $200 million fundraising goal a “lowball” estimate, saying the Bush campaign is “raising it at double that rate.”

But once the general campaign starts in September, “Bush will go back into the public financing system and get something like $74 million.” These totals don’t include money from the Republican Party and outside spending by advocacy groups.

The Bush campaign’s strategy is clear. With an unpopularity war and stagnant economy, the Republicans’ only hope is to relentlessly push “tort reform” that would benefit these tycoons to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. These cuts “are just the first step in a push toward making all investment income tax-free,” notes Public Citizen.

Wall Street’s wish list for a second Bush term is said to include derring, “further regulation of hedge funds, derivatives trading and arcane, highly profitable tax- avoidance schemes...remodeling the retirement and pension systems to drive more business to stockbrokers, limiting class-action lawsuits and, ultimately, privatizing Social Security.”

Wally O’Dell, Diebold CEO and top Bush money raiser, has stepped in to defend OPG and Indymedia against Diebold, which asserts that the material is “Diebold Property...being publicly displayed...without Diebold’s consent.” Indymedia believes that “journalists and the public have a right to evaluate the legitimacy of these memos and their import on the security of our democratic process.”

When Bush comes to shove... who do you turn to for news?

Naomi Klein says The Independent “mixes the spirit of direct action with a searing critique of corporate power.” Drawing upon the global network of Indymedia Centers, we let people speak for themselves—from the streets of Baghdad to the jungles of Colombia, the shantytowns of South Africa to the villages of East Timor. We look at those resisting the Pentagon and Wall Street reign of terror, from the fight at home for housing, quality education and civil liberties to the broader struggle against corporate globalization. Don’t miss an issue—subscribe today!

Subscribe rate: $27/year (33 issues). Angel rate: $100/year. Make checks payable to the NYC IMC Print Team and send to: 34 East 29th St., 2nd Floor, New York, NY 10016. Or for even faster service email your address to indysubs@yahoo.com and we will begin your subscription right away!

Diebold tries to muzzle vote fraud critics

By IMC Staff

Diebold Election Systems, Inc., manufacturer of electronic voting systems which have recently been shown to have major security problems, has begun using the 1998 Digital Millennium Copyright Act to silence online critics who have posted links to leaked company memos. Dozens of Internet service providers (ISPs) have complied with cease-and-desist letters sent out by the company that asks ISPs to take down client pages that link to the memos.

The leaked memos indicate Diebold has been careless (or worse) about test runs, accuracy audits and security for its voting machines.

According to the Electronic Frontier Foundation, the Online Policy Group (OPG), appears to have been the only ISP that has refused to comply with the notice. OPG is a nonprofit that donates Internet services to San Francisco Indymedia. The Electronic Frontier Foundation has defended OPG’s right to post the memos, which asserts that the material is “Diebold Property...being publicly displayed...without Diebold’s consent.” Indymedia believes that “journalists and the public have a right to evaluate the legitimacy of these memos and their import on the security of our democratic process.”

While other targets of the letter have complied, much of the information has been posted to smaller, subterfuge sites such as peer-to-peer networks, Web sites such as Soots.co.nz have also posted the material.

Questions about the integrity of Diebold’s systems have not gone unnoticed. Representative Tammy Baldwin (D-Wisc.) has signed on to a house resolution 2239, which would require a voter-verified permanent record or hardcopy to be used with any electronic voting system. Currently, Diebold systems produce no such record for either the voter or for the polling staff to verify the accuracy of the votes cast.

Moreover, a recent study performed by computer security researchers at Johns Hopkins University determined that AccuVote machines are vulnerable to hackers, multiple votes and vote-switching. The AccuVote-TS systems are regular desktop computers running Microsoft Windows, which by its nature increases the system’s vulnerability. But the problems only begin there.

According to Bev Harris, author of Black Box Voting, tests done on the software originally downloadable from Diebold’s website showed the existence of numerous backdoors in the vote counting system that enables those with access to manipulate the tabulation of results in real-time as they are coming in, without any trace that they were ever there.

The 3 major manufacturers of the voting computers—Diebold, Election Systems & Software (ES&S) and Sequoia Voting Systems—all have Republican Party links. Wally O’Dell, Diebold CEO and top Bush fundraiser, has publicly committed himself to “delivering” his home state of Ohio to Bush in 2004. Part of the agreement the companies insist on before selling to any state is the right for the seller to backdate votes. This eliminates state electoral commissions as one of the fundamental safeguards of the voting system.

For more information, please see www.blackboxvoting.org and www.indymedia.org/display.php3?article_id=356465&group=webcast
HAPLESS PRISONERS IN A BLACK HOLE

By ELAINE CASSEL

I started to write about the disgraceful situation in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba on Friday morning, Oct. 10. I had read about the International Red Cross’s condemnation of the Bush administration’s continued detention of over 650 prisoners, some of them juveniles, at a U.S. military base, classified them as “enemy combatants” so as to try to exempt those who try to help them look like terrorists from human beings or treating prisoners humanely. If the government could, it would charge them with the crime of kindness to fellow human beings or treating prisoners humanely. It can’t do that, so it trumps up charges to make those who try to help them look like terrorists themselves. All this, when the prisoners have not themselves been shown to be terrorists. So, in an administration where irony is too subtle a term, we have George Bush opening up the shores of Florida to Cubans who will, as soon as they can, become citizens and vote for him and his brother. In the meantime, the Cuban lobby in Florida will see that Bush carries Florida. By hook or crook.

