



WW PHOTO: ANNE PRUDEN

9/11 EXPLOITATION

- Mumia's commentary 8
- Former World Trade Center worker speaks out 8

WORKERS FACE A CHOICE

It's time to fight—but not in Bush's war 5

MIGRANT WORKERS

Racist court decision denies 50 years of back pay 4

LABOR DAY MASSACRE

Bankruptcy destroys 15,500 Teamster jobs. Who gets the property? Workers should have first claim 4

MOTOR CITY LABOR

Unions unite against cutbacks 2

EMERGENCY SOCIALIST CONFERENCE

War, racism, recession: Capitalism's the problem. What's the solution? Workers World Party Emergency Conference scheduled for Sept. 21-22 3

Bush gang seeks pretext for war

By Brian Becker

The Bush administration is confronted with a problem as it prepares to attack Iraq. At the moment, the U.S. government appears to the world in a distinctly "American" image from a scene repeated in countless stereotypical Hollywood movies: the frightful rampage of drunken gun-slingers who shoot up the town in a Saturday night frenzy—just because they can.

That their sneering, swaggering and threatening foreign policy actually mirrors the physical pose struck by Bush, Cheney and Rumsfeld when they appear on television or in front of crowds only reinforces the conclusion of the rest of the world—that this is indeed a dangerous regime. A rogue state, if you will.

Now, as they make the case that a U.S. war against Iraq is only a "pre-emptive defense" rather than an unprovoked and thus lawless aggression, no one around the world believes them.

With a straight face they tell the world that Iraq is the major threat to world peace and that its government must be destroyed by military action. Because the administration lacks even the slimmest credible pretext for attacking Iraq, it has launched a media hype about Saddam Hussein's supposed stepped-up efforts to acquire nuclear weapons.

The rulers of the largest nuclear power in the world, along with their pliant sidekick from Britain, appear every day now before the world media to howl about Iraq's nuclear threat. It is all lies—incredible lies. The truth is a casualty in the publicity war that precedes the actual war.

On Sept. 6 and 7, the major U.S. dailies put "new evidence of Iraq's nuclear threat" on their front pages. It started with a prominent New York Times story reporting that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) had released satellite photos showing new, significant activity at "nuclear sites" in Iraq. "UN Spy Photos Show New Building at Iraqi Nuclear Sites," said the headline.

Pundits on CNN and the Fox network then talked for the next 48 hours about this new, "clear proof" that the Bush team had been right about Iraq's nuclear intentions. "We can't wait for the 'smoking gun' to be a mushroom

cloud," stated Condoleezza Rice, Bush's national security advisor, in a dramatic interview on CNN on Sept. 8. Vice President Dick Cheney and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld spoke virtually the same words in this calibrated media offensive. "Waiting [to attack Iraq] is not an option," Cheney somberly concluded, and called on listeners to imagine that "they" had used nuclear weapons on

Momentum building for Oct. 26 National March to STOP the war on Iraq before it starts 7

Sept. 11: "It wouldn't be 3,000 dead but tens of thousands dead."

British Prime Minister Tony Blair used the report to justify his pro-Bush position before a dubious public. He told the British press on Sept. 7, "We need only look at the report from the International Atomic Energy Agency this morning, showing what has been going on at a former nuclear site," to justify British support for Bush's war. "A policy of inaction is not something we can responsibly subscribe to," he warned.

IAEA says 'there was no report'

But the whole story—like most others of its kind—was false. It provided three consecutive days of propaganda against Iraq to prepare the population for war, but it was based on hype.

The IAEA stated on Sept. 8 that the satellite imagery did not prove anything. There was no report and "no new information about Iraqi nuclear activity," according to Mark Gwozdecky, a spokesperson for the agency. Gwozdecky told the Washington Post that the "confusion" was caused by a quote from a single nuclear inspector, which had been used as the basis for the New York Times story two days earlier.

While Iraq has never possessed nuclear weapons, the Pentagon currently has about 6,000 nuclear warheads. It has spent more than \$6 trillion on nuclear weapons since 1942 and is the only country to have used atomic bombs,

Continued on page 6



Sept. 7 anti-war protest in New York City.



WW PHOTOS: G. DUNKEL

SUBSCRIBE to Workers World

WEEKLY NEWSPAPER
Special trial subscription:
\$2 for 8 weeks
\$25 for one year

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY/STATE/ZIP _____

PHONE NUMBER _____

WORKERS WORLD NEWSPAPER
55 W. 17 St. NY, NY 10011 (212) 627-2994
www.workers.org read it online

Rally supports prominent Black journalist

By Dave Axel
Brooklyn, N.Y.

An enthusiastic standing-room-only crowd of over 250 people packed into a meeting room at Bethany Baptist Church in Bedford Stuyvesant, Brooklyn, on Aug. 30 to show solidarity with Gil Noble, and his long-running TV program "Like It Is." Noble, an Emmy-award winning African American broadcast radio and television journalist, has hosted the weekly program on ABC-TV for 34 years.

"Like It Is" has, for decades, been virtually the sole venue on broadcast TV to air interviews with activists and leaders of struggles against racism, police brutality and economic oppression at home as well as leaders of national liberation struggles from around the world. His guests have ranged from Malcolm X (a close friend), Nelson Mandela, the family of murdered police victim Amadou Diallo, to supporters of Mumia Abu-Jamal and other political prisoners, and the sons of Black firefighters (from the Vulcan Society) who perished in the World Trade Center.

Over the years, with strong support from the Black community, Noble has been able to beat back a number of threats to take his program off the air. Now the ABC-TV network, owned by the Walt Disney Corp., has told Noble that his show is being removed from the air. ABC executives have refused requests to discuss the issue with community representatives.

ABC executives have been quoted saying that "Noble's show did not gen-

erate enough advertising dollars to maintain the 12:00 time slot." To raise support, the Committee to Eliminate Media Offense to African People, the December 12th Movement and the Black community at large raised money for ads to air on "Like It Is."

The network turned down the ads—on the grounds that they weren't in the "public interest."

Speaker after speaker at the rally denounced ABC and Disney, emphasizing that "Like It Is" is the most significant Black news show on television, and its loss would be an extremely serious blow to the community. In response to this "corporate media attack on the Black community" (as the headline on the call for the rally put it), a "counter-attack" was proposed including a mass boycott of the Disney Corporation and its affiliates: Miramax, Dimension Films and Touchstone Films.

The crowded room rang with chants of "Boycott Disney" and "Black Power" with fists in the air in the spirit of the struggle of the 1960s. Those assembled also showed their high political consciousness by supporting calls from the podium for a rally supporting the people of Zimbabwe, and its President, Robert Mugabe, for taking back some of the land stolen by white colonial farmers and British corporate interests. Many in the crowd also promised to attend a rally/prayer vigil in support of Tiamani Gittens, a 3-and-a-half-year old Black child who lies on a respirator machine at Kings County Hospital, struck down in Prospect Heights, Brooklyn, in late



Gil Noble

August, by a hit and run driver of Hasidic background, who has not been arrested or charged for leaving the scene.

Speakers at the Aug. 30 rally included Attorney Malik Z. Shabazz of the New Black Panther Party, Elombe Brath of the December 12th Movement, Viola Plummer of Millions For Reparations, Minister Tyrone Muhammad of the Nation of Islam and Dr. James McIntosh, the coordinator of Boycott Disney.

Gil Noble spoke last. He expressed his gratitude for the support he has gotten from the Black community over the years and especially now at this critical point.

Noble put his struggle in historical perspective, noting, "I am the result of an uprising in the 60s." He ended by calling for organizations to develop a collective strategy for the ongoing struggle.

In this post-Sept. 11 period of increasing government and media muzzling of dissenting opinion, it is heartening to see a struggle like this developing—and it is important for every progressive person to support it. As the recent battle to stop the corporate takeover of the listener-sponsored radio station, WBAI, showed, the fight to save "Like It Is" can be won. Boycott Disney! Demand the firing of WABC TV President Tom Kane! Demand the continuation of "Like It Is!"

Detroit city unions unite to win justice

Special to Workers World
Detroit

On Sept. 5, in a show of unity of a sort rarely seen here, 37 local union presidents representing most of the 15,000 city of Detroit workers, jointly sent a letter to Mayor Kwame Kilpatrick denouncing his "no raise" contract position. Thousands of copies of the letter were distributed at the massive Labor Day Parade in Detroit under the headline "We Won't Take Your 'No-Raise' Nonsense!"

Detroit city workers are represented by over 40 local unions. About one-third are members of the State

County and Municipal Employees bargaining units of Council 25. The others include Teamsters, Auto Workers, skilled trades and other unions, and independent associations.

Concerted action among these unions has been difficult. What has finally brought a measure of unity is the Kilpatrick administration's position. Elected last November, Mayor Kilpatrick has stalled negotiations.

While all the contracts expired on July 1, 2001, the union members have been working day to day under their old agreements. The city first broke off talks in November, asking the unions to wait until the new mayor took of-

ice. Upon his January inauguration, Kilpatrick asked the unions to wait until April so he could put his "team" together.

Bargaining with some unions has been going on since then. Others have still not been called in to continue talks.

But it was the mayor's announcement that he would not give any raises for the first two years of the contract, and would only provide a wage increase if the economy allowed it, in the third and final year, that brought the unions' response: mass protest at City Hall. After that, in the spring, 500 angry

Continued on page 5

This week ...



★ **National**

- Rally supports prominent Black journalist 2
- Detroit city unions unite to win justice 2
- Courts and banks rob migrant workers. 4
- Teamsters sacked in corporate blitz 4
- Time for workers to fight, not for Bush's war 5
- The Evil Empire at work, by Sam Marcy 6
- Oct. 26 protest in Washington 7
- NYC protest: Iraq is not the problem 8
- 9-11 remembered 8
- A worker from the WTC 8
- Palestinian professor speaks out 9
- Labor activists demand release of Muslim detainees. . 9
- Activists in Harlem support Mugabe 9

★ **International**

- Bush gang seeks pretext for war 1
- Why Washington battles international court. 10

★ **Editorials**

- Afghanistan 10

★ **Noticias En Español**

- iNO! a la guerra de Bush 12

WW CALENDAR

ATLANTA

Sun., Oct. 6
Demonstration at the America Israel Political Action Committee National Summit. Sponsored by Atlanta Palestine Solidarity. 2 p.m. At Swissotel, next to Lenox Mall. For info email aps@atlanta4palestine.org.

standoff with the bosses and the government, which is seeking to intervene in contract negotiations. Sponsored by International ANSWER coalition, ILWU Local 10 Exec. Board, San Francisco Labor Council, and many others. 11 a.m. At UN Plaza. For info phone (415) 821-6545.

NEW YORK

Sat., Sep. 21-Sun., Sep. 22
Workers World Party Emergency Conference. For info call, email or write Workers World Party, 55 W. 17 St., 5th Fl., New York, NY 10011; (212) 255-0352; www.workers.org.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mon., Sept. 16
Protest Donald Rumsfeld at the military-industrial complex's 'festival of vultures.' No new war on Iraq. Money for jobs, education, health care and human needs—not for war and repression. Sponsored by International ANSWER. 8-10 a.m. At Connecticut Ave. & Calvert Ave. NW. For info (202) 332-5757 or (212) 633-6646 or info@internationalanswer.org or www.InternationalANSWER.org

SAN FRANCISCO

Sat., Sept. 14
No new war against Iraq. Labor and community activists march and rally to stop U.S. from attacking Iraq and to support the International Longshore & Warehouse Union in its

Workers World

55 West 17 Street
New York, N.Y. 10011
Phone: (212) 627-2994 • Fax: (212) 675-7869
E-mail: editor@workers.org
Web: <http://www.workers.org/>
Vol. 44, No. 37 • Sept. 19, 2002
Closing date: Sept. 11, 2002

Editor: Deirdre Griswold;
Technical Editor: Lal Roohk; Managing Editors: Greg Butterfield, John Catalinotto, Leslie Feinberg, Monica Moorehead, Gary Wilson; West Coast Editors: Richard Becker, Gloria La Riva; Contributing Editors: Joyce Chediak, Pat Chin, Naomi Cohen, Shelley Ettinger, Teresa Gutierrez; Technical Staff: Gery Armsby, Lyn Neeley, Hank Sambach, Leslie Senior; Mundo Obrero: Carl Glenn, Carlos Vargas; Internet: Janet Mayes

Workers World/WW (ISSN-0043-809X) is published weekly except the first week of January by WW Publishers, 55 W. 17 St., N.Y., N.Y. 10011. Phone: (212) 627-2994. Subscriptions: One year: \$25; foreign and institutions: \$35. Letters to the editor may be condensed and edited. Articles can be freely reprinted, with credit to Workers World, 55 W. 17 St., New York, NY 10011. Back issues and individual articles are available on microfilm and/or photocopy from University Microfilms International, 300 Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48106.

