

### Workers World Party to Oct. 26 marchers:

### Look for the motive

When a crime is committed, the first thing investigators look for is a suspect. The second is a motive.

The whole world knows that the Bush administration is preparing to commit a monstrous crime. It is assembling one of the most powerful armies ever seen for a high-tech attack on an impoverished, small country whose defenses have been destroyed. The criminal, in other words, is already known.

The growing anti-war movement needs to understand the answer to the second question: What is Bush's motive?

More and more, people are putting two and two together. They are learning of this administration's intimate connections to the oil industry. They are finding out that Iraq, though small, has one-tenth of the world's proven oil reserves. Slogans like "No blood for oil" have become very popular.

But the oil-producing countries all want to sell their oil to the rest of the world. It's their major—sometimes their only—source of for-

*Continued on page 11*

- African Americans in the military 4
- U.S. weapons cut both ways 7
- Bush Doctrine vs. self-determination 9
- U.S. firms & Iraqi oil: a sordid history 8

## Not Congress, not UN

# Only the people can stop war

By Fred Goldstein

The anti-war movement must expose the Bush administration's latest attempt to give the impression that Washington is trying to avoid war. No one should give an ounce of credibility to Bush's toning down of his war rhetoric. All attention must be focused on the Pentagon's feverish preparations for invasion.

The only answer to these war moves is an escalation of the anti-war struggle on all fronts.

In order to placate its opponents on the UN Security Council and the growing opposition in the U.S. and around the world, Bush has hypocritically declared that he will give diplomacy "one more chance." In addition, he said that if Saddam Hussein "were to meet all the conditions of the United Nations, the conditions that I've described very clearly in terms that everybody can understand, that in itself will mean the regime has changed." (New York Times, Oct. 21)

This is a last-ditch effort to once again shift the blame for unprovoked U.S. aggression onto its intended victim. Bush is trying to set up the Iraqis, by saying that, oh yes, there can be "regime change" without invasion and without overthrowing the Iraqi government—but only if Iraq meets the impossible condition of proving that it does not have weapons of mass destruction.

In addition, the Bush administration is maneuvering in the UN Security Council to impose onerous conditions that will lead to war even before inspections. For example, Washington is demanding that a UN resolution require that Iraqi scientists be questioned outside the country

## OCT. 26 STANDING UP AGAINST WAR

By Leslie Feinberg

The Bush administration is on a war footing against Iraq. It is tightening repression at home. And at the same time, a sniper is killing people in the Washington, D.C., area.

Despite all these deterrents, huge numbers of people of all backgrounds are making preparations to be in Washington and in San Francisco on Oct. 26 to call for "No war on Iraq" and no repression and racist

*Continued on page 6*

and their families be removed with them.

Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz asked, "What kind of leader in the world is going to allow the Americans to take these scientists out of the country against their will? They are living the law of the jungle." (New York Times, Oct. 22)

More fundamentally, the Iraqis have declared over and over again that they have no weapons of mass destruction. They submitted to over 9,000 inspections between 1991 and 1998. What happened in 1998 was that Washington withdrew the inspectors because it planned a bombing attack on Iraq. In recent weeks the Iraqi government has agreed to unannounced inspections of the most intrusive type, including of all government buildings.

*Continued on page 10*

## ILWU to Bush: 'Hands off the docks' 5



WW PHOTO: BILL HACKWELL

**SUBSCRIBE**  
 to Workers World  
 WEEKLY NEWSPAPER  
 Special price: \$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

# The Web is hell

**The Web is hell ... until you Google Workers World.**

Cyberspace can be hell. Hard to find what you want on the Internet. That's why when someone asks you where to find something, the answer is often, "Google it."

If you want real anti-war news and analysis, if you want to find an organization that really fights racism, battles sexism, stands for lesbian/gay/bi/trans liberation, and looks at everything else with a revolutionary eye, then you'll want to find Workers World on the Web: [www.workers.org](http://www.workers.org).

WW, a Marxist newspaper that's been published in the United States since 1959, has been on the Web since 1995. And if you use Google you'll find that it is one of the most popular sites on the Internet for news with an anti-capitalist perspective. You'll find that WW has been around a long time and has solid anti-war experience to back up what it is saying and doing.

Unlike some publications on the Web that only offer samples or charge fees to read current or past articles, every issue of Workers World newspaper can be read in its entirety—for free. That's free as in freedom. WW is an open content publication that can be freely shared by everyone.

(Of course, it still costs money to keep up the Web site. The site is kept free by all the donations we get from our readers and supporters. It's easy to become a supporter online at [www.workers.org/orders/](http://www.workers.org/orders/).)

There's a regular Web version of WW online, with hyperlinks and all the other stuff you'd expect to find on a Web edition of a newspaper. Or you can download the entire paper in PDF format and not only read the stories but also see all the photos of struggles happening across the United States and around the world. Some Workers World photos and photographers have won awards here and internationally, so it can definitely be worthwhile to see the whole paper, if you have a high-speed connection for the download.

Or better yet, buy a subscription and get a printed copy every week in the mail.

As for Google, well, it's great. But if you want to find socialist news, you'll do even better on the WW Web site, where there is a fast search engine that goes through five years of Workers World's archives so you can find the background story to what is happening today.

Read Workers World on the Web. You'll thank yourself for doing it.

—Gary Wilson

## Support an independent, working-class voice

Today, as the Bush administration readies a new war against Iraq, capitalist economic crisis drives millions out of jobs and into food banks, and the racist crack-down and civil rights and liberties continues, Workers World's independent voice is more crucial than ever. Help us keep going. We pledge to keep bringing you the news and analysis you need to fight back.

Join the Workers World Supporter Program! Supporters who contribute \$75 annually receive a year's subscription to WW, a monthly letter and five free trial subscriptions for friends. Sponsors who contribute \$100 a year also get a book published by WW Publishers. Sustainers get five books or videos.

### Join the WORKERS WORLD Supporter Program

- \$75 to become a WW Supporter.
- \$100 to become a WW Sponsor.
- \$300 to become a WW Sustainer.

### Subscribe to WORKERS WORLD

- \$25 Enclosed for a one-year subscription.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
 ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_  
 CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_  
 PHONE \_\_\_\_\_ E-MAIL \_\_\_\_\_

### Give Workers World to a Prisoner

The Free Workers World Subscriptions to Prisoners Program sends Workers World every week to thousands of our readers behind the prison walls. You can help this vital service continue by donating a subscription to a prisoner.



Now you can donate and subscribe by credit card. In addition to writing a check, you can contribute by providing your credit card information on the coupon below. And with the credit card payment method, you have the opportunity to make an automatic monthly donation.

**You can also donate and subscribe online at [www.workers.org/orders](http://www.workers.org/orders)**

- Payment by check. Total enclosed: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.
- Payment by credit card.

### Credit Card Information

Total charge: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Charge per month: \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
 Type of card:  Visa  MasterCard  
 Card Number \_\_\_\_\_  
 Expiration Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name as it appears on card \_\_\_\_\_

### WORKERS WORLD

55 West 17 St., 5th Fl., New York, NY 10011  
 212 627-2994

**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](mailto: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](mailto:boston@workers.org)

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

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

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

**Detroit**  
 5920 Second Ave.,  
 Detroit, Mich. 48202  
 (313) 831-0750;  
[detroit@workers.org](mailto:detroit@workers.org)

**Houston**  
 P.O. Box 130322,  
 Houston, Texas  
 77219 (713) 861-5965  
[houston@workers.org](mailto: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](mailto:la@workers.org)

**Milwaukee**  
 P.O. Box 12839,  
 Milwaukee, Wis. 53212  
[milw@workers.org](mailto:milw@workers.org)

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

**Richmond, Va.**  
 P.O. Box 14602,  
 Richmond, Va. 23221  
[richmond@workers.org](mailto:richmond@workers.org)

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

**San Diego, Calif.**  
 3659 India St., #102,  
 San Diego, Calif. 92103  
 (619) 692-4496

**San Francisco**  
 2489 Mission St.  
 Rm. 28,  
 San Francisco,  
 Calif. 94110  
 (415) 826-4828;  
 fax (415) 821-5782;  
[sf@workers.org](mailto: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](mailto:jxb58@psu.edu)

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

*This week ...*



### ★ National

Only the people can stop war . . . . . 1  
 Workers World Party statement. . . . . 1  
 Standing up against war . . . . . 1  
 The Web is hell . . . . . 2  
 Los Angeles immigrants march for rights . . . . . 3  
 Pension funds in deep trouble. . . . . 3  
 Bush to promote anti-gay general . . . . . 3  
 African Americans in the military . . . . . 4  
 What \$200 billion could buy . . . . . 4  
 Why ILWU won't be Bush's PATCO . . . . . 5  
 NYC unionists oppose war . . . . . 5  
 When soldiers built a union . . . . . 6  
 Detroit: The people must stop the war. . . . . 6  
 U.S. weapons fire both ways . . . . . 7  
 Mumia's statement to Oct. 26 . . . . . 7  
 U.S. corporations and Iraqi oil. . . . . 8  
 Bush doctrine vs. self-determination . . . . . 9  
 How a revolution stopped a war . . . . . 10  
 Teresa Gutierrez on 9/11 . . . . . 12

### ★ International

Israel and anti-Semitism. . . . . 11  
 New coup danger in Venezuela . . . . . 12  
 Koreans want end to war threats. . . . . 13  
 U.S. Navy out of Vieques . . . . . 13  
 Pentagon sends combat troops to Colombia . . . . . 13  
 General strike in Italy . . . . . 14

### ★ Editorial

Snipers and money . . . . . 14

### ★ Noticias En Español

La doctrina de Bush. . . . . 16  
 Los heroes cubanos. . . . . 16

### WW CALENDAR

#### SAN FRANCISCO

**Sat., Oct. 26**  
 Stop the war against Iraq before it starts. Gather 11 a.m. Justin Herman Plaza (Embarcadero BART) 1 p.m. rally Civic Center (Grove & Larkin). For info (415) 821-6545, [answer@actionsf.org](mailto:answer@actionsf.org) or [www.actionsf.org](http://www.actionsf.org).

#### WASHINGTON, D.C.

**Sat., Oct. 26**  
 Stop the war against Iraq before it starts. National march. Gather 11 a.m. Constitution Gardens adjacent to the Vietnam Veterans War Memorial, 21st St. & Constitution NW. March on the White House. For info (202) 332-5757 or (212) 633-6646 or [dc@internationalanswer.org](mailto:dc@internationalanswer.org) or [www.internationalanswer.org](http://www.internationalanswer.org).

### Workers World

55 West 17 Street  
 New York, N.Y. 10011  
 Phone: (212) 627-2994 • Fax: (212) 675-7869  
 E-mail: [editor@workers.org](mailto:editor@workers.org)  
 Web: <http://www.workers.org/>  
 Vol. 44, No. 43 • Oct. 31, 2002  
 Closing date: Oct. 23, 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, Elena J. Peckham, Hank Sambach, Leslie Senior; Mundo Obrero: Carl Glenn, Carlos Vargas; Internet: Janet Mayes

Workers World-WW (ISSN-1070-4205) 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](mailto: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.

## LOS ANGELES

# Indignant immigrants march for rights

By Adrian Garcia  
Los Angeles

Two thousand people, mostly Latino/as, descended on the streets of downtown Los Angeles Oct. 19 to demand an immediate end to attacks against undocumented workers in California and elsewhere in the United States.

The crowd marched on Broadway, one of the busiest commercial streets in downtown Los Angeles. Thousands of onlookers witnessed the march. Many joined the protest as it passed en route to City Hall.

"This is the first protest I have ever been to," said Gabino Alvarez, who lives in a predominately immigrant area of Los Angeles. "It is very exciting to see all these people rally around this very important cause."

Other marchers expressed concerns about the police presence. "I feel scared, but I believe it is important to stand up for my rights. I am also doing this for my children," said one undocumented worker, a mother of three.

Latino Movement USA and Hermandad Mexicana Nacional organized the protest

in response to the Bush administration's reactionary anti-immigrant policies.

Los Angeles International Airport is one target of the government's attack on immigrants' rights. The Immigration and Naturalization Service carries out almost daily raids against undocumented workers there under the veneer of "national security."

In October California Gov. Gray Davis vetoed a bill that would have granted drivers' licenses to undocumented workers. Earlier Davis had promised to sign the bill.

Davis claimed that issuing licenses or identification cards is a matter of national security. This has become the mantra for the attacks against working people throughout the United States, from undocumented workers to Arab Americans to the West Coast dock workers of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union.

The march was followed by a rally on the steps of City Hall. Speakers commented on the enthusiastic response of onlookers and the need for more people to become involved in the struggle for immigrants' rights.

Dolores Huerta, co-founder of the



Los Angeles, Oct. 19.

WW PHOTO: GLORIA LA RIVA

United Farm Workers union, got applause when she equated the struggle for immigrants' rights to the hardships that farm workers endured during their attempts to unionize in the 1960s. However, her declaration of continued support for Gov. Davis was not well received by the crowd.

Juan Jose Gutierrez, founder of Latino Movement USA, expressed his enthusiasm about the day's turnout and informed the people that the struggle will not end until respect, dignity and equal rights are granted to the hard-working people who are undocumented. □

## Corporate hands in the cookie jar

# Pension funds in deep trouble

By Heather Cottin

Workers with 401(k) retirement funds invested by Enron and other companies have lost billions of dollars. Now comes news that this alarming trend is widespread throughout Corporate America.

Automakers, electronics manufacturers, airlines and a raft of other major corporations have begun to admit that they don't have enough money to cover their pension plans.

In one of the most dramatic cases, Ford, General Motors and other auto manufacturers and suppliers, hit by declining sales, have "underfunded" their workers' pensions by an estimated \$30 billion.

A recent study by Credit Suisse First Boston estimates that of the 360 companies in the Standard & Poor's 500 that have pension plans, 325 will have shortfalls by the end of this year. The airline and automobile industries will be hit hardest, said David Zion, the study's author.

Zion said the companies would face a total pension shortfall of \$240 billion by the end of the year. (Reuters, Oct. 20)

Even in smaller service industries there is a crisis. KFC, Pizza Hut and Taco Bell said their pension funds would fall short by \$100 million. (CFO.com)

### 'Creative accounting' batters pensions

By now the "creative accounting" chicanery revealed in the Enron/Arthur Andersen scandal is old news. But workers at other companies didn't realize that the value of their pension funds was part of the same bogus business bungling.

In the late 1990s companies took pension funds and claimed those billions of dollars as assets to boost their bottom lines. There they "worked wonders on stock prices," according to Business Week Online, helping to float the financial balloon during the 1990s boom.

Some companies projected over 9-per-

cent earnings on their pension fund investments when the actual rate was barely over 1 percent. They were taking the workers' money and losing it, calling this technique "smoothing."

Only one-third of all workers in the United States have company pensions. These workers, who struggled hard for pension plans, are supposed to be protected by the Erisa Law, which requires management to pay defined benefits negotiated by unions.

By law, business owners can't cheat workers out of their pensions. They must provide for every worker as long as the company stays in business.

However, other parts of the Erisa law

undercut this protection and place pensions in great jeopardy.

Companies can take the pension funds and plow them back into the company or invest them in whatever they want to. Under the Erisa law, workers and their unions have no say in where the pension funds are invested.

The bosses' investments, made with workers' pensions, have been losing money as the stock market has fallen 33 percent in two years.

Businesses reeling from a depressed market for their goods are supposed to cough up the funds for pensions when there is a shortfall. This cuts into their profits.

How long will it be before these

monopolies gang up with the Bush administration and Congress to strike down the requirement that they must make up the lost money?

Will the White House try to invoke "national security" to defend corporate profits over workers' retirement funds?

### Who owns bankrupt companies?

Capitalists make profits by paying workers less than the value of the goods they create. Karl Marx called the difference "surplus value."

U.S. corporations have been engaging clandestinely in another form of robbery. They have been committing grand

*Continued on page 14*

# Bush to promote anti-gay general

By Leslie Feinberg

Maj. Gen. Robert T. Clark is up for promotion. Another star to add to the growing constellation on his U.S. Army officer uniform. The fact that he commanded a base where a soldier labeled gay was beaten to death with a baseball bat after a long period of widespread harassment has not seemed to hurt his upward mobility.

Clark's shot at hiking himself up another rung on the Pentagon ladder is aided by the fact that President George W. Bush himself nominated him for promotion to the Army's second-highest rank of lieutenant general.

Clark was commander of Fort Campbell, Ky., in July 1999 when a 21-year-old soldier—PFC Barry Winchell—was bludgeoned as he slept in his barracks. Winchell had endured six months of harassment after he began dating a transgender woman, Calpernia Adams.

