


www.coveractionquarterly.org

CovertAction

QUARTERLY

Fall 2004
Number 77



Million Worker March

Israel-U.S. Against Iraq

Sabotage in North Korea

Cover-up of Pan Am 103

Genocide in Chiapas

Hate Crime

A Kathy Kelly Diary

\$4.95US \$7.95CAN

43>



7 97377 81460 5

Million Worker March, October 17, 2004

NOW IS THE TIME TO SHOW OUR STRENGTH AND TO FIGHT FOR OUR RIGHTS!

The million worker march organizing committee responds to the directive from the AFL-CIO

On June 23, 2004, at the behest of John Sweeney and the leadership of the AFL-CIO, Marilyn C. Sneiderman, Director of the Field Mobilization Department of the AFL-CIO, sent out a Memorandum to "All State Federations and Central Labor Councils of the AFL-CIO" referencing the "Million Worker March," and directing them "not to sponsor or devote resources to the demonstration in Washington, D.C."

We take note of the fact that this Memorandum was dispatched without any prior communication with the organizers and official endorsers of the Million Worker March. These include the entire ILWU Long shore Division, the National Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, South Carolina State AFL-CIO Labor Federation, Labor Councils across the United States and national organizations such as the International Action Committee and Global Exchange.

In effect, the leadership of the AFL-CIO has gone over the heads of significant sectors of the labor, anti-war, community and inter-faith organizations in issuing a directive to boycott a labor mobilization in Washington, D.C.

This is unprecedented and requires us to pose the question: Why would the leadership of the AFL-CIO feel threatened by a labor mobilization that confronts the crisis facing working people in America and seeks to reverse the wholesale attacks on our living standards, social services, housing, health, and education while challenging the diversion of trillions of dollars derived from the labor of working people to fund permanent war over decades and a brutal war for oil and occupation in Iraq?

The Million Worker March is organizing working people to put forth our needs and our agenda independently of politicians and parties.

We say that only by acting in our name can we build a movement that advances our needs. The very formation of the trade union movement was the result of independent organizing and mobilizing of working people. The struggle for industrial unionism, the movement for women's suffrage, the great movements for civil rights — all these flowed from the will to mobilize independently and in our own name.

Our aims, with which the AFL-CIO leadership purports to agree, include universal single-payer health care from the cradle to the grave — that ends the stranglehold of greedy insurance companies.

Will the defeat of George Bush result in this?

Our aims include an end to the corporate trade agreements that pit workers against each other everywhere in a mad race to the sweat-shop bottom. Will the defeat of George Bush change this when the Democratic Party brought us NAFTA, MAI and Fast Track with Disney and J. C. Penny paying Haitian workers 21 cents per hour?

Will the defeat of George Bush end privatization and the destruction of unions in the public sector when the Democratic Party privatized and outsourced our jobs under the rubric of "downsizing government?"



What were downsized were our social services while corporate profits and the military sucked trillions of dollars taken from the sweat of our collective labor.

Will the defeat of George Bush bring a crash program to restore our decaying and devastated public schools, replacing them with state of the art public education in every community in America?

Will the defeat of George Bush result in the rebuilding of our inner cities with free modern, state of the art housing and an end to homelessness?

Will that presumptive defeat see the launching of a national training program in skills and capacities that enlist our people in rebuilding this country?

Will it end the criminalization of poverty or abolish the prison-industrial complex that has destroyed generations of Black and Latino youth?

Will the defeat of George Bush roll back the bi-partisan union-busting and anti-labor legislation, such as Taft-Hartley, that has been on the books for 67 years?

Will a Bush defeat secure for us a modern, free mass transit system in every city and town?

John Kerry, outflanking Bush from the far right, has called for an intensification of the so-called "war on terror" by targeting people "before they act" — giving explicit sanction to secret arrests, detention without trial and the labeling of opponents as "terrorists."

Will the removal of George Bush preserve the Bill of Rights, repeal the Patriot Act, Anti-Terrorism Act and all the repressive legislation that has set the stage for a Police State in America?

John Kerry, the presumptive candidate of the Democratic Party, has demanded a dramatic increase in the number of U.S. soldiers in Iraq and the extension of U.S. military control in the Middle East and beyond.

Will the defeat of George Bush end the occupation in Iraq and the plans for greater imperial war?

Will his defeat bring the troops home now or is the plan after the election, as widely reported, for conscription of working class youth and an expansion of militarism in America?

We take note of the fact that the Department of Defense Accounting Office acknowledged that \$4.4 trillion have disappeared from the Pentagon's accounts and the books have been cooked for decades.

continues on p. 11

Covert Action Quarterly

Project Censored Top 25 Stories' award winner

CAQ • Number 77 Fall 2004

www.covertactionquarterly.org

In This Issue

Boycott of an Election is a Democratic Option

Excess of Evil: Israel-U.S. Connections Against Iraq

James Petras and Robin Eastman-Abaya 2

"Axis of Evil" Leader Targeted in Botched Assassination Attempt

Pre - "422" Chatter Points to Neo-Con and Israeli Involvement in North Korea
Wayne Madsen 6

The Bombing of Pan Am 103 and Libya – Case Still Not Closed

William Blum 12

Access of Evil: Genocide in Chiapas

John Steinbach, Philip Wheaton, Milt Shapiro 20

Acts of Evil: An Analysis of Hate Crime Report

Hussein Ibish 26

Liberty and Justice for All

Pre-Prison Notes
Kathy Kelly 30

Covert Action Quarterly

Contributors: Thomas F. Barton, Scott Blackburn, William Blum, Heather Cottin, Robin Eastman-Abaya, Apollo GT, Laurie Hasbrook, Hussein Ibish, Kathy Kelly, Wayne Madsen, Bill Montross, Dolores Neuman, James Petras, Lallan Schoenstein, Milt Shapiro, John Steinbach, Lorna Tychostup, Philip Wheaton, Louis Wolf.

CovertAction Quarterly: (ISSN 1067-7232) is published by Covert Action Publications, Inc., 1500 Massachusetts Ave, NW, # 732, Washington, D.C., 20005, USA, a District of Columbia not-for-profit corporation. Member of the Independent Press Association. Indexed by Alternative Press Index, University Microfilms. © 2004, Copyright by Covert Action Publications, Inc. All rights reserved. No article may be reproduced, in part or whole, without prior written permission from the CA Publications, Inc.

Subscription Information:

phone: 202 331 9763 • fax: 202 331 9751

email: info@covertactionquarterly.org

www.covertactionquarterly.org

On the cover:

Basrah Children at a Gas Station; Iraq, 2004. Photo by Cathy Breen.