Selected articles are available via e-mail subscription. Send an e-mail message to info@workers.org for details.

Periodicals postage paid at New York, N.Y.
POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Workers World/WW, 55 W. 17 St., 5th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10011.

JOIN US. Workers World Party (WWP) fights on all issues that face the working class and oppressed peoples—Black and white, Latino, Asian, Arab and Native peoples, women and men, young and old, lesbian, gay, bi, straight, trans, disabled, working, unemployed and students.

If you would like to know more about WWP, or to join us in these struggles, contact the branch nearest you.

National Office
55 W. 17 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10011
(212) 627-2994;
Fax (212) 675-7869
wwp@workers.org

Atlanta P.O. Box 424,
Atlanta, Ga. 30301
(404) 235-5704

Baltimore 426 E. 31 St.,
Baltimore, Md. 21218
(410) 235-7040

Boston 31 Germania St.,
Boston, Mass. 02130
(Enter at 284 Amory St.)
(617) 983-3835;
Fax (617) 983-3836
boston@workers.org

Buffalo, N.Y.
P.O. Box 1204
Buffalo NY 14213
(716) 857-2112
buffalo@workers.org

Chicago P.O. Box 06178,
Wacker Drive Station,
Chicago, Ill. 60606
(773) 381-5839;
Fax (773) 761-9330;
chicago@workers.org

Cleveland
P.O. Box 5963
Cleveland, OH 44101
phone (216) 531-4004
cleveland@workers.org

Detroit
5920 Second Ave.,
Detroit, Mich. 48202
(313) 831-0750;
detroit@workers.org

Houston
P.O. Box 130322,
Houston, Texas
77219 (713) 861-5965
houston@workers.org

Los Angeles
422 S. Western Ave.,
Room 114,
Los Angeles, Calif. 90020
(213) 487-2368
fax (213) 387-9355
la@workers.org

Milwaukee
P.O. Box 12839,
Milwaukee, Wis. 53212
milw@workers.org

Philadelphia
P.O. Box 9202,
Philadelphia, Pa. 19139
(610) 352-3625;
phila@workers.org

Richmond, Va.
P.O. Box 14602,
Richmond, Va. 23221
richmond@workers.org

Rochester, N.Y.
2117 Buffalo Rd., PMB.
303, Rochester, N.Y. 14624
(716) 436-6458;
rochester@workers.org

San Diego, Calif.
3930 Oregon St., Suite 230
San Diego, Calif. 92104
(619) 692-4496

San Francisco
2489 Mission St.
Rm. 28,
San Francisco,
Calif. 94110
(415) 826-4828;
fax (415) 821-5782;
sf@workers.org

Seattle
1218 E. Cherry #201,
Seattle, Wash. 98122
(206) 325-0085

State College, Pa.
100 Grandview Rd.,
State College,
Pa. 16801
(814) 237-8695;
jxb58@psu.edu

Washington, D.C.
P.O. Box 57300,
Washington, DC 20037,
(202) 347-9300
dc@workers.org

WORKERS WORLD PARTY EMERGENCY CONFERENCE

Sept. 21-22 • New York City

CAPITALISM IN CRISIS

- X Imperialist war on Iraq
- X Economic downturn
- X Racism and repression
- X Wall Street's war at home and abroad

Hear what revolutionary Marxists say can be done to fight back

Workers World Party is holding an emergency conference on the weekend of Sept. 21-22 in New York City to strengthen the fight-back movement against the growing war crisis, escalating racism and repression carried out in the name of "homeland security" and the deepening economic crisis affecting millions of workers and their families.

As the Bush administration readies plans for open aggression against Iraq, steps up its intervention in Colombia, and threatens every country in the world that won't march to the orders of the Pentagon and the transnational corporations, the capitalist system is moving towards crisis.

The loss of TRILLIONS in the stock market is translating into bankruptcies and mass layoffs and poverty for millions of workers. This developing economic crisis is motivating the hawks in the Bush administration to move recklessly in the traditional direction that capitalism takes when it is sinking into crisis—towards war, racism and repression.

No to imperialist war

Bush & Co. want to divert this crisis into a general war against the developing and underdeveloped countries. Targeting Iraq is aimed at securing the vast wealth of the Middle East for Big Oil. But it is also meant to keep the U.S. working class from fighting the real enemy—the millionaires and billionaires who exploit them, steal their labor, cut their pay and throw them out of a job the minute they can't make a profit off them anymore.

No to Pentagon-CIA intervention

Bush used the 9/11 disaster to claim the right to destroy any movement or government that does not bow to the dictates of Washington—from the Palestinians fighting the U.S.-backed Israeli occupation to the liberation fighters battling the U.S.-sponsored death squad government in Colombia, to Puerto Ricans struggling for independence and to get the U.S. Navy out of Vieques.

Bush and the Pentagon have also targeted Iran, Syria, Libya, Cuba and north Korea. U.S. troops are fighting in Afghanistan and the Philippines. Wall Street and the Pentagon are intervening in Latin America—from Brazil

to Venezuela, Uruguay to Argentina—with coups and financial strangulation. Bush is targeting Zimbabwe for trying to take the land back from rich white farmers who stole it from the people during the days of British rule. The whole continent of Africa is suffering intensified oppression under neo-colonial domination.

Washington wants to turn the world into Wall Street's plantation.

Their huge expansion of the military, plus tax breaks for the rich, have moved the country back into deficit spending—which means more stealing from Social Security and what remains of social services.

Fight racism; Build a rainbow of unity

Capitalism thrives on divide and conquer. When in crisis, it steps up super-patriotism and racism against people of African descent, Latinos, Asians, Native people and other nationally oppressed peoples. Since 9/11 Bush, Ashcroft and Company have especially targeted immigrants from Arab and Muslim countries. But this reactionary program endangers the rights and well-being of all working people—oppressed nationalities, women, lesbian, gay, bi and trans people, seniors, disabled, organized labor and others.

How can a working-class program struggle against all these forms of oppression in order to build the broadest, most united fight-back movement against the super-rich and their repressive state?

How can we stop the next war before it starts? How can the anti-war struggle join up with the economic fightback of the workers?

How can those fighting for social justice develop a program that defends the interests of the workers as a whole while the big banks and corporations are ruthlessly slashing and burning to boost their profits?

WORKERS WORLD PARTY

55 West 17 Street, 5th Floor
New York, NY 10011

September 5, 2002

Dear Friend,

We urge you to participate in an Emergency Conference on "Capitalism in Crisis and the War Danger" called by Workers World Party. It will be held in New York on September 21-22. Political activists, workers and Marxist revolutionaries from all over the United States will be attending this important gathering.

This is a critical moment. The movement needs a careful and thorough analysis of post-9/11 world developments in order to strengthen our response to Bush's monstrous plans for war on Iraq, to escalating racism and repression, and to the deepening economic crisis affecting millions of workers and their families.

The conference will bring together people of all colors, nationalities, genders, ages and sexual expressions. Party members who give leadership in many struggles will bring their wealth of experience to the conference—fresh from the front lines.

A major focus will be the struggle to stop Bush's new imperialist war on behalf of Big Oil, especially the mass demonstrations planned for October 26. There will be a first-hand report from a recent solidarity trip to Iraq.

The capitalist economic crisis is now worldwide, bringing joblessness and poverty. Labor's right to strike is being threatened by Tom Ridge in the name of "national security." How can the working class get back on its marching feet? How can we revive the superb tools of Marxism, not just as a theory, but as a living force of class struggle against the predatory bosses?

Find the answers at the Workers World Party Conference

Come to the Workers World Party Emergency Conference Sept. 21-22

This conference will be devoted to discussing and analyzing the present period and reviewing the struggles of the recent past. The goal is to build a fighting movement against the rapidly developing military, political and economic crisis. The conference is where people of all colors, nationalities, genders, ages and sexual expressions can exchange experiences and develop an approach to the coming struggles.

Party leaders and members have given support and leadership to many organizations in a variety of struggles and have a wealth of experience that they will bring to the conference—fresh from the front lines of these struggles.

OUR MARXIST HERITAGE

WWP studies Marx, Lenin and other great socialist revolutionaries and has a firm understanding of their contributions to the world historic struggle against class division and national oppression.

Build a revolutionary party

What is needed in this country is a revolutionary working-class party. Workers World Party fights to win the most gains for our class under capitalism. And we work to build a united movement that can get rid of the ruling class once and for all.

Can such a thing happen in the United States? We think so. Come to the conference on Sept. 21-22 and find out why.

CONFERENCE REGISTRATION

- Saturday & Sunday \$20 (\$10 fixed income)
- Saturday only \$10 (\$5 fixed income)
- Sunday only \$10 (\$5 fixed income)
- I need motel information
- I need mass housing information (limited availability)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone _____

Email _____

Organization _____

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Sat., September 21
9 am Registration
9:30 am-8 pm
Panels & Workshops

Sun., September 22
10 am-2 pm
Panels & Workshops

Return Coupon to Workers World Party
55 West 17 Street, 5th Floor, NY, NY 10011
212-627-2994 • register@wwpublish.com
www.workers.org

Courts and banks reach back half a century to rob migrant workers

By Adrian Garcia
Los Angeles

In an Aug. 23 court ruling that exposes the U.S. ruling establishment's disregard and utter contempt for migrant workers, a federal judge in San Francisco dismissed a class action lawsuit filed last year by Mexican laborers—to obtain savings that had been withheld from their wages back in the 1940s.

Judge Charles R. Breyer of federal district court admitted there was "no doubt that many braceros never received Savings Fund withholdings to which they were entitled" and claimed, "The court is sympathetic to the braceros' situation." (New York Times, Aug. 30)

But his ruling cleared Mexico and the United States of any legal culpability. He cited "sovereign immunity" and ruled that the statute of limitations had expired.

The lawsuit implicated the governments of Mexico and the United States, three

Mexican banks and a Wells Fargo bank in squandering the migrant workers' salaries.

Under the Bracero Program, Mexico agreed to provide the United States with workers as a gesture of good faith to help alleviate labor shortages caused by World War II. Between 1942 and 1949, the years considered in the lawsuit, about 400,000 Mexicans worked on farms and railroads in the United States.

Unbeknownst to many of the Mexican migrant workers, or braceros, their wages were subject to a 10-percent deduction for the purpose of establishing savings accounts in Mexico. The money was to be transferred from U.S. banks to Mexican banks.

The workers were expected to collect their savings upon returning to Mexico. To this day, many of them have not received their due wages. And now a U.S. court has ruled that these workers have no right to their money because of legal technicalities.

The New York Times reported that "United States records at the time indicate that at least \$32 million was withheld from the workers' wages." No accounting has been made of how much of that money was given back to the braceros.

A 1946 Mexican report claimed that most of the money, minus \$6 million, was returned to the workers. Advocates for the braceros and their families view both the U.S. and Mexican reports with great suspicion. They say the braceros may have been cheated of as much as \$500 million, including interest.

Breyer's ruling cleared Mexico and its banks of any responsibility on the grounds of sovereign immunity because the banks were state-owned. Wells Fargo, the bank entrusted with transferring the funds into Mexican banks, was cleared on the grounds that the workers' lawyers neglected to state a claim against the bank.

Claims against the United States were discarded on the grounds that the statute

of limitations had expired. This begs the question: If some of the braceros were unaware of the deductions made to their salaries, how could they possibly make a claim before the statute of limitations ran out?

Breyer, in his ruling, stipulated that the lawsuit could be reopened on condition that proof be presented that the workers didn't know about the deductions.

Jonathan Rothstein, a lawyer for the braceros, told the New York Times that an appeal is possible.