At the same time, we have Bush presiding over the wholesale mistreatment, even torture, some say, of upwards of 700 men who have not been shown to have done anything wrong except to have been on the streets of Afghanistan when Bush wanted to act like a cowboy and get “somebody” for 9-11.

>> We have Bush presiding over the wholesale mistreatment, even torture, some say, of upwards of 700 men who have not been shown to have done anything wrong except to have been on the streets of Afghanistan when Bush wanted to act like a cowboy and get “somebody” for 9-11.

But hearing the plea of the Guantanamo prisoners, the lower courts agreed that the federal courts had no jurisdiction because the prisoners are not on American soil. How’s that for a catch-22? We arrested them to lock them up in military bases, and now we have declared them to be outside of the law. I guess, in a sick and twisted way, that does make some sense after all.

For the hapless prisoners in the black hole of Guantanamo comes a voice from the past to fill a void of the court brief in their behalf. Fred Korematsu, an American citizen of Japanese descent who refused to enter a Japanese internment camp in California 60 some years ago. He was prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned for challenging the internment order. The Supreme Court then said it was just fine that he was ordered to be locked up, and even finer that he was prosecuted for challenging the order.

In the same way, the Supreme Court will follow its leader and “refuse to accept” Korematsu’s plea. After all, what do fairness, justice, and decency have to do with anything anymore?

Elena Cardoza practice law in Virginia and Washington, D.C. This article originally appeared on CounterPunch.org.
U.N. Resolution Is Its Epitaph

By Donald Paneth

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The unanimous adoption October 16, 2003 of United Nations Security Council resolution 1511 (2003) on Iraq successfully concluded more than a year of diplomatic, war and occupation efforts. It is a major victory by the United States and United Kingdom.

The resolution provided essentially what the U.S. and British governments and a broad international coalition joined by the Security Council of a multinational force for Iraq under U.S. command; an appeal to the United Nations to join the United States and United Kingdom.

The resolution was adopted by the United Nations through a vote of 14-0, with the United States and Britain abstaining, and the United States, which was represented by its Special Envoy for Iraq, Ambassador L. Paul Bremer, voting in favor. The resolution was the result of months of negotiations and consultations. It was praised by all sides for its fairness and its recognition of the sovereignty of Iraq.

The resolution established a new government in Iraq and called for the formation of a coalition government. It also established a new constitution for Iraq and called for the formation of a new government. The resolution also called for the withdrawal of all international forces from Iraq, including the U.S. military, by the end of 2005.

The resolution was met with widespread support from the international community. It was seen as a major step forward in the process of rebuilding Iraq and establishing a democratic government. It was also seen as a major victory for the United States and United Kingdom, which had been pushing for the resolution for months.

The resolution was signed by the leaders of the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, and Japan, as well as other member states of the United Nations. It was a major victory for the United States and United Kingdom, which had been pushing for the resolution for months.
COLOMBIA: INEQUALITY AND BLOOD
By Nick Dearden

There are few countries on earth where trade unions can only access their offices by climbing out of a bulletproof jeep surrounded by bodyguards holding semi-automatic weapons and walking through a metal room equipped with electronic steel gates in order to start work in a bomb-proof office.

This is Colombia, one of Latin America’s “old-est democracies.”

One teacher or lecturer has been killed every single week in Colombia this year. From 27 assassinations in the first six months of 1999 to 27 in 1999 to 83 in 2003, have made organizing impossible in many areas. Extreme right-wing militias linked to the armed forces and authorities carry out 95 percent of these attacks.

Colombians are so poor because Colombia is so rich. Colombia possesses 16 of the world’s 22 most valuable resources, notably oil and gold.

Yet just over one percent of the population owns 58 percent of the land, 13 million Colombians earn more than $400 a month. 3.5 million children are outside the educational system and half of the citizenry lacks health care. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of Colombians are fleeing the country – Colombia is the third biggest recipient of U.S. military aid in the world – is poured into paying off the national debt and increasing the military controls of the security forces.

One teacher who works in a school on the outskirts of Bogotá has been persecuted for the past 15 years. She is accused of being a guerrilla – a woman set up for “cleansing” operations and her two teenage daughters have also been targeted. She described matter-of-factly how her husband was kidnapped and then killed by paramilitaries.

Teachers and lecturers are not the only targets – progressive lawyers, priests, students, any form of trade unionist or of the social leaders who happen to live in the wrong area have also been victimized. Colombia is a country in which protest is being outlawed, in which anyone who questions authority is labeled a terrorist.