ATTENTION SUBSCRIBERS:

Send us all address changes. USPS does not forward them! Contact us by telephone, email, fax or mail using the information above. Thank you.

Excess of Evil: Israel-U.S. Connections Against Iraq

James Petras and Robin Eastman-Abaya

Why did the U.S. go to war against Iraq in March 2003 with further plans to attack Syria? None of the reasons thus far given provides a shred of evidence. No weapons of mass destruction have been discovered. No ties between Iraq and al Qaeda have been established. No threats to U.S. security existed. Many past and present U.S. allies have equal or worse human rights records than Iraq. The war, the conquest, occupation, killing and vile systematic torture and imprisonment of thousands of Iraqis have aroused the hostility and indignation of hundreds of millions of people of conscience throughout the world, justly discrediting the whole political establishment in Washington. U.S. oil companies have been unable to benefit in the face of a growing anti-colonial resistance, their investments throughout the Middle East and South Central Asia are under siege.

Who is benefitting from the U.S. war? By examining the beneficiaries we can get an idea who had a motive for promoting this crime against humanity. The only major beneficiary of the war is the State of Israel, which succeeded in having the U.S. destroy its most consistent adversary in the Middle East, the regime that extended the greatest political support to the Palestinian resistance.¹

What were the obstacles to Greater Israel? First, the Intifada, the uprising of Palestinians who refused to be driven out of their country and was able to inflict losses on the self-styled "Chosen People of God" (Israel is by law an exclusively Jewish state, inhabited by immigrants mostly from Europe and their children and governed by exclusionary religious

dogma). Second, Lebanese militants who had inflicted a strategic military-political defeat on Israel, forcing them and their client Lebanese Maronite Christian mercenary allies to evacuate Southern Lebanon. Third, Iraq and Syria, the two countries which were most consequential in their opposition to Israeli annexation and regional domination. Fourth, the Iraqi regime was slowly recovering, despite

pendent Arab regimes, beginning with Iraq, was clearly in the interests of the Israeli state and so it was perceived by the Sharon regime, its secret police (Mossad), the Israeli military and right-wing pro-Zionists in positions of influence in Washington.

How was the Israeli state able to influence the U.S. imperial state into pursuing a series of wars, which would imperil its own imperial economic and security interests and further those of Israel?

The most direct answer is to be found in the role played by key pro-Zionist officials in and around the most important policymaking positions in the Bush administration. These U.S. officials had long-standing ideological and political ties to the Israeli state, including advisory policy positions. Throughout most of their political lives they had dedicated themselves to furthering Israel's state interests in the U.S. While the design

and execution of the U.S. war strategy was in the hands of pro-Zionist civilian militarists in the Pentagon, they were only able to succeed because of the powerful support exercised by Sharon's acolytes in the major Jewish organizations in the U.S. The presidents of the major Jewish organizations, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), and thousands of their activists acted in concert with key pro-Israel politicians and ideologues to press the case for a war, because they would argue, it was in the interest of the State of Israel to destroy Saddam Hussein and the secular Baath Party state apparatus.

THE ONLY MAJOR BENEFICIARY OF THE WAR IS THE STATE OF ISRAEL, WHICH SUCCEEDED IN HAVING THE U.S. DESTROY ITS MOST CONSISTENT ADVERSARY IN THE MIDDLE EAST, THE REGIME THAT EXTENDED THE GREATEST POLITICAL SUPPORT TO THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE.

the decade-long U.S.-European boycott and constant military aggression. With time running out, the Israelis and their agents in the Bush administration realized that an agreement to end the boycott and normalize relations with Iraq was on the horizon. Finally, there was a deepening internal crisis in Israel over the economic costs and personal insecurity accompanying the policy of the criminal settlements and savage repression in the Occupied Territories. Israel's out-migration exceeded its in-migration, its Jewish-based welfare policies were in tatters, and hundreds of active reservists refused military duty in the dirty colonial war.

A series of U.S. wars against inde-



AP Photo/Pablo Martinez Monsivais

April 14, 2004, George W. Bush and Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon at the White House, where they discussed, among other things, assassination of world leaders including Yasser Arafat.

Israel and the U.S.: A Unique Relationship

There is a unique aspect in the relationship between an imperial power like the U.S. and a regional power such as Israel. Unlike Washington's relation with the EU, Japan and Oceania, it is Israel which pressures and secures vast transfer of financial resources (\$6 billion per year).² Israel secures the latest arms and technology transfers, unrestrictive entry into U.S. markets, free entry of immigrants, unconditional commitment of U.S. support in case of war and repression of colonized people and guaranteed U.S. vetoes against any U.N. resolutions.

From the angle of interstate relations, it is the lesser regional power which exacts a tribute from the Empire, a

seemingly unique or paradoxical outcome. The explanation for this paradox is found in the powerful and influential role of pro-Israel elements in strategic sectors of the U.S. economy, political parties, Congress and the Executive Branch. The closest equivalent to the past empires is that of influential white settlers in the colonies, who through their overseas linkages were able to secure subsidies and special trading relations.

The Israeli "colons" in the U.S. have invested and donated billions of dollars to Israel, in some cases diverting funds from union dues of low-paid workers to purchase Israel bonds used to finance new colonial settlements in the Occupied Territories.³ In other cases Jewish fugitives from the U.S. justice system have

been protected by the Israeli state, especially super-rich financial swindlers like Marc Rich and even gangsters and murderers. Occasional official demands of extradition from the U.S. Justice Department have been pointedly ignored.

The U.S.-Israeli relationship is the first in modern history in which the imperial country covers up a deliberate major military assault by a supposed ally. In 1967, the U.S.S. *Liberty*, a communications and reconnaissance ship, was bombed and strafed by Israeli fighter planes in international waters for nearly an hour, killing and wounding hundreds of seamen and officers. Intercepted Israeli messages as well as the clearly displayed U.S. flag demonstrate that this was a deliberate act of aggression.