In the months after the brutal slaying, the Servicemembers Legal Defense Network reported scores of calls from gay GIs

at Fort Campbell who feared for their own lives. More than 200 soldiers were discharged from the base over the rest of the year—many voluntarily out of terror. (Gay & Lesbian Times, Oct. 17)

Investigations after Winchell's killing turned up a pattern of prevalent anti-gay harassment—graffiti, verbal and physical abuse.

SLDN Executive Director C. Dixon Osburn charges, "In the wake of Winchell's murder, Gen. Clark demonstrated the poorest leadership, issuing no statements against harassment, refusing to speak with or meet the parents of PFC Winchell or to reassure base soldiers that harassment would not be tolerated."

Yet his brass still gleams in the eyes of Bush—and Democrats, too.

The Senate Armed Forces Committee refused to allow Patricia Kutteles, Winchell's mother, to testify against Clark. It's a Democrat-controlled committee. In the face of protests by lesbian, gay, bi and trans and women's rights organizations, they voted to hold a closed-door confirmation

hearing.

Lest anyone hope that a Democrat will lead the charge against the bigoted brass, don't forget that it was Democrat Bill Clinton who made acceptance of gays in the military a campaign promise in his first 1992 election bid, then surrendered to the admirals and generals once he had hunkered down in the White House. He proposed a "compromise" that resulted in stepped-up witch hunts against lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans GIs. Both houses of Congress, it should be recalled, were controlled by Democrats at that time.

It's important to fight against the Pentagon's official policy. The biggest employer in the United States says it's okay to discriminate against and wage war on its own lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans GIs. But a change in that biased policy won't create a kinder, gentler killing machine. Racist, sexist, anti-gay? That's basic military indoctrination to create a Rambo mentality.

Be all that you can be: Join the ranks of the anti-war movement. □

## African Americans in the military

# The struggle against racism & war

By Pat Chin

What is the potential for a Black GI resistance movement if the Bush administration goes ahead with its criminal war against Iraq?

Racism in the U.S. armed forces has long reflected institutionalized racism in society at large, which views people of African descent as inferior. Despite this stigma, however, Blacks in the military have insisted on their democratic right to be treated equally, rather than being forced to serve in segregated units.

In Vietnam, thousands of Black soldiers rebelled against what they saw as an unjust war by a government that wielded racism like a club against their communities at home. Many agreed with Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who said, "The greatest purveyor of violence in the world today is the U.S. government."

Black people have always been an important part of the anti-war movement in the United States. Many African Americans and others of African descent staunchly oppose U.S. wars of aggression around the world and reject the notion that Black people should fight on behalf of a system that's responsible for slavery, Jim Crow and racist profiling.

Many also hold the view, shared by internationalists of all nationalities, that the U.S. military represents the interests of greedy, super-rich bosses and bankers, not of poor and working people.

### Racism deeply rooted

The history of African Americans in the U.S. armed forces stretches back to the Civil War. Many believed that their participation in the war would win them basic democratic rights and respect. But despite the Emancipation Proclamation and later efforts to desegregate the armed forces, racism still remains deeply rooted.

During the Civil War, more than 180,000 joined the Union Army. Another 30,000 served in the Navy, and 200,000 worked on military support projects. Some 33,000 perished in the conflict. (See [www.louisdiggs.com/buffalo/history.html](http://www.louisdiggs.com/buffalo/history.html))

Historian Howard Zinn writes, "When the Emancipation Proclamation was issued Jan. 1, 1863, it declared slaves free in

those areas still fighting against the Union (which it listed very carefully), and said nothing about slaves behind Union lines." ("A People's History of the United States")

The Emancipation Proclamation, and the huge numbers of Blacks who joined the Union Army, gave the erroneous impression that the Civil War was being fought principally for Black freedom rather than the domination of the capitalist mode of production over the system of chattel slavery.

"The more whites had to sacrifice," explains Zinn, "the more resentment there was, particularly among poor whites in the North, who were drafted by a law that allowed the rich to buy their way out of the draft for \$300. And so the draft riots of 1863 took place, uprisings of angry whites in northern cities, their targets not the rich, far away, but the Blacks, near at hand."

### From WWII to Vietnam

Although Blacks participated in every U.S. war since, they still were subjected to the worst kind of racism.

Some 200,000 fought in World War I. They faced racist death squads like the Ku Klux Klan upon their return home. They also went into combat in large numbers in World War II, even though the military continued to deny them access to adequate equipment and training.

This exposed the hypocrisy of the U.S. government, which was willing to let Black soldiers fight and die overseas while denying them full equality and reparations for hundreds of years of unpaid slave labor.

The armed forces were legally desegregated in 1948 by the Truman administration. But Black soldiers and commanders received little or no respect from white officers and they remained poorly trained and ill equipped. Black units were, in fact, expected to fail, and Truman's desegregation orders did little to change this racist mind-set.

Reform was forced, however, during the Korean War, when huge battlefield casualties exposed the unsound nature of a segregated army. The post-World-War-II vigor of the civil rights movement also brought about concessions.

Washington's bloody war against Vietnam—a heroic nation that successfully re-

**A whopping 75 percent of all African Americans and other military personnel of color say they experience racism**

sisted U.S. colonial domination—coincided during the 1960s with a big upsurge in the civil rights movement and rebellions in the inner cities. There were also frequent acts of war resistance. Muhammad Ali's refusal to serve in the military had a big influence on Black, Latino and white youths.

The Black Panther Party influenced many drafted African American youths. Not only did the BPP oppose the war; its leadership offered to organize military units to fight alongside the Vietcong against the Pentagon. Some Black troops even defected to the side of the Vietnamese liberation forces.

The American Servicemen's Union defended 43 Black Marines from Fort Hood, Texas, who refused orders to go and repress anti-war protests at the 1968 Democratic National Convention.

There were huge numbers of conscientious objectors, some of whom left the country to avoid service. In the United States, Blacks were among the hundreds of thousands who took to the streets in numerous protests until the war was ended.

After the Vietnam War, anti-militarist sentiment was still so strong that the draft was ended.

### Choice for youths: military or jail

An "economic draft" became widespread with the technological revolution of the late 1970s and 1980s, which led to widespread layoffs. This, coupled with deep cuts in social programs, forced many Black and Latino youths into the military, which promised a lot, including free education.

Meanwhile, the prison-industrial complex, with its captive workforce toiling for slave wages, began to mushroom.

For many Black and Latino youths, it's been either join the military or face prison. Blacks and Latinos, in fact, "make up 62

percent of the incarcerated population, though comprising only 25 percent of the national population." (Human Rights Watch Report, Feb. 27, 2002)

Most youths don't join the military for "patriotic" reasons. This is even truer for oppressed youths, who have fewer opportunities than whites.

With the deepening instability of the capitalist economy, many young people of color feel even greater pressure to enlist in the military, where racism still exists and where they're trained to kill other poor people and/or be killed themselves.

History has shown that it's been mainly poor and working-class people—disproportionately Black and Latino youths—who become the casualties of war. Their role, in the long run, is to be killers or cannon fodder.

A whopping 75 percent of all African Americans and other military personnel of color "complain that they have experienced racially offensive behavior, and less than half expressed confidence that complaints of discrimination are thoroughly investigated, according to the largest survey of racial attitudes ever conducted within the armed forces," reported the Washington Post of Nov. 23, 1999.

Furthermore: "Nearly 20 percent of Blacks and 13 percent of Hispanics in uniform reported that they had been given inferior assignments or evaluations because of racial bias. Only 4 percent of whites reported such treatment."

This remains true despite Secretary of State Gen. Colin Powell's ascendancy to the higher echelons of power, from whence "he would be put out to pasture," to quote Harry Belafonte, should he not submit to the program of war and exploitation being foisted on the world by the racist and sexist capitalist class. Powell, along with National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, serves them dutifully.

The anti-war movement, in alliance with supporters abroad, is uniquely positioned to stop George W. Bush's Pentagon war machine in the insane rush to dominate the world for super profits.

Linking the anti-war movement with the struggle against racism is a powerful way to forge the unity that's needed to resist and disarm the military brass. □

## What \$200 billion could buy

By Greg Butterfield

What is the projected cost of President George W. Bush's plan for an invasion and colonial occupation of Iraq?

In September, top Bush economic advisor Lawrence Lindsey estimated the war would end up costing between \$100 billion and \$200 billion.

That's \$200,000,000,000.

And that is in addition to the existing Pentagon budget, which already tops \$300 billion.

A congressional budget report prepared by House Democrats and released Sept. 23 concurred. "A U.S. attack on Iraq could cost as much as \$60 billion even if swift and successful, with any follow-up and broader economic strain perhaps pushing the final tab to \$200 billion," Reuters news service reported.

"When all costs are considered, Mr. Lindsey's estimate ... seems to be in the ball park," South Carolina Rep. John Spratt, the top Democrat on the House

Budget Committee, admitted.

So what happens if Bush doesn't get the "swift and successful" victory he's depending on? The Pentagon doesn't exactly have a reputation for coming in under budget.

How much more could workers here end up shelling out for Big Oil's war to dominate the workers in the Middle East?

At a time when layoffs continue, homelessness and hunger grow, and the social safety net is shredded, can the working class afford to stand by and let Bush & Co. throw away their money?

The Wisconsin Service Employees Representatives Assembly doesn't think so. They are among the many unionists who have adopted anti-war resolutions in recent weeks.

Using Lawrence Lindsey's lowest estimate, the union asks: "How much is \$100 billion?"

Their answer: "Three times what the federal government spends on education. Enough to provide health care to all unin-

sured children in the U.S. for five years."

### Money for jobs ... lots of 'em

What else could that money do if it were put to good use here?

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the number of "officially" unemployed people was 8.1 million in September.

With \$200 billion, every single one of those unemployed workers could be employed for a year at a job that pays \$24,691, or nearly \$12 per hour for a 40-hour work week.

According to a recent Census Bureau report, the number of people in the United States living in poverty grew 1.3 million last year, to 32.9 million. On the other side of the gap, the most affluent one-fifth of the population received one-half of all household income.

A May 2000 study by the Economic Policy Institute entitled "How Much Is Enough? Basic Family Budgets for Working Families" reported that a family of four

living in a medium-sized city like Baltimore requires \$34,732.28 per year "just to meet its basic needs and achieve a safe and decent standard of living," including food, housing, health care, child care, taxes, transportation and utilities.

With \$200 billion, some 5,758,378 impoverished families could be provided with annual incomes of \$34,732.28.

More than 41 million people in the United States don't have any medical insurance—a rise of 1.5 million over 2001. A study by the Kaiser Foundation last February found the average cost of medical coverage was \$221 per month for individuals.

It would take just over half of that \$200 billion bill for the war—about \$109 billion—to provide health insurance for all 41 million uninsured people for a whole year.

### Overcrowded schools

Millions of students in cities and rural areas attend school in inadequate and

*Continued on next page*

## Dock workers fight back

# Why ILWU won't be Bush's PATCO

By Milt Neidenberg

The Taft-Hartley injunction issued on Oct. 8 has deepened the crisis on the docks.

In a double whammy aimed at the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, first the Pacific Maritime Association locked out the union's 10,500 members, and then the Bush administration stepped in illegally to force them back to work for 80 days without a contract.

Well into the injunction's second week, problems continue to ratchet up. Although some goods are trickling through, gridlock, congestion and confusion continue to plague the maritime industry.

The class struggle is heating up, too. Negotiations between the PMA and the union are to resume soon.

The ILWU attributes the crisis on the docks to the snarls created by the lockout. Increased productivity vs. safety continues to be the issue in the ongoing war with the PMA.

The docks are unsafe. Before the lockout, the union shut down the Port of Los Angeles for 30 minutes, responding to congestion, speedup and dangerous conditions. It reminded the PMA that five workers had been killed over the previous seven months.

Since the injunction, accidents have sent several workers to the hospital. To alleviate the crisis, the union has begun a campaign to pressure the PMA to hire and train more workers to move the cargo. The PMA has rejected the proposal.

### Cargo piles up on docks

The Oct. 16 Wall Street Journal echoed the bosses' line in an article headlined "Port Operators Accuse Dockworkers of Slowdown." However, ILWU spokesperson Steve Stallone vehemently denies the PMA charges. He says the problem is that "the incoming cargo far outpaces the outbound capacity of trains and trucks."

In the same article the Journal admitted, "Union Pacific Railroad, the nation's largest railroad, has announced an allocation plan that limits dock customers to the same amount of space they used 30 days earlier." This is a blow to the PMA and the West Coast Waterfront Coalition, which represents transnational corporations that do business in Asia.

Railroads are a key mover of cargo containers, which are loaded piggy-back onto

even dangerous facilities. The national average cost of building a new school is \$146 per square foot, according to the Aug. 30 New York Times.

Figures on school construction in New Jersey compiled by the New Jersey Policy Perspective show that an elementary school for 1,000 students averages about 100,000 square feet. At the national average cost, that works out to about \$14,600,000 per school.

So \$200 billion could build 13,698 elementary schools.

There is a national shortage of affordable day care. A November 2001 study by management consulting firm Runzheimer International reported that the average cost of day care for a child last year was \$516 per month, or \$6,192 per year.

So \$200 billion could pay for two years of day care for over 16 million children.

Or it could pay a year's rent on \$1,500-per-month apartments for 11 million homeless and overcrowded families. □

freight trains. The American Trucking Association recommended to the PMA that terminal operators extend the hours the truck gates are open, as trucks continue to be backed up for miles.

Estimates are that over 200 ships are waiting in and around the 29 West Coast ports—over 100 ships outside Los Angeles and Long Beach alone. This means transoceanic ships are also backed up in their home ports abroad. Terminals are packed sky-high with containers that have no place to go.

These problems have been created by the PMA lockout. The PMA strategy is to frame the union in order to get a court order forcing the rank and file to work faster at the risk of safety from the federal judge who issued the temporary injunction.

The ILWU also faces the threat of intervention by the military. In sworn testimony read at the Oct. 7 hearing on a Taft-Hartley injunction, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld injected the government's war plans against Iraq. His affidavit stated: "The Department of Defense increasingly relies upon commercial items and practices to meet its requirements ... raw materials, medical supplies, replacement parts and components, as well as everyday subsistence needs of our armed forces, are just some of the essential military cargo provided by commercial contractors."

The Department of Defense has contracts with many shipping companies to carry "essential military cargo." For example, Maersk Sealand, a powerful PMA member, is the world's biggest shipping corporation. The corporation is one of the main contractors for the U.S. military. Many of its ships sail to the Middle East, continually carrying military cargo. Dock workers in Copenhagen, Denmark, have demonstrated at the company's headquarters there in sympathy with the ILWU.

### Rumsfeld wants war on backs of workers

Rumsfeld's ultimatum broadens the military's role on the docks. His affidavit declares that the Department of Defense "increasingly relies upon commercial items and practices." Their frenzied preparations for war will inevitably increase inhuman speedup and take a heavy toll on the health and safety of the rank and file. The ILWU is determined to resist and make safety its top priority.

AFL-CIO President John Sweeney has announced that safety is the number-one issue for labor. It would be timely if the labor federation were to organize a Na-

Asked if the government would break the dock workers union, ILWU President Spinoso said, 'You don't know our union.'

WW PHOTO: BILL HACKWELL



tional Workers' Safety Day to back up the ILWU. It would send a message to the Bush administration that the organized labor movement is prepared to take independent mass action to defend these embattled workers.

The threat from the Defense Department to control the ports sets a dangerous and illegal precedent that should concern all those forces opposed to the pre-emptive attack on Iraq planned by the Pentagon and Bush.

The Pentagon uses commercial shippers to transport 95 percent of its military supplies. In fiscal 2003, which began on Oct. 1, the Pentagon budget is expected to total almost \$400 billion. The main beneficiaries in the military-industrial complex are Lockheed Martin, Northrop, Raytheon and General Dynamics—dominant players whose profits have tripled since 1990.

While Wall Street tycoons are ripping off billions of dollars before their companies go belly-up, millions in the multinational work force—organized and unorganized—are losing their jobs, unemployment insurance, pensions, health benefits and decent education. Homelessness is on the rise. Racism and immigrant bashing are increasing at an alarming rate.

Workers are being driven into the ranks of the permanently unemployed and poor who are flooding the food banks, church pantries and charities to survive. They will become a powerful sector of the growing anti-war movement, bringing grievances about their economic hardships and their numbers into the streets.