Considering the attacks that immigrants are enduring in the United States today, it should not come as a great surprise that a court, while acknowledging that workers who came to this country legally were wronged and exploited, should then simply dismiss their legitimate claims. All the more reason why progressive people must not rely on the courts but must stand up and defend the migrant workers of today as well as those of yesterday.

Labor must fight bankruptcy court

Teamsters sacked in corporate blitz

By Milt Neidenberg
Retired Teamster

It was a pre-emptive attack. Not on the Iraqi people. Not yet.

Those attacked were 15,500 workers at Consolidated Freightways Corporation, this country's third-largest less-than-truckload (LTL) carrier.

It was a dehumanizing act of vengeance. Imagine leaving home, prepared for work, and arriving at the terminal to find the gates locked. That's what happened on Sept. 2—Labor Day. Without warning, the company shut down operations and filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.

CF locked out thousands of drivers, freight handlers and clerks. According to several Teamsters members who reported to work to pick up deliveries, the union was unprepared and uninformed.

Teamsters represent over 95 percent of the workforce at Consolidated. About 80 percent of them lost their jobs. Many had 20 and 30 years on the job.

One thousand retirees lost health benefits immediately.

The national LTL market is dominated by huge carriers such as Roadway, Yellow, and union-busting Overnite Transportation. LTL is a strategic sector of the transportation industry covering nearly half of the entire truckload industry, according to the American Trucking Association.

Headquartered in Vancouver, Wash., CF has been in business for 73 years.

Only Teamsters can operate LTL equipment

LTL drivers and freight handlers live and work in a stressful environment. Their workday can begin at any time, usually at night.

CF hires city drivers who pick up shipments from 20 or more customers and deliver them to a terminal. There, freight handlers sort out loads going to the same destination.

City drivers and loaders are paid at an hourly rate. Then line-haul drivers take the trailers to destination terminals, where the loads are separated for on-time customer deliveries. Speedup and efficiency are essentials in this cutthroat competitive

industry. The drivers are paid primarily on mileage.

It's a grueling life, filled with danger and injuries. Drivers are fortunate if they get home twice a week. CF runs sleeper teams. "They might drive from California to Memphis, taking turns and shifts, then lay over and bring a load back in the succeeding days," says CF spokesperson Mike Brown.

They usually spend their time in a bunkhouse, waiting to pick up another load, either to return to their home base or go to another destination. Often they sleep in their tractors on the side of the road.

They do most of their driving at night. Loads often include hazardous materials. If a snowstorm or a serious accident closes an interstate highway or some unexpected event delays the deliveries, leaving a driver with undelivered drops in the trailer, management may invoke punitive measures.

LTL drivers must be skilled and experienced as they maneuver their trucks through cities and small towns. A driver can go from an industrial park with docks to a neighborhood crowded with cars and people. LTL carriers come in all sizes. Some trailers are huge, covering national, regional and intrastate traffic. For handling smaller shipments, there are dry van, refrigerated or flatbed trucks.

Bankruptcy—tool of the bosses

The workers have earned the right to take over CF and run this bankrupt company. They gave life and value to the 73-year-old corporation. Should these workers lose their jobs, their wages and benefits due to CF's colossal mismanagement in a highly competitive, cutthroat industry?

Should a small clique of bankers and other creditors rip off the equity of the company, which they know will be approved by a U.S. bankruptcy judge? This is a critical issue for the entire labor movement as the economy spins out of control toward more layoffs, plant closings and bankruptcies.

Chapter 11 bankruptcies continue to rise at an alarming rate: Enron, WorldCom, Global Crossing, Tyco, Adelphia. In the steel industry alone, 30 companies have filed for bankruptcy in recent years.

The intent of a corporate bankruptcy



The workers have earned the right to take over CF and run this bankrupt company. They gave life and value to the 73-year-old corporation

is to cut labor costs. Thousands of workers are laid off, union contracts are torn up, and retirees lose their pensions and health benefits.

Yet these corporations have no legal right to impose such abuses.

They have been stripped of their power. They can't sign a check, pay a bill or make a single financial deal unless the bankruptcy court-appointed trustee approves the transaction. They are "absentee owners," "a debtor in possession" under the law. They are no longer in possession of the property.

It is only in collusion with the bankruptcy court that their power is restored.

On the day CF locked out the Teamsters and declared bankruptcy, a company spokesperson invited smaller companies to pick up their shipments from many of its 290 terminals. Management asked their top competitors—Roadway and Yellow Corp.—to deliver freight to larger customers. The Teamsters union, which has contracts with these companies, could order its members to refuse to honor CF requests. It would have the legal right to do so.

It's time to change the locks

Recently the AFL-CIO has supported the principle that workers are entitled to be declared the primary creditor in a bankruptcy and stand first in line, ahead of all other investors. Most important, the workers could declare their right to trusteeship and run the bankrupt company.

The AFL-CIO statement is a significant

development, but it needs to be backed up with an organized fight. So far, no attention is being paid to the AFL-CIO position, even as high-priced lawyers representing Wall Street creditors, bankers and vendors wheel and deal to strip the equity from the fallen company.

CF operates about 6,000 tractors, 27,000 trailers and about 290 extensive terminals. The property is sitting idle behind locked gates while thousands of laid-off workers scramble to survive. Survival rests with their right to claim these tractors, trailers, and terminals.

The indisputable fact is that their long years of strenuous and stressful labor, their skills and experience entitle them to run the company. Add to this the value of back wages, pensions and other accumulated benefits and it is crystal clear that the Teamsters are the principal creditors and should be declared the trustees of CF.

The Teamsters, over 10,000 strong, have been caught off guard by being locked out and laid off. They need to quickly regroup and defend the idle property behind the locked gates—the trailers, the tractors and the terminals.

As they fight for their legal rights in bankruptcy court, they need to put picket lines around these valuable pieces of property and means of production, to prevent them from being sold off or used to satisfy the wants of greedy bankers and other lenders.

Changing the locks would send these parasites a strong message that labor has property rights.

Time for workers to fight?

YES—but not in Bush's war

By Deirdre Griswold

Flight or fight—scientists say those are the two ways we react to fear.

Run away from danger if you can. Stand and fight if you can't.

What's the danger facing workers right now? Should we be running away or standing and fighting?

Bush says that to calm our fears we have to run overseas and fight Iraq. That anyone who doesn't agree is supporting terrorism.

He knows that people are afraid, for lots of reasons. This selected president, buddy of the billionaire oil companies, who never saw a union he liked, wants to recruit the workers for his war and thinks that fears of terrorism in this uncertain world will push us into his corner.

But it's baloney. After yet another war, will the world be more secure? When there are more grieving families, more destroyed cities and towns, will the U.S. be more popular overseas? And how will a war on Iraq exact "vengeance" for the Sept. 11 attacks? Iraq had nothing to do with the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon.

Anyone who knows the least little bit about the Arab world knows that the Iraqi people and leaders are not allies of Al-Qaeda or the Islamic fundamentalist movement, even though they are very angry at the U.S. government for its treatment of their country.

Not one country in the Middle East—except for the Israeli settler regime, a U.S. client state—supports this government's war plans.

War equals more pain and suffering

What the working people here will get out of such a war is more pain and suffering. More veterans will come home with all kinds of disabilities. A huge bill for high-tech military equipment will make the war merchants and their friends in Washington happy, but will bankrupt what remains of social programs and plunder our entitlements, like Social Security.

Inevitably, it will have to be paid for, and the hundreds of billions of dollars that Bush wants won't be coming from the rich who profit off war. They've had their lawyers rewrite the tax laws so that now 99 percent of the burden of paying for the government's follies rests on the workers and middle class.

Will seniors suddenly be able to afford their overpriced medications if there's a war? Will the 40 million (and growing) people without health insurance get coverage?

Will workers whose cars and homes have been repossessed by the banks get back their property? Will the hundreds of thousands laid off over the last year by corporations that put profits before people get their jobs back? Will there be decent homes for those now living in trailers or parks—or on the streets?

Let's be honest. Will a war help lock up the criminal, greedy corporate executives who have been riding high at the expense of workers and investors, including employee retirement plans? Or will it elevate the class of billionaires to new heights of global power?

Will education suddenly become free, or at least affordable, for working-class students? Or will they have to shoulder a gun and be prepared to kill people on the other side of the world to have access to some training—which may or may not be useful in civilian life?

What the workers will get out of a war on Iraq is more pain and suffering.

Will a war help lock up the criminal, greedy corporate executives who have

been riding high at the workers' expense? Or will it elevate the class

of billionaires to new heights of global power?

But a war abroad is not inevitable. We can stand and fight here.

Will a war bring down the inflated price of apartments and houses? Will it help provide good, cheap public transportation for workers who now spend most of their lives in or paying for their cars?

Will a war end the very real threat to this planet posed by global warming? Will a U.S.-British monopoly on the oil in the Middle East—which is why Tony Blair is the only political leader backing Bush, against the wishes of most of the people in Britain—help shift our energy use away from fuels that are polluting the world with greenhouse gases?

What about communities of color?

More of the troops these days come from oppressed communities of color. Will putting even more Black and Latino youth in uniform stop the cops from killing unarmed people in their neighborhoods? Will a war help Black people win reparations for the centuries of slavery their ancestors endured?

Will it help end the scourge of drugs in poor communities—or will it make it much worse, as happened during the Vietnam War?

Will a war help reverse this country's shocking rate of incarceration and find a way back into society for the 3 million people—mostly poor and disproportionately people of color—whose freedom has been taken away by the cruel system of prisons and parole?

Will it lessen Arab bashing, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, and other forms of scapegoating, or just make them worse?

Will it make it easier for immigrants to join unions, get paid a decent wage, and have the basic rights that any worker, anywhere, is entitled to? Or will it increase the anti-"foreigner" hatred and fear already whipped up in the media?

Will a war lessen the discrimination against lesbian, gay, bi and trans people, or will it demand conformity to a violent Rambo model of heterosexist male domination?

The fears are real

Workers do have a lot to be afraid of right now. The Wall Street bubble has burst, and many of the Mickey Mouse jobs created over the last decade are now evaporating, along with what had been more secure union jobs.

How many people do you know who are trying to figure out how to rearrange their lives because the income they need just isn't there?

How many young people have to stay with their parents—or parents move in with their children—when they would prefer their independence? How many women—like the four recently murdered by soldiers at Fort Bragg—are trapped in abusive relationships because they can't afford to leave? How many children are left on their own because there's no help for working parents?

Wouldn't a war that pulls soldiers and

even reservists away from their families for long periods just make everything worse?

This year, the number of people suffering from long-term joblessness rose by 50 percent, according to the Department of Labor. Almost 3 million people who lost their jobs have been unemployed for at least 15 weeks, and half of them have not worked in at least six months.

And just when all these people found they could no longer pay their bills, Congress passed a law preventing individuals from getting out of debt through personal bankruptcy.

This level of long-term unemployment is typically seen not at the end of a recession, which is how the Bush administration characterizes the present, but in "a period of deep downturn." (New York Times, Sept. 9)

It's a common myth that wars provide jobs. But it's been proven that in today's economy schools, parks, libraries, health facilities and other social services create far more jobs for the dollar than do high-tech war industries, which are very automated. Also, these kinds of public service jobs are much more likely to be unionized and to hire people of diverse backgrounds. But these jobs are exactly what get cut back when the military budget eats up civilian services.

Last Iraq war brought unemployment, not jobs

The last war against Iraq, launched in 1991 when Bush Senior was president, led to such a strong recession that he lost the 1992 election to Bill Clinton. Unemployment was so bad that the Clinton/Gore campaign slogan in 1992 was "It's the economy, stupid."

The Economic Policy Institute recently reported that the income gap is growing again, after having slowed down during the 1990s boom. Will a war that provides a few jobs for high-tech specialists in the military industries, while leading to cutbacks of many more public service jobs, decrease this growing gap—or make it worse?

The Bush administration has already shown that it means to discipline labor under the excuse that the right to strike interferes with "national security." Tom Ridge, the Homeland Security czar, threatened the West Coast longshore workers that if they walked out to win a contract, he would call out the National Guard.

What will happen to labor's rights if Bush is allowed to go ahead with his plans to militarize this country?