Washington acted as any Third World leader would when faced with an embarrassing attack by its hegemon: It silenced its naval officers who witnessed the attack and quietly received compensation and a pro-forma apology. Apart from the fact this was an unprecedented action in U.S. military and diplomatic relations with an ally, there is no case on record of an imperial country covering up for an assault by a regional ally.⁴ On the contrary, similar circumstances have been followed by diplomatic and bellicose responses. This apparent anomaly cannot in any way be explained by military weakness or diplomatic failures: Washington has far superior armaments and its diplomats are capable of forceful representation to allies or adversaries, when the political will is present. The Jewish-American lobby, Congress, media and Wall Street moguls strategically located in the U.S. political economic system ensured that President Johnson would act as a docile subject. No direct pressures were necessary, for a hegemonized political leadership acts, seemingly on its own beliefs, having learned the rules of the political game. Israel-U.S. is a unique relationship that not even an unprovoked military attack should call into question. Like all hegemonized powers, Washington threatened the U.S. naval witnesses with courts martial if they spoke out, while they coddled their attackers in Tel Aviv.⁵

Another illustration of the asymmetrical relation is found in one of the most important espionage cases during the Cold War involving an Israeli agent, Jonathan Pollard, and the Pentagon. Over several years Pollard stole and duplicated bagfuls of top-secret documents about U.S. Intelligence, counter-intelligence, strategic plans, military weaponry and turned them over to his Israeli handlers. This was the biggest case of espionage carried out against the U.S. by any ally in recent history. Pollard and his wife were convicted in 1986. The U.S. government privately protested to the Israeli government. The Israeli government on the other hand, through its Jewish-American allies, organized a lobby to propagandize in his favor. Eventually all top Israeli leaders and Jewish-American lobbyists campaigned for his pardon, and almost succeeded with President Clinton.

The unequal relation is clearly evident in the case of a major fugitive from

justice, Marc Rich (CAQ, No.70). A financier and trader, he was indicted in a U.S. federal court on several counts of swindling and defrauding clients. He fled to Switzerland and subsequently obtained an Israeli passport and citizenship, investing hefty sums of his ill-begotten wealth into Israeli industries and charities. Despite the seriousness of his offense, Rich hobnobbed with top political leaders in Israel and its economic elite. In the year 2000, the Prime Minister of Israel and numerous pro-Israeli Jewish personalities, including Rich's ex-wife, convinced Clinton to pardon him. While an outcry was raised about a link between the Rich pardon and his wife's \$100,000 plus contribution to the Democratic Party, the underlying relationship of subordination to Israeli influence and the power of the Israeli lobby in the U.S. were clearly more important. It is worth noting that it is extraordinarily unusual for a U.S. president to consult with a foreign ruler (as Clinton consulted with Ehud Barak) in dealing with an accused swindler. It is unprecedented to pardon an indicted fugitive who fled his trial and never served any sentence.

The power of Israel is manifested in the numerous annual pilgrimages that influential U.S. politicians make to Israel to declare their loyalty to the Israeli state, even during periods of intensive repression of rebellious subject people.⁶ On the contrary, U.S. satraps of the Israeli mini-empire applauded the invasion of Lebanon, its bloody repression of Intifada I and II and opposed any international mediation to prevent further Israeli massacres, sacrificing any credibility in the United Nations.

In votes in the United Nations, even in the Security Council, despite overwhelming evidence of human rights violations presented by EU allies, Washington has toiled in the service of its hegemon. Sacrificing international credibility and deliberately alienating 150 other nations, Washington labeled criticisms of Israeli racism as "anti-Semitism."

Israeli Espionage in the U.S.

The most recent and perhaps the most important instance of U.S. servility occurred in the months preceding and following the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. On December 12, 2001, Fox News learned from U.S. Intelligence

sources and federal investigators that 60 Israelis engaged in a long-running effort to spy on U.S. government officials were detained after 9/11. Many of those arrested are active Israeli military or intelligence operatives. They were arrested under the USA PATRIOT anti-terrorism law. Many failed polygraph questions dealing with surveillance activities against and in the United States. More seriously federal investigators have reason to believe that the Israeli operatives gathered intelligence about the September 11 attacks in advance and did not share it with its Washington ally. The degree of Israeli involvement in September 11 is a tightly guarded secret. A highly placed federal investigator told Fox News there are "tie-ins." When asked to provide details, the federal investigator refused: "Evidence linking these Israelis to 9/11 is classified. I cannot tell you about evidence that has been gathered. It is classified information."⁷

Even in the case of the worst bombing in U.S. history, Washington suppresses federally collected evidence linking known Israeli spies to possible prior knowledge. Clearly this evidence might raise questions about the links and ties between political and economic elites as well as undermining strategic relations in the Middle East. More important it would pit the Bush administration against the Jewish-American lobby and its powerful informal and formal networks in the media, finance, and government. Fox News obtained numerous classified documents from federal investigators probably frustrated by the cover-ups of Israeli espionage by political leaders in Washington. These documents unearthed by Carl Cameron reveal that, even before September 11, as many as 140 other Israelis had been detained or arrested in a secret investigation of large-scale, long-term Israeli espionage in the United States. Not one of the major print or electronic media reported on these arrests. Neither the President nor any congressional leaders spoke out on Israel's pervasive and sustained effort to obtain key U.S. military and intelligence information.

The classified documents detail "hundreds of incidents in cities and towns across the country," that investigators claim could be an Israeli-organized intelligence gathering activity. Israeli agents targeted and penetrated military bases, the Drug Enforcement

Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and dozens of government facilities and even secret offices and unlisted private homes of law enforcement and intelligence personnel according to the federal documents, cited by Fox News. A General Accounting Office (an investigatory arm of the U.S. Congress) document referred to Israel as "Country A"; it said "the government of Country A conducts the most aggressive espionage operation against the U.S. of any U.S. ally."⁸ A Defense Intelligence Agency report said Israel has a "voracious appetite for information ... It aggressively collects military and industrial technology and the U.S. is a high priority."⁹

The Fox News report written by Carl Cameron appeared on the Fox News internet site briefly (Dec. 12, 2001) and then disappeared — there was no follow up. None of the other mass media picked up on this major espionage report. No doubt the powerful pro-Israeli influentials in the mass media played a role.

While the web of Israeli agents is sometimes subject to arrest, interrogation and expulsion, the Israeli state and the ministers in charge are never publicly condemned, nor is there any official diplomatic riposte such as the symbolic temporary withdrawal of the U.S. Ambassador.

Unanswered Question: September 11 and the Israelis

Now U.S. federal investigators reveal that the Israelis may have known about the attack before it occurred and did not share it.

This raises the question of the relationships between the Arab terrorists and the Israeli secret police. Did the Israelis penetrate the group or pick up information about them?¹⁰ Federal investigators' confidential information could probably clarify these vital questions. But will the confidential information ever become public? Most likely not. For the very reason that it would expose Israeli influence in the U.S. via its secret agents and more importantly via its powerful overseas lobby and allies in government. The lack of any public statement concerning Israel's possible knowledge of 9/11 is indicative of the vast, ubiquitous and aggressive nature of its powerful Diaspora supporters.¹¹ Given the enor-

mous political and economic importance which the mass media have given to 9/11, and the sweeping powers, funding and institutions created around the issue of national security, it is astonishing that no mention has been made about Israel's spy networks operating in the U.S.'s most delicate spheres of counter-terrorism.