They, like most of those polled, do not support a war against Iraq. They will be

the catalyst for a sector of the organized labor movement to break away from the pro-war policies of most of the AFL-CIO leaders. And it is already happening. Many members of organized labor throughout the country, and a significant number of AFL-CIO central labor councils, have endorsed the Oct. 26 mobilization against the war on Iraq. The list is growing daily, and can be found on the ANSWER coalition web site: [www.internationalanswer.org](http://www.internationalanswer.org).

An historic regroupment is in the making. History has confirmed repeatedly that all profound economic and social change begins from below. The Oct. 26 anti-war demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco will be a giant stride in this development.

The ILWU is fighting on many fronts and needs the support of the anti-war movement.

### 'There won't be another PATCO'

When ILWU President James Spinoso emerged from the injunction hearing to join a militant demonstration outside, a reporter asked him if he thought the ILWU would become another PATCO—the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization that was broken up by President Ronald Reagan in 1981. Spinoso was heard to say over the chants, "You don't know our union if you think we'll be another PATCO."

The air controllers had gone on strike on Aug. 3, 1981. Within 48 hours Reagan fired over 11,000. Lacking a serious fight-back and with hardly any support, PATCO and the strike were broken. The labor movement suffered a major defeat.

The ILWU will not repeat this history. This union has won major strikes and gained respect both here and abroad for its support of labor and progressive struggles too numerous to mention.

The ILWU has a critical role to play in the development of a united front as the war deepens and the capitalist crisis widens. It is an integral player in the growing worldwide class struggle.

The dock workers are now on the front lines of this class war. They have already taken casualties—deaths and injuries of their members—as they fight to preserve their jobs, control of their hiring hall, and a safe work environment in the face of brutal enemies such as the PMA, the transnational companies and now the military.

This is a proud and progressive union with a rich history of struggle, a union born and nurtured in the historic San Francisco 1934 general strike. There will be no PATCO in the stormy days ahead. □

## NYC unionists oppose war

More and more unions are taking a stand against the Pentagon's plans to invade Iraq. Unions representing a range of workers—from immigrant laborers to longshore workers—gathered at a New York City Labor Against War conference held at AFSCME District Council 1707 headquarters Oct. 19. Pictured at right Larry Adams, representing mail handlers, and Mario Santos from the Filipino Workers Association.

—Anne Pruden



# When soldiers built a union

By John Catalinotto

As the threat that the United States will launch an invasion of Iraq grows, the Pentagon generals' worries focus not on Congress's willingness to fund their war, but on the troops' reaction if battle drags on. Does the "Vietnam Syndrome" still exist within the armed forces?

Workers World spoke with Pvt. Andrew D. Stapp (retired 1968). Stapp isn't like the usual military pundits paraded on CNN. He led GI anti-war resistance during the U.S. war against Vietnam and founded the American Servicemen's Union.

The following paraphrases an hour-long conversation on Oct. 19 between Stapp and this writer—who was himself a civilian organizer for the ASU—reviewing Vietnam-era developments for insights into the current crisis.

## Experience sparks resistance

U.S. troop strength in South Vietnam reached 500,000 in 1967. U.S. control of the air and superior firepower caused many casualties for the Vietnamese guerrilla fighters. But U.S. troops also began to die in greater numbers.

In the January 1968 Tet offensive, guer-

**During the Vietnam War, acts of individual resistance led to organizing. Within two years of its founding, the ASU had 10,000 members**

rillas struck at bases and headquarters across the country and even the U.S. Embassy in Saigon. Thousands of ordinary U.S. enlisted troops came home from the battle in body bags.

The Tet offensive was a body blow to political support at home for what amounted to a U.S. invasion and occupation of Vietnam.

Battle-weary veterans rotated back to the States in 1967 and 1968 after their year in Vietnam. They shared their war experiences with newer recruits.

All over the United States, at basic and advanced training bases, the new recruits heard one story about Vietnam from officers and top sergeants and a completely different story from returning veterans.

"The official propaganda was that the

U.S. was there to help the Vietnamese people," said Stapp. "By 1968 that was obviously untrue. The Vietnamese were fighting like hell to get the U.S. troops out."

## From individual resistance to a union

Earlier, dissent in the military had taken the form of individual resistance. Dr. Howard Levy, an Army captain, refused to train Special Forces troops for Vietnam. At Fort Hood, Texas, this resistance took a big step further when three GIs refused duty in Vietnam.

In the spring of 1967, when Stapp was an enlisted soldier at the artillery training center at Fort Sill, Okla., he was court-martialed for refusing to open and turn over a footlocker full of anti-war and pro-socialist magazines. This sparked a struggle that shook up the base.

Activists from Youth Against War and Fascism supported Pvt. Stapp's battle with the officers. The case ended without Stapp having to serve time in the stockade. He already had the backing of a core of his fellow enlisted GIs and the sympathy of most people in his barracks.

"The civilian anti-war movement was tremendous," said Stapp. "But the anti-war

feeling among the GIs was even greater.

"At Fort Sill the brass baited me constantly, calling me a communist, trying to drum up a frenzied reaction. I was in contact daily with hundreds of fellow GIs. None of them were openly hostile. Most were friendly. They loved that I was dishing it out to the officers and attacking the war."

By the end of 1967 Stapp and other GIs, Marines, sailors and airmen from around the United States founded the ASU. The idea caught on fast. Within two years the ASU had over 10,000 members. Its newspaper, *The Bond*, had 75,000 readers and correspondents wherever the Pentagon had troops.

"While we didn't win union recognition," said Stapp, "we were a factor in ending the war."

## Troops are workers in uniform

The ASU's demands included an end to racism, election of officers by enlisted men and the right to refuse illegal orders "like orders to fight in an illegal war in Vietnam."

The movement in the military was broad. Anti-war newspapers sprang up at many forts. Anti-war activists from the civilian movement set up "coffee houses" near many larger U.S. bases where dissident GIs would hang out.

Many individual servicemen—in those days almost all the troops were male—simply left for Canada or stayed among civilians in Europe. Some even joined the Vietnamese liberation fighters.

But the ASU was the single most effective organization of enlisted men and women. The military reflected the unjust and privileged structures of capitalist society. The ASU mobilized around the class interests of the enlisted soldiers—who were working-class youths in uniform.

"It was not just that the war threatened their lives, though of course that was true," Stapp said. "But it was something they considered wrong—killing Vietnamese peasants who wanted to liberate their country. They felt bitter they were being forced to fight an unpopular war that couldn't be justified."

"By the later years of the war the anti-war feeling among the troops in Vietnam was so great it led to direct action, like refusing to go out on patrols."

"Officers who were particularly cruel or who tried to push their troops into dangerous situations were taking a risk," Stapp added. "Several hundred officers and high-ranking sergeants wound up 'fragged' by their troops, that is, killed with fragmentation grenades."

## Today's economic draft

Stapp continued: "That the personnel in today's military are all volunteers doesn't mean they won't want to resist a war or that they won't want to be organized in a union. Even back in 1970, when most of the Army were draftees, about half the ASU members were young people who had joined up."

"In some ways a volunteer military means the rank-and-file soldiers are drawn even more from the working class, poor, and from the communities of color. It's an economic draft. Young people—including women these days—join up to get education and job training. They're not stockholders in oil and munitions monopolies."

"The ruling class uses them in the military to fight in the interests of the rich. So they have all the same reasons to be part of a union that defends their interests."

"It's hard to say what will happen in a short war, fought mostly from the air. But in a long occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan," said Stapp, "with guerrilla fighting and steady casualties, a real opposition movement within the military is possible." □

# What's next for anti-war struggle?

Continued from page 1

profiling at home.

A month ago many of them were hoping that Congress would reject this war. They bombarded the offices of senators and representatives with fervent anti-war appeals. Even elected officials far on the right reported their mail and faxes were running 100 to 1 against a war.

Nevertheless, Congress caved in and gave the Bush administration the green light and the authority to spend limitless amounts on this aggression. Perhaps the war makers thought that now they would have easy sailing.

But the popular movement against the war has instead multiplied, spurred on by social conditions at home and the grim news of what the Pentagon has in store for the people of Iraq.

The Oct. 26 anti-war mobilization started with a call from the International ANSWER coalition—Act Now to Stop War & End Racism. This is the coalition of many organizations that came together soon after the 9/11 attacks and called a successful Washington demonstration, showing there was significant opposition to the Bush administration's use of that terrible tragedy to further its right-

wing objectives.

More than 4,000 individuals and groups have now endorsed Oct. 26. They come from a broad spectrum of political and social forces who recognize the urgent need to give voice to the millions in this country who oppose the war but have been ignored and denied by the government and the media.

Many unions have joined in denouncing the war and endorsing mass action—a big change from the period of the Vietnam War. Central labor councils in Seattle, San Francisco, Albany, Syracuse and many other large cities have gone on record against the war. Their spirit was summed up most recently in a resolution passed on Oct. 18 by the second-largest Teamster local in the country, Local 705 in Chicago.

It said, in part, "Whereas, we value the lives of our sons and daughters, of our brothers and sisters more than Bush's control of Middle East oil profits; Whereas, we have no quarrel with the ordinary working-class men, women and children of Iraq who will suffer the most in any war; Whereas, the billions of dollars being spent to stage and execute this invasion, means billions taken away

from our schools, hospitals, housing, and social security; Whereas, Bush's drive for war serves as a cover and a distraction for the sinking economy, corporate corruption, layoffs, Taft-Hartley (used against the locked-out ILWU longshoremen); Whereas, Teamsters Local 705 is known far and wide as fighters for justice: Be it Resolved that Teamsters Local 705 stands firmly against Bush's drive for war."

The resolution then called for "promoting anti-war activity in the labor movement and community."

The ANSWER coalition reports that other countries are also planning protests on Oct. 26. Major rallies and marches will take place in Puerto Rico, Mexico, Japan, India, south Korea, Italy, Germany, Denmark, Belgium, the Netherlands and Spain.

Phones at the ANSWER offices around the country have been ringing off the hooks—calls from people wanting to know how they could get to D.C. One young woman hitchhiked from her home in San Diego to an ANSWER organizing center in Seminole, Okla., in order to get on a bus headed for Washington.

Five hundred students sought help in getting transportation from Pennsylvania State University; 400 are traveling from Bennington College in Vermont. By Oct. 22, more than 150 cities in more than 40 states were sending buses to Washington and the ANSWER offices had received calls from people traveling to the demonstration from every state.

As the capitalist economy crashes in slow motion, it is producing a sea change in popular consciousness within the United States. More and more working people see the exhortations for war from the White House and congressional podiums as weapons of mass distraction.

The groundswell of response to the call for a huge turnout in D.C. on Oct. 26 reflects a growing and deep-seated understanding that only the mobilized multitude of people that this government misrepresents can pull back the dogs of war.

## 'The people must stop the war'

Larry Holmes, a spokesperson for the International ANSWER coalition—Act Now to Stop War & End Racism—spoke at the historic New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit Oct. 19. Other speakers included the Rev. Robert Smith, head of the church, who had been on the radio all week long calling for people to march on Washington against the war on Oct. 26, and Detroit City Council President Maryann Mahaffey.

Holmes stressed the need for the biggest possible turnout on Oct. 26. "Congress won't stop this imperialist war; the United Nations won't stop this war. It's the people who have the power," he concluded.

—David Sole

WW PHOTO: DEIRDRE GRISWOLD



## Veterans still suffering

# U.S. weapons fire both ways

By Sara Flounders

As the Pentagon moves forward with plans for a new war against Iraq, tens of thousands of U.S. military personnel are wondering what they will face. The lesson of past wars is to trust no one from the Pentagon on this matter.

The Defense Department claims to look after the health and safety of U.S. troops. President George W. Bush argues that the Pentagon must forcibly disarm Iraq's "weapons of mass destruction."

But on Oct. 9, the New York Times reported that 16 newly declassified documents show that the Defense Department used chemical weapons and live biological weapons against its own soldiers.

The documents detail secret tests involving Sarin and VX gas, as well as biological toxins, conducted between 1962 and 1971.

This is hardly the first exposé of the government's use of its own soldiers as guinea pigs. The is just the tip of the iceberg.

From 1945 to 1963 the Pentagon deliberately exposed more than 250,000 U.S. military personnel to radiation during nuclear tests in order to study the impact on humans. These tests also callously exposed thousands of Marshall Islanders who were being secretly studied.

Any soldier who spoke out on this faced court martial and imprisonment for violating "national security." Finally, after veterans and their families mobilized and demanded treatment for their unusually high rates of cancer and many other diseases, a special 1984 congressional bill acknowledged this vast secret program and promised compensation to the surviving "Atomic Veterans." Fewer than 500 veterans received compensation, however.

Then there was the 1991 Gulf War. U.S. soldiers protected by an enormous shield of high-tech weaponry seemed invulnerable. The Pentagon reported 148 U.S. deaths, half from "friendly fire." Not one armored vehicle belonging to the allied forces was reported lost.

In comparison, the United States and its allies dropped 88,500 tons of explosives on a country whose air defenses had been obliterated by the third day. In 42 days of bombs and cruise missile attacks, they killed over 100,000 Iraqis.

Now it is clear that the U.S. casualties were back-loaded. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. veterans now in their mid-30s who should be in the prime of health are wasting away from "Gulf War Syndrome."

The mass inoculations with untested vaccines, the bombing of industrial and chemical plants, and the smoke of burning oil wells, along with radioactive depleted uranium weapons, have all had an impact. The people of the Gulf region will have to face the effects of this poisoning for years to come, and so will the Pentagon's own soldiers.

The fact that the U.S. government's own studies had warned of the dangers of using radioactive weapons confirms that when the conquests of markets and great profits are at stake, even their own troops are expendable.

### Why the Pentagon uses DU

Uranium is 1.7 times as dense as lead. Shells with depleted uranium casings penetrate steel like a hot knife through butter. DU is also pyrophoric—that is, it burns fiercely on impact and turns into tiny particles of uranium oxide dust.

This dust can drift dozens of miles on the wind. It can be small enough to lodge in the lungs when inhaled, and then enter the bloodstream or other organs. Since DU

**All reports over the past six years confirm that the Gulf War resulted in a huge number of soldiers wounded by sickness, disease and disability. What will a new war bring?**

oxide is both toxic and radioactive, its presence in the body can cause serious ailments.

DU is a waste by-product of the uranium enrichment process. The U.S. government gives it away free to weapons manufacturers, making the production of these weapons quite profitable. Yet U.S. government studies have warned of the health risks from DU exposure.

A 1990 report before the Gulf War warned: "Short-term effects of high doses can result in death, while long-term effects of low doses have been implicated in cancer. ... Aerosol DU exposures to soldiers on the battlefield could be significant with potential radiological and toxicological effects."

Nevertheless, during the 1991 U.S. war against Iraq, the Pentagon fired over 940,000 of 30-millimeter uranium-tipped bullets and more than 14,000 large DU rounds. More than 600,000 pounds of radioactive material were left in Iraq's soil, water and air.

Seven years after the bombing, Iraq's southern provinces showed an 11-fold increase in skin cancer, a six-fold increase in breast cancer and a 16-fold increase in ovarian cancer.

### The war comes home

By 1996, the number of chronically ill U.S. veterans became a national scandal. Over 100,000 veterans were sick, with a wide range of mysterious medical problems and unexplained illnesses that were lumped together under the name "Gulf War Syndrome."

The list of chronic ailments included unusually high rates of tumors and cancers of all types, hemorrhaging, bleeding gums, memory loss, overwhelming fatigue, persistent rashes and eczema, and severe muscle and joint pain—among people who should have been in the prime of health.

Children of the soldiers suffered above-average rates of birth defects and auto-immune problems.

For years the Pentagon denied that the sickness existed—until Gulf veterans organized themselves to demand disability pay and medical care. Congress held hear-

ings. A presidential commission was established.

The Pentagon continued using these radioactive weapons in the 1995 bombing of Bosnia, the 1999 NATO bombing of Yugoslavia and the bombing of Afghanistan.

Anti-DU activists have called for a moratorium on DU weapons, a demand that is now backed by the European Union and the parliaments of Germany, Italy and Norway. Angry mass movements have denounced the test firing of these radioactive weapons at U.S. bases in Okinawa, Japan; Vieques, Puerto Rico; and south Korea.

### DU use accelerates in Afghanistan

Despite the dangers, the Pentagon has expanded its use of DU.

The 120-mm antitank round used in 1991 in Iraq had a maximum weight of 12 pounds. Raytheon's "bunker buster" GBU-28 used in Afghanistan can weigh up to one-and-a-half metric tons.

A March 3 report in *Le Monde Diplomatique* headlined "America's Big Dirty Secret" charged that depleted uranium was the heavy metal used in enormous bunker bombs that burrowed through mountains of rock or many feet of reinforced concrete to destroy cave complexes in Afghanistan.