Since Bush became president in January 2001, \$94 billion in pay has disappeared as 110 million workers have seen their wages stagnate. (Louis Uchitelle in the New York Times, Aug. 11) Bosses are taking larger deductions out of paychecks for health insurance, and overtime hours are down. In addition, 1.7 million jobs have disappeared since March 2001.

What are workers going to do about

all this? Will the response to the bosses and their chief henchman in Washington be flight or fight?

The war can be stopped

The war is not inevitable. Bush is already having an extremely difficult time lining up even token support around the world. The public attitude here is changing all the time—which is why the administration put on a full-court press around the Sept. 11 anniversary to shore up its waning support.

We can refuse to be diverted by war propaganda. We can stand and fight here for better social services and more public jobs. We can challenge the bosses' "right" to throw us into the streets after decades of hard work. We can demand that the wealth of this society go into workers' wages and benefits and not into bosses' profits and perks.

We can extend solidarity to our working-class sisters and brothers, regardless of where they come from or what language or culture or religion they share. Solidarity is the greatest weapon of the working class—every worker needs the solidarity of others, whether to press a simple grievance or to win a major battle with the bosses.

We can build back our unions—and tell Bush where to put his union-busting threats.

Working-class heroes belong in the anti-war struggle—at its very core. The attempts of this big business administration to link heroism to their violence against the Third World are nothing but a cynical manipulation of the people's genuine grief and shock over Sept. 11.

More and more workers know it, too. Even Stephen J. Cassidy, president of New York's Uniformed Firefighters Association, said at a recent rally, "I'm tired of politicians coming to our funerals and telling the widows how sorry they are. Pay us a living wage."

If even firefighters aren't getting a living wage, you know things are bad. Now is the time to fight right here at home for the working class and tell Bush that, if he wants a war on Iraq, he and the generals and the arms merchants and the oil billionaires should strap on their desert gear and go play soldier.

Detroit city unions unite

Continued from page 2

city workers packed a city council budget hearing.

With no progress since then, the Coalition of City of Detroit Unions has been growing. The Labor Day message told the mayor: "This is simply not acceptable. We will not quietly accept a reduction in our families' standard of living."

The letter exposed the waste, outsized executive salaries and expensive privatization rampant in the city government.

In response to the mayor's offer to show the unions the city's books the union officials responded: "Pardon us if we are skeptical. We have gotten a good education over the past six months about corporate book-keeping practices with Enron and the other corporate crooks."

The coalition of unions ended by demanding that the mayor revise his budgetary priorities and settle all outstanding contracts within 90 days. Union members and community supporters are mobilizing to picket the mayor on Sept. 21.

Analysis of first Gulf War from Workers World, Aug. 23, 1990

The Evil Empire at work

By Sam Marcy

This penetrating article on the motives and machinations behind the first Gulf War, written by the founder of Workers World Party, appeared originally in the Aug. 23, 1990, issue of Workers World. At that time, the first Bush regime was furiously rounding up international support for its coming onslaught against Iraq. Ronald Reagan had invented the term "Evil Empire" to describe his adversaries. Sound familiar? But as Marcy shows, the real Evil Empire was based in Washington and Wall Street.

The Evil Empire is hard at work, moving faster than at any time since World War II. It has mobilized the largest naval armada since that global conflict. It has already deployed thousands of U.S. soldiers on the sands of Saudi Arabia and along the coast of Kuwait. President Bush is talking openly of a quarantine, which is the last step before open war.

"Why are we in Saudi Arabia?" asks the Wall Street Journal of Aug. 15. "We're there to protect the integrity of the world's oil supply," say the Journal editors. But the world's oil supply doesn't belong to the world. It belongs to a handful of multinational corporations, as greedy, avaricious, and extortionate a grouping as ever existed.

"The world cannot tolerate," says the Journal, "a power with the capability of imposing a tax on all the West, especially a power that would use its profits to build nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to extract more declarations of surrender and tribute."

Who's raising gas prices?

Who is the Journal talking about? Who is imposing a tax on the American people as of today? Look at any gas station in the country and the answer is as clear as crystal. It is Mobil, Exxon, Texaco, Ashland, Gulf—or any one of a dozen of smaller companies. Even in the period of a glutted oil market, they dared to raise the price of gasoline! And when President Bush was asked why he didn't do something, he urged them to exercise "voluntary restraint."

What power "uses its profits to build nuclear, chemical and biological weapons to extract declarations of surrender and tribute"? Isn't that the U.S.? Wasn't the Pentagon the first to store chemical, nuclear and biological weapons by the hundreds of thousands?

Don't they extract both tribute and surrender from oppressed peoples who dare to stand up to the behemoth of imperialist finance?

"Saddam Hussein is indeed a modern pirate, whose men this week were literally looting Kuwait of its material wealth and carting it back to Baghdad," says the Journal editorial.

So it's Saddam Hussein. Yesterday it was Noriega. He's all but forgotten in the last few months, now that Panama is presumably securely occupied by U.S. military forces after the many, many casualties meted out to the population, women and children included. The day before that it was Muammar Qaddafi.

But this week it's Hussein whose men are looting Kuwait of its material wealth. Oh, how the imperialists can lie and lie in the face of the most obvious facts!

The wealth of Kuwait has been flowing into the coffers of the Western imperialists

for decades. It's in the superbanks of the imperialist world—Chase Manhattan, Chemical, Manufacturers Hanover, as well as the big British, French, Swiss, Belgian, German and Japanese banks. Who should know this better than the financial hot-shots of the Wall Street Journal?

The real pirates

Then the Journal quotes Secretary of State James Baker. He briefed NATO foreign ministers last week, suggesting "that 'the world could be plunged into a new dark age' if the Iraqis got away with stealing Kuwait." All the Middle East knows that the Kuwaiti government has been a puppet of U.S. imperialism and that its wealth has been stuffing the deep pockets of the bankers in New York, Tokyo, London, etc.

What constitutes the Evil Empire? It is the unholy alliance of big oil, the multinational corporations, the military-industrial complex, the big banks, and the capitalist government which undeviatingly acts as their willing servants. How else can we account for the deafening silence from Congress and the liberal luminaries of bourgeois public opinion in the face of a global conflagration?

Nobody has spoken out. At the time of the notorious Gulf of Tonkin resolution giving Lyndon Johnson a free hand in Vietnam, Senators Wayne Morse (D-Ore.) and Ernest Gruening (D-Alaska) voted against it. Why isn't there even one senator or representative speaking up today?

Such a monolithic situation can arise only because free expression is stifled by the complete monopolization of all the vital arteries of communication by corporate entities intimately connected to or owned by the Evil Empire.

How different the situation was a century ago! In 1898, when U.S. capitalism was already moving into the imperialist epoch, it invaded the Philippines during the Spanish-American War. But at that time, literally half a million people—when the U.S. population was less than a third what it is today—joined the Anti-Imperialist League, along with many intellectuals and even business people, to protest the brutal colonialist occupation of the islands.

Nor were they turned around by the rhetoric of William Randolph Hearst and his nationwide chain of tabloids, who decried the cruel and despotic Spanish rulers and preached the gospel of democratic U.S. capitalist overlordship in the Philippines.

Why today is there no up-and-down vote in Congress as required by the Constitution and restated in the War Powers Act? Forget it. It's a mere scrap of paper whenever the needs of finance capital become imperative.

A monolithic unity?

France, Britain and even Denmark have joined the imperialist combination to commit aggression in the Middle East. What accounts for the unanimity of the imperialist robbers? What accounts for their sudden turn from a cantankerous diversity of opinions to apparently monolithic unity?

The imperialist powers are known throughout history for their bitter rivalry and conflict over economic, financial and strategic interests. Even when allies in some respects, they retain their adversarial relationship in other areas. The present monolithic unity is therefore suspicious in light of the historical evolution of one of their principal characteristic features: the division and redivision of world markets and resources.

When the relationship of forces on a world scale no longer corresponds to the political and economic situation, then pressures build up to revise the old divisions. The decade that began with the Israeli aggression in 1967, followed by the oil boycott and the 1973 Arab-Israeli war, froze certain areas of exploitation by the imperialists, corresponding to their interests for the time being. Thus it would remain until a more attractive opportunity arose to reconsider the relationship of forces among the imperialists and develop a strategy for new aggression in this area of fabulous raw materials that holds decisive significance for a good part of the rest of the world.

Is the division and redivision of markets and sources of supply merely a theoretical premise lacking a factual historical basis? Let us look at the historical record.

In 1916, during the bloodiest international carnage ever, when the outcome of the war was still uncertain and U.S. intervention was being debated in Congress, France, Britain and czarist Russia secretly signed a treaty dividing a good part of the world markets in strategic areas among themselves. We wouldn't even know about this secret agreement except that the Bolsheviks, on taking power in Russia, kept their promise to reveal all secret treaties of the czarist regime and published the Sykes-Picot agreement. What were its terms?

The territory czarist Russia staked out for itself is not relevant to our present concern. But of preeminent importance was the agreement between France and Britain. They divided between themselves, among other areas, all of the Arabian peninsula.

When Lenin wrote his "Imperialism," in which he offered abundant data showing that one of the characteristic features of imperialism was the division and redivision of the world, some still argued that this was a general theoretical conclusion not sufficiently fortified by facts.

Likewise, Rudolf Hilferding's earlier work, "Finance Capital," had been pooh-poohed by the capitalist press as mere theorizing, although both books relied heavily on the data of J.A. Hobson, a British author with impeccable credentials.

None of the imperialists' plans for division and redivision of world markets were "open covenants, openly arrived at," as Woodrow Wilson pledged after World War I. That never happened. Nearly all were secret, revealed only after public outcry or the overthrow of governments forced them into the open.

Today's secret agreements

We don't know any more about the secret agreements being made today than the people during World War I knew about the Sykes-Picot treaty. But we do know about the greed of the imperialists—whether in the U.S., Japan, West Germany, France, Britain or even Denmark. None of them would gratuitously join a naval armada out of humanitarian instincts. They would only do it for what is called in imperialist diplomacy "a consideration." And the division of the oil is an enormous factor in getting their cooperation. The hows we may not know, but we know the whys.

The present situation is characterized by the fact that the conditions for a redivision of world markets and sources of supply have matured. It has only awaited an attractive opportunity for the redivision to take place. Saddam Hussein provided that opportunity, in a way far more provocative than the shooting of Archduke Ferdinand

of Austria in 1914. The concern professed by the imperialists for the independence of Kuwait rings as false as their forefathers' crocodile tears over "little Serbia."

The real reason for both world wars was the imbalance in world political and economic relations after great technological and military growth. Germany, and later Japan, had become increasingly powerful but lacked access to the world markets. The attempts of Britain and France to contain the growing might of German imperialism would in the end lead to war.

Now an amazing array of naval might is being assembled, supposedly to stop aggression. Why was this not available when the Israelis invaded Egypt in 1967? Or the countless times since when they have bombed, strafed and killed thousands of people? Resolutions of condemnation have become routine in the United Nations, but there has never been a naval armada to force back the Israelis from their illegal occupation of territories. Of course not, because the Israelis are in cahoots with the imperialists and serve as an arm for the protection of their interests.

The question of aggression

But let us assume that there is genuine concern about the fate of a small, independent country being taken over by a

Continued on page 10

Bush gang

Continued from page 1

which it did against the civilian cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on Aug. 6 and 9, 1945.

While Japan's other cities had been massively bombed with conventional weapons before those dates, Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been spared by the U.S. Air Force so that the later impact of nuclear weapons could be cleanly evaluated. More than 200,000 civilians were incinerated or died from radiation poisoning.

While ranting against an Iraqi "nuclear threat," Bush and company would actually like to overcome what they consider an ill-advised taboo against the use of nuclear weapons. The "why build 'em if we can't use 'em" nuclear mentality has finally been codified with a new military doctrine that takes the U.S. a giant step forward toward the use of nuclear weapons.

The Pentagon, under the Bush administration, has developed a new military doctrine under the title Nuclear Policy Review. Released in early 2002, it allows for the first use of nuclear weapons against several countries, including Iraq, Iran, Syria, China, Russia and others. (Los Angeles Times, March 10, 2002)

Weapons inspectors: the pretext for war takes shape

The Bush strategy to get support, or more likely the acquiescence, of other governments for the planned U.S. aggression will likely revolve around the issue of Iraq's willingness or lack of willingness to allow UN weapons inspectors to hunt for "weapons of mass destruction."