President Alvaro Uribe is desperate to sign on to the U.S. “war on terror” in the Americas, which will create the world’s largest single market and solidify Latin America as a source of cheap raw materials, labor and markets. Colombia’s food imports in the world – summed up in the slogan “Kill one to live in the wrong area have also been victimized. Colombia is a country in which protest is being outlawed, in which anyone who questions authority is labeled a terrorist. President Alvaro Uribe is desperate to sign on to the U.S. “war on terror” in the Americas, which will create the world’s largest single market and solidify Latin America as a source of cheap raw materials, labor and markets. Colombia’s food imports in the world – summed up in the slogan “Kill one to live” – the guerrillas. The U.S.-backed government has overseen a huge wave of raids, security measures and violence throughout the country, but many more community and social leaders have been killed than guerrillas.

But if fear and terror stretch to the base of society, then so do the comforts and hope. Despite the frontal assault, ordinary Colombians refuse to allow the bonds of society to be broken. Trade unions under attack become social movements fighting poverty. New communities grow up around displacement and disappearance. Victimized Colombians are surely among the bravest people the world.”

For the full report go to colombiajournal.org.

AFGHANISTAN: THE OTHER OCCUPATION
By Catrina Stewart

As the cold nights of winter begin to descend upon Afghanistan for the third time since the U.S. invasion, conditions for international soldiers, relief workers and the country’s 26 million citizens are still a long way from favorable.

Increasingly bold assaults by Taliban and Al-Qaeda insurgents have contributed to scores of attacks on military and civilian personnel. In an effort to undermine the U.S.-backed reconstruction effort, Taliban fighters have attacked government offices in the South, targeted and killed foreign aid workers, and using a U.S.-supplied Blackhawk jeep surrounded by bodyguards holding semi-automatic weapons and walking through a metal room equipped with electronic steel gates in order to start work in a bomb-proof office.

The bloodshed also includes heavy factional fighting in the northern provinces, where last week alone some 80 militants were killed. One teacher or lecturer has been killed every single week in Colombia this year. From 27 assassinations in the first six months of 1999 to 27 in 1999 to 83 in 2003, have made organizing impossible in many areas. Extreme right-wing militias linked to the armed forces and authorities carry out 95 percent of these attacks.

Colombians are so poor because Colombia is so rich. Colombia possesses 16 of the world’s 22 most valuable resources, notably oil and gold. Yet just over one percent of the population owns 58 percent of the land, 13 million Colombians earn more than $400 a month. 3.5 million children are outside the educational system and half of the citizenry lacks health care. Meanwhile, increasing numbers of Colombians are fleeing the country – Colombia is the third biggest recipient of U.S. military aid in the world – is poured into paying off the national debt and increasing the military controls of the security forces.

One teacher who works in a school on the outskirts of Bogotá has been persecuted for the past 15 years. She is accused of being a guerrilla – a woman set up for “cleansing” operations and her two teenage daughters have also been targeted. She described matter-of-factly how her husband was kidnapped and then killed by paramilitaries.

Teachers and lecturers are not the only targets – progressive lawyers, priests, students, any form of trade unionist or of the social leaders who happen to live in the wrong area have also been victimized. Colombia is a country in which protest is being outlawed, in which anyone who questions authority is labeled a terrorist. President Alvaro Uribe is desperate to sign on to the U.S. “war on terror” in the Americas, which will create the world’s largest single market and solidify Latin America as a source of cheap raw materials, labor and markets. Colombia’s food imports in the world – summed up in the slogan “Kill one to live” – the guerrillas. The U.S.-backed government has overseen a huge wave of raids, security measures and violence throughout the country, but many more community and social leaders have been killed than guerrillas.

But if fear and terror stretch to the base of society, then so do the comforts and hope. Despite the frontal assault, ordinary Colombians refuse to allow the bonds of society to be broken. Trade unions under attack become social movements fighting poverty. New communities grow up around displacement and disappearance. Victimized Colombians are surely among the bravest people the world.”

For the full report go to colombiajournal.org.

AFRICA: U.S. BUILDS FORWARD BASES
By Kazembe Bulagoo

In the name of fighting global terrorism the United States is expanding its military presence in Africa. General James Jones, the chief of staff and commander of U.S. European forces, said the U.S. was negotiating to install several military bases in the West African country of Senegal, and signed an agreement in the United States is expanding its military presence in Africa. General James Jones, the chief of staff and commander of U.S. European forces, said the U.S. was negotiating to install several military bases in the West African country of Senegal, and signed an agreement in
**VENEZUELA: THE COUP THAT NEVER ENDS**

**By Alex Hogan**

Venezuela’s been in a hard ride since Hugo Chavez was first elected president in 1999. Since then, the country has been hit by a storm of protests and repressive measures, with dozens of deaths and thousands detained and arrested. The protests were response to the government’s plan to privatize the state oil company, PDVSA.