The issue of Gulf War Syndrome receded from the headlines in the United States. But the number of chronically ill veterans has continued to climb.

According to the Veterans Benefits Administration, out of 504,047 eligible Gulf War veterans, 185,780 have filed claims for service-related medical disabilities. That is 36 percent.

Of this number, 149,094 claims have been approved. This means that 29 percent of all Gulf War vets have recognized service-related disabilities.

Thousands of claims are still pending. These veterans can die before they are compensated.

All the reports over the past six years confirm that the Gulf War resulted in a huge number of soldiers wounded by long-term sickness, disease and disability.

With similar weapons set for use in Iraq, what will the health consequences in the region and for U.S. soldiers be?

*Flounders is an editor of the book "Metal of Dishonor—How the Pentagon Radiates Soldiers and Civilians with DU Weapons," published by the International Action Center in 1997 and 1999. It includes reports from scientists, doctors and veterans themselves, along with government documents, and has been translated into Arabic, Japanese, Italian and Greek. A video of the same name was made by the late videographer Ellen Andors. □*

**From death row:  
Mumia Abu Jamal's  
statement to Oct. 26**

## NO WAR FOR OIL!

On a Move! Long live John Africa.

I thank you for gathering in Washington and in San Francisco, against the gathering forces of war. The one thing I would like to stress is this: War is



not inevitable. The media echo chambers of corporate greed may wish you to think that, but that is just to sap your will and deaden your purpose.

If you, the real people of this nation, its students, its workers, its housewives and its children, really believe that war is inevitable, then you wouldn't be here today. Also you would be admitting that you really don't believe in democracy, for if the people don't want war, then who are all the politicians really representing? If they don't represent the will and the wishes of the people, then who do they represent?

If you organize, if you build forces among the people, the politicians won't be able to ignore you. They won't be able to act as if you don't exist. So build those forces against a bloody war for oil.

You know, we have been here before.

Way back in 1972 Iraqi Gen. Ahmed Hasan al-Bakr nationalized Iraq's oil. Nixon approved the arming of the Kurds in Northern Iraq and promptly placed Iraq on America's list of nations that sponsor terrorism.

Three years later Iraq's vice president, a man named Saddam Hussein, made a deal with the Shah of Iran for control over the Shatt al-Arab waterway in the gulf. Once the U.S. puppet, the shah, had his way opened to the Persian Gulf, America ceased all support to the Kurds. They were once again on their own. America cared about one thing, oil. The same thing they care about now.

This war has nothing to do with democracy, nothing to do with human rights, nothing to do with the oppression of the Kurds, and everything to do with oil. So say no to Exxon, to British Petroleum, to Harkin Oil, to blood for oil and to war for oil.

**Thank you all. On a Move.  
Long live John Africa.  
Free the Move 9.**

**This is Mumia Abu-Jamal. □**

### THE FIRE THIS TIME

By former U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark  
U.S. war crimes in the 1991 Gulf War  
\$19.95

### Challenge to Genocide: LET IRAQ LIVE

Devastating effects of U.S.-led sanctions on Iraq since Gulf War  
\$12.95

### Metal of Dishonor: DEPLETED URANIUM

How the Pentagon radiates soldiers & civilians  
\$12.95



**LET IRAQ LIVE!**

Published by the INTERNATIONAL ACTION CENTER (212) 633-6646 • iacenter@action-mail.org  
Send check or money order to IAC, 39 W. 14th St., Rm. 206, N.Y., N.Y. 10011

Available for 20% off at [Leftbooks.com](http://Leftbooks.com)

## Skulduggery since the 1920s

# U.S. corporations and Iraqi oil

By Richard Becker

How and why did U.S. involvement in Iraq begin?

In all the countless hours the corporate media devote to broadcasting the Bush administration's lies and deceptions about Iraq, that simple and crucial question is almost never addressed. And for good reason.

Since its very beginning eight decades ago, U.S. policy toward Iraq has been intensely focused on one objective: taking control of that country's rich oil resources.

The roots of U.S. intervention in Iraq lie in the aftermath of World War I. It was a war between capitalist empires. On one side were the German, Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman (Turkish) Empires. On the other side was the British-French-Russian imperial entente. Most of the Middle East was under Ottoman control.

The British, through their agent T.E. Lawrence—known to moviegoers as “Lawrence of Arabia”—promised Arab leaders that if they fought with Britain against their Turkish rulers, the British would support the creation of an independent Arab state after the war.

At the same time, the British, French and Russian foreign ministries were secretly signing the Sykes-Picot agreement. Sykes-Picot re-carved the Middle East. The agreement was made public after the Russian Revolution of 1917 by the Bolshevik party, which denounced it as imperialist.

Mass revolts broke out all over the Middle East when the Arab and Kurdish peoples discovered their betrayal at the hands of the imperial “democracies.” The rebellions continued throughout the colonial period. Repression was brutal in the extreme. In 1925, for instance, the British dropped poison gas on the Kurdish town of Sulaimaniya in Iraq, the first time that gas was deployed from warplanes.

### Britain, France divide Middle East

After the war ended in 1918, Britain and France proceeded with their plans. Lebanon and Syria, they agreed, would be incorporated into the French Empire. Palestine, Jordan and the two southern provinces of Iraq—Baghdad and Basra—would become part of the far-flung British Empire.

What they didn't agree about was who would get Mosul province, the northern area of present-day Iraq. According to the Sykes-Picot accord, it was part of the French “sphere of influence.” The British were determined, however, to add Mosul, which was mainly Kurdish in population, to their new Iraq colony. To back its claim, the British army occupied Mosul four days after the Turkish surrender in October 1918—and never left.

The resolution of the inter-imperialist struggle between Britain and France over Mosul brought with it the beginning of the U.S. role in Iraq.

Mosul's importance to the big powers was based on its known but as of then largely undeveloped oil resources. The United States had entered World War I on the side of Britain and France in 1917, after both its allies and enemies were largely exhausted. U.S. conditions for entering the war included the demand that its economic and political objectives be taken into account in the post-war world. Among those objectives was access to new sources of raw materials, particularly oil.

In February 1919, Sir Arthur Hirtzel, a top British colonial official, warned his associates, “It should be borne in mind that the Standard Oil Company is very anxious

**The roots of U.S. intervention lie in the aftermath of World War I. The resolution of the inter-imperialist struggle between Britain and France over Mosul brought with it the beginning of the U.S. role in Iraq**

to take over Iraq.” (Quoted in Peter Sluglett, “Britain in Iraq, 1914-32,” London, 1974)

In the face of the British-French domination of the region, the United States at first demanded an “Open Door” policy. U.S. oil companies should be allowed to freely negotiate contracts with the new puppet monarchy of King Faisal, whom the British had installed on the throne in Iraq.

The solution to the victorious allies' conflict over Iraq was found in dividing up Iraq's oil. The British kept Mosul as part of their new Iraq colony.

### Not one drop for Iraq

Iraq's oil was split five ways: 23.75 percent each to Britain, France, Holland and the United States. The remaining 5 percent went to an oil baron named Caloste Gulbenkian, known as “Mr. Five-Percenter,” who helped negotiate the agreement.

Exactly zero percent of Iraq's oil belonged to Iraq. That's how it was to stay until the revolution of 1958.

In 1927, major oil exploration got under way. Huge deposits were discovered in Mosul province.

Two years later, the Iraqi Petroleum Co.—composed of Anglo-Iranian (today British Petroleum), Shell, Mobil and Standard Oil of New Jersey (Exxon)—was set up. Within a few years it totally monopolized Iraqi oil production.

During the same period the al-Saud family, with Washington's backing, conquered much of the neighboring Arabian peninsula. Saudi Arabia came into being in the 1930s as a neocolony of the United States. The U.S. embassy in Riyadh, the Saudi capital, was located in the ARAMCO (Arab American Oil Co.) building.

But the U.S. oil companies and their government in Washington weren't satisfied. They wanted complete control of the Middle East's oil, just as they had a near-monopoly of the Western Hemisphere's petroleum reserves. This meant displacing the British, who were still top dog in the region.

The U.S. opportunity came as a result of World War II. While the United States and British are generally depicted as the closest of wartime allies, the fact is that they were at the same time fierce opponents.

The war greatly weakened the British Empire both at home and in the loss of key colonies in Asia. In the early stages of the war, 1939-42, it was a question whether Britain would survive. It was never to fully recover its former dominance.

The United States, on the other hand, grew increasingly powerful throughout the war—which the Washington rulers had once again bided their time before entering.

In the latter stages of World War II, the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, dominated by big banking, oil and other corporate interests, were determined to restructure the post-war world to ensure the dominant position of the United States.

The key elements in their strategy were: 1) U.S. military superiority in nuclear and conventional weaponry; 2) U.S.-domi-

nated corporate globalization, using the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, created in 1944, and establishment of the dollar as the world currency; and 3) control of global resources, particularly oil.

While the fighting was still raging on the battlefields, a behind-the-scenes struggle for global economic control was unfolding between the United States and Britain. So intense was this battle that on March 4, 1944—three months before the D-Day invasion at Normandy—British Prime Minister Winston Churchill sent a message to President Franklin Roosevelt that was unusual in its imperialist content and hostile tone:

“Thank you very much for your assurances about no sheep's eyes [looking enviously—RB] on our oilfields in Iran and Iraq. Let me reciprocate by giving you the fullest assurance that we have no thought of trying to horn in upon your interests or property in Saudi Arabia. My position in this as in all matters is that Great Britain seeks no advantage, territorial or otherwise, as a result of this war. On the other hand she will not be deprived of anything which rightly belongs to her after having given her best services to the good cause, at least not so long as your humble servant is entrusted with the conduct of her affairs.” (Quoted in Gabriel Kolko, “The Politics of War,” New York, 1968)

What this note clearly showed was that the U.S. leaders were so intent on taking over Iran and Iraq, both important neocolonies of Britain, that they had set off alarm bells in British ruling circles.

Despite Churchill's bluster, there was nothing the British could do to restrain rising U.S. power. Within a few years, the British ruling class would adapt to the new reality and accept the role of Washington's junior partner.

### U.S. role expands after WW II

In 1953, after the CIA coup that put the shah (king) in power, the United States took control of Iran. By the mid-1950s, Iraq was jointly controlled by the United States and Britain.

Washington set up the Baghdad Pact, which included its client regimes in Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and Iraq, along with Britain, in 1955. The Baghdad Pact, or CENTO—Central Treaty Organization, had two purposes.

First was to oppose the rise of Arab and other liberation movements in the Middle East and south Asia. The second purpose was to be another in a series of military alliances—NATO, SEATO and ANZUS were the others—encircling the socialist camp of the Soviet Union, China, Eastern Europe, north Korea and north Vietnam.

Iraq, the core of CENTO, was independent only in name. The British maintained military airfields in Iraq. While the country was extremely rich in oil—10 percent of the world's reserves—the people lived in extreme poverty and hunger. Illiteracy was over 80 percent. There was one doctor for every 6,000 people, one dentist for every 500,000.

Iraq was ruled by a corrupt monarchy

under King Faisal II and a coterie of feudal landowners and merchant capitalists.

Underlying Iraq's poverty was the simple fact that Iraq did not own its vast oil reserves.

### The Iraqi Revolution

But on July 14, 1958, Iraq was rocked by a powerful social explosion. A military rebellion turned into a countrywide revolution. The king and his administration were suddenly gone, the recipients of people's justice.

Washington and Wall Street were stunned. In the week that followed, the New York Times, the U.S. “newspaper of record,” had virtually no stories in its first 10 pages other than those about the Iraqi Revolution.

While another great revolution that took place just six months later in Cuba is better remembered today, Washington regarded the Iraqi upheaval as far more threatening to its vital interests at the time.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower called it “the gravest crisis since the Korean War.” The day after the Iraqi Revolution, 20,000 U.S. Marines began landing in Lebanon. The day after that, 6,600 British paratroopers were dropped into Jordan.

This was what came to be known as the “Eisenhower Doctrine.” The United States would intervene directly—go to war—to prevent the spread of revolution in the vital Middle East.

U.S. and British expeditionary forces went in to save the neocolonial governments in Lebanon and Jordan. Had they not, the popular impulse from Iraq would have surely brought down the rotten dependent regimes in Beirut and Amman.

But Eisenhower, his generals and his arch-imperialist Secretary of State John Foster Dulles also had something else in mind: invading Iraq, overturning the revolution and installing a new puppet government in Baghdad.

Three factors forced Washington to abandon that plan in 1958: the sweeping character of the Iraqi Revolution; the announcement by the United Arab Republic, which bordered Iraq, that its forces would fight the imperialists if they sought to invade; and the emphatic support of the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union for the revolution. The USSR began a mobilization of troops in the southern Soviet republics close to Iraq.

The combination of these factors forced the U.S. leaders to accept the existence of the Iraqi Revolution. But Washington never really reconciled itself to the loss of Iraq.

Over the next three decades, the U.S. government applied many tactics designed to weaken and undermine Iraq as an independent country. At various times—such as after Iraq completed the nationalization of the Iraqi Petroleum Co. in 1972 and signed a defense treaty with the USSR—the United States gave massive military support to right-wing Kurdish elements fighting Baghdad and added Iraq to its list of “terrorist states.”

The United States supported the more rightist elements within the post-revolution political structure against the communist and left-nationalist forces. For example, the United States applauded the suppression of the Iraqi Communist Party and left-led labor unions by the Ba'ath Party government of Saddam Hussein in the late 1970s.

In the 1980s, the United States encour-

*Continued on page 10*



## An attempt to turn back history

# Bush doctrine vs. self-determination

By Fred Goldstein

The Bush administration is rushing ahead with plans for its unprovoked war of aggression against Iraq based on unsubstantiated charges repeated over and over again by its spokespeople. Their goal for the last year has been to transform the shock and outrage over the Sept. 11 disaster into a permanent state of pro-war psychology in the United States and worldwide that can be harnessed to support a campaign of “permanent war.”

But while the White House, Pentagon and the big-business media have managed to create this war psychology in the Congress and win a complete capitulation of the Democratic Party, their strategy is backfiring down below, among the people.

Every poll shows declining support for the war. Reports from congressional offices around the country, Republican and Democrat alike, show e-mails, letters and phone calls running overwhelmingly against an assault. A growing number of labor unions are passing resolutions against the war.

While George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Colin Powell, Paul Wolfowitz and Condoleezza Rice concoct imaginary threats to justify a war of conquest, the masses of people are experiencing the very real threats arising out of the growing economic crisis: layoffs, cutbacks in social services, retirement funds vanishing in the collapsing stock market, loss of medical coverage and growing poverty.

While Washington pours forth a continuous stream of charges of “terrorism” and “weapons of mass destruction” against Iraq, the world watches as the Pentagon prepares a campaign of terror bombing that will kill thousands and assure the mass destruction of Iraqi cities and towns.

### Bush’s broader purpose

With its intended war of “preemption” against Iraq, the Bush administration is engaged in a much broader purpose: a unilateral campaign to revamp the entire legal and political structure of international relations in the post-Soviet period, to reflect the absolute superpower domination of U.S. imperialism over the world. This campaign is directed first and foremost against the oppressed peoples of the world, but also against Washington and Wall Street’s imperialist allies/rivals in Europe and Japan.

The Bush administration has openly stated its goal in Iraq to be “regime change.” Against all advice and pleadings, Bush has stubbornly refused to mute or disguise this goal of his intended military action.

No matter how much the Iraqi government extends itself to comply with the demands of an inspections regime, the Bush administration dismisses in advance any prospect that such a regime could succeed. War plans are going ahead full steam. Plans for a military occupation and the establishment of a colonial-style puppet regime are openly discussed, even as the so-called debates go ahead, first in Congress and then in the United Nations Security Council.

There is a clear political purpose behind this brazen assertion of the right to destroy the government of Saddam Hussein. The Bush administration is determined to demonstratively overturn the right of sovereignty, self-determination and self-defense of former colonial peoples.

In Washington’s New World Order, these rights have no place.

Using the cover of the so-called “war

**The Bush administration and the Cheney-Rumsfeld-Wolfowitz grouping represent those elements within the capitalist state and the ruling class who regard this new situation as the opportunity to go back to the old colonial era that existed before the rise of the socialist camp and the national liberation movements**

against terrorism,” Bush is promoting a conception that is nothing less than a brazen revival of the old rights of colonial powers. The rights of sovereignty and self-determination are to be openly eliminated and explicitly replaced by the superior right of U.S. imperialism to remove any regime that will not submit to its dictates.

The right of regime change is directly and brutally counterpoised to the rights of sovereignty and self-determination of colonial and formerly colonial peoples. These rights of oppressed peoples arose out of the innumerable struggles of the 20th century that overturned the colonial powers’ right of “regime change” at the cost of millions of lives and rivers of blood.