Bush doesn't really give a hoot about weapons inspectors, because neither he nor any of the U.S. officials is actually worried about Iraq's military capability.

The Bush team will craft a new "coercive inspections" proposal that will be such a flagrant violation of Iraq's sovereignty

Momentum for Oct. 26 national march grows

By Sarah Sloan
Washington, D.C.

In the days after a Sept. 4 news conference launched organizing for the Oct. 26 National March on Washington, volunteers had to be called in to help answer phones at the ANSWER coalition's offices in Washington and New York while the C-Span cable TV network broadcast and re-broadcast the hour-and-a-half event.

The news conference featured former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, who had just returned from Iraq, along with representatives from a wide variety of anti-war, civil rights and religious organizations announcing a call for a National March in Washington and a joint action in San Francisco to "Stop the War on Iraq Before it Starts."

By Sept. 8, the news conference had been broadcast four times on C-Span 1 and 2—and volunteers had lost count of the number of calls.

"It was definitely in the hundreds," said Ayn Kirkendall, a 16-year-old student intern with ANSWER—Act Now To Stop War and End Racism. She said: "As soon as the show began airing, the phones began ringing, and this continued throughout the broadcast and after. Then we would check the voicemail and find a number of mes-

sages equal or greater than the number of people we had spoken to.

"Considering the amount of war propaganda propagated by the Bush administration, I was very surprised that the calls were overwhelmingly positive. Everybody wanted to come to Washington, D.C., on Oct. 26. They weren't just calling to express support—they plan to be in D.C. on Oct. 26, and to be there with their friends, family and co-workers, who all oppose the war."

Pam Parker, a research analyst and shop steward at Newspaper Guild Local 32035 who regularly volunteers with ANSWER on her evenings and weekends, said: "I've spoken with a retired woman from South Carolina whose husband was killed in World War II, who wants to come with her study group. I've spoken to numerous women whose kids are in the military and one who is in the Air Force reserves. I spoke to a man who started the conversation by saying, 'I'm a retired senior citizen—how do I get to D.C.?'"

"I've spoken to college students and younger students, including a few in middle school, from all over the South, Midwest, East and West Coasts. I've spoken to people of all ages, some of whom have been involved in many protests before, some of whom have never

protested a day in their lives.

"We spoke to quite a number of people who want to set up what we call Organizing Centers—this means they are serving as a local contact for their area, helping to get the word out and organizing transportation to D.C. Though they had only found out about the march moments before and this is a two-month organizing effort and commitment, they were so committed to stopping the war that they agreed immediately. Their organizing got off the ground a little while later when we received calls from others in their area."

Become an organizer today!

The Oct. 26 National March in Washington, D.C., and joint action in San Francisco were initiated by groups including the ANSWER Coalition, National Lawyers Guild, Muslim American Society Freedom Foundation, Dorothy Day Catholic Worker, IFCO/Pastors for Peace, Free Palestine Alliance, Muslim Student Association, Partnership for Civil Justice-LDEF, Mexico Solidarity Network, Nicaragua Network, International Action Center, Kensington Welfare Rights Union, Middle East Children's Alliance, Bayan USA-International (Filipino community), and Korea Truth Commission.

Now endorsed by over 400 organiza-



Iraqi mother and injured child.

tions and prominent individuals, the Call to Action reads in part: "On Saturday, October 26, 2002—the first anniversary of the signing of the so-called Patriot Act—anti-war, civil rights, labor, student and other forces are joining together to launch a massive international mobilization in opposition to a new war against the people of Iraq. Mass marches and rallies will be held in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco in the U.S., and in many other countries."

The organizers call on all those who oppose a new war in Iraq to not only be there for the protest. They are asking everyone to become organizers, help get the word out, raise consciousness about the real U.S. motives and bring the people they win over to D.C.

To read the Call to Action, endorse, find transportation from your area, download the flyer and more, see www.InternationalANSWER.org, call 202-332-5757 or email dc@internationalanswer.org for more information.

seeks pretext for war

and so militarily dangerous that Iraq will not be able to accept it. Then Iraq can be labeled intransigent, obstructionist and unwilling to "cooperate with the United Nations"—so that the Pentagon can begin the air war and invasion.

Bush and the media will thus assert that the U.S. went the extra mile to prevent war. It went to the UN first to seek one last chance at resolution. When the war comes it will be presented as Iraq's failure to comply with the UN, rather than as a unilateral act of aggression by imperialism against a small, oil-rich Third World nation.

The war will be to "protect American people from nuclear terror" rather than the re-conquest of a country that had earlier dared to nationalize Western oil installations. Iraq possesses 10 percent of the world's oil supply and was first placed on the "terrorist nations" list in 1972 when it took over the Western oil monopolies which had gotten rich from the plunder of its natural resources.

Coercive inspections: Wolf in sheep's clothing

Making Iraq an offer that it would have to refuse was laid out in a document circulated recently by the so-called Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. It is a prescription for war rather than peace.

The plan, which is referred to in the media as "muscular inspections," amounts to demanding that Iraq voluntarily allow the U.S. invasion force into the country under the name of an Inspections Implementation Force (IIF), or some similar name.

"The IIF must be highly mobile, composed principally of air and armored cavalry units. It might include an armored cavalry regiment or equivalent on the Jordan-Iraq border, an air-mobile brigade in eastern Turkey, and two or more brigades and corps-sized infrastructure based in

Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Air support including fighter and fighter-bomber aircraft and continuous air and ground surveillance, provided by AWACS and JSTARS, will be required," writes Jessica Matthews, president of the Carnegie Endowment.

That this is a prescription for war rather than negotiations is evident. It has the advantage, though, of making Iraq appear to be in non-compliance and therefore subject to all-out war at any moment.

"The inspection teams would return to Iraq accompanied by a military arm strong enough to force immediate entry into any site at any time with complete security for the inspection team. No terms would be negotiated regarding the dates, duration, or modalities of inspection. If Iraq chose not to accept, or established a record of noncompliance, the U.S. regime-change option or, better, a UN authorization of 'use of all necessary means' would come into play."

Bush knows that Iraq's acceptance of this inspections model or a variant of the model is unlikely if not impossible. If Iraq allows weapons inspections like this, it would signify that the country from then on would be under the control of the military forces of a foreign power that seeks its destruction.

Between 1991 and 1998, Iraq was subjected to more than 9,000 weapons inspections. According to Scott Ritter, the former chief U.S. weapons inspector in Iraq, the country has been largely disarmed for many years.

Iraq is in a hobbled state as a result of economic sanctions that have been imposed on it for more than a decade. Its economy was wrecked, its industrial infrastructure degraded. Where clean drinking water was guaranteed before 1991, people today get sick and die from drinking contaminated water. The destruction of water plants and aqueducts by aerial bombing and the refusal to allow Iraq to

import spare parts and decontaminants was part of an intentional and integrated U.S. strategy to destroy the water system. (Thomas Nagy, *The Progressive*, September 2001)

The people of the United States must take action now to prevent the next war on Iraq. It is part and parcel of the long-standing struggle between imperialist domination and all those—the majority of the world's people—who seek to be

free from colonialism and neocolonialism so that they can determine their own destiny.

The writer is a co-director of the International Action Center and a spokesperson for the ANSWER coalition. He was on a five-member delegation, including former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark, that just visited Iraq.

PROTEST DONALD RUMSFELD at the military-industrial complex's

'festival of vultures'



**Monday, Sept. 16
8-10 a.m.**

Connecticut Ave. & Calvert Ave. NW
Washington, D.C.

NO NEW WAR ON IRAQ

The military-industrial complex is holding its annual arms bazaar in Washington, D.C., to show off its latest weapons of mass destruction.

The featured speaker will be Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, the Bush administration's chief cheerleader for a new war against Iraq.

While money is being cut from schools, housing, health care and social programs, the Bush administration is increasing the military budget by \$50 billion.

Money for jobs, education, health care and human needs — not for war and repression!

International ANSWER

(202) 332-5757 or (212) 633-6646 or info@internationalanswer.org or www.InternationalANSWER.org

Mumia Abu-Jamal
Live from death row

9-11 Remembered

Forever in the American mind, 9-11 will be a day of shock, of disbelief, of sorrow and of loss. Like a flash photo image superimposed on the retina, the specter of

planes circling like metal vultures the twin towers of midtown Manhattan repeats itself in the mind's eye, revealing itself over and over again. What American political, media and economic elites have done with 9-11, however, should be cause for concern to all of us. For the shock and

sorrow and yes, the rage borne from the flames of 9-11 have been used by these elites to reward the very culprits who brought 9-11 into being. Those elites have bequeathed billions if not trillions more to the military industrial complex that armed, trained and justified the Mujahadeen in Afghanistan in the first place. The late Pakistani scholar Eqbal Ahmad, in his last book, "Terrorism: Theirs and Ours," points out that the entire Muslim world was mobilized to fight the "evil empire," as Reagan called the former Soviet Union. Ahmad wrote:

"I've seen planeloads of them arriving from Algeria, Sudan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, even from Palestine where at that time Israel was supporting Hamas against Alshata(sp), Yassar Arafat's faction of the PLO. These people were brought in, given an ideology and told that armed struggle is virtuous, when the whole notion of Jihad as an international Pan-Islamic terrorist movement was born. The U.S. has spent billions in producing the Bin Ladens of our time. In 1986 I visited the camp they hit in Zahowar Afghanistan. It was a CIA-sponsored camp," Ahmad writes.

There, in the poverty-stricken, dusty mountains of Afghanistan, the beginnings of 9-11 were born. What we saw in the second week of September 2001 was merely what the late Malcolm X called the "chickens coming home to roost." Deep down, in our hearts, away from the polls, away from the politicians, we know this. We really do. Then along come the oil barons, the Rumsfelds, Cheneys and the boy King, Bush. "Bomb Iraq," they say.

Americans are looking at a new colonialism that will leave a taste as foul in their mouths as the last one. Vicious, rapacious greed priming the pump of war—a war that will enrich the few by raising oil prices, impoverish the many and sow the seeds of Islamic and Arab hatred that will last until the next century. If you're against the empire of war, hatred, greed and new colonialism: Join us. We are growing. I thank you all.

Ona Move,

Long Live John Africa

Free the MOVE 9

Free the Angola 3

To Freedom for us all

This is Mumia Abu-Jamal



A worker from the WTC:

'Don't let Bush use our pain to push the world to war'

By John Catalinotto
Former World Trade Center worker
New York

Could you imagine this a year ago? It's September 2002. Under the pretext of a "war on terror," Washington is waging an aggressive war against any who resist its domination of the world—from Afghanistan and Iraq to the guerrillas of Colombia and the progressive nationalist government in Venezuela.

What made this possible was the Bush administration's exploitation of the events of Sept. 11, 2001.

Sometimes, looking downtown, I almost expect to still see the World Trade Center towers. On Sept. 10, 2001, I worked late on the 31st floor of Tower Number 1. I felt justified sleeping late the next morning. I was late enough to see the towers burning, and Tower 2 collapse, and lucky enough not to be inside.

Most of my 1,900 co-workers on floors 18 to 31 made it out. But 11 died, including one in his wheelchair and one keeping him company. Everyone in the office that day was traumatized. They climbed down smoky staircases dripping with water from automatic sprinklers.

To escape falling debris, one co-worker out on Liberty Street had to leap over a woman killed by a wheel from the airplane that crashed into Tower 2.

Like the rest of the city's working class, about a third of my co-workers were immigrants—mainly from China, Russia, South Asia, the Pacific islands and Latin America.

The company survived. In a month everyone was back at work—everyone but the 11 who died and 6 percent of the company's work force who were downsized. That plan had been in the works long before the attacks, as part of capitalist restructuring. Our work time was increased 6 percent without extra pay.

A year later, the families of those who died on Sept. 11 got substantial financial compensation. Many workers, like some

who bussed and waited at the Windows on the World restaurant, have remained jobless. One has said he wished he had been caught in the rubble, where his compensation would have been more valuable to his family.