Of course it is not astonishing if we understand properly the "unique relationship" between the U.S. Empire and Israel, a regional power.

A GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE DOCUMENT REFERRED TO ISRAEL AS "COUNTRY A"; IT SAID "THE GOVERNMENT OF COUNTRY A CONDUCTS THE MOST AGGRESSIVE ESPIONAGE OPERATION AGAINST THE U.S. OF ANY U.S. ALLY."

Theoretical Issues

The relationship between the U.S. — a global imperial power — and Israel, a regional power, provides us with a unique model of interstate relations. In this case the regional power exacts tribute (\$6 billion annually), free access to U.S. markets, protection of overseas felonious Jews from prosecution or extradition to the U.S., while engaging in pervasive espionage and money laundering. Moreover, Israel establishes limits on U.S.-Middle Eastern policy, in the international forums. Israel's hegemonic position has endured under both Democratic and Republican presidencies for almost half a century. In other words it is a structural historical relation, not one based on personalities, or particular transitory policy-making configurations.

Several hypotheses emerge from an examination of this unique relationship: The first stems from the fact that the territorial Israeli state has little power of persuasion, economic reach or military clout in comparison to the major powers (Europe and the U.S.). The power of Israel is based on the Diaspora, the highly structured and politically and economically powerful Jewish networks which have direct and indirect access to the

centers of power and propaganda in the most powerful imperial country in the world. Tribute is exacted via the influence of these "internal colonialists" who operate at the level of mass media opinion makers and via Congress and the Presidency. Close to 50% of the funding of the Democratic Party comes from pro-Israeli Jews. For every dollar spent by the Jewish networks in influencing voting outcomes, the Israeli state receives \$20 in aid to finance the building and arming of colonial settlements in the Occupied

Territories complete with swimming pools, Romanian gardeners and Filipino maids.

Through the overseas networks the Israeli state can directly intervene and set the parameters to U.S. foreign aid in the Middle East. The overseas networks play a major role in shaping the internal debate on U.S. policy toward Israel. Propaganda associating Israeli repression of Palestinians as the righteous response of the victims of

the Holocaust has been repeated and circulated throughout the mass media. From the heights of the network to the boardrooms, the supporters of the network aggressively attack as "anti-Semites" any critical voices. Through local intimidation and malicious intervention in the professions, the zealots defend Israeli policy and leaders and contribute money, organize voters and run for office. Once in office they tune in to Israeli policy needs.

The phenomenon of overseas expatriates attempting to influence an imperial power is not an exclusively Jewish phenomenon. The Cuban exiles in Miami exercise significant influence in both major parties. But in no other case has linkage led to the establishment of an enduring hegemonic relationship: An empire colonized by a regional power, the U.S. paying tribute to Israel and subject to the ideological blinders of its overseas colons.


As the colons extend their influence throughout the political and intellectual spheres, they feel more confident in asserting Israel's superiority to the U.S., particularly in the areas of political coercion and war. They brazenly boast of Israel's superior security system, its

continues on p. 37

“Axis of Evil” Leader Targeted in Botched Assassination Attempt

Pre-“422” Chatter Points to Neo-Con and Israeli Involvement in North Korea

Wayne Madsen



A compartment destroyed in the train blast is seen on Saturday, April 24, 2004, in Ryongchon County, North Korea. North Korean officials said Thursday's explosion at a railway station in Ryongchon, a city near China's border, killed at least 154 people and injured 1,300, Red Cross official Jay Matta said by phone from a nearby town. Half of the dead were children, killed when their school was destroyed.

AP Photo/Xinhua, Ren Libo

If early April 2004 “chatter” from neo-conservative web sites is any indication, April 22, 2004 (or “4/22”), may go down in history as a deadly terrorist keystone date as September 11, 2001 (“9/11”), in New York and Washington, D.C. and March 11, 2004 (“3/11”), in Madrid. However, “4/22” might be remembered as a date when the neo-cons actually engaged in international terrorism on a scale matched only by al Qaeda.

At around noon on April 22 train cars at the Ryongchon, North Korea Yongcheon central train station, which were carrying ammonium nitrate (the major component of the Oklahoma City Murrah Federal Office Building bomb in

1995), oil, liquefied natural gas and dynamite, ignited in a chain reaction episode by a downed electrical power line. Although one would have to question how North Korea’s notoriously suspicious security service would have allowed dynamite anywhere near a station where North Korean leader Kim Jong Il had transited just hours before from a secret trip to China. The resulting blast from the “incident” killed at least several hundred people, injured thousands, leveled 1,850 buildings (including multi-story apartment buildings), and severely damaged 6,000 others. The “Ground Zero” from the blast extended for a radius of 1.5 miles in the city of 130,000 people. Some 8,000

people were left homeless. The first photos from Ryongchon looked like Hiroshima and Nagasaki after the atomic bombs were dropped. The United Nations later estimated that 40 percent of the city had been destroyed or damaged. On May 16, 2004, South Korea’s *Chosun Ilbo* reported the blast registered a 3.6 on the Richter scale (equivalent to 800 tons of TNT) at Japanese earthquake monitoring stations in Nagano, Oita, and Okinawa. Early reports, including an April 24 report from the Chinese news agency Xinhua, claimed 161 people had died, 76 of them children whose middle school was demolished by the blast.

A Chinese news report stated that

the North Korean security services had dismantled all explosives and gas vehicles at the Yongcheon station before Kim Jong Il's special train passed through it on its way back from China. Although trips by Kim outside his reclusive country are rare, his four-day trip to China was part of an effort to restore international monitoring of North Korea's nuclear weapons program. Kim, fearful of assassination, refuses to fly in airplanes. The question of why dynamite would have been permitted anywhere near the station remains an enigma.

North Korea's United Nations ambassador, Pak Gil Yon, insisted that the major cause of the explosion was two train cars full of dynamite. In any event, the mere suspicion that an attempt may have been made on the North Korean leadership would have been suppressed by the Pyongyang government and certainly tamped down by the South Korean government in Seoul — a government which barely survived a March 2004 Bush administration-backed attempt to have its progressive president, Roh Moo Hyun, removed from power through impeachment. Riding on an overwhelming national feeling that Roh was being forced out of office by pro-U.S. right-wing parties, Roh's Uri Party captured a staggering 152 seats out of 299 in recent parliamentary elections — all but derailing efforts to impeach him and ensuring the decision by the Korean Supreme Court to restore him to the presidency. In fact, one of the pro-U.S. South Korean parties was eclipsed in the new parliament by an even more militantly leftist party — the Democratic Labor Party.