In February, Chavez declared a state of emergency in the country,مرور the gas – stated that the pipeline will go through Chile. If or not the pipeline will go through Chile. It is important to note that the pipeline will go through Chile. Other countries have offered to build pipelines through their territories for Bolivia, but Bolivia’s poor indigenous majority was already upset by the government’s fixed-rate reforms and U.S.-backed plans to eradicate coca, local water sources and national gas to the United States and Mexico.

Southern Bolivia’s recently discovered natural gas resources are equivalent to about 5 billion barrels of petrol, which several foreign corporations and governments are eager to purchase from the country. The government offered to have a pipeline built through their territory for Bolivia, which has been landlocked since Chile annexed Bolivia’s access to the Pacific after the war of 1879-1884. Running the pipeline through Peru was estimated to cost Bolivia some $500 million more than building it through Chile, which most Bolivians were already opposed to because of the animosity between the two nations that has lingered since the 1879 war. Many Bolivians who support Chavez see the decision to build a pipeline through Chile to the Pacific Ocean to export billions of dollars of natural gas to the United States and Mexico.

**People Power: MINERS CELEBRATE THE RISE OF BOLIVIAN PRESIDENT GONZALO SANCHEZ DE LOZADA**

LNG is a consortium made up of British Gas, British Petroleum and Spain’s Repsol-YPF. Fumurs, students, labor unions, community groups and other government opponents escalated their protests, calling for Sanchez de Lozada’s resignation. Human rights groups reported that up to 70 people died since the protests began in mid-September.

Bolivia’s poor indigenous majority was already upset by the government’s fixed-rate reforms and U.S.-backed plans to eradicate coca, local water sources and national gas to the United States and Mexico. The government offered to have a pipeline built through their territory for Bolivia, which has been landlocked since Chile annexed Bolivia’s access to the Pacific after the war of 1879-1884. Running the pipeline through Peru was estimated to cost Bolivia some $500 million more than building it through Chile, which most Bolivians were already opposed to because of the animosity between the two nations that has lingered since the 1879 war. Many Bolivians who support Chavez see the decision to build a pipeline through Chile to the Pacific Ocean to export billions of dollars of natural gas to the United States and Mexico.

**BOLIVIA: PROTESTERS BRING DOWN PRESIDENT**

**By Vanessa Hladky**

On Saturday, October 18, after a month of social unrest, Bolivian President Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada finally gave in to protesters’ demands for his resignation. Under Bolivia’s Constitution, his Vice President, Carlos Mesa, was appointed to finish his term.

In the largest demonstrations ever seen in the tiny landlocked country, tens of thousands of protesters – most of them indigenous Aymara Indians – blocked major roads and took over the capital, La Paz, infuriated by the government’s failure to meet their demands for redistribution of the nation’s substantial oil wealth. They had been trying to force Sanchez de Lozada to resign ever since he took over the capital, La Paz, infuriated by the government’s failure to meet their demands for redistribution of the nation’s substantial oil wealth.

“Chavezian.” Through the slams of Cataras, newly formed Bolivarian military centered on the paternal figure of the president.

However, the Bolivians still have hope for a better future. They are determined to reverse the free-market course charted by his predecessor or be overthrown. They will continue to fight for their rights and their country.

**PALESTINE UNDER SEIGE**

**By Kristen Ees**

WEST BANK, Palestine—“We always react to Israel. It’s like we’re always trying to appease them just in case it will make them stop the violence.” The Palestinian president head of an NGO in Ramallah, Abu Ala told the al-Ittihad al-Islamiyat that "When someone is constantly pushing on your head, you can’t look around. You can’t look up. The Israelis don’t want us to think for ourselves, they want us to do what they say."

He explains that Palestinians are trying to work on a strategy, to proactively build one with more people involved. We completely lack a strategy in everything. We just depend on our cause being good. We solve nothing.

The U.N. General Assembly rallied to the Palestinian cause on Oct. 21 by passing a resolution in a 144-4 vote that called upon Israel to respect the sovereignty of the Palestinian people and to prevent the rest of the world from doing enough to stop the Israeli military. In late October, Israeli forces bombed and rocketed residential neighborhoods in Gaza City killing more than another 300 people and wounded hundreds of thousands more. Israeli forces have been blowing through long-since devastated Rafah. Roughly 2,000 people there were made homeless in just three days.

Israel’s government has been in a “civil cold war,” rocked by unrest during Sanchez de Lozada’s presidency. Under Bolivia’s Constitution, his Vice President, Carlos Mesa, was appointed to finish his term.

Bolivia’s poor indigenous majority was already upset by the government’s fixed-rate reforms and U.S.-backed plans to eradicate coca, local water sources and national gas to the United States and Mexico. The government offered to have a pipeline built through their territory for Bolivia, which has been landlocked since Chile annexed Bolivia’s access to the Pacific after the war of 1879-1884. Running the pipeline through Peru was estimated to cost Bolivia some $500 million more than building it through Chile, which most Bolivians were already opposed to because of the animosity between the two nations that has lingered since the 1879 war. Many Bolivians who support Chavez see the decision to build a pipeline through Chile to the Pacific Ocean to export billions of dollars of natural gas to the United States and Mexico.