The World Trade Center towers were places where tens of thousands of people worked. That's the human side of the equation.

Symbols of U.S. domination

But the towers were also symbols of U.S. economic domination of the world, of so-called globalization that reduces hundreds of millions of people to starvation and which aroused a powerful worldwide movement to fight it.

The Pentagon, also hit that day, is the symbol of U.S. military domination, and of the bombs dropped on Korea, Vietnam, Iraq and Yugoslavia—that have killed many, many more than the 3,000 in the towers.

Together these buildings symbolized the grip that Washington, Wall Street and Hollywood have on the Middle East, sucking out the oil and money, and pumping in a foreign culture. Holding down the masses and stifling the educated middle classes. Propping up the intrusive Israeli settler state.

U.S. foreign policies and practices, especially throughout the Middle East, aroused a deep anger. And, even according to the official story, this anger found expression through organizations that Washington itself had funded and aided for decades as part of its war against communism.

Those who killed themselves and 3,000 others may have intended a blow against U.S. domination. And the destruction of these symbols was indeed an insult to the perceived invulnerability of the U.S. state. But the slap in the face broke no teeth.

A propaganda weapon

On the contrary, the Sept. 11, 2001, attack put a propaganda weapon in the

hands of the most right-wing, aggressive faction in the U.S. political establishment. It stunned much of the population into passivity, and made it possible for George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Paul Wolfowitz and others in their grouping to exploit the pain and fear the attack inspired to push the country toward a permanent state of war abroad and repression at home.

Right now the threat of a major assault on Iraq seems the biggest danger. But along with this—or waiting in line behind it—is a war against all peoples and parts of the world that resist "globalization." Henry Kissinger, in a 1999 talk at Trinity College, admitted that "globalization" means the domination of U.S. financial and strategic interests.

U.S. advisers and weapons pour into Colombia, now openly to battle leftist guerrillas of the FARC and ELN who have been fighting the oligarchy. U.S. troops are back in the Philippines, allegedly to battle "Islamic terrorists" but really to intervene against a people's liberation army.

U.S. agents and money move against the progressive Hugo Chávez government in Venezuela, which neighbors Colombia at the north end of a continent that is in a depression deeper than that of the 1930s.

Suffering Afghanistan is now permanently occupied by U.S. troops, ruled by a president who can't survive without a team of 70 U.S. bodyguards.

Meanwhile U.S. bases proliferate from Eastern Europe to Central Asia, setting up a modern version of the old Roman Empire, with its capital in Washington.

Those of us who worked in the towers can rightly ask ourselves, "Will we let Bush and Company use our worries and sorrows as an excuse for the Pentagon to wage war on the world?" As an indication of the answer, the sister of the worker who died keeping his friend in the wheelchair company has become a spokesperson for anti-war causes.

I, for another, say no, and I'll be demonstrating this decision in the weeks that come.

New York City protesters

'Iraq is not the problem!'

Around 1,000 people marched from Times Square to Union Square in Manhattan Sept. 8 to demand "global peace and justice."

While the spirit of the march was focused on commemorating the events of Sept. 11, the protesters obviously had Iraq on their minds. Signs called for "A regime change in D.C." as well as "Global peace and justice." One of the more popular chants was: "War is not the answer, Iraq is not the problem."

People on the sidewalks generally reacted very positively. A group of African street peddlers even joined the march for several blocks. A number of foreign television crews covered the event.

At the beginning of the march, police arrested one protester for carrying a "deadly weapon." He had a box-cutter taped to his sign.

—Photos and story by G. Dunkel



Palestinian professor speaks out against repression

By Dianne Mathiowetz
Atlanta

On Sept. 7 an Atlanta audience of 150 or more listened attentively to Dr. Sami Al-Arian describe the repression he and his brother-in-law have endured because of their political views in support of Palestine.

Al-Arian was the featured speaker at a Sept. 7 program entitled "Voices for Palestine," which also included International Action Center co-director Sara Flounders and Rania Masri, Arab-American activist, researcher and writer.

For over 16 years, Al-Arian has been an award-winning professor of computer engineering at the University of South Florida in Tampa. During the same time, he has been a vocal advocate for Palestinian rights, opposing the Israeli occupation.

He and his brother-in-law, Mazen Al-Najjar, also a teacher at USF, established an Islamic research center at the university called The World and Islam Studies Enterprises, as well as a charity named the Islamic Committee for Palestine.

Since the late 1980s, their political activities have been under scrutiny by federal authorities.

Anti-Arab frenzy swept the country after the bombing of the Oklahoma City federal building in 1995. Right-wing journalists with ties to Israeli intelligence pointed to Al-Arian as the culprit despite the FBI's finding that the prime suspects were white men.

The major Tampa newspaper repeatedly ran sensational stories filled with unsubstantiated and false accusations charging Al-Arian and Al-Najjar with being associated with "terrorism."

Federal agents raided their offices in 1995 and froze the assets of their organizations.

Mazen Al-Najjar was then imprisoned for three years in solitary confinement without charges on "secret evidence."

During his brother-in-law's incarceration, Al-Arian conducted a public campaign against the use of "secret evidence." He won the support of constitutional experts and civil-liberties advocates who successfully convinced Congress members to legislate against its use.

Mazen Al-Najjar was finally released from prison after a Florida judge reviewed the case. In a scathing 57-page decision, he stated that not only had Al-Najjar's constitutional rights been violated but that there was no evidence to support any of the charges.

Meanwhile the university itself conducted an investigation and found no evidence of terrorist activities.

As Al-Arian said on Sept. 7, "We thought we had won. We had proven our innocence."

Then came Sept. 11. As an imam and re-

spected Muslim leader in the Tampa Bay area, Al-Arian mobilized blood drives and donations, participated in interfaith memorials and counseled the Arab and Muslim communities.

Two weeks after Sept. 11, Al-Arian was invited to appear on the Fox news show hosted by Bill O'Reilly, supposedly to discuss the ramifications on the community since several of the hijackers had lived in Florida.

O'Reilly blindsided Al-Arian, repeatedly accusing him of supporting terrorists. The show's producers were fed their information by the Tampa journalists who had started the witch hunt years before. They omitted the judge's findings, and the university's.

What were Al-Arian's "crimes"? At a 1988 rally, he had said, "Death to Israel." Years ago, he had been at an Islamic conference also attended by Sheik Omar Abdu-Rahman, the Egyptian cleric convicted of masterminding the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. He knew members of Hamas and other Palestinian organizations.

After the O'Reilly show aired, Al-Arian received death threats. The Islamic school he founded in Tampa was vandalized.

University President Judy Genshaft suspended him with pay. She declared that his presence on campus endangered the safety of the institution and its 37,000 students.

Days later, on Aug. 21, the University of Southern Florida filed a lawsuit charging that Al-Arian, a tenured professor, had violated his contract by creating "disruptions" at the school with his public statements.

The American Association of University Professors has been vocal in its support of Al-Arian as a matter of union rights and academic freedom. Al-Arian's case has been compared to Calif. Gov. Ronald Reagan's firing of Black activist Angela Davis in the early 1970s.

Florida Gov. Jeb Bush has also weighed in on the matter. It's no surprise that he agrees with the university president and board of regents' actions to fire Al-Arian.

In the year since Sept. 11, 2001, thousands of Arabs, Muslims and South Asians

have been picked up by federal agents and held incommunicado. They have been questioned endlessly and moved from prison to prison without any charges filed against them. Mazen Al-Najjar was one of them. After months of detention, Al-Najjar was deported in mid-August 2002, for a 20-year-old visa violation.

Al-Arian warned the Sept. 7 audience of students, African Americans, Arab, Muslim and Jewish community members, and anti-war activists that the Bush administration does not only want to suppress support for Palestine. He detailed the provisions of the USA Patriot Act that infringe on Bill of Rights freedoms—free speech, freedom of association and assembly, protection from unreasonable search and seizure—making opponents of government policy targets for political repression.

Al-Arian concluded by expressing confidence that this attempt at political repression will fail—not only because the case against him has no merit, but because the cause of freedom will not be suppressed.

For more information, go to www.academicfreedom.org.

Activists in Harlem declare:

'Mugabe is right! Free the land!'

Special to Workers World
Harlem, N.Y.

The main theme of a Sept. 5 street meeting in Harlem was defense of Zimbabwe President Robert Mugabe, who has come under a vicious, racist, pro-imperialist attack for calling for the redistribution of the land to the indigenous masses. The Zimbabwean government is currently in a struggle with 4,500 white farmers who occupy the most arable lands in the former British colony.

The Friends of Zimbabwe Coalition and December 12th Movement sponsored the street rally. Speakers included Viola Plummer, with fist raised, from the Dec. 12 Movement, Kevin Muhammad from the Nation of Islam, and Monica Moorehead, at mike, from the International Action Center.



PVN PHOTO: BRIAN KOHL

Labor activists demand release of Muslim detainees



Special to Workers World
Brooklyn, N.Y.

A number of labor unionists under the umbrella of "Justice For Detainees" picketed in front of the Metropolitan Detention Center here Sept. 7. Their objective was to bring attention to the illegal detention of hundreds of people, mainly of Arab and South Asian descent, who are being held indefinitely and in secret, imprisoned since the reactionary Patriot Act was signed after the Sept. 11th attacks. The 200 protestors chanted, "INS, FBI—No more suspects, no more lies."

WW PHOTO: ANNE PRUDEN

The Bolsheviks and War

Lessons for today's anti-war movement

By Sam Marcy \$4.95



What distinguished the Bolsheviks from the other parties in the Socialist International? Lenin and the Bolsheviks used the crisis of WWI to organize the revolutionary overthrow of the old order in Russia.

Add \$1 postage each
Order from WW Publishers,
55 W. 17 St., 5 Fl., NY, NY 10011



U.S. domination in Afghanistan

Stability—U.S. style. That's what the people of Afghanistan are enduring today, at Ground Zero of the Pentagon's war on their impoverished country. The Sept. 5 assassination attempt on the country's president, Hamid Karzai, and the car bomb explosion in Kabul that killed at least 30 people earlier the same day, illustrate that the United States has not and will not be able to establish a stable government in Afghanistan.

The grueling conditions in the war-torn country are generating anger, resentment and resistance from sectors of the population.

Some 1.5 million people were turned into refugees by the devastation of U.S. bombing raids and destruction of the infrastructure. On Sept. 7 the Pentagon admitted that scores of civilians were killed or injured in a U.S. air strike on a string of Afghan villages in July. According to Afghan investigators, what Washington called "valid military targets" were really wedding parties.

After a quarter of a century of U.S.-instigated wars, 10 million land mines remain buried in the earth, killing or injuring some 400 people every month. And, the United Nations estimates, 6 million people face starvation this winter.

Very little of the billions of dollars promised by Washington and other Western powers has arrived.

The Karzai government is the lightning rod for a great deal of

anger—which is why the United States installed this puppet regime to enforce its imperial bidding. Those placed as titular heads of Afghanistan are certainly beholden to U.S. interests in the region.

Karzai, it should be recalled, is a former consultant for the U.S. oil company Unocal. He helped Unocal plan a proposed 1,500-kilometer gas pipeline starting in Turkmenistan, stretching across Afghanistan, and ending in Pakistan. In May, while he was still acting as interim leader, Karzai and the presidents of Pakistan and Turkmenistan signed an agreement to move ahead with the pipeline. Unocal was said to be the frontrunner to head the multi-billion-dollar project.

Finance Minister Ashraf Ghani reportedly worked for the World Bank after nearly a decade as a professor of anthropology at Johns Hopkins University. Anwar Ahady, governor of Afghanistan's central bank, taught political science at Providence College in Rhode Island and worked as a banker in Chicago before returning home.

These are just the most prominent individuals who guarantee the United States nearly absolute control over all financial and economic decisions made in Kabul.

Instability in Afghanistan is guaranteed as long as U.S. military brass steer from the helm toward their course of economic and strategic interests in the region.

Analysis of first Gulf War from Workers World, Aug. 23, 1990

Evil Empire at work

Continued from page 6

larger neighbor. Shouldn't it be considered first as an internal affair of the region? Shouldn't an opportunity be afforded to the people in the area to discuss and take whatever measures they regard necessary? But this never happened.