To be sure, the Pentagon has overturned many governments in the past. It overthrew Maurice Bishop in Grenada, Manuel Noriega in Panama and Slobodan Milosevic in Yugoslavia, to name a few. But each one was overthrown under cover of some pretext and without referring to any generalized principle of Washington’s right of “regime change.”

### Marxist view of legality

The general Marxist view of legality in class society is that it arises out of the class struggle and reflects class and national relations. For example, in the United States in the mid-19th century it was illegal for three or more workers to gather for the purposes of discussing the formation of a trade union. Such behavior was regarded as an illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade. Only the class struggle established the right to organize and to force the bosses to engage in collective bargaining.

In the same way the sovereignty and right of self-determination of oppressed peoples became inscribed in international conventions only after generations of anti-colonial struggle.

The right of sovereignty of nation-states arose with the establishment of capitalism. But for centuries those rights belonged only to the oppressor states—feudal, capitalist and, in the modern era, imperialist.

It was not until 1960, after many liberation and anti-colonial movements had either triumphed or were under way—including the Cuban Revolution, the liberation movement against the French in Algeria, the struggles for independence in India, Palestine, Libya, Syria, Kenya, Indonesia, Malaya, Ghana, Guinea, Vietnam, Korea, Egypt and many others—that the right of self-determination for colonial peoples was even recognized.

The United Nations was finally compelled to issue a document on Dec. 14, 1960, entitled “Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples” in which the right of sovereignty and self-determination was raised to the level of international principle.

### How self-determination got on the agenda

It was with the advent of the socialist rev-

olutions and the national liberation struggles that the question of the sovereignty of oppressed peoples made its way onto the historical agenda. After the Bolshevik Revolution—the seizure of power by the workers and peasants of czarist Russia—V.I. Lenin amended Karl Marx’s slogan “workers of the world unite” to “workers and oppressed peoples of the world unite.” At its Second Congress in 1920, the Communist International reached out to the colonial peoples in an attempt to forge ties of solidarity and support between the workers’ revolution and the struggle against imperialism.

This congress enshrined the doctrine of an alliance aimed at breaking the stranglehold of imperialism over the colonies, through socialist support for national liberation. Later, after World War II, the socialist revolution triumphed in China and anti-colonial movements swept Asia, Africa and Latin America. Despite many mistakes on the part of the Soviet and Chinese leaderships relative to various national liberation struggles, the broad alliance between the socialist camp and the colonial and formerly colonial peoples held up, however imperfectly. Certainly, the imperialists did everything within their power to break it up.

The USSR and China supported the Vietnamese struggle against the French and U.S. imperialists. The USSR gave decisive support to the Cuban Revolution at critical junctures. The socialist camp gave support to the struggle of the African National Congress against apartheid in South Africa and to other liberation fighters around the world, including SWAPO in Namibia, the MPLA in Angola, and Palestinians fighting the Israeli occupiers. They all relied heavily on material and political support from the socialist countries.

Newly liberated countries suffering from centuries of underdevelopment could get technical training, education, commercial, financial and military support in Moscow before Mikhail Gorbachev became Communist Party general secretary, and in Beijing before President Richard Nixon’s visit there in 1972.

When the imperialists refused to support projects of national development, the socialist countries, despite their limited resources and their own desperate struggle to overcome imperialist blockade, often stepped up to supply necessary assistance. These projects were not like the investments by private capitalists that suck out profits from developing countries. What they built became the property of the newly liberated nation. The USSR helped Egypt build the Aswan dam when the United States refused. It also built the first steel mill in India. It tried to help the Bolivian government break the stranglehold of U.S. mining companies by supplying a tin refinery—an effort that was overturned by the United States.

In general, the military prowess and material support of the socialist camp, partic-

ularly the Soviet military and economic power, formed a shield that limited the aggression of the U.S., European and Japanese imperialists against the many national liberation struggles and newly liberated countries. It helped them hold on to their national sovereignty in the face of the Pentagon and the CIA.

The USSR was the first place on earth where the working class came to power for a sustained period. This revolution took place in the impoverished capitalist country of czarist Russia, which in 1917 was still emerging from feudalism. Despite its poverty, despite losing 12 million people in the ensuing civil war and being blockaded by 14 imperialist powers, despite losing 20 million people later in the Nazi invasion during World War II, and despite having to face the Pentagon, NATO and Japanese imperialism—the USSR managed to become the second-greatest power in the world. Its tremendous development was based on state ownership of the means of production, a planned economy, a state monopoly on foreign trade and production for society, not for profit.

Without capitalist bosses or private property, it managed to inaugurate the space age, build the biggest construction projects in world history, defeat the Nazi war machine, and show the world that society without capitalism can make great strides, even in an underdeveloped and impoverished country.

But 70 years of unrelenting military, political and economic pressure enabled the imperialist camp to bring about a deterioration in the leadership of the USSR that resulted in the alienation of the workers from the government and opened the door to capitalist counter-revolution. The collapse of the USSR and Eastern Europe, plus China’s retreat from its position of international solidarity with the oppressed peoples, removed a mighty prop of support for the sovereignty and right of self-determination of the peoples of the Third World.

### Think they can go back to colonial era

The U.S. ruling class emerged from this historic struggle with a massive military machine and a worldwide apparatus of subversion and political control. The Bush administration and the Cheney-Rumsfeld-Wolfowitz grouping represent those elements within the capitalist state and the ruling class who regard this new situation as the opportunity to go back to the old colonial era that existed before the rise of the socialist camp and the national liberation movements.

The concepts of “pre-emption” and “regime change” being promoted under the guise of the “war against terrorism” are an attempt to codify, in international legal and political relations, the post-Soviet world relationship of class forces. Under this new doctrine, not only is the right of sovereignty and self-determination eradicated, but Washington retains the absolute right to dictate the new rules of international relations—whether in regard to the Geneva Conventions covering prisoners of war, the United Nations Charter on non-interference in the internal affairs of other governments, the Kyoto Accord on the environment, or the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, among many examples.

But these dreams of world domination and a return to colonial times, like when the British imperialists decided to create Iraq and rule it as a colonial power, are just that:

*Continued on page 11*

# How a revolution stopped a war

By Greg Butterfield

People new to progressive politics might wonder why revolutionary Marxists study V. I. Lenin's writings on World War I and the Russian Bolshevik Party's role in the anti-war movement of the time.



After all, the world has changed a lot in the nine decades since World War I. Back then nerve gas and bi-planes were the cutting edge of military technology. Today there are mini-nukes, smart bombs and bunker busters, CNN, MSNBC and Fox, and George W. Bush's plan for a \$200-billion war and occupation of Iraq.

What hasn't changed, though, is the fundamental nature of imperialism. Its insatiable drive to war for profit operates 24/7. But so too does the irreconcilable class struggle between workers and bosses, between labor and the repressive capitalist state.

Witness the ongoing battle of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union on the West Coast. After the bosses locked out the dockers as part of an ongoing fight over jobs and safety, the Bush administration ordered them back to work without a contract, supposedly for reasons of "national security."

One of the best introductions you'll find to that earlier era is the book "The Bolsheviks and War: Lessons for Today's Anti-War Movement," written in 1985 by Sam Marcy, the founder and chairperson of Workers World Party.

In clear, contemporary language, Marcy explains the controversies that wracked the European and U.S. anti-war movements during World War I, and how the Bolsheviks in Russia staked out a revolutionary internationalist position, advocating class struggle to stop the bloody war of the imperialist powers. This culminated in Russia's 1917 socialist revolution.

Marcy also shows how the lessons of that time can be applied to anti-war struggles today. Along the way, he uncovers the long-buried history of the Green Corn Rebellion, a socialist-led

insurrection against the war in the United States.

## Lenin on war and revolution

In every war crisis, many of the same conflicts and questions arise within the movement over how best to oppose the war, or even whether to oppose it.

Is imperialism just a bad policy or is it a system? Do the United States and other imperialist powers have "legitimate interests" in the Middle East or elsewhere?

Should the movement advocate sanctions or weapons inspections as an alternative to outright invasion, or should it oppose all forms of imperialist domination? Does a country that has been oppressed and plundered by colonialism and imperialism have the right to self-defense?

Is the anti-war movement's goal simply to curb the war machine's worst excesses? Or should it be to get rid of the system that breeds war, racism and environmental devastation on a global scale?

As Marcy's book recounts, the European workers' movement adopted many fine-sounding anti-war resolutions before World War I broke out in 1914. But as soon as war was declared, nearly all the officialdom of the Social Democratic parties abandoned the workers' interests and backed their national ruling classes in the war.

Only Lenin and the Bolsheviks in Russia, along with Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg in Germany, the left wing of the U.S. Socialist Party and a few others, stood firm.

Instead of using the war as an excuse to pull back from the class struggle, Lenin and his co-thinkers argued that it was exactly the right time to direct the struggle of the workers and oppressed against capitalism. "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war" was the Bolsheviks' motto.

"A revolutionary class cannot but wish for the defeat of its government in a reactionary war," Lenin wrote in 1915, "and cannot fail to see that the latter's military reverses must facilitate its overthrow." This thoroughly internationalist

position, which scandalized the "official, loyal" anti-war opposition then and now, is called revolutionary defeatism.

## Dying for the bosses' profits

The Russian workers and peasants wanted peace desperately. It became clear to them that the only way to get it was to overthrow their government. The war with Germany was literally killing them by the hundreds of thousands, in the trenches and by starvation at home.

First they overthrew the czarist regime. But the "democratic" capitalist government that followed still refused to get out of the war. It kept sending young men to be killed because the bankers and industrialists didn't want to give up territories valuable to them.

After the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917, one of the first things the new workers' and peasants' government did was make public the secret treaties these rulers had made. The treaties showed what the capitalists had expected to get out of the war—much like the secret agreements being made today over who gets Iraqi oil after a U.S. invasion and occupation.

Marcy's book also explains the Bolshevik view on wars of imperialist powers against underdeveloped countries striving for national liberation or to maintain their independence. The planned U.S. aggression against Iraq falls into that category.

Lenin argued that communists "of the oppressor countries should recognize and

champion the oppressed nation's right to self-determination. The socialist of a ruling country who does not stand for this right is a chauvinist."

## Class struggle and war

Marcy contends, "If the struggle against imperialist war is to become serious, it must take on a working class character." What does this mean?

"Taking on a working-class character means that the fundamental aim of the anti-war struggle is not merely against the military-industrial complex, but also the defense contractors and the big banks, as well as the giant oil corporations," he writes.

Unless the class nature of war is clearly understood by the anti-war forces, their focus can be sidetracked. Instead of building a militant, grassroots movement, they can waste their energies trying to win over liberal politicians and capitalists who are beholden to the interests of Big Oil, Wall Street and the military contractors.

The movement's energy can also be diverted into making demands on an oppressed country to weaken its sovereignty, like the trend today that demands Iraq open itself to the U.S.-dominated United Nations weapons inspection regime.

"The Bolsheviks and War" can be purchased for \$5 plus \$2 shipping and handling from: World View Forum, 55 W. 17 St., 5th fl., New York, NY 10011. □

## U.S. firms & Iraqi oil

Continued from page 8

aged and helped to fund and arm Iraq in its war against Iran. U.S. domination of the latter was ended by Iran's Islamic revolution in 1979. In reality, though, the U.S. aim in the Iran-Iraq war was to weaken and destroy both countries. Ex-Secretary of State Henry Kissinger revealed the real U.S. attitude about the war when he said, "I hope they kill each other."

The Pentagon provided Iraq's air force with satellite photos of Iranian targets. At the same time, as the Iran-Contra scandal revealed, the United States was sending anti-aircraft missiles to Iran.

The Iran-Iraq war was a disaster, killing a million people and weakening both countries.

### Collapse of USSR and Gulf War

When the war finally ended in 1988, developments in the Soviet Union were posing a new and even graver danger to Iraq, which had a military and friendship treaty with the USSR. In pursuit of "permanent détente" with the United States, the Gorbachev leadership in Moscow began to cut its support for its

allies in the developing world.

In 1989, Gorbachev went further and withdrew support for the socialist governments in Eastern Europe, most of which then collapsed. This sharp shift in the world relationship of forces—culminating with the collapse of the Soviet Union itself two years later—constituted the greatest victory for U.S. imperialism since World War II.

It also opened the door for the U.S. war against Iraq in 1991, and more than a decade of sanctions/blockade and bombing that have devastated Iraq and its people.

Today, the Bush administration is seeking to win public support for a new war against Iraq by talking about "weapons of mass destruction" and "human rights." The reality is that Washington is concerned about neither Iraq's diminished military capacity nor human rights anywhere in the world.

What moves U.S. policy toward Iraq in 2002 is the same objective that motivated Washington and Wall Street 80 years ago: oil. □

## The people can stop war

Continued from page 1

But the Bush administration has made it gospel that Iraq is working on chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. If these production facilities are not found, according to the Bush administration, it will be because the Iraqis are engaging in obstruction and have moved them around and hidden them.

The Bush administration is on a crusade to conquer Iraq and to seize its 110 billion barrels of oil reserves, the second largest in the world. And it has made clear that there are no conditions and no concessions that the government of Iraq can offer which will deter Bush, the Pentagon and the giant oil companies from war.

According to the Times, "an official who sits in many of the Iraq policy discussions said tonight, 'I don't think the president is backing down one iota from his conclusions that Saddam's got to go. But he's learned that talking about it doesn't help his cause.'"

### Pentagon plan for military regime

In recent days the White House and the Pentagon have shown how advanced are the plans for a war of conquest. On Oct. 10 they disclosed the latest plans for a U.S. military regime in Iraq. It would be run by a top military official, possibly Gen. Tommy Franks of the U.S. Central Command. Among other things, the U.S. military and its imperialist allies would take over Iraq's oil.

It has also been revealed that the State Department has initiated the "Future of Iraq Project" to train a new team of puppet administrators that would advise a U.S.-installed regime on the various political, legal, technical and administrative aspects of ruling after an invasion.

Around the same time came the news that the Pentagon had issued orders for the Marines and the Army to move their

central commands from California and Heidelberg, Germany, to Kuwait. The Central Command will move to the region next month. Enough military supplies have already been moved to Diego Garcia military base in the Indian Ocean to equip 10,000 Army troops and 15,000 Marines. More is on the way.

The latest information is that the Pentagon is "training furiously and polishing a plan for attacking Baghdad that calls for isolating the city and then taking control of it," according to the New York Times of Oct. 22. "Marines are now using a 1,000-building complex at George Air Force Base, a shuttered installation in southern California," as they practice urban warfare. Other urban combat units are practicing on Guam, in Louisiana and in New York state.

### Real issue: disarm the Pentagon

Any nod by Bush toward diplomacy is just a maneuver to dodge criticism and gain consent for war from the UN Security Council. The debate in the Security Council is really a debate over what tactics to use to subjugate the sovereign country of Iraq, which has refused to give up its independent status and become a satellite of U.S. imperialism and the giant oil monopolies.

The debate over the best way to "disarm Iraq" is a false debate. Iraq and all formerly colonial countries have every right to arm themselves for protection against imperialist predator states that want to reimpose colonial subjugation upon them. The real debate should be about how to disarm the Pentagon, which has more weapons of mass destruction and conventional destruction than the rest of the world combined and has openly stated its intentions of launching a new war of aggression. □

# Workers World Party to Oct. 26 marchers: Look for the motive

Continued from page 1

foreign currency. The U.S. doesn't have to go to war to get oil. Sometimes it's those who want a war who talk the most about our "need" for oil. They try to scare us with dire warnings that we'll be lining up at the gas pumps or freezing in our homes—in order to get us to support a military adventure.

So the war is about more than oil. It's about the profits of the oil companies. They're the ones pushing for a war. That's who the Bush administration listens to.

But does that explain why Congress voted for the war? Does it explain why the media help Ashcroft's scare campaign to gut civil liberties? Are they all in the pockets of the oil companies?

Some are. Some aren't.

The problem, really, is broader than just the oil companies, as big as they are. The problem is this economic system that has allowed so much power and wealth to be concentrated in the hands of so few.

The system has a name—capitalism. It's not the first economic system that human beings have had, and it won't be the last. It developed out of commerce and trade centuries ago. The exchange of goods for money spurred on production, which in turn started a scientific and technological leap forward called the Industrial Revolution.

This expanded production tremendously, and with it the exploitation of labor. Much of the wealth extracted from the workers soon wound up in banks and stock markets. Mergers and bankruptcies concentrated capital into fewer hands. Free trade was replaced by monopolies. The banks and other financial institutions became top dog.