South Korea's new government was already set to reach out to the North — something that would drive a stake in the neo-cons' "Axis of Evil" dogma. The possibility that South Korea might seek a rapprochement with North Korea's communist government sent shock waves through the neo-con policy establishment in Washington. Besides, Vice President Dick Cheney was in Beijing a week before Kim's trip and reportedly told the Chinese that the Bush adminis-

tration wanted maximum pressure exerted on the North. Korea, both North and South, had all of a sudden become a major irritant to the neo-cons running Washington. Something would have to be done and done fast.

Early reports claimed as many as 3,000 people had perished in the super-explosion in North Korea. After witnesses in China felt the blast and then saw a huge black mushroom cloud in the direction of North Korea, hospitals in the Chinese border town of Dandong, just across the Yalu River from North Korea and 12 miles from Ryongchon, were alerted to prepare for mass casualties from the blast. However, no ambulances arrived with North Korean or Chinese casualties. People in North Korea and China thought a nuclear war had started. The ever-suspect corporate Western media, including the *Washington Post*,

PEOPLE IN NORTH KOREA AND CHINA THOUGHT A NUCLEAR WAR HAD STARTED ...THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION WENT TO GREAT LENGTHS TO DISTANCE ITSELF FROM KNOWLEDGE OF THE NORTH KOREAN DISASTER, TERMED BY WITNESSES AS A "SEA OF FIRE."

reported that North Korea prevented wounded North Koreans from getting treatment in China.¹ However, considering the massive destruction, there may not have been that many injured to transport — most victims were likely already dead, missing, or simply vaporized.

"A Sea of Fire"

Whatever caused the cataclysmic explosion, termed by witnesses as a "sea of fire," the Bush administration went to great lengths to distance itself from knowledge of the North Korean disaster. And considering the fact that George W. Bush did not raise any strenuous objections to Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon assassinating Palestinian leaders, including Palestinian Authority President Yassir Arafat, during a White House meeting just a week before, and North

Korean leader Kim Jong Il's designation by the neo-conservatives as one of the three "Axis of Evil" leaders, the possibility that the Ryongchon train yard explosion being an act of terrorism — planned in Washington and Jerusalem and supported by a notorious North Korean-trained surrogate in Africa — cannot be ruled out. It is no secret that Bush has called North Korea's government the "world's most dangerous regime," even more so than that of Saddam Hussein. If "4/22" is proven to be an act of terrorism and an attempted "decapitation" of the North Korean leadership by the neo-con war hawks in charge of the White House and the Knesset, it definitely places Sharon and Bush in the category of international terrorists.

Although Washington played dumb about the North Korean explosion, some South Korean newspapers, in speculating that it may have been an attempt to assassinate Kim Jong Il, also noted from "intelligence sources" that the Bush administration had surveillance satellites and other intelligence assets devoted to watching the homeward-bound special train carrying Kim and was aware when his train approached Ryongchon — shortly before 5:00 a.m. local time — when it transited the Yongcheon station, and when it departed. In fact, a

U.S. spy satellite had photographed Ryongchon's devastation according to the South Korean paper *Chosun Ilbo*.² A defense satellite photograph of Ryongchon, which was posted on the BBC's web site, showed dark billowing clouds of smoke reportedly 18 hours after the explosion. However, according to a U.S. intelligence source, the satellite was later discovered to have taken the photo much closer to the time of the explosion — minutes after the initial fireball. The satellite photo was then quickly removed from the web site. All of this indicates that there was a high-level decision made by the Bush White House to concentrate portions of the already stressed U.S. reconnaissance satellite fleet over North Korea at the same time that Kim Jong Il's train was transiting home from Beijing. A British intelligence



AP Photo/Korea News Agency

North Korea's leader Kim Jong Il, left, visits a paddy field run by Unit 534 of the (North) Korean People's Army on Wednesday, June 4, 2003. The reclusive leader, who also is supreme commander of the army, went on an inspection tour of a farm and goat breeding station run by servicemen of Unit 534.

source confirmed that the movement of Kim's train and a decoy train on 4/22 were subjected to special spy satellite monitoring.

As the neo-cons began turning up the heat on Syria, an interesting story appeared in the Japanese newspaper *Sankei Shimbun*. It was reported that a dozen Syrian technicians from the Syrian Center for Scientific Research were killed at Ryongchon when a train car full of North Korean missile components and other equipment they were accompanying to a North Korean port was destroyed in the 4/22 explosion. The report claimed the Syrians were trained by North Korea in the use of Scud C and Scud D missiles.³ Reports that chemical weapons were in the train were dismissed by international aid workers who found no evidence of chemical contamination. If the report about the missile equipment were true, the presence of Syrians and missile components in the same location where Kim Jong Il had transited would have

made Ryongchon a target of opportunity for coordinated U.S.-Israeli sabotage. In addition, the Russians offered assistance to North Korea and did not rule out sabotage by foreign intelligence services.

In the weeks following the blast, news reports emanating from the South Korean and British press indicated that the Ryongchon blast was, in fact, an assassination attempt against Kim Jong Il and that a rigged cell phone may have been used to trigger the blast. On May 24, 2004, *Chosun Ilbo* carried a comment by a North Korean official who was visiting China. He said, "the North Korean National Security Agency has investigated the incident since it took place and concluded that rebellious forces had plotted the explosions targeting the exclusive train of Kim Jong Il. The security agency, in particular, gained evidence that cell phones had been used in triggering the explosion and reported to the North Korean leader that the use of cell phones should be banned for the sake of the

leader's safety." North Korean officials discovered the remains of a cell phone with adhesive tape attached to it at the blast scene. The neo-conservative London *Daily Telegraph* reported on June 13, 2004, that North Korean security tracked down the owner of the phone and questioned him but his ultimate fate was not known.

Cell Phone Warfare

It is noteworthy that Israel's Mossad pioneered the use of booby-trapped cell phones to trigger explosions. In 1996, Yehiya Ayyash, Hamas's top bomb maker, who was also known as "The Engineer," had half his head blown off after the Mossad stole his cell phone, rigged it with explosives, and returned it to him. The discovery of Syrian technicians on a train at Ryongchon and the remains of a booby-trapped cell phone adds to the mystery of who was behind the blast and why.