From the beginning to the end, it has been the U.S. and its imperialist allies, with the collaboration of the USSR and China, orchestrating every move. It is brazen intervention. Only as an afterthought, when it became clear that a virtual firestorm of protest would come from the masses, the workers and peasants, the progressive intelligentsia, did the imperialists begin to think that perhaps there should be an Arab solution.

Then came the idea of an Arab League summit meeting. But it's a fraud to call this an Arab solution. These are the bought-and-paid-for tools of imperialism. Take the largest and most significant country in the Arab world, Egypt. The government of Hosni Mubarak has been getting \$2.3 billion a year for the last 10 years. No wonder, exclaims a New York Times article of Aug. 13 [1990], that aid to the Egyptian government has "really paid off in terms of American interests" in the area.

Egypt is leading the so-called deployment of Arab soldiers to guard Saudi Arabia against invasion. The Saudi government is as totalitarian and dynastic as any ancient monarchy ever was and as removed from the people.

What this Arab solution amounts to is a rounding up by the imperialists of comprador elements of the Arab bourgeoisie to guard the interests of the imperialists against any attempt to dislodge them from their fabulous empire of oil. This is the issue.

The mass of the people in these Arab nations have not been heard from. Of course, the PLO, Libya and Yemen have registered their opposition. But even if only Arab nations were involved, this would not necessarily exhaust the issue of the right of all nations to self-determination. ...

Participation of USSR and China in UN vote

Apart from the division and redivision of world markets and sources of raw materials, there is still another factor that accounts for the suspicious unity of the imperialists in their flagrant aggression in the Middle East. It is the accommodation of both the USSR and China to the needs of the imperialists, particularly the U.S. A number of smaller "nonaligned" countries have also followed suit, incapable of resisting the pressures of both the imperialists and the accommodating position of the two large socialist countries which previously had stood as obstacles in the road of imperialist aggression.

Why is it so woefully wrong for a socialist country, or a workers' state that aspires to socialism, to vote in the Security Council—as both the USSR and China did—for an imperialist-sponsored resolution condemning Iraq and imposing sanctions?

Because it confuses the masses. They are concerned about the rights of nations to self-determination against unjust or illegal annexations or amalgamations. That's what world progressive public opinion is concerned with. That's what the anti-imperialist forces and the advanced working class everywhere is concerned with.

But the U.S., Britain, France, Germany, Japan—what are they concerned with? The super profits to be drawn out of the sweat and blood of the Arabian workers and peasants. They're concerned with predatory, avaricious, extortionate profits.

That's why they are sending their naval armadas and are ready to go through an imperialist holocaust, just as they have done in two imperialist world wars and innumerable coup d'états and interventions.

To vote with them is to convey the impression that they are concerned about the rights of small nations. In the face of what has happened in

Grenada, Panama, Nicaragua, Kanaky, the Malvinas, and many other parts of the world, that's wholly wrong. Confusing the masses facilitates the role of the imperialists and has enabled them to virtually issue a declaration of war against Iraq.

But note this. Having seen that the imperialists are on the verge of open military warfare and have gathered such a vast armada, both China and the USSR have become worried about where all this is leading.

Earlier they agreed on sanctions, thinking it's a slow process which may not work and is less important than arriving at some sort of accommodation with the imperialists. Foreign ministers Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker made a joint statement Aug. 3 calling for "an international cutoff of all arms supplies to Iraq." It was a signal for the imperialists, especially the U.S., to hurry the military and especially the naval preparations to attack Iraq.

The point is that the U.S. originated the maneuvers for sanctions in the Security Council, getting the support of China, the USSR, and some other countries that ordinarily would have been glad to denounce the U.S. for its intervention.

This gave the U.S. a sort of legal basis for its unilateral action against Iraq, although this was not specifically agreed to by the Security Council. You can read backwards and forwards the resolution that was passed. It did not give carte blanche to the U.S. and its allies to open aggressive military action against Iraq.

But the imperialist press, following the orders of their respective governments, have interpreted it that way, and the world movement has been incredibly confused by the apparent full-scale agreement of China and the USSR with the imperialist powers. For all that anyone knows, they are so much in cahoots with the imperialists that perhaps they will share in the booty in one way or another.

USSR calls for UN role

But note this. No sooner had U.S. military forces arrived in Saudi Arabia than the USSR suddenly discovered that there really is no UN authority for the military intervention. Why else would they call a Security Council meeting and ask the council to pass a resolution calling for a UN role?

Fearful now that this has gone too far, too fast, the USSR wants the UN Security Council to appoint a military commander to guard against invasion who would have the consent of the Arab countries as well as the others. By asking for UN intervention rather than the unilateral intervention of the imperialist allies, they demonstrated a fear that this may turn into a general conflagration going far beyond the occupation of Iraq.

Had the USSR been concerned from the very beginning with the potential for imperialist aggression, they would have denounced U.S. plans for intervention, as they have done on other occasions together with China. But having gone halfway to meet the demands of imperialism, they found themselves in a trap and tried to pull back somewhat by calling for a UN role. What kind of UN role can there be when an alien force is already poised in the Gulf, albeit without the permission of the other countries of the region? ...

If in a labor dispute, a large union because of bureaucratic and class collaborationist tendencies begins to undermine a smaller union, is it right to seek a special agreement with the employer? That can only result in scab-herding and strike-breaking. No self-respecting union with a militant tradition would ever engage in it.

For oppressor and oppressed to join in a common resolution, as in the UN, completely wipes out the principal division in the contemporary world, which is between the super-exploited billions of people and the handful of imperialist powers which dominate the world. This tendency has become strengthened by the will-



**SUBSCRIBE TO
WORKERS WORLD
SPECIAL TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION
\$2 FOR EIGHT WEEKS (NEW SUBSCRIPTION)**

\$25 for one year

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Phone number _____

Workers World Newspaper

55 West 17 St. NY, NY 10011 (212) 627-2994

ing collaboration of the USSR and China in this ghastly act of imperialist interventionism.

In light of the contemporary situation in the Middle East, it would be foolhardy for the workers and the peasants to allow one or another of the bourgeois states to dominate the area on the basis of its oil wealth or military strength.

The very idea of domination is alien not only to anti-imperialist but to socialist principles. In the world labor movement, it is elementary that no large union should infringe on the rights of a small union or try to absorb it by high-handed tactics contrary to the will of the membership. What's applicable in the movement of the working class is also applicable among sovereign, independent and oppressed nations.

Current science and technology teach us how indispensable it is that there be a world organization to deal with environmental factors arising out of industrialization, particularly high technology. But it will never be viable if it's composed of oppressors and oppressed, where a few of the exploiting groups manage to hoodwink or corral the rest, claiming to be representative of no less than humanity.

What's needed is a world organization composed of the oppressed people and socialist countries. Actually, this is not a new thought. We advanced it in the sixties, as did President Sukarno of Indonesia. He actually proposed such an organization from which the imperialists would be excluded, rather than one in which they are dominant.

The UN in its long existence since 1945 has not solved a single significant issue which was not in the long run solved by the masses themselves. It was under the cover of the UN that the U.S. opened the Korean War and cowed more than a dozen nations to send military forces under the command of General MacArthur. The UN flag still flies there although it can no longer disguise naked U.S. occupation.

The UN may have some useful purposes here and there, but grave and very serious issues like imperialist intervention in any country can be solved only by the people themselves and their representatives. The fact that the UN Security Council at this late date is still dominated by a pro-imperialist majority disqualifies it from any progressive struggle.

Some countries don't have oil and need an equitable redistribution of the world's resources. It is an altogether regressive feature of the contemporary world that one small country, by virtue of its underground resources, can control the destiny of millions of people in other geographical areas. The imperialist bourgeoisie or the comprador bourgeoisie cannot be relied upon for an equitable or just solution.

Indeed, the world cries out against domination by the big imperialist powers. But not to replace it with another form of domination. The only answer is a world cooperative socialist federation, where the means of production are the common property of the workers and peasants and, as we are learning more and more, its natural resources are utilized in an equitable way regardless of the geographical position of the country or the availability of the resources.

Only a world federation of socialist states can rid humanity not only of predatory imperialist wars but of poverty and underdevelopment as well as all kinds of disequilibriums that have developed as a result of society having been divided into antagonistic classes, into oppressors and oppressed.

As Marx put it in his monumental introduction to "A Critique of Political Economy," the abolition of capitalism will close the pre-history of humanity. But in the meantime, stopping imperialist aggression is the first priority.

Protecting mass murderers

Why Washington battles the International Criminal Court

By John Catalinotto

Washington usually couches its hostility to the proposed International Criminal Court in terms of its desire to "protect U.S. soldiers."

Naturally the U.S. ruling class wants no one else to sit in judgment of its troops, whatever the nature of their crimes. But this is a relatively minor concern. Washington could sacrifice some troops to an otherwise useful court, just as it could sacrifice cannon fodder on the field of battle.

The real concern is for the big honchos in the White House and the Pentagon who decide to make the war in the first place. Or who decide to overthrow a government and slaughter all the labor leaders of a country.

A quote from a top Bush official, published in the Sept. 7 New York Times, put it bluntly. "The soldiers are like the capillaries; the top public officials—President Bush, Secretary Rumsfeld, Secretary Powell—they are at the heart of our concern," the senior official said. "Henry Kissinger, that's what they really care about."

The official added, "They don't really care about the Lt. Calleys of the future."

In 1969, when news of the My Lai massacre spread in the United States and around the world, it became a focal point for anti-war fury. A U.S. unit, led by the infamous Lt. William Calley, had opened fire on unarmed Vietnamese villagers. The soldiers killed 347 people by official U.S. Army count. About half were children. Calley got a life sentence from a U.S. court but was quickly paroled.

Calley was only one of the U.S. criminals in Vietnam, distinguished because he could see his victims up close and because other troops reported him. There were also the pilots who bombed and rocketed the

same villages from a distance.

More to the point, Presidents Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon, Gen. William Westmoreland and other Pentagon chiefs, their advisers and lieutenants ordered the overall slaughter. They were real mass murderers.

One such was Henry Kissinger, Nixon's secretary of state. He promoted bombing Cambodia and, while negotiating, threatened nuclear warfare against north Vietnam. Kissinger also was behind the Sept. 11, 1973, coup in Chile that overthrew the elected government of President Salvador Allende and ushered in a brutal military dictatorship run by Gen. Augusto Pinochet.

Protecting mass murderers

U.S. officials oppose the proposed international court because they want to protect and defend the latest crop of mass murderers. This group—Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Vice President Richard Cheney, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and President George W. Bush—know they could potentially be charged for these crimes.

John Bolton, under secretary of state for arms control and international security, is spokesperson for the Bush gang on this question. On July 23, 1998, when Bolton was heading the right-wing American Enterprise Institute—also home to Rumsfeld and Cheney—he wrote in a summary of his remarks to a meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"Much of the media attention to the American negotiating position on the ICC concentrated on the risks perceived by the Pentagon to American peacekeepers stationed around the world. ... [O]ur real concern should be for the president and his top advisers.

"The definition of 'war crimes' includes,

for example: 'intentionally directing attacks against the civilian population as such or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities.'"

Bolton wrote that under the ICC rules, U.S. leaders could have been found guilty of a war crime for dropping atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and for all the aerial bombardments of German and Japanese civilian areas.

Bolton's policy, which is also the administration's, has a single virtue: It is frank. The troops are expendable, but the rich and powerful must be protected.

The Milosevic 'trial'

The only "international court" Washington approves is one like the International Criminal Court for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), now sitting in judgment of former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic in The Hague, Netherlands. This political court is NATO's creation, a weapon aimed against any leader from the Balkans who resisted the U.S./NATO takeover.

As the prosecution ends the "Kosovo phase" of the trial Sept. 10 or 11, it has brought in 124 witnesses—some testifying in secret or at a distance—against Milosevic. It has proved nothing.

Acting as his own attorney, preparing his case from his jail cell, and working with pitifully little resources, the Yugoslav leader has conducted a heroic case, exposing U.S. and NATO crimes against his people.

Even with the full backing of the U.S. imperialist state, and with very little likelihood they would face charges as long as the United States remains the military dominant force, U.S. leaders are terrified of being put in the position they were so anxious to put Milosevic in.