This transition happened in the U.S. and Europe over a hundred years ago, and in Japan soon after.

This was the beginning of the imperialist era. The finance capitalists now controlled so much wealth that they couldn't invest all of it at home. Capitalism was yo-yoing up and down, with "panics"—today we'd call them recessions—occurring about every 10 years. The owners of capital

needed to find markets and workers to exploit in other countries.

In the war with Spain that began in 1898, U.S. finance capitalists got their wish. The U.S. military grabbed Cuba, Puerto Rico and the Philippines and the rich immediately set about making money there. They invested some of the wealth they had accumulated from exploitation here at home—including the immense fortunes made off the forced labor of Black people in the South.

Investment in ports and railroads abroad might have looked like "development" at first, but it was only so they could take out big profits later.

That was the first really imperialist war of the U.S. There had been earlier wars just as brutal—against Mexico, against the Native people—but they were for territory. The Spanish-American War was so U.S. capital could expand into "spheres of influence" and keep out competing banks and businesses from other countries.

Now, a hundred years and many, many wars and interventions later, the super-wealthy ruling class of the U.S. is totally addicted to imperialism. A huge part of their capital is invested in war itself—the military-industrial complex that makes everything from fighter jets to sniper guns.

Then there are all the companies that pay super-cheap wages around the world—while laying off workers here. And the banks that gain financial control of whole countries through loans. All these corporations and banks would go into a tailspin without the immense profits they get from investments all over the world. As they get richer and billions of people get poorer, they're sitting on a powder keg of anger and resentment, and they know it. But they have no answers—except to send the military.

This explains why the politicians, whose campaigns are all paid for by the moneyed establishment, voted for the war. It explains why the media, which depends on corporate advertising, gives the impression that almost everyone is for a war. You know that's a lie. That's why you're demonstrating.

The war Bush is planning isn't something unique in U.S. history. Unless we

fight to change the system itself, the wars will continue and grow ever more horrendous.

Back in 1898, a few brave souls who were horrified at this country's imperial ambitions—they included the writer Mark Twain—formed the Anti-Imperialist League. Today, more than ever, we need to oppose U.S. imperialism. We need to show solidarity with all those peoples around the world who have been invaded, sanctioned, bombed and exploited so U.S. companies could make huge profits off their land and labor.

We need to do this for ourselves, first of all. The more these corporations get away with exploiting the rest of the world, the more they try to grind down our wages to the same level. They can't help it, either. Capital flows to where the profits are highest. Those corporate executives who can't or won't squeeze more out of the workers

fall by the wayside.

We don't have to accept this dog-eat-dog system. We can fight it. We can replace it with something infinitely better. We can live in harmony with the rest of the world instead of going with a gun in our hands to make the world safe for Exxon and Mobil and The Gap.

The war we need to fight is the war at home for jobs, pensions, healthcare, housing, equality, the environment and all the other necessities of life being undercut by this profit system.

We need socialism. It's a word that's been demonized by the establishment, but it simply means an economic system where the wealth is owned in common by the people and shared equitably. Of course, this scares the rich no end. They see it as the end of their world. It is—and the beginning of a truly human world. □

## Zionists don't speak for all Jews Support for Palestine is not 'anti-Semitism'

By Leslie Feinberg

As pro-Palestinian activism sweeps campuses across the United States, pro-Zionist supporters of Israel are trying to block this rising movement by labeling any expression of solidarity with Palestinian freedom—indeed, any criticism of Israel itself—as "anti-Semitic." This is a despicable and unconscionable accusation in light of the historic toll that genuine anti-Semitism has claimed.

Zionism has long hid its crimes against the besieged Palestinian nation behind the claim that it represents a "Jewish homeland" and that as an ideology it articulates the aspirations of Jewish people everywhere.

But Zionism has never been the voice of all Jewish people.

Modern political Zionism and its goal of a Jewish colonial-style settler state took root with the development of inter-imperialist competition and expansion. The drive to emigrate from Czarist Russia and eastern and central Europe was fueled by the widespread anti-Semitism engendered by the ruling classes of the continent and the scattered and oppressed condition of this minority population.

For many decades in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Zionism was not the voice of the majority of Jewish people. Quite the contrary. Jewish workers and intellectuals played a major role in the socialist, communist and other progressive movements. They took part in the working class struggles to overturn the ruling classes. They fought for equality, not separation. Prior to World War II, progressives largely viewed Zionist ideology as a reactionary political current.

Zionism hitched its wagon to the emerging imperialist monopoly stage of capitalism as capital burst beyond the borders of the industrialized countries and sought to expand by colonizing the planet. Cloaked in a religious guise, Zionist leaders offered themselves as colonial shock troops.

The ruling classes in England and the United States—permeated with anti-Semitism themselves—later stood by and did little while six million Jews were systematically exterminated, as long as Hitler was crushing the Soviet Union under the treads

of his military machine. They did not bomb the rail lines that carried precious human cargo to the concentration camps. They did not open their borders to a flood of refugees fleeing the holocaust.

After World War II the imperialist powers saw an opportunity to sink their claws more deeply into the oil-rich Middle East by allowing the Zionists to create the settler state of Israel in historic Palestine. The formation of this "safe Jewish homeland" was itself a terrible act of anti-Semitism, as well as a violent racist crime against the Palestinian people.

The terror used to force Palestinians into a Diaspora, the maintenance of a brutal apartheid state in Israel, the military crushing of Palestinian resistance and holding back the tide of Arab revolutionary aspirations have all created worldwide rage against Israel. Because Zionism speaks in the name of all Jewish people, much of that anger can become directed at Jewish people as a whole.

Zionism and its deep-pocketed benefactors on Wall Street and in the White House bear the responsibility. Zionism is itself an anti-Semitic ideology in two ways: by inflaming anger at the crimes of its "Jewish state" and by fueling anti-Arab hatred, since the Arab population—including Palestinian—is also a Semitic people.

Today the ranks of the burgeoning international solidarity movement in support of the Palestinian liberation struggle have been swelled by growing numbers of Jewish people of all ages and walks of life.

They are traveling to the occupied territories to put their bodies on the line for the Palestinian struggle. They are speaking out on college campuses for divestment from Israel. They are marching for Palestinian self-determination.

They are revitalizing and swelling the ranks of the left-wing Jewish political current that has for generations been a large and dynamic component of the struggles of the working class, fighting back shoulder-to-shoulder with those who bear the greatest burdens of inequality and injustice. And in doing so, they are delivering a body blow to anti-Semitism.

At this moment in history, the battles to defeat anti-Semitism and free Palestine are inextricably entwined. □



Must  
reading  
for  
anti-war  
activists

### THE BOLSHEVIKS AND WAR

By Sam Marcy

Lessons for today's anti-war movement

\$4.95

### THE BUILT-IN U.S. WAR DRIVE

By Vince Copeland

Motives behind U.S. wars since 1898

\$3.50

Plus \$1.50 first class shipping & handling

Order from World View Forum, Inc.

55 W. 17th St.,

5th floor

N.Y., N.Y. 10011

## Bush Doctrine

Continued from page 9

dreams and delusions. They are created in Pentagon war rooms, in the Foggy Bottom of the State Department, and in the right-wing think tanks.

Whatever the military outcome of the U.S. war effort, the Iraqi people will never accept going back to the days of colonialism. Nor will the peoples of the Middle East ever accept such a counter-revolutionary overturn. The minds that have conceived this plan—the Cheneys, the Rumsfelds and the Wolfowitzes—have been shaped in an era of retreat and setback for the socialist camp and the world liberation struggle, beginning with Reagan.

Their entire program is predicated upon the assumption that the masses of people, in the United States and abroad, will passively accept this new world order without struggle and resistance. But all of history shows that repression and reaction breed resistance, rebellion and revolution. When reaction is applied worldwide, resistance is bound to grow worldwide. □

# 'No force is mightier than struggle for liberation'

By Teresa Gutierrez

*From a speech to the Sept. 21-22 Workers World Party conference. Gutierrez, a member of WWP's Secretariat, was part of an International Action Center delegation to an anti-war conference in Iraq in mid-September.*

This past May, speaking about events in the U.S. since 9/11, President Fidel Castro of Cuba said, "As a leader in a country that has had to defend itself for more than four decades from thousands of terrorist actions, I can assure you that the constant stirring up of panic is not the right way to proceed—since it can psychologically affect the people and turn life in that immense country into an unbearable nightmare."

Cuba has much experience with terrorist attacks. Over 3,000 Cubans have died as a result of U.S.-sponsored terrorism. In proportion to the population, that would be as though 88,434 people

had died in the U.S.

Cuba's leader knows what he's talking about when he says that it's wrong to instill panic. But how else could the U.S. government—a regime built on slavery, genocide and theft—handle the 9/11 attacks? The Bush administration aimed to take full advantage of the attacks to launch the boldest war program imperialism could muster. To do this it had to justify its agenda to the people of this country. A wave of racial profiling and violations of civil rights followed.

Another insidious tactic was to constantly warn of more attacks. Here in New York, announcements of possible "terrorist attacks" have become as commonplace as the weather forecast. Reporters go to Grand Central Station and ask people if they are afraid to ride the trains.

Now think about this. If you're an average worker, not politically con-



WW PHOTO

scious, what kind of effect would this have on you? You have no choice but to ride the subway.

Instilling this kind of fear is reckless and irresponsible. But it's not surprising. It's just one of the ways the ruling class has manipulated events for its capitalist agenda since 9/11.

## Gov't puts the people in harm's way

As communists, we were and remain shocked and saddened by the deaths of nearly 3,000 people at the World Trade Center, mainly civilians. We care about the plight of the survivors and others who were directly affected: people who lost housing, jobs and whose physical and mental health suffered. We care about the immigrant workers who suffer triple exploitation.

But what distinguishes us from the incredible hype around the tragedy is that we say it is the U.S. government and ruling class that put the people here in harm's way.

It is their sanctions on Iraq, their funding and arming of the Israeli occupation of Palestine, their lust for domination and control that put the people of this country in imminent danger.

Not that the Iraqis or Palestinians were responsible for the attacks. All the efforts of the Bush administration to use 9/11 as an excuse for its war plans in the Middle East have turned up not a shred of evidence for that. But U.S. efforts to totally dominate the Middle East have enraged and alienated even forces that once worked with the CIA, as in Afghanistan.

We pointed out that the nearly 3,000 lives lost at the World Trade Center on Sept. 11, 2001, are no more valuable than the lives lost in Chile on Sept. 11, 1973, or anywhere else that the U.S. has led massacres of one kind or another.

I have traveled to many places in the world where U.S. imperialism has inflicted terrible tragedy: Korea, Panama, Vieques, Palestine, Sudan, Colombia, Iraq. So many oppressed people open up their lives and their hearts to visitors and ask, "Why?"

The Iraqi people were no different. When I was there, they shared their condolences with us on the losses of 9/11. But they also asked, "Why? Why does the U.S. hate us so much?" If we were not class conscious, it would be difficult to meet their eyes.

Is it any wonder that as passengers de-board the plane in Baghdad, the words "Down with the USA" welcome you? The Iraqi people have great reason to hate the U.S. government.

## U.S. workers will resist

During the International Solidarity Conference in Baghdad, one of the points that Larry Holmes and I made in our presentations was to urge everyone not to give up on us. There is a certain level of skepticism and pessimism about the people of the United States.

But we were confident and optimistic and spoke of the great capacity of the movement and the people in this country. We said this was not based on wishful thinking but based on a clear Marxist analysis of history and the class struggle.

This is the time to remind the world

that it was on this land that rich working-class struggles gave birth to two glorious workers' celebrations: May Day and International Women's Day.

During the 1930s, the struggle of the workers here produced many committed fighters against the capitalist system. Just 30 years ago, millions protested and did everything in their power to join the people of Vietnam in stopping U.S. terror in Southeast Asia.

Countless solidarity campaigns have been carried out for the people of Central America. We fought to stop apartheid in South Africa. Hundreds of thousands here have defied the U.S. blockade of Cuba.

This is a country rich with lessons of building multinational unity. Many a white worker has sacrificed to join people of African descent in the struggles to abolish slavery, win civil rights and end racism.

Even the World Trade Center crisis showed how workers are instinctively inclined to pull together, to work for peace, rather than to be at war. Pitching in and solace and comfort were the order of the day. We all heard stories of people traveling here to help from many places across the U.S. and other countries.

The conditions workers and oppressed people face here are exactly why we are confident that the vast majority of people can be pulled away from the camp of the bourgeoisie to the other side of the class struggle.

## Army of occupation can't win

When six women were killed by their soldier husbands/partners on a military base in North Carolina this summer, it told us the terrible truth about the vile culture of the Pentagon. But it also told us that it's possible to talk to service people and family members, and to recruit anti-war activists from their ranks.

An army built on the slaughter of innocent Iraqis is an army that cannot win. Armies built on the occupation of Palestine or Vieques or on the backs of millions around the world are armies that will surely be defeated.

There is no mightier force than the righteous struggle for liberation. The people of Vietnam, like many others, proved that imperialism can be defeated.

Bush's arrogant doctrine for war and domination, "The National Security Strategy of the United States," may have a chilling effect on some here and abroad. But Workers World Party is prepared to face this doctrine head-on.

When the anti-war movement marched on Washington last April 20, it was a sign that, as Malcolm X once said, the chickens have come home to roost. On April 20—just seven months after 9/11—100,000 people in the U.S. marched for Palestine and against racial profiling and repression. Over half were people from the Middle East and South Asia.

Our party was instrumental in supporting this event. And we are confident that April 20 was just the beginning of a massive struggle against the capitalist class.

We want socialism in the U.S. We won't stop until we get it.

One day Ground Zero will be dedicated to the people of Iraq and Palestine, to all the people of the Middle East. We will not just pay tribute, we will make the occupiers, oppressors and exploiters pay reparations for their crimes. □



"Say no to the strike of the rich people," reads graffiti in Caracas.

## New coup threat in Venezuela

On Oct. 21, Venezuela's wealthy bosses staged a 12-hour lockout across the South American country, which they called a "general strike," in an effort to force President Hugo Chavez to call early presidential elections.

Supporters of Chavez's progressive government declared the lockout a failure. "The country did not stop. It's on its feet and running," said Vice President Jose Vicente Rangel. Oil production and export, the pillars of Venezuela's economy, were unaffected.

"In downtown Caracas and poorer western neighborhoods and slums, traditional strongholds of support for the populist president, many shops, bars and businesses opened their doors," Reuters news agency reported.

Still, there are ominous signs that a new U.S.-backed coup may be in the offing.

On Oct. 23, a group of 14 military officers went on national television to call on people to "overthrow" Chavez and come to a reactionary demonstration in the capital, BBC reported.

Venezuela is rich in petroleum resources and the third-largest exporter of oil to the U.S. For years the Rockefeller-owned Standard Oil Co. controlled this valuable resource.

The Bush administration fears the revolutionary process unfolding in Venezuela. The Bolivarian Revolution, as it is called, aims to take power away from the rich oligarchy and put it in the hands of the peasants and workers, who suffer an 80-percent poverty rate thanks to decades of U.S. domination over their country.

The poor have organized themselves in Bolivarian Circles to defend the revolutionary process. In April, these organizations were crucial in turning back an attempted coup d'etat by U.S.-backed businessmen and military officers.

Since Chavez's landslide election in 1998, Venezuela has voted in a new Constitution and National Assembly based on mass participation that promotes equal rights for all, including lesbians and gays. He defied Washington by visiting Iraq and selling oil to Cuba. Last November he signed a package of 49 laws aimed at land reform on behalf of small and landless farmers.

Progressive people in the United States need to be on the alert for a rerun of last April's attempted coup. The movement building opposition to Bush's planned war in Iraq must also demand "U.S. hands off Venezuela."

-Greg Butterfield

# Koreans want end to U.S. war threats

By Deirdre Griswold

Why has the government of north Korea said that the 1994 agreement it had with the Clinton administration over its nuclear program is now dead?

Because the Bush administration killed it.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is merely stating the truth. It wants a normalization of relations with the U.S., not a war. But Bush sabotaged steps made in that direction when he declared the DPRK part of an "Axis of Evil" and a "terrorist nation."

The DPRK had been making progress in improving its relations with south Korea. A summit meeting had taken place between the leaders of the north and the south. Hundreds of families separated for 50 years had sent members across the demilitarized zone to meet relatives on the

other side. There was talk of joint economic cooperation.

Meanwhile, it was waiting for the U.S. to fulfill its end of the 1994 agreement. At that time, the DPRK had agreed to end its plans to build a nuclear reactor that would have supplied it with much-needed power on the promise that the U.S., south Korea and Japan would help it build a different kind of reactor, one which would not produce plutonium as a byproduct. Plutonium can be used to trigger nuclear weapons.