There was also a great deal of disinformation concerning North Korea's gov-

ernment cutting off international communications. On 9/11, anyone in New York and Washington discovered that landline and cell phone circuits were overloaded. North Korea, which, unlike the United States, has only a rudimentary telephone system, would have been easily swamped by official phone calls on the catastrophe, causing circuits to become overloaded. However, a number of cell phone calls were made by Koreans and Chinese in Ryongchon to relatives across the border

prior to the North Korean explosion. Rwandan President Paul Kagame, the only U.S. military-trained world leader who was also trained in North Korea by that nation's army, was in Washington accompanied by a number of Pentagon, Central Intelligence Agency, Defense Intelligence Agency, and neo-con political activists. Kagame, who was accused by French counterterrorism Judge Jean-Louis Bruguière of being behind the April 6, 1994, shooting down of the

U.S.-South Korean-Japanese mini-summit of government officials had been held in San Francisco on April 8 in preparation for Kim Jong Il's talks in Beijing.

In what can only be described as incredible irony, Kagame, who has been accused of waging a counter-genocide in Rwanda and the neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo, possibly resulting in the deaths of four million people, was praised for his "accomplishments" during his Washington visit by officials of the Holocaust Museum.

SIMPLY STATED, IF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION AND ITS FRIENDS IN ISRAEL WANTED TO OVERTHROW THE THIRD "AXIS OF EVIL" LEADER, NO ONE WAS MORE FAMILIAR WITH NORTH KOREA'S INNER CIRCLE THAN KAGAME, A VETERAN OF THE COUNTRY'S POLITICAL INDOCTRINATION AND MILITARY TRAINING AND ALSO, CONVENIENTLY, A 1990 GRADUATE OF THE U.S. ARMY'S STAFF AND COMMAND COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANSAS.

in China. There was no attempt by North Korea to jam the signals. North Korea's U.N. mission almost immediately appealed for international assistance hours after the scope of the tragedy became known. These actions were repeated by North Korean diplomats in Moscow, London, and Geneva. As soon as the head of North Korea's Red Cross found out about the seriousness of the situation in Ryongchon, he appealed for assistance from his South Korean counterpart, who just happened to be visiting Pyongyang at the time. Although North Korea is a hermit nation, its willingness to allow foreign aid workers in was unprecedented.

Nevertheless, even as news of the explosion was transmitted to China and South Korea, U.S. State Department spokesman Richard Boucher on the day of the disaster said that the Bush administration had no information on the collision. The Bush administration had parked spy satellites over Ryongchon, yet pronounced ignorance on the details of the catastrophe.

It was also curious that just days

Rwandan presidential jet carrying the presidents of Rwanda and Burundi and their staffs, had ample experience with North Korea's military and government. In fact, although Kagame is allied with U.S. neo-con and Israeli circles, his country hosts a large North Korean embassy, one of the largest in Kigali, the Rwandan capital. Kagame's top military officers subscribe to North Korean newspapers. Kagame is familiar with the North Korean weapons industry and intelligence network because — using the offices of North Korean embassies in East Africa — he once received North Korean arms shipments for his Ugandan-led guerrilla army. Simply stated, if the Bush administration and its friends in Israel wanted to overthrow the third "Axis of Evil" leader, no one was more familiar with North Korea's inner circle than Kagame, a veteran of the country's political indoctrination and military training and also, conveniently, a 1990 graduate of the U.S. Army's Staff and Command College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. And a few days prior to "4/22," Kagame was on the West Coast of the United States where a

The Neo-Cons Do Their Thing

In 1982, top Reagan administration hawks (including the "cabal" that would become known as the neo-conservatives — Richard Perle, Ken Adelman, Paul Wolfowitz, and Douglas Feith) approved a plan to sabotage the Soviet Union's economy through covert transfers of special technology that contained hidden Trojan Horse computer programs. One such computer program triggered a huge explosion in a gas pipeline in Siberia.⁴ The explosion was so powerful it was detected by orbiting spy satellites. While no one was reported to have died from the pipeline explosion, it resulted in significant disruption to the Soviet economy. Even though Kim Jong Il was not harmed in the North Korean explosion, there was significant disruption to cross-border North Korean-Chinese commerce.

The most telling evidence that the Ryongchon explosion may have been planned as an attempt to kill North Korea's leaders comes from the www.freenorthkorea.net web site. On April 7, 2004, just two weeks before the explosion, the following message about Kim Jong Il's planned trip to Beijing was posted by someone named James:

This might be a good time to assassinate Kim Jong-Il, perhaps when he rides in his armoured [sic] railroad car to Beijing. He avoids travelling by airplane because its relatively easy to shoot down an airplane. I recall that during his last trip outside of NK — to Russia — his train was hit by gunfire. [Posted by: James at April 7, 2004 12:52 PM]

James followed up his message with this:

Actually, I wasn't thinking about

China killing Kim Jong-Il. They are buddies, after all.

I was thinking more along lines of the assassination of SS General Reinhard Heydrich in 1942 by the Czech patriots Jan Kubis and Josef Gabcik. For reference, see this URL:

www.us-israel.org/jsource/Holocaust/Heydrich.html

An individual named Joshua responded to James:

James,

You definitely know your history, but an armored train is probably harder to knock off than a Mercedes convertible. You'd almost need a MOAB to snuff the runt out. Hmmm. Could we buy one on E-Bay?

Perhaps killing The Porcine One would be a (ahem) tall order, but a few Korean Gabciks could do much damage . . . or even form the core of a rural rebel movement.

Of course, Richard Perle has all but invited the ChiComs to replace the Great Pumpkin with their own puppet. I don't happen to agree with that, but a state visit is an opportune moment for that. The easiest thing on earth would be for China to place Kim Jong-Il 'under arrest' in Beijing, purportedly at the request of the 'legitimate' Nork authorities. There he would remain in spartan but comfortable isolation until he drinks himself to death. [Posted by: Joshua at April 8, 2004 01:43 PM]

Someone named James C. responds to Joshua:

Joshua,

I am still convinced that the best way to save North Korea is through the assassination of Kim Jong-Il, either through the NK military, Western-trained agents or even our military. This is not unprecedented, as those who know their history are familiar with plots against Admiral Yamamoto and Hitler

(Stauffenberg).

It is time for the Western governments to act by formenting [sic] a revolt within the North Korean military, and to attempt an assassination using NK exiles.

What would U.S. intelligence do if they overheard Arabs talking about using a Massive Ordnance Air Burst (MOAB) bomb to wipe out the leadership of a foreign government? What would happen to the "chatterers" if the bombing was actually carried off?

Then there is this interesting note on www.freenorthkorea.net concerning a new Israeli organization dedicated to opposing North Korea's government:

New Israeli Organization Founded to fight for human rights in North Korea, plans event for April 28.