**Palestinian Authority has appointed Ahmed Quria. But the Israelis will not allow the right to speak to, and losing him because of his unwillingness to be bullied through the Road Map for Arafat was through Oslo, the Palestinian Authority has appointed Ahmed Quria. But the Israelis will not speak to him either. The PA is planning to hold elections in June. The Jenin journalist laughs out loud, “Arafat Quria still thinks we’ll have elections! How could we even make it to the polls?”**

The West Bank and Gaza Strip are closed, many towns remain under curfew, the sound of F-16s fills the room.
While applauding Indymedia’s interest in learning from the past, I think Naomi Jaffe’s article, “After the Storm,” adds little to the discussion. It is not that the views of those like her and others were prominent student leaders in their day, thousands of activists founded the Weathermen’s focus on violence as strategy problematic.

The debate over violence and nonviolence also highlights a constantly recurring theme, distracting the effort toward a coherent anti-capitalist, anti-globalization movement. Jaffe and the documentary film reiterate the Weathermen’s fixation on violent confrontation. Yet, as Jaffe well points out, the debate is about “convincing violence” — not so bad. Then came unqualified support for the Roosevelt administration after CP intellectuals accepted posts within the government. The agreement to dissolve the Party organization within trade unions, and to limit-resenting violence as potential strategy problematic.
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The “violence as ideology and strategy” debacle derives while applauding Indymedia’s interest in learning from the past, I think Naomi Jaffe’s article, “After the Storm,” adds little to the discussion. It is not that the views of those like her and others were prominent student leaders in their day, thousands of activists founded the Weathermen’s focus on violence as strategy problematic.

The debate over violence and nonviolence also highlights a constantly recurring theme, distracting the effort toward a coherent anti-capitalist, anti-globalization movement. Jaffe and the documentary film reiterate the Weathermen’s fixation on violent confrontation. Yet, as Jaffe well points out, the debate is about “convincing violence” — not so bad. Then came unqualified support for the Roosevelt administration after CP intellectuals accepted posts within the government. The agreement to dissolve the Party organization within trade unions, and to limit-resenting violence as potential strategy problematic.
A REVOLUTION IN THEIR OWN MIND

By Steven Wisnia

The Weather Underground was incredibly destructive to the radical movement of the sixties. Its dismissal of the white working class as hopelessly racist pigs alienated a crucial potential constituency, and its denunciation of activists who wouldn’t follow their ham-handed line contributed to the radical movement’s disintegration.

Granted, some white working-class people engaged in foul behavior during that era, from the beatings of anti-war protestors by World Trade Center construction workers in 1970 to the racist resistance to school busing in Boston in 1975-76. On the other hand, if you want to start a revolution – or any progressive movement – in America, you have to look among the people who don’t have a lot of money and have to deal with boredom and petty tyranny on the job.

It’s suicidal to reject the largest demographic among this group, just because they won’t jump to become armed revolutionaries when some privileged kid (most of the Weatherpeople came from upper-middle-class-and-up backgrounds) tells them they should. Dismissing as racist white people’s concerns about their kids getting ripped off for their lunch money driven them into the arms of the right wing, and won’t win any credibility either among black or Latino people who live in or have escaped high-crime areas.

In an era when much of the left had an apologetic or romantic attitude toward street criminals, the Weatherpeople toppled it all by celebrating the Mannion family murders. “Dig it, they even shoved a fork into a victim’s stomach,” Weather leader Bernardine Dohrn exclaimed in a December 1969 speech. (This was before Charles Manson was revealed to be a pimpoid white supremacist in hippie drag.) This helped open the way for the racist, “tough on crime,” phony populism that has permeated American politics for the last 35 years, from the racist, “tough on crime,” phony populism that has permeated American politics for the last 35 years, from the racist, “tough on crime,” phony populism that has permeated American politics for the last 35 years.

The tragedy of this is that by the time my generation came of age, Watergate and the 1973-74 gas crisis were proving to most people in America that the movement had righted: Richard Nixon was a petty-fascist liar and the rich were scamming while everyone else suffered. But with little left of the Left beyond a handful of miniscule, often cult-like sects, the main alternatives for disaffected youth were grudging assimilation, rural-hippie isolation, or a nihilistic devotion to sex, drugs, and rock ‘n’ roll. (The second grew organic vegetables and the third produced punk-rock, so they weren’t all bad.)

I don’t have any answers. The tragic paradox of political violence is that the ruling class is not likely to yield power without it, but the types of personalities and organizations that are most likely to lead to dictatorship (Soviet Union, China, Cambodia), while the US has brutally deposed leftist governments that tried to stay democratic (Chile, Nicaragua). I can understand the frustrations that led people to turn urban guerrilla. The Weather Underground was formed after four years of protesting had failed to stop the Vietnam War, and if you don’t want to explode after watching The Weather Underground documentary’s blood-spurting footage of a South Vietnamese general shooting a handicapped prisoner in the head, you’ve got a hole in your soul. But successful politics is about effective tactics and strategy, not merely acting out your rage.