That reactor has never been built. The DPRK has suffered through freezing winters, lack of electric power and fuel, for eight years since the agreement. Weather disasters have compounded their problems.

Fuel oil the U.S. also promised as a stop-gap measure has come too little and too late to alleviate mass suffering.

According to Selig Harrison, author of

"Korean Endgame" and director of the Asia Program at the Center for International Policy in Washington, the U.S. "has failed to fulfill two key provisions of the accord: steps to normalize relations and 'formal assurances' ruling out 'the threat or use of nuclear weapons by the United States' against North Korea." (USA Today, Oct. 22)

Actually, instead of ruling out the threat of using nuclear weapons, the Pentagon has recently issued a shocking document threatening their first use if it deems that necessary anywhere in the world.

The north Koreans say in all their diplomatic overtures that they want all this discussed within the framework of a formal end to the Korean War—something Washington has refused to do for almost 50 years.

The U.S. media have been running scare headlines about north Korea having nu-

clear weapons. But that is very misleading. This is not about the DPRK possessing nuclear weapons. It's only about them saying that they reserve the right to develop a program to enrich uranium that could in the future be used for nuclear weapons. They are leaving the door open for negotiations, in other words.

Of course, the media don't mention the many U.S. nuclear weapons that have been targeted on north Korea for decades.

People in the United States, in trying to understand the current struggle, should remember what the Koreans can never forget: that from 1950 to 1953, hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops were fighting in Korea in a war that left 3 million Koreans and 33,000 U.S. soldiers dead. After such a disaster, could any government in north Korea take the question of defense lightly? □

## COLOMBIA

# Pentagon sends combat troops

By Andy McInerney

Before the Clinton administration launched "Plan Colombia," a \$1.3 billion military aid package to Colombia, the U.S. government admitted to having around 200 troops—Special Forces "advisers"—in that South American country. Today, according to an Oct. 12 in the British newspaper *The Daily Telegraph*, that number has doubled.

Now, with the Bush administration dropping any pretense of fighting a "drug war," these troops are on the battlefield. The *Telegraph* reported that Special Forces began operations in Arauca, an oil-rich state on the Venezuelan border, in early October. Their mission is "training local soldiers in helicopter-borne operations, night fighting and intelligence operations."

Congress approved this overt military intervention in July as part of the \$29 billion "Anti-Terrorism" package. The appropriation included \$35 million in new military aid to Colombia. Of that, \$6 million is specifically aimed at protecting oil pipelines for U.S.-owned oil conglomer-

ates like Occidental Petroleum.

According to an report in the *New York Times* headlined "America's For-Profit Secret Army," an unspecified number of U.S. mercenaries hired by the Pentagon and by oil companies are also operating in Colombia.

The oil pipelines are frequent targets for attack by Colombia's two largest revolutionary armed insurgencies, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia-People's Army (FARC-EP) and the National Liberation Army (ELN). Arauca, where the Special Forces are beginning their training, is a traditional stronghold of the ELN.

The right-wing president of Colombia, Alvaro Uribe, declared Arauca a "Zone of Rehabilitation and Consolidation." This elaborate title means that the Colombian military has declared martial law: Peasant and union leaders can be arrested without warrant or formal charges, and curfews can be declared at will.

The military head of the zone is Brig. Gen. Carlos Lemus Pedraza. Human-rights groups charge he has close ties to the right-wing death squads working with the army in the region.

Since Uribe's election, fighting between the U.S.-backed Colombian military and paramilitary death squads, on the one hand, and the Marxist insurgencies on the other has intensified. Street battles have taken place repeatedly in poor and working-class neighborhoods in Medellin, Colombia's third-biggest city.

In September, just six weeks after Uribe's inauguration, millions of workers, peasants and students marched in a nationwide mobilization against the govern-

ment's economic policies.

So the open U.S. military intervention is taking place at the same time that the class struggle—in both its armed and its mass forms—is intensifying in Colombia. This raises the prospect of the confrontation spilling over the narrow bounds that the Pentagon is trying to delineate.

Will the U.S. government be able to fight a growing popular insurgency in Colombia at the same time as a massive military adventure in the Middle East? □

*Behind Pentagon lies about the Balkans war*

## HIDDEN AGENDA: U.S./NATO takeover of Yugoslavia

The truth about why the imperialists bombed Yugoslavia

\$19.95

## NATO IN THE BALKANS

Pentagon 'Big Lie' war propaganda about the Balkans

\$15.95

## LIAR'S POKER:

The Great Powers, Yugoslavia and the Wars of the Future  
By Michel Collon

'This book predicted the Kosovo War'  
—Sara Flounders, co-director of IAC

\$19.95



Published by the INTERNATIONAL ACTION CENTER  
Send check or money order to IAC  
39 W. 14<sup>th</sup> St., Rm. 206 N. Y., N.Y. 10011  
(212) 633-6646  
iacenter@action-mail.org  
Available for 20% off at [Leftbooks.com](http://Leftbooks.com)

## Protests in NYC, Puerto Rico

# U.S. Navy out of Vieques

On Oct. 26, pro-independence groups and opponents of the U.S. Navy presence in Vieques will rally in San Juan, Puerto Rico, to demand an immediate halt to Pentagon military exercises and no war against Iraq.

Meanwhile, in New York City, the ProLibertad Freedom Campaign and other groups will sponsor a benefit Walkathon for Vieques.

Former Puerto Rican political prisoner Dylcia Pagan and Committee for the Rescue and Development of Vieques leader Ismael Guadalupe will be among those participating in the walkathon.

The actions are being held in coordination with the Oct. 26 anti-war marches in Washington, San Francisco and other cities around the world.

Since a U.S. bomb killed civilian guard David Sanes in 1999, a powerful people's movement has grown in Vieques, the Big Island of Puerto Rico and the U.S. to rid Vieques of six decades of Navy occupation.

The Pentagon has used the Vieques base to conduct training exercises for every U.S. war of aggression since World War II, including the planned invasion of Iraq. The Navy presence has brought death, eco-



PHOTO: COMMITTEE FOR THE RESCUE AND DEVELOPMENT OF VIEQUES

Banner reads, 'Vieques will win—Navy out of Vieques!'

economic devastation and environmental catastrophe to residents of the small island.

The Bush administration says the Navy will leave Vieques in Spring 2003. But Bush has refused to sign a document guaranteeing the withdrawal, and has not guaranteed any measures to clean up the military's toxic mess.

The Committee for the Rescue and Development of Vieques and other groups are planning mass protests and other activities in April and May to ensure that the Navy gets out once and for all.

For more information, see the Web sites [www.prorescatevieques.org](http://www.prorescatevieques.org) and [viequeslibre.org](http://viequeslibre.org).

—Greg Butterfield



## Snipers and money

The headlines and airwaves are filled with reports that the person or persons connected with the sniper killings has demanded millions of dollars, threatening to shoot children if the money isn't received. Of course this news strikes terror in the hearts of parents and other loved ones who have been looking over their shoulders in fear since the serial killings began.

The "Beltway Sniper" is the topic of anxious discussion in airports, barber shops, restaurants and video stores. Who would treat precious human lives with such chilling disdain?

Experts on criminology and psychology fill news programs posing the same question that's on many peoples' minds: What produces these serial killers? Video games? Aberrant individual mindsets? Violence on television and in the movies?

How could such a thing happen in this society, touted as the most democratic and free in the world?

But they leave out the most important questions. Shouldn't these pundits be exploring the role of militarization and the dog-eat-dog, get-rich-or-be-a-chump culture that dominates and imbues life under capitalism?

If the killer, or killers, is demand-

ing money in return for the lives of children, isn't that a microcosm of the demand being made by powerful U.S. capital to Iraq: "Hand over your oil or we will continue to starve your children to death"? That's how it must look to the parents of more than half a million Iraqi children who have died as a result of the U.S.-led embargo that is strangling Iraq economically.

Bush boasts from the bully pulpit that no one will get in the way of U.S. interests—read the banks' and oil companies' drive for profits—without paying the price in the blood of their parents and children, neighbors and co-workers.

Is there any way that this imperialist policy, bristling with weaponry, would not seep down into the society as a whole?

Of course those who live in the D.C. region are concerned, first and foremost, about an end to the threat of the Beltway sniper. And people around the county and around the world support them.

But when the question is raised, "What kind of person or persons would kill for money," we think many people around the world know the answer. And they are looking to the anti-war movement in the United States to disarm the most powerful killers of all. □

## ITALY

# Millions walk out in general strike

By John Catalinotto

On Oct. 18, for the second time in six months, millions of Italian workers held a one-day general strike, accompanied by mass demonstrations throughout the country.

The issue was government policy. Workers are facing a change in the labor law that would remove job protection under the hard-won 1970 law called Article 18.

The workers were also protesting budget cuts that the CGIL union confederation says will cost up to 280,000 jobs.

The strike brought much commuter transportation to a halt. It tangled regional and air traffic. In many places high school and university students joined workers for mass demonstrations.

Among the bigger actions were a march of 200,000 in the northern industrial city of Turin, home of the FIAT automaker; 100,000 in Milan; the same number in Rome; and 40,000 each in Venice and Florence.

Some 50,000 people—the biggest such demonstration since 1945—came out in Palermo, Sicily, to protest the planned closing of the local FIAT plant. Somewhere between 1 million and 2 million people demonstrated throughout the country.

Although the two smaller labor union federations, the CISL and the UIL, did not join this strike as they had in April, it was still an enormous job action. The CISL and UIL had

reached an agreement with the government in the summer, agreeing to give up job protections after some minor concessions by the regime.

Many placards targeted Italy's right-wing premier and media magnate Silvio Berlusconi. He was pictured as a long-nosed Pinocchio because of his propensity to lie to the Italian workers.

Berlusconi's rightist coalition, which includes the Northern League as well as National Alliance, the successor to Mussolini's fascist party, had won the Spring 2001 elections against a center-left coalition. This latter group, the Olive Tree, had led Italy into NATO's war on Yugoslavia and was overseeing a declining capitalist economy that has continued to decline under the billionaire premier.

Berlusconi has adopted a foreign policy that can only be described as servile to U.S. imperialism. Despite this willingness to push Italy into U.S.-led wars, Bush has yet to invite the Italian premier into the inner imperialist circle.

Besides protesting the elimination of Article 18, the strike and demonstrations protested the government budget, its attack on workers' rights and the drive toward war.

Observers in the area around Venice reported that one of the most shouted slogans was, "No war in Iraq," and that many placards and banners, including those brought by individuals, called for solidarity with the Iraqi people against the U.S. war. □



## Pension funds in deep trouble

Continued from page 3

larceny by taking pension funds and calling them assets.

The revelation that corporations have been misappropriating the workers' pension funds is evidence that the workers are in fact the rightful owners of the companies that engaged in such accounting practices.

If many corporations "actually earned more money from their [pension plans] than from their operations," as CFO.com reported Oct. 17, then the unions can now demand their right to run those companies.

When businesses go bankrupt, workers can lose both their jobs and their pensions. Bankruptcy casts the legal ownership of a corporation into doubt, with the company's creditors being the first priority.

Although not acknowledged yet by U.S. courts, the workers are in reality a company's principal creditors. They lend the business their labor power every time they go to work.

Workers get paid every couple of weeks or once a month, after they lend the bosses their time and labor power. The 130 million workers in the United States are in fact lending the capitalists billions of dollars weekly.

Now factor in the credit owed to workers whose pensions have been siphoned off to enhance the bottom lines of the leading corporations. Not only shouldn't workers be fired in a bankruptcy, they should be recognized as the corporations' principal creditors.

The workers have every right to fire the thieving bosses and run the company themselves. □

## Workers World Newspaper

They say in wartime, lies travel halfway around the world while the truth is still tying its shoes.

But Workers World newspaper brings you breaking developments in the anti-war struggle!

### SUBSCRIBE NOW!

Special introductory rate for Oct. 26 activists:  
\$2 for 8 weeks

\$25 for one year

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_ TELEPHONE \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE/E-MAIL \_\_\_\_\_

Clip and return to: Workers World  
55 West 17 St., 5th Fl., New York, NY 10011

# La doctrina de Bush versus la autodeterminación

Continúa de página 16

pertencieron a estados opresores —feudales, capitalistas y, en la época moderna, imperialistas.

No fue hasta 1960, después de que movimientos numerosos de liberación nacional y anti colonial habían o triunfados o estaban en desarrollo— incluso la Revolución Cubana, el movimiento por la liberación nacional contra los franceses en Argelia, las luchas por la independencia en la India, Palestina, Libia, Siria, Kenya, Indonesia, Malaya, Ghana, Vietnam, Corea, Egipto y muchos más, que el derecho a la autodeterminación de los pueblos coloniales fue reconocido.

Al fin, la ONU fue obligada a publicar un documento el 14 de diciembre de 1960, intitulado “La Declaración sobre la Concesión de Independencia a Países y Pueblos Coloniales” en lo cual el derecho de la soberanía y la autodeterminación fue alzado al nivel de un principio internacional.

## Como llegó en la agenda la autodeterminación

Fue con la llegada de las revoluciones socialistas y las luchas por la liberación nacional que la cuestión de la soberanía de los pueblos oprimidos llegó a inscribirse en la agenda histórica. Después de la Revolución Bolchevique —la toma del poder de parte de los trabajadores y campesinos de Rusia zarista— V.I. Lenin enmendó el lema de Karl Marx, “Proletarios de todos los países uníos” para volver en “Proletarios y oprimidos de todos los países uníos.” La Internacional Comunista en su Segundo Congreso de 1920 estrechó la mano a los pueblos coloniales en un esfuerzo para forjar lazos de solidaridad y apoyo entre la revolución de los trabajadores y la lucha contra el imperialismo.

Este congreso estableció honradamente a la doctrina de una alianza con la meta de romper el asimiento sofocante del imperialismo sobre las colonias, por medio de apoyo socialista por la liberación nacional. Más tarde, después de la Segunda Guerra Mundial, la revolución socialista triunfó en China y movimientos anti coloniales azotaban a Asia, África y Latinoamérica. A pesar de muchos errores de parte de los líderes de la URSS y China popular con relación a varios movimientos de lib-

eración nacional, la alianza amplia entre el campo socialista y los pueblos coloniales se mantuvo, aún no sin problemas. Por supuesto, los imperialistas hicieron todo lo posible para romper esa alianza.

La URSS y China apoyaron a la lucha vietnamita contra los imperialistas franceses y estadounidenses. La URSS dio un apoyo decisivo a la Revolución Cubana durante coyunturas críticas. El campo socialista dio su apoyo a la lucha del Congreso Nacional Africano contra el apartheid en Sur Africa y a otras lucha de liberación al rededor del mundo, incluyendo a SWAPO en Namibia, el MPLA en Angola y a los palestinos que luchaban contra los invasores israelitas. Todos ellos contaron fuertemente con el apoyo material y político de los países socialistas.

Los países recién liberados que sufrían siglos de subdesarrollo podían obtener entrenamiento técnico, educación, apoyo comercial, financiero y militar en Moscú antes de la llegada de Mikhail Gorbachev al Partido Comunista como Secretario General y en Beijing antes de la visita del entonces Presidente Nixon en 1972.

Cuando los imperialistas se rehusaron a apoyar los proyectos de desarrollo nacional, los países socialistas, a pesar de sus recursos limitados y su propia lucha desesperada para superar el bloqueo imperialista, muchas veces se adelantaban a suplir la asistencia necesaria. Estos proyectos no eran como inversiones por capitalistas privados que chupaban las ganancias de los países en desarrollo. Lo que ellos construían se convertían en la propiedad de una nación recién liberada. La URSS ayudó a Egipto a construir Dique de Aswan cuando los Estados Unidos se rehusaron. También construyó el primer molino de acero en India. Trató de ayudar al gobierno boliviano a liberarse de las garras de las compañías mineras de los Estados Unidos dándoles un refinera de estaño—un esfuerzo que fue derrocado por los Estados Unidos.

En general, la proeza militar y el apoyo material del campo socialista, particularmente el poder militar y económico soviético, formó un escudo que limitó la agresión de los imperialistas estadounidenses, europeos y japoneses contra las numerosas luchas de liberación nacional y los países recién liberados. Este les ayudó a mantener

su soberanía nacional frente al Pentágono y la CIA.