This is from nkfreedom.org:

There is a demonstration in front of the South Korean Embassy in Tel Aviv on April 28, 2004 its sponsored by the Israeli-Jewish Committee against Gas Chambers in North Korea.

I don't speak Hebrew, so I can't read the home page, but for those who can, please visit www.korea-lolishtok.com/index.aspx

We call upon the State of Israel to speak out, to use diplomatic influence, and to enlist the Jewish Diaspora in the struggle. We call upon the State of Israel to mobilize the international community to compel North Korea to open its prison camps to international supervision.

A search of the Whois database provides the following information on the web sites involved in the anti-North Korea campaign:

The Israeli web site, Korea-Lo-Lishtok.com was registered on April 7, 2004, the same date that the Freenorthkorea.net chatter spoke about blowing up Kim Jong Il's train with a MOAB-type bomb. The Israeli registrant

is listed as Itai Raz, who operates from P.O. Box 10128 in Tel Aviv.

Freenorthkorea.net was registered on April 14, 2003, by Chris Beaumont, operating from P.O. Box 170156 in San Francisco.

The site containing the notice on the new Israeli site, Nkfreedom.org, was registered on February 21, 2004, by Sue Yoon-Logan, 9689-C Main Street, Fairfax, Virginia. Her e-mail address lists her as being with jubileecampaign.org. Jubileecampaign.org was registered on June 28, 2000, by Jubilee Campaign USA, 9689-C Main Street, Fairfax, Virginia. The administrator for Jubilee Campaign is listed as Ann Buwalda. The Internet Service Provider for Jubilee is listed as Christian Web Host, P.O. Box 97, Remlap, Alabama.

In fact, [jubileecampaign](http://jubileecampaign.org) and Nkfreedom.org are evangelical Christian organizations that receive support from groups like the Christian Coalition. Fundamentalists of any religion claim that they receive their orders from a higher "father." Considering the penchant Bush and his evangelical Christian and expansionistic Israeli colleagues have for assassinating foreign leaders, Ryongchon and "4/22" cannot be written off so easily as an "accident."



Wayne Madsen is a Washington, D.C.-based investigative journalist and columnist. He worked at the National Security Agency (NSA) during the Reagan administration and wrote the introduction to Forbidden Truth. He is the co-author, with John Stanton, of "America's Nightmare: The Presidency of George Bush II." His forthcoming book is titled: "Jaded Tasks: Big Oil, Black Ops, and Brass Plates."

NOTES

1. Edward Cody, "N. Korean Blast Sent 'Sea of Fire': 'Carelessness' to Blame, Statement Says," *Washington Post*, April 24, 2004, p. A12.
 2. "Train blast call for help," *The Sunday Times* (Perth, Australia), April 25, 2004.
 3. "DPRK Train Explosion: Syrian Technicians on Board: Debris Recovered by Team Wearing Protective Suits Immediately After Explosion; Possibility of Train Transporting Military Cargo," *Sankei Shimbun* (Internet Version), May 7, 2004.
 4. Matt Bivens, "Spooky Triumphs," *The Nation*, March 1, 2004.
- www.thenation.com/outrage/index.mhtml?bid=6&pid=1292

Million Worker March...

One trillion dollars represents \$1,000 a minute since the birth of Jesus.

Will the defeat of George Bush recover these looted funds or stop the perpetual siphoning of trillions of dollars into the arms industry, leading inevitably to even more drastic cuts in all social services?

Today, 71% of U.S. corporations pay no taxes but John Kerry's principal economic adviser is Wall Street's Warren Buffett, who, along with George Schultz, performs the identical role for Arnold Schwarzenegger.

Do John McCain, who John Kerry sought as his running mate or Lee Iacocca of General Motors and Chrysler, who endorsed Kerry, represent the interests of labor and working people?

The official leadership of the AFL-CIO, faced with rapidly growing rank and file support for a great mobilization of working people in America, has ordered organized labor to cease and desist in its support for the Million Worker March.

The entire labor movement and organized labor has been put on notice to boycott the call for a Million Worker March on Washington on October 17, 2004.

Working people in America are under siege. The corporate and banking oligarchy that has power in this society is waging class war against us all.

In the face of attack after attack, the response of the leaders of the AFL-CIO has been silence and default.

Their voices are stilled. They dare not cry out "enough is enough." They fail to take note that the two parties are financed by the same people and their address is Wall Street.

We must not fall silent when it comes to leading working people to fight back and vocal in denouncing those who do.

36 years ago Martin Luther King summoned our people to a great Poor Peoples March on Washington to address a system in crisis and to confront the hijacking of our government and our country by a banking and corporate oligarchy that has captured the two political parties in America.

Would the AFL-CIO dare send out a directive to all of labor to boycott and sabotage the marches and mobilizations of the great civil rights movement, led by Martin Luther King, Jr. Malcolm X and Cesar Chavez?

In a very real sense, the labor movement in America is facing a crisis of its own. The unrelenting class war that has been waged against us has reduced the number of unionized workers to twelve percent. This is the result of a conscious campaign by that one percent of the population that owns and controls ninety percent of the national wealth.

We are at the point of production and when we mobilize our ranks, we represent a force that no illicit power, however concentrated, can hold back.

We have taken the pulse of the rank and file and of unorganized labor. The overwhelming majority of working people want an end to permanent war and the hemorrhage of national resources into military production and war.

Just this weekend, AFSCME and SEIU, two of the largest trade unions in America, passed unanimous resolutions calling for an immediate end to the war in Iraq, an end to the occupation and a return of all U.S. troops.

That is why the Million Worker March reaches out to labor.

We are proud that labor councils across America have endorsed the March. We are inspired by the knowledge that

every ILWU local from San Diego to Anchorage has endorsed. We are energized by the endorsement of the Coalition of Black Trade Unionists, by the Farm Labor Organizing Committee and by national organizations for immigrant rights.

We are organizing in every trade union in America and drawing upon the energy and passion of the labor movement wherever people desire change.

We are summoning working people from every walk of life to mobilize around a working peoples' agenda, and a vision of an America transformed.

Ours is a March and a Mobilization for all who say "enough is enough." Infant mortality in Harlem is greater than in Bangladesh and in Bangladesh the same Stevedore Association that sought to break the ILWU is privatizing their ports and imposing starvation wages.

Unemployment in our inner cities has reached catastrophic proportions with over 60% of black male youth without work while militarized police units are deployed as an occupation army.

One out of four children in America goes to bed hungry but hundreds of millions of dollars of our union dues fund politicians who do nothing about it.