Marge Piercy, in “The Grand Coolie Damn,” her pioneering critique of sexism on the left, wrote that, beyond a certain point, the process of hardening yourself for the struggle “does not produce a more efficient revolutionary army, only a more efficient son of a bitch.” And Chicago Black Panther leader Fred Hampton, two months before he was murdered by police in December 1969, called the Weather “Days of Rage” protests “opportunistic, adventurist, and Custeristic.”

Both criticisms still stand.
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MORE RADICAL LESS EXTREME

By Jed Brandt

Violence is not the issue. I don’t think it ever was. Not back in the day when the Weather Underground blew up toilets in the Capitol Building and not today as the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) flips out over SUVs and condominiums. Revolution isn’t a leather-jacket tactical radicals adopt – it is a transformation of the whole society made by millions, it can be violent, it’s not about violence. And it’s definitely not, as the old saying goes, a dinner party.

Over the last few years, dozens of attacks claimed by the ELF have burned a lot of cars, a few construction sites on the West Coast, and earned a 23-year prison sentence for Jeffrey “Free” Leurs, a young anarchist who never hurt a fly. The ELF is more logo than organization, a mantle individuals can claim without the security risk – or accountability – of a collective process. Yet, despite their claims to “direct action,” it’s a lot more “propaganda of the deed” than a storming of the Bastille. It makes a big splash, but changes nothing. The system is unaffected.

The Weathermen despised the common people of this country with a spirit more aristocratic than proletarian. In opposition to the Black Panther-inspired slogan “Serve the People,” Weather argued that radicals need to “Fight the People,” meaning white people, for their supposed complicity in the system. Weather was, of course, all white.

The ELF was theoretical in their approach, paints slogans like “Fat Lazy Americans” on the side of SUVs before they torch them. What they both miss is that it is people themselves and not self-appointed bands of the disinherited who actually make revolution. People aren’t just fat, lazy and stupid. And quite a few have a good idea what’s wrong, not that you’d ever know it from the narrow worldview of these self-appointed savirs.

Hating people for the miserable conditions we find ourselves in is corrosive – and a sure sign that “radicals” are isolated and out of touch. Extremism is taking reformist politics to the level of violence. Radicalism is getting to the source of the problem and organizing broadly to build people’s power. It’s a lot easier to talk to your neighbor than it is to light his car on fire.

Weatherman developed out a maestros like one’s not unlike today’s global justice movement. Predominantly white, middle class and young, today’s protest radicals often rebel against their own culture instead of fighting for it. In the 1960s they used “participatory democracy.” Today, the talk at least is of “consensus.” Weather was an all-white group packed with upper-class dropouts that guillotined about “white privilege.” The ELF just ignores it. Weatherman thought they were revolutionaries, while the ELF seems to have no vision of the future whatsoever. Both are responses to a rapid growth in individualized radicalism without much connection to people in everyday life, or even radical groups with more than a couple of years experience. The frustration and alienation remain the same, but the times are different. Very different.

Responding to this desperation with some Todd Gitlin mantra about becoming a young loyal opposition isn’t an option. When the cold truth is confronted – that we don’t live in some wondrous democratic experiment and that the state will guarantee the power of unaccountable elites through the most vicious wars and repression – activists face a choice: Are we to remain content as a peripheral presence beyond slogans and symbolism. Somewhere along the way, this got lost to the Black Bloc fetishists and the grant-written glitterati.

All across America, millions have had their illusions ripped away in the last two years. The ugly empire is on full display. The Democratic Party, and the leftist intelligentsia, have proven themselves complicit in it not just the bloodlettings abroad, but the ongoing internment of Muslims and repression at home. Something needs to be done. But turning to vandalism and symbolic violence isn’t all that different from the “violence” of the legal left. In a strange way, it isn’t even that different from voting. It is all a politics of representation – and not actually. We need to be more radical, less extreme.

For the first time in a generation, the radical left has an opening, what some have called a “teachable moment.” But too many activists confuse extremism and alienation with a healthy, robust insurgency that speaks in plain English to everyday people at work, on the train and in the neighborhood. If radicals are angry enough to fight, the question then stands: Do they have enough love to win? Another world isn’t just possible, it’s inevitable. How it goes is up to us.
American’s war of aggression in Iraq is pulling together surprising and unusual coalitions for a number of particular reasons. Many if not most are choosing to take the same road to ending the war—a road that leads through Cancun and Miami, the respective sites of the most recent, failed World Trade Organization conference and the upcoming attempt to impose a Free Trade Area of the Americas on the developing nations of the Western Hemisphere. By taking time away to join the indigenous peoples and workers protesting these conspiracies of the wealthy, antiwar activists help to link the imperialism represented by the “Washington Consensus” on global trade with the imperialism embodied by Washington’s push to dominate the Middle East.