Perhaps it is because U.S. officials are so acutely aware of their guilt.

Paremos la guerra antes de que comience

Continúa de página 12

Cumbre sobre el Desarrollo Mundial en Johannesburgo, África, el 3 de septiembre.

Los intereses de la clase gobernante

La división entre Powell, y el grupo Bush/Cheney, Rumsfeld, no es de principios. Todos son sirvientes de la clase capitalista de los Estados Unidos y quieren ver la independencia de Irak destruida. La diferencia descansa sobre cual es la manera más barata de lograr una meta común.

Los malos reportajes de la prensa o las dudas de los asociados de la administración no pararán a Bush de llevar a cabo sus planes de guerra. El es subserviente a amos mucho más fuertes—los intereses de la clase gobernante y el hambre por las ganancias, el cual están resueltos a asegurar su dominación sobre el Medio Oriente rico en petróleo.

Y mientras que ellos temen a las consecuencias de acciones incautas por el gobierno de los Estados Unidos, no se puede contar con ninguno de los otros gobiernos capitalistas en todo el mundo para que monten una seria oposición a la campaña de guerra. Desafortunadamente esto tam-

bién se puede decir del actual grupo gobernante en China, el único país socialista miembro del Consejo de Seguridad de la ONU.

Estos gobiernos están más interesados en mantenerse al lado bueno del imperio que desafiarlo por la ley internacional o la soberanía de Irak. Ninguno de ellos quieren ser el próximo objetivo de la agresión del Pentágono.

Tampoco se puede confiar en la ONU. A pesar de las esperanzas de muchos países oprimidos que pertenecen a la Asamblea General, la ONU ha históricamente servido como una cortina para las aventuras imperialistas de los Estados Unidos, desde la Guerra contra Corea hasta la Guerra del Golfo, aunque el grupo de Bush ahora quisiera omitirle totalmente.

La única cosa que puede prevenir una guerra—la única cosa que daría a la administración de Bush y sus amos empresariales—es la amenaza de un levantamiento social y resistencia de las masas tanto aquí como en todo el mundo.

Afortunadamente, hay terreno fértil para construir un movimiento anti guerra masivo aquí mismo: ira sobre la decadente crisis económica de los pobres y obreros,

los ataques criminales contra los derechos civiles, la creciente aprehensión sobre las consecuencias de la política de "tiempos de guerra todo el tiempo" de Bush.

Una encuesta por la revista Time Magazine y la CNN del 1 septiembre mostró que el apoyo para enviar a soldados estadounidenses a derrocar al gobierno de Irak ha bajado desde un 73% en diciembre del 2001 a un 51% en agosto del año en curso. Una encuesta del periódico Los Angeles Times mostró que un 64%, menos de dos tercios—respaldaría a la guerra, aún en medio de la ola de jingoísmo promovido por los medios de difusión marcando el aniversario del 11 de septiembre.

Un 49% de los encuestados por el Time/CNN estuvieron de acuerdo en que una guerra contra Irak sería "largo y costosa".

Estas cifras muestra una duda y una oposición mucho más amplia contra la guerra que durante los primeros años de la Guerra en Vietnam y se siguen alejando de Bush todos los días.

La edificación de la protesta del 26 de octubre en Washington puede ser un gran paso hacia la organización de un movimiento que puede parar la guerra.

Coalición planifica protestas nacionales:

Paremos la Guerra antes de que comience

Por Greg Butterfield

Con cada día que pasa, la administración de Bush se vuelve cada vez más aislada en su plan para lanzar una invasión total contra Irak. Entre los líderes del mundo que han condenado los planes de guerra de Washington está Nelson Mandela, el símbolo heroico de la lucha en contra del apartheid en Sudáfrica.

Pero el aislamiento no es motivo político suficiente para prevenir una guerra nueva, dijeron miembros de una delegación de paz encabezada por el ex procurador nacional de los Estados Unidos Ramsey Clark, que hizo una visita a Irak. Declararon que se necesita un movimiento popular poderoso para eso.

En una conferencia de prensa celebrada el 4 de septiembre en el National Press Club en Washington, D.C., los delegados se juntaron con organizaciones en contra de la guerra, líderes de la comunidad musulmana y africana americana, estudiantes y activistas laborales para anunciar planes por una Marcha Nacional a Washington para Parar la Guerra contra Irak el 26 de octubre. Se va a llevar a cabo una marcha en San Francisco también.

Los organizadores están pidiendo a los opositores a la guerra y el racismo organizar protestas en ciudades alrededor del mundo ese día. El 26 de octubre es el primer aniversario de la Ley Patriótica (Patriot Act) que redujo libertades civiles tras el desastre del 11 de septiembre, 2001.

La marcha del 26 de octubre a Washington fue iniciada por el grupo International ANSWER (Respuesta Internacional—las siglas del nombre en inglés representan las palabras Actúe Ahora para Parar la Guerra y el Racismo), la Fundación de Libertad de la Sociedad Musulman-Americana, y el Gremio Nacional de Abogados.

“La gente de los Estados Unidos y de todos lados tiene la obligación de parar la administración de Bush en su afán de cometer una nueva agresión militar total contra Irak”, dijo Brian Becker, un miembro de la delegación de Clark y un vocero del ANSWER. “La administración de Bush no tiene el derecho de hacer la guerra contra un país que no representa amenaza alguna a los EE.UU.

“Con una indiferencia absoluta todo derecho internacional, el Presidente George W. Bush, el Vicepresidente Dick Cheney, el Secretario de Defensa Donald Rumsfeld y compañía están planeando enviar decenas de miles de soldados jóvenes a matar y a perder sus vidas en otra guerra para asegurar las ganancias petroleras.

“La cuestión más importante es esta”, agregó Becker. “Mientras que la opinión pública está firmemente en contra de la campaña bélica de Bush, se requiere un movimiento masivo del pueblo —en las calles, en los lugares de trabajo, las comunidades, los campos escolares— para prevenir una guerra.

“Llamamos a los civiles y militares igualmente a ejercer sus derechos políticos de hablar de claramente en contra de una guerra ilegal”.

Acciones de urgencia en contra de la guerra también están apuntadas para los días 14-17 de septiembre en Washington, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle y otras ciudades. Para más información visite el lugar del Web www.internationalanswer.org.

Nelson Mandela: ‘Estamos horrorizados’

El 2 de septiembre, el ex presidente sudafricano, Nelson Mandela, denunció las amenazas contra Irak, diciendo que la Casa Blanca está “introduciendo caos en asuntos internacionales, y esto lo condenamos en los términos más enfáticos”.

Dijo Mandela: “Estamos realmente horrorizados por cualquier país, si sea una superpotencia o un país pequeño, que actúa fuera de las Naciones Unidas y ataque a países independientes”. (CNN.com, 2 de septiembre)

Los gobiernos de Alemania, Francia, Rusia y China se han opuesto públicamente al plan de guerra de los Estados Unidos. El aliado de Washington más estrecho, el Primer Ministro Británico Tony Blair, no ha asumido una posición sobre el plan de invasión, aunque está de acuerdo con Bush, de que el gobierno de Irak tiene que ser “reemplazado”.

Ningún miembro de la coalición encabezada por los EE.UU que condujo la Guerra del Golfo de 1991 han suscrito a la

aventura de Bush. Todos temen que una invasión a Irak de parte de los EE.UU., faltando el pretexto de autorización de la ONU o cualquier pretexto creíble, pueda encender una ola nueva de lucha entre los pueblos oprimidos del Medio Oriente, además que movimientos anti guerra populares en los EE.UU. y Europa como ocurrió durante la Guerra de Vietnam.

Líderes de Europa que pronto enfrentarán su reelección, como Gerhard Schroeder en Alemania, también están motivados por la aritmética básica electoral de votos. Encuestas en Alemania, Francia y Bretaña consistentemente han demostrado la oposición del público a una guerra nueva a niveles de un 70 por ciento o más, y una hostilidad a cualquier oficial que parece a un títere de Bush.

Siria e Irán, ambos oponentes de largo plazo al gobierno de Irak, se juntaron en condenar el plan de Bush, sabiendo que ellos mismos puedan ser los próximos en la lista de blancos de Washington. Igualmente los regímenes en pro de los EE.UU. como Arabia Saudita, Turquía y Egipto han rechazado la posición de Bush.

Hasta Kuwait, la diminuta, monarquía que depende de los EE.UU. rehusó la invasión.

¿Inspecciones de armas la solución?

Muchos aliados de los EE.UU. están usando la cuestión de inspecciones de armas para ablandar para volverse menos intransigente en su oposición y no parecer demasiado fuera de acuerdo

con el plan de la Casa Blanca.

En vez de abiertamente defender el derecho de Irak a la soberanía y el derecho de defensa propia, están apresurando a Bagdad a aceptar el retorno de inspectores de armas de la ONU, con esperanzas de que de algún modo esto convierta el esquema de Bush en algo irrealizable.

El Secretario del Estado, Colin Powell, también ha tomado esta posición. Powell hizo pública su decisión a la invasión de Bush durante una entrevista con la Corporación Radiodifusora Británica el 1 de septiembre. Powell dijo que Bush tenía que dar justificaciones claras al Congreso y al mundo. “Se necesita un debate.... Para que todos podamos dar un fallo sobre esto.

“Como primer paso, debemos ver que encontrarán los inspectores, enviémosles de nuevo.”

Por muchos meses, Bush y sus asociados cercanos han tratado de forjar un caso para la invasión de Irak. Su táctica principal era decir que Irak estaba “construyendo armas de destrucción en masiva.”

Pero algunos inspectores de armas de la ONU, quienes han estado revisando los planteles de Irak desde la década de los noventa, públicamente refutaron estas alegaciones, diciendo que Irak no tiene tales armas o la capacidad de construirlas.

El ex miembro de la marina estadounidense, Scott Ritter, quien encabezó al equipo de inspección, admitió que no eran más que operaciones de espionaje para Washington. Ritter dijo que los inspectores daban información sobre puntos estratégicos políticos y militares a la CIA para usar en los bombardeos, como la operación “Zorra del Desierto” de Bretaña y E.U. en 1998.

Desde que los Estados Unidos retiraron a los inspectores en preparación para un asalto, el gobierno de Irak ha debidamente rehusado dejarles entrar de nuevo.

Buscando otra justificación, Cheney, dio un discurso beligerante el 26 de agosto, afirmando que asalto de anticipación era necesario porque Irak algún día podría construir un arma nuclear. Cheney agregó que más inspecciones por la ONU no servirían de nada.

El 2 de septiembre, el Vice Primer Ministro de Irak, Tariq Aziz dijo que el regreso a los inspectores de la ONU “estaba bajo consideración” y podría suceder, pero solo como parte de un “acuerdo comprensivo” que diera fin a las sanciones por los Estados Unidos, las cuales han matado a más de un millón de personas desde 1991, y el regreso de la soberanía sobre todo el territorio de Irak.

“Si ustedes quieren encontrar una solución, tiene que encontrar una solución para todos estos asuntos, no solo escoger cierto aspecto. Nosotros estamos listos para encontrar tal solución,” dijo Aziz después de reunirse con el Secretario General de la ONU, Koffi Annan durante la Reunión

Conferencia Urgente del Partido Obrero (Workers World Party)

Septiembre 21-22 2002 • En la ciudad de Nueva York

EL CAPITALISMO EN CRISIS

- X La campaña de guerra de Wall Street
- X La guerra imperialista contra Irak
- X La depresión económica
- X El racismo y la represión

Ven a escuchar a marxistas revolucionarios hablar sobre opciones de lucha

Pasa un fin de semana aprendiendo, intercambiando puntos de vista e información y a funcionar en red con otros que lucha por el Socialismo y la liberación. Si estás buscando por análisis y una guía para tomar acción contra el militarismo y la ola de racismo que sale de Washington y Wall Street, es aquí donde debes venir.

Habrás una sesión plenaria, talleres y muchas oportunidades de compartir tus experiencias con pensadores marxistas y luchadores de todas las edades.

Para más información y cómo registrar tu nombre, llama o contáctanos por escrito y email a:

Workers World Party, 55 W. 17St., 5th. fl N.Y., N.Y. 10011;
212-627-2994; ww@workers.org