Our labor movement has the opportunity and the obligation to reach out to hundreds of millions of working people, organized and unorganized.

We need not hand politicians a blank check so they can soft soap us at election time and destroy our jobs, benefits and social services all the time in between.

We say to every union member, to every union local and to every labor council, to every State Federation and to Central Labor Council, let labor's voice be heard.

Join us in standing up for our rights. Join us in advancing our own agenda. Join us in fighting for our communities and our jobs.

Support the ILWU workers who shut down the port to protest apartheid and launched a mobilization against Taft-Hartley and all repressive anti-labor legislation.

Support the one and quarter of a million women who marched and mobilized in Washington D.C. for reproductive rights and equal pay for equal work.

Send a message to all the politicians — whoever they are and under whatever banner they parade: We are not for sale; we cannot be soft-soaped, lied to or taken for granted.

Let them know that we have our own agenda based upon our own experience, our own needs and our own vision and that we shall hold everyone's feet to the fire.

We say to the leadership of the AFL-CIO and to all and everyone who has hopes or expectations of John Kerry or any politician seeking our support: do not take us for granted; do not confound silence at the top for acquiescence at the base.

Labor has issued too many blank checks only to have our pockets picked and our aspirations ignored.

Let us join together everyone in the house of labor.

Every gain we have ever made has been won under the signal banner of labor: we are working people proud and strong, union strong, and we fight for our rights with our own voice and in our own name.

Come together, sisters and brothers. Let us tap into our great strength — the desire for change and for social justice.

We call on everyone to endorse, build, finance and mobilize the Million Worker March on Washington, D.C. on October 17 a day when we demonstrate across the United States that labor and working people are on the march and will no longer be denied.

The Bombing of PanAm 103 and Libya – Case Still Not Closed

William Blum



AP Photo/Martin Cleaver

This December 1988 photo shows wrecked houses and a deep gash in the ground in the village of Lockerbie, Scotland - damage caused by the crash of Pan Am Flight 103.

The page one headlines in the *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times* and *New York Times* of December 20, 2003, were all about Libya "vowing to give up its banned weapons!" George Bush and Tony Blair – in a "choreographed sequence" as the *Post* called it – hailed Moammar Qaddafi's seeing the light!

Readers could have been forgiven for not having been aware that Libya had been stockpiling Weapons of Mass Destruction and had become the newest Danger To The Civilized World. But all they had to do was "think Iraq."

That's apparently what Bush and Blair had been thinking: What can we do to regain our credibility as saviors, as the good guys? If only we could remove "another" imminent WMD threat. Perhaps it might come out sounding

believable this time.

Qaddafi was tailor-made to be used for the purpose. The Libyan leader had been eager for years to end the American sanctions against his country. Or as Bush put it: "Leaders who abandon the pursuit of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them will find an open path to better relations with the United States and other free nations. Libya has begun the process of rejoining the community of nations." Qaddafi, Tony Blair chimed in, made a "courageous decision." The British Prime Minister declared that "Libya's actions entitle it to rejoin the international community."

One wondered at the time whether American and British voters could expect to be hearing about this "success" *ad*

nauseum in their upcoming national elections in an attempt to spray over the awful odor of the Iraq misadventure. One did not have to wait long to find out.

White House officials immediately said they "felt certain that the brewing military confrontation with Iraq [in late 2002 and early 2003] influenced Qaddafi's decision to reach out." They "touted the Libyan move as vindication for the decision to go to war against Iraq ... because of the message it sent."

Bush described Libya's announcement "as resulting from careful U.S. strategy and diplomacy, including the decision to invade Iraq in March."

"I can't imagine that Iraq went unnoticed by the Libyan leadership," a senior U.S. official added to the chorus.

And the *Los Angeles Times* opined

that "Libya's announcement enables the Bush administration to claim a major foreign policy victory and deflect criticism that the war in Iraq had done little to decrease the broader threat of terrorism and proliferation of deadly weapons."

Yet it was unmistakable that Qaddafi had been "reaching out" to repair relations with the U.S. and the U.K. long before their invasion of Iraq, even before 9/11. Why else did he agree to turn over two Libyans for trial in 1999 for the bombing of Pan Am flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland, on December 21, 1988?

So how close were we to yet another Arab-terrorist-madman unleashing his vast arsenal of doomsday weapons upon an innocent and unsuspecting world? Here's what the three leading American newspapers reported (emphasis added):

"The Libyan foreign ministry issued a statement admitting that the country had SOUGHT to develop unconventional weapons."

U.S., U.K., and U.N. "Experts met with [Libyan] scientists at research centers that COULD SUPPORT biological weapons research and also examined missile RESEARCH facilities."

"They also revealed 'DUAL-USE' chemicals that can be used for peaceful purposes OR FOR WEAPONS."

"British officials said that experts were given access to RESEARCH projects, including uranium enrichment that COULD BE USED for nuclear weapons."

Finally, a U.S. official said that "They found that the program was more advanced than had been previously confirmed ... and that Libya possessed all the equipment and expertise NEEDED TO PRODUCE weapons-grade uranium." A petrified world hung on the official's every word with bated breath ... at last able to exhale when the official added: "We did not see an enrichment facil-

ity. We saw the components that would make for an enrichment facility." He then added that "the Libyans did not say they had produced any highly enriched uranium."

Is Libya's abandonment of any kind of WMD program a good thing no matter at how primitive a stage it might have been? Yes, and it would be even better if all nations abandoned such programs, whether primitive or advanced.

Washington spinmeisters, a la Iraq, were trying to make a mountain of uranium out of a molehill of sand, although other voices were soon heard. Ray Takeyh, a Libya expert at the Pentagon's National Defense University, declared that "Libya's program did not have a sophisticated enough infrastructure for a very viable program, and they haven't had it for years." And Joseph Cirincione at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace said that "it made little sense for Libya to embark on a slow and costly nuclear weapons program and wondered how much of the nuclear research was new or simply left over from earlier, now discarded programs."¹

Summing it all up, "One senior Bush administration official, in an interview, said Libya's bumbling attempts at mastering the science of advanced weapons earned it a reputation as the 'clown prince of weapons of mass destruction.'"²

Is Libya's abandonment of any kind of WMD program a good thing no matter at how primitive a stage it might have been? Yes, and it would be even better if all nations abandoned such programs, whether primitive or advanced. George W. declared: "Those weapons do not bring influence or prestige. They bring isolation and otherwise unwelcome consequences ... I hope that other leaders will find an example in Libya's announcement today." This tired, sad old world can only wish that one