That’s the good news, and it promises to help tie U.S. antiwar activists into a more tightly woven global coalition against the American imperial project than existed even during the Vietnam War. The bad news? There isn’t any yet—but there will be if the antiwar movement fails to extend its critique of the war to that of the state itself.

So let’s stop beating up on George Bush for a second—he was hardly noticing it anyway!—and instead ask the question why a supposedly democratic representative government decided to do such a harebrained thing as invade Iraq.

Whatever kind of government it has, the function of the state is to take direction—from a leader, from an elite, from a powerful coterie of propertied interests. The state is the blank slate on which these players inscribe their plans for acquiring power and wealth. In laying out a grand plan for U.S. domination of the Middle East, Bush and his cohorts have supplied Washington with what it needs most—a mission and a long-term project to strengthen itself and extend its influence.

Make no mistake about it, should the imperial project that began with the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq have any long-term success, the U.S. is liable to emerge as a vastly more powerful state than any we’ve seen before. Its military reach will be wider and deeper than any other state in history. Its capability to pry into every detail—not just of its citizens’ lives but those of anyone in the world it targets—will be unprecedented. Its ability to project the interests of large corporations and natural resources despots into every inch of the globe will be nearly absolute. The destructive force it can unleash will be many times greater than that held by any other power.

Congress is now on the brink of giving the Bush regime everything it needs—for now—to push forward with this new blueprint, and no wonder: It’s the only long-term vision for the American state that’s actually on the table and in the process of being implemented. None of the Democratic presidential candidates has yet articulated a different scenario because, I suspect, they don’t have one—and perhaps, deep down, they find the Bush vision too attractive—if only one of them, rather than Bush, was in charge.

We’ve been here before. For most of the Vietnam War period, Democratic critics of the “conflict” acted with one hand tied behind their backs, because they could not articulate a vision in which the U.S. would actually withdraw itself from one of its quasi-colonial possessions. Every day that the U.S. stays in Iraq and Afghanistan, this will become more and more the case as well. The losses may be unacceptable, the costs may be unbearable, but the mere thought of pulling out will be unthinkable because it would mean curtailing the expansion and enrichment of the American state.

Politicians, and political scientists, like to see the state not as a servant of the people but as a creative, dynamic, and expanding force—and if it must be fertilized with blood so be it. Today, the U.S. and China are the states with the most potential to fit this model, which is why Washington wants so badly to contain and constrain Beijing. But Washington and its apologists have seen the U.S. as a different kind of state for a long time. During the Vietnam War, the Johnson and Nixon Administrations surrounded themselves with troops of academics and “policy professionals” whose job was to provide a rationale for the war and the national security state whose creation the war was facilitating. Today their descendents are.

Eric Laursen is an organizer for No Blood For Oil.
The peace and justice movement in the United States is at a defining moment. We have, for the first time in the past 30 years, really begun to build a movement in a real way. This movement building has also caused us to exercise our internalized and ignored demons; our own prejudices and presumptions.

For the past two years the world has been in a place of continual change. After September 11, 2001 the U.S. government and military began a new war, the war on terrorism. This war, with its use of spies, economic sanctions, and unconditional surrender of states was promoted to be a war that wouldn’t end in our lifetimes. So far the U.S. has made good on that promise.

The war on terrorism has had major battles fought, fascist legislation has been passed in the U.S., in parts of the Caribbean and Latin America, as well as in U.S. allied countries across the world.

This is an unprecedented war in a nuclear age where the stakes may climb so high as to challenge whether humanity, as a species, can long endure. The war on terrorism has issued in a new area of international politics and diplomacy. Arms treaties that have existed since World War Two are now easily discardable. In the decade following the end of the Cold War the war on terror affords weapons manufacturers new markets to sell their wares. Traditional allies have become polite enemies in this area of “for us or against us” politics with the “us” not being very clear. The detainment, expulsion and deportation of many people have pushed our country back to a new period of xenophobia.

The drive for violence and retribution, of death and nuclear peril people the world over are resisting. This resistance gives me hope and proves that the “war without end” will come to an end. The people of the world demand it. This is evident in the global protests of February 2003. These protests gave a face, voice and size to the largest anti-war movement in history.

It is evident in the coalition of the coerced and the ability of small, isolated countries to stand up together against the U.S. It is evident in the breakdown of negotiations for global trade agreements that seek to invest more power and money in the hands of the few at the expense of the many; it is evident in the movement that is growing globally every day.

Movement building is the item of the era. No longer are organizers seeing their work as isolated to stopping War X or stopping Dam Z from being built in some country. Organizations, activists and advocates are banding together and recognizing our community. We are recognizing that the systems that kill farm crops and farmers in Columbia is also drilling for oil in the Artic and clear cutting rainforest land in the Amazon. We are realizing that the systems that oppress us are working together to accomplish their goals and that we as activists must find our communalities and work together as well.

We are movement building and growing and winning. Recently the president of Bolivia resigned due to pressure from his own people. Countries have forced the corporate welfare queens of international businesses to rethink who they exploit. They have refused essentially to buy what they are selling. U.S. troops more and more are becoming conscientious objectors. Turning their back on the military but not on their visions of their country as a peacemaker instead of an occupier. The movement grows. The struggle continues.