La URSS fue la primera parte en la tierra donde la clase obrera tomó el poder por un largo período. Esta revolución tomó luchar en el país empobrecido de la Rusia zarista, el cual en 1917 todavía estaba tratando de salir del feudalismo. A pesar de su pobreza, a pesar de perder 12 millones de personas en la guerra civil y siendo bloqueada por 14 potencias imperialistas, a pesar de perder 20 millones de personas luego en la invasión Nazi durante la Segunda Guerra Mundial, y a pesar de tener que enfrentarse al Pentágono, la OTAN y el imperialismo japonés, este logró convertirse en la segunda potencia mundial. Su tremendo desarrollo basado en la propiedad estatal de los medios de producción, una economía planeada, un monopolio estatal sobre el comercio extranjero y la producción para la sociedad y no por ganancias.

Sin los empresarios capitalistas o la propiedad privada, este logró inaugurar la era espacial, construir el más grande de los proyectos en la historia del mundo, venció a la maquinaria guerrillera Nazi y demostró al mundo que una sociedad sin capitalismo puede avanzar a grandes pasos, aún en un país subdesarrollado y empobrecido.

Pero 70 años de presión militar, política y económica implacable hizo posible para el campo imperialista llevar el deterioro al liderazgo de la URSS el cual resultó en la alienación de los obreros del gobierno y abrió la puerta a la contra revolución capitalista. Este colapso de la URSS y de Europa Oriental, además del repliegue de China de su posición de solidaridad internacional con los pueblos oprimidos, deshizo un poderoso soporte de apoyo para la soberanía y el derecho a la autodeterminación de los pueblos del Tercer Mundo.

## Ellos creen que pueden regresar a la era colonial

La clase gobernante de los Estados Unidos emergió de su histórica lucha con una masiva máquina militar y un aparato de subversión y control político mundial. La Administración de Bush y el grupo Cheney, Rumsfeld y Wolfowitz representa a esos elementos dentro del estado capitalista y la clase capitalista que ve a esta nueva

situación como una oportunidad para regresar a la era colonial que existió antes de la llegada del campo socialista y los movimientos de liberación nacional.

Los conceptos de “prevención” y “cambios de regímenes” que siendo promovidos bajo la excusa de la guerra “contra el terrorismo” son un atentado a codificar, en las relaciones políticas y legales internacionalmente, a las relaciones mundiales subsiguiente a la era soviética de las fuerzas de clase. Bajo esta nueva doctrina, no solo es el derecho a la soberanía y la autodeterminación erradicada, sino que Washington retiene el derecho absoluto de dictar las nuevas reglas de relaciones internacionales—ya sea con relación a las Convenciones de Génova que cubre a los prisioneros de guerra, el Capítulo de la Naciones Unidas en la no interferencia en los asuntos internacionales de otros gobiernos, el Acuerdo Kioto sobre el medio ambiente o el tratado Anti-Bélico de Misiles, entre muchos ejemplos.

Pero estos sueños de dominación mundial y el retorno a los tiempos coloniales, como cuando los británicos imperialistas decidieron crear a Irak y gobernarle como una potencia colonial, son solo eso—sueños y decepciones. Estos sueños son creados en los salones de guerra del Pentágono, en el Departamento del Estado y por los derechistas.

Cualquiera que sea el resultado de los esfuerzos de guerra por los Estados Unidos, el pueblo iraquí no aceptará el regreso a los días de colonialismo. Ni tampoco los pueblos del Medio Oriente jamás aceptarán tal derrocamiento contra revolucionario. Los cerebros que han concebido este plan—los Cheneys, Rumsfeld y los Wolfowitz—han sido formados en una era de retirada y adversidad para el campo socialista y la lucha de liberación mundial, comenzando con Reagan.

Su programa entero es predicado sobre la presunción de que las masas populares, en los Estados Unidos y en el extranjero, aceptarán pasivamente este nuevo orden mundial sin lucha ni resistencia. Pero toda la historia muestra que la represión y la reacción crean resistencia, rebelión y revolución. Cuando la reacción es aplicada mundialmente, la resistencia está destinada a crecer mundialmente. □

# Conferencia en Bélgica demanda la libertad para los héroes cubanos

Continúa de página 16

cios del Che y amor por la humanidad. Ella dijo: “Cuba tiene el derecho de protegerse contra el terror. Con ese objetivo algunos jóvenes valientes arriesgaron sus vidas para infiltrarse en organizaciones terroristas de cubanos anti Castro en Miami. Ellos dieron a Cuba la información que permitió la prevención de ataques terroristas. Hace cuatro años, cinco de ellos fueron arrestados en Miami.

“Cinco jóvenes quienes, siguiendo los pasos del Che, sacrificaron sus propias vidas al servicio de su gente. Ramón, Antonio, Fernando, Gerardo y René son los héroes de estos tiempos. En la lucha contra la guerra, ellos son la vanguardia.”

Ella citó a Ramón Labanino en su carta a los partidarios de los cinco: “Con especial interés, nosotros presenciamos que un proceso bellos de UNIDAD entre los movimientos progresistas, de izquierda, de

la clase obrera y pobres y hasta gente honorable de diferentes historiales que creen en la justicia y la verdad, se da lugar.

“Este es un momento ideal para unirse, y unir todas nuestras fuerzas, para luchar contra el verdadero enemigo: el imperialismo, arquitecto de guerras, destrucción y crímenes, el cual está destruyendo nuestro planeta. La gente del mundo se merece y necesita un mejor futuro. UNIDOS, podemos hacer que nuestro sueño se haga realidad.

“Si nuestro sacrificio y modestos esfuerzos ayudan en cualquier manera que sea posible para alcanzar este sueño, inosotros hemos de honrarlo! Cuenten con nosotros, como sus hermanos, en la defender las buenas causas del mundo.”

## La Riva: ‘Todos para el 26 de octubre’

La Riva habló de gran peligro creciente y la necesidad de movilización de

las masas en todo el mundo el 26 de octubre. Un carrera de paz está siendo organizada en Flandes para ese día; se espera una gran concurrencia. “La administración de Bush está movilizand sus tropas furiosamente, su armada y la más grande colección de armas que jamás en la historia se ha visto para llevar a cabo una guerra genocida contra Irak, dijo La Riva.

“La pequeña oposición de algunos políticos en los Estados Unidos es solo en diferencia de tácticas con la Bush, Cheney y la ultra derecha. Ellos no difieren en el objetivo de aniquilar al gobierno iraquí y su pueblo para poderse tomar a Irak y sus recursos y así más completamente dominar al Medio Oriente. En los días y semanas próximos, nosotros debemos usar todas las oportunidades para detener la guerra antes de que comience.”

Ella enfatizó la unidad y coordinación de los comités de ayuda para la Libertad de los Cinco en todo el mundo será la mejor manera de poner presión política al gobierno de Estados Unidos para que libere a los cinco cubanos héroes.

“Así como la lucha para detener la guerra en Irak, nosotros debemos pedirle al pueblo, si, especialmente al pueblo de los Estados Unidos, que sepa, que entienda y ayude a liberarlos. ¿Porqué? Por que nosotros verdaderamente creemos que una vez que el pueblo de los Estados Unidos y el mundo sepa de la existencia y motivos de la cinco héroes, ellos exigirán su libertad también.”

Más de 1500 firmas en peticiones para la Libertad de los Cinco fueron recogidas por la Iniciativa Cuba Socialista y las entregaron al comité de Estados Unidos para sellar la presentación. Después cientos llenaron el salón en un baile de salsa. □

# La doctrina de Bush versus la autodeterminación

Por Fred Goldstein

La administración de Bush está avanzando de toda prisa con sus planes de una guerra no provocada contra Irak, basado en las acusaciones no substanciadas repetidas tantas veces por sus voceros. Su meta por todo el año pasado ha sido de transformar el susto y la indignación sobre el desastre del 11 de septiembre en una psicología permanente a favor de la guerra en los Estados Unidos y alrededor del mundo que se puede aprovechar para apoyar una campaña de “guerra permanente”.

Pero mientras que la Casa Blanca, el Pentágono y los medios de comunicación monopolistas han podido crear esta psicología en el Congreso y ganar una capitulación total del Partido Demócrata, su estrategia está saliendo el tiro por la culata entre las masas. El movimiento en contra de una guerra está perdiendo su letargo y se está movilizándose. Toda encuesta demuestra apoyo por una guerra en declive. Reportes desde las oficinas congresionales alrededor del país, igualmente entre los Republicanos y los Demócratas indican que las llamadas, las cartas y los mensajes electrónicos están llegando en cantidades abrumadoras en contra de un ataque contra Irak. El número de sindicatos aprobando resoluciones en contra de la guerra está incrementando.

Mientras que George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Donald Rumsfeld, Colin Powell, Paul Wolfowitz y Condoleezza Rice confeccionan amenazas imaginarias, las masas del pueblo están experimentando amenazas reales resultando de la crisis económica que sigue subiendo: de despidos, recortes en

servicios sociales, fondos para la jubilación desapareciendo como producto del colapso de la bolsa de valores, la pérdida de seguro médico y un incremento en los índices de la pobreza.

Mientras que Washington produce un chorro continuo de acusaciones contra Irak del “terrorismo” y “armas de destrucción masivas”, el mundo mira mientras que el Pentágono prepara una campaña de bombardeos terroristas que matará a miles y asegurará la destrucción masiva de pueblos y ciudades iraquíes.

## El objetivo más amplio de Bush

Con su intención de lanzar una guerra “preventiva” contra Irak, la administración de Bush está tiene un objetivo mucho más amplio: una campaña unilateral para renovar toda la estructura política y legal de las relaciones internacionales en el periodo pos-soviético, para reflejar la dominación absoluta del imperialismo estadounidense como super potencia sobre el mundo entero. Esta campaña está dirigida sobretodo contra los pueblos oprimidos del mundo, pero también en contra de los aliados imperialistas que son a la vez rivales de Wall Street en Europa y Japón.

La administración de Bush ha declarado abiertamente que su meta en Irak es un “cambio de régimen”. En contra de todo consejo y suplicas, Bush ha tercamente rehusado adoptar una postura menos intransigente o disfrazar esta meta de acción militar planeada.

No importa cuanto el gobierno de Irak se extiende para cumplir con las demandas de un régimen de inspección, la ad-

ministración de Bush descarta con anticipación cualquier posibilidad de que tales inspecciones puedan funcionar con éxito. Los planes de guerra siguen a todo vapor y planes por una ocupación militar y el establecimiento de un régimen títere de estilo colonial están discutidos abiertamente, hasta que mientras las llamadas debates ocurren, primero en el Congreso y después en el Consejo de Seguridad de la ONU.

Hay una meta política clara detrás de esta reafirmación descarada del derecho de destruir el gobierno de Saddam Hussein. La administración de Bush está comprometida a derrocar el derecho a la soberanía, la autodeterminación, y la autodefensa de los pueblos anteriormente colonizados.

En el Nuevo Orden Mundial de Washington, estos derechos no tienen lugar.

Utilizando la guerra contra el terrorismo como un pretexto, la llamada “guerra contra el terrorismo”, Bush está promoviendo un concepto que no es menos descarado que una resucitación de los antiguos derechos de las potencias coloniales. Los derechos de la soberanía y la autodeterminación van a ser eliminados abiertamente y remplazados explícitamente por el derecho superior del imperialismo estadounidense de eliminar cualquier régimen que no se someta a sus mandatos.

El derecho de cambiar un régimen desde afuera es directamente y brutalmente contrapuesto a los derechos de soberanía y autodeterminación de pueblos colonizados y anteriormente colonizados. Estos derechos de pueblos oprimidos surgieron de innumerables luchas del siglo XX que

volcaron el derecho de las potencias coloniales de cambiar un régimen desde afuera”, al costo de millones de vidas y ríos de sangre.

Sin duda, el Pentágono ha derrocado muchos gobiernos en el pasado. Derrocó el gobierno de Maurice Bishop en Grenada, Manuel Noriega en Panamá y Slobodan Milosevic en Yugoslavia, para mencionar unos pocos. Pero cada uno fue derribado utilizando algún pretexto y sin recorrer a cualquier principio generalizado del derecho de Washington de efectuar “un cambio de régimen desde afuera”.

## Interpretación marxista de legalidad

La interpretación general marxista de legalidad en la sociedad de clases es que tal sociedad surge de la lucha de clases y es una reflexión de relaciones nacionales y de clase. Por ejemplo, en los EE.UU. a mediados del siglo XIX era ilegal que tres trabajadores se reunieran con la intención de discutir la fundación de un sindicato. Tal conducta fue considerada como una conspiración ilegal que limitara el comercio. Solo la lucha de clases estableció el derecho de organizar y forzar a los patrones participar en negociaciones colectivas.

En la misma manera, la soberanía y el derecho a la autodeterminación de pueblos oprimidos fueron incluidos en convenciones internacionales solamente después de generaciones de lucha anti colonial.

El derecho a la soberanía de estados nacionales surgió con el establecimiento del capitalismo. Pero por siglos estos derechos

*Continúa a pagina 15*

# Conferencia en Bélgica demanda la libertad para los héroes cubanos

Especial para Mundo Obrero  
Bruselas, Bélgica.

“Libertad para los Cinco, Alto a la Guerra” era el llamado del clarín durante una conferencia de un día en nombre de Cuba en la capital de Bélgica. Iniciativa Cuba Socialista, un organización no gubernamental Bélgica organizó la conferencia. Atrajo a más de 1000 personas, con luna participación amplia de jóvenes, sindicalistas al igual que miembros de grupos solidarios con Cuba de Alemania, Francia, Holanda y América Latina.

Uno de los principales oradores fue Harry “Pombo” Villegas, el revolucionario cubano quien luchó junto a Che Guevara en la Sierra Maestra de Bolivia. Además estuvieron presente: Rodolfo Dávalos de la Universidad de la Habana, y quien trabaja en la lucha legal para liberar a los Cinco Cubanos; Katrien DeMuynck, coordinador del Comité Belga Libertad para los Cinco Prisioneros Políticos Cubanos.

Hubo varios talleres de trabajo durante el día. Un foro político cultural de se dio en la noche.



Antonio Guerrero, Fernando Gonzalez, Gerardo Hernández, Ramón Labanino, René Gonzalez

## Los Cinco Cubanos

En el taller sobre los Cinco Cubanos, Rodolfo Dávalos describió como los Estados Unidos enjuiciaron a los cinco prisioneros políticos solo por defender a Cuba.

Los Cinco Cubanos, dijo él, “Son cinco jóvenes: un piloto, un ingeniero, un economista, dos graduados de la escuela diplomática. Dos de ellos son ciudadanos estadounidenses. ¿Qué hicieron? Ellos se infiltraron las organizaciones terroristas contra revolucionarias en Miami. Su trabajo no era de buscar información militar de los Estados Unidos como dice estos. Era simplemente buscar información de los planes terroristas: ¿Cuándo plantaría las bombas, cuando ellos tratarían asesinatos?”

“Cuba ha sufrido muchos ataques ter-

roristas por más de 40 años. No solo la invasión en la Bahía de Cochinos, o el peligro de la Crisis de Mísiles Cubana, no solo la bomba planteada en el vuelo cubano en 1976 o el ataque biológico hemorrágico del dengue. Esto todavía sucede hoy.”

Durante su visita a Bélgica, Dávalos habló con asociaciones de abogados progresistas sobre el caso de los Cinco. Él reportó que los abogados respondieron con mucha voluntad para “hace todo lo necesario para alzar un apoyo legal internacional” para sus apelaciones y su libertad.

DeMuynck y La Riva estaban también en el panel.

La conferencia en la que Harry “Pombo” Villegas habló estaba lleno de admiradores quienes querían escuchar sus experiencias como luchador guerrillero en la Revolución de Cuba y como compañero combatiente

del Che en el Congo y Bolivia. Villegas comenzó su vida en la lucha a los 14 años de edad, casi inmediato del golpe de 1952 por el dictador respaldado por Estados Unidos, Fulgencio Batista. El se internó en el movimiento urbano clandestino y se unió a las guerrillas en la Sierra Maestra.

En una entrevista en Bruselas por Mundo Obrero, él dijo sobre el Che: “Él fue un hombre extraordinariamente humanitario, extraordinariamente justo, con un gran sentido de honor, sensibilidad y responsabilidad. Es su actividad militar y en carácter, era un hombre muy disciplinado, muy exigente y valiente. Él vivió el principio de no exigir a sus soldados lo que él mismo era incapaz de abordar.”

“Esto le dio una gran autoridad entre las tropas guerrilleras, lo cual aseguró que sus hombre le seguiría con confianza total.”, dijo Villegas.

## ‘En los pasos del Che’

Katrien DeMuynck dijo que los Cinco Cubanos prisioneros políticos aprendidos en los Estados Unidos son héroes de la era actual, siguiendo el ejemplo de los sacrifi-

*Continúa a pagina 15*