**BASE BUILDING**

**ANTI-RACIST ORGANIZING KEY TO LIBERATION**
Yesterday Seattle and today Bolivia. The World Trade Organization is paralyzed. The global south is precariously tilting away from the free trade orthodoxy of the Clinton era. And a rolling carnival of ecstatic street protests has brought the most powerful people in the world to their knees. But if the war was a practical outcome of the system they were unable to see the real nature of the war.

In opposition to the liberals, more radical forces argued that the war was actually a collectivization of the end of history. Many have begun to dream out loud. Aside from the ambition of an anthology trying to cover "progressive social movements" and "the best ones do what the smart crowds do if they actually broke in?" The Age of Imperialism.
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‘THE WRITER’S FIRST JOB IS TO TELL THE TRUTH’
SONTAG VS. THE AMERICAN EMPIRE

Often called America’s most eclectic intellectual, Susan Sontag is best known as a daring essayist who has acted as a transatlantic conduit, sedulously uniting avant-garde ideas and the subtlest post-modern personalities of Europe to America. She has also capably played the roles of novelist, screenwriter, photographer, film director, and human-rights activist. Lately, this 70-year-old of Polish-Lithuanian Jewish descent who grew up in America and Los Angeles, but who considers herself above all a citizen of the literary world—has been giving extraordinarily honest speeches, untangling America’s knotty complexity for non-Yankees.
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NAFTA ON STEROIDS: FIGHT THE FTAA
L. A. KAUFMAN

On November 20 and 21, trade ministers from 34 countries will meet in Miami to negotiate the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA), a sweeping agreement that would extend the NAFTA model of corporate-driven globalization to the entire Western Hemisphere, except for Cuba. Tens of thousands of protesters will greet these trade ministers in a massive display of opposition to the FTAA, in what is shaping up to be the most important showdown over globalization since Seattle.

Corporate globalization is central to the Bush administration’s broad empire-building agenda and a key cause of militarism and war, which is why United for Peace and Justice has made mobilizing against the FTAA a major priority for the fall.

The FTAA summit comes on the heels of one of the Bush administration’s greatest political defeats to date, the September collapse of World Trade Organization negotiations in Cancun, Mexico. At that meeting, a newly formed coalition of countries from the Global South, known as the Group of 21 - emboldened by massive protests in the streets of Cancun and solidarity protests around the world - walked out of the WTO meetings after the United States and other rich countries rejected demands that they reduce their massive agricultural subsidies. UFPJ and its member groups helped organize more than 60 solidarity events across the United States during the Cancun WTO meetings, helping to create a first-ever convergence between the anti-war and anti-globalization movements.

The failure of the WTO meetings makes regional trade agreements such as the FTAA the leading edge of the Bush administration’s corporate global policy and reckless drive for empire. For all who support peace, democracy, environmental sustainability, and human dignity, the Miami mobilization is a crucial opportunity to carry forward the momentum of Cancun and derail the FTAA.

COME TO MIAMI
Take part in this historic uprising for peace and justice. Participate in some or all of the wide array of activities planned for the summit week, ranging from teach-ins and conferences to a massive legal march and rally to powerful nonviolent direct action.

www.unitedforpeace.org

BY ASHLEY KIINO

UNITED FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE
Co-sponsoring the Oct. 25 March on Washington, UPP, a coalition of more than 650 local and national groups, demonstrates against the war in Iraq and the associated issues of the “war against terror.” Begun in 2002, it has put together some of the largest anti-war events, such as the May 2003 teach-in in Washington, DC, with Arundhati Roy, Howard Zinn and Edward Said.
(212) 868-5545
www.unitedforpeace.org

CODEPINK
Founded last year, CODEPINK is a women-initiated grassroots movement whose members wear pink and hold creative, sometimes outrageous, actions against the war in Iraq, such as unfurling a 40-foot “pink slip” to George Bush in Los Angeles. Including protesting the FTC, among other things, in its mission, CODEPINK encourages everyone to ask questions and stand out by wearing pink.
www.codepink4peace.org

GLOBAL EXCHANGE
Global Exchange, a human rights organization that found ed United for Peace and Justice, defines its mission broadly, to include fair trade, an Occupation Watch in Iraq, Green Expos and anti-war demonstrations, besides its educational tours and retail outlets, where one can buy fairly traded goods. In San Francisco, it is organizing a parallel march to this one in DC. Call (415) 575-5555, to get involved.

NOT IN OUR NAME
Not In Our Name, initiated on March 23, 2002, builds a network of resistance to the War on Iraq, and the course of action our government has taken since September 11, 2002. With more than 150 affiliated groups, the project aims to build resistance to the war by supporting demonstrations and brainstorming actions that focus on three areas of government policy: the war on the World, “Detentions, Deportations and Roundups of Immigrants,” and “Police State Restrictions.”
info@notinourname.net
www.notinourname.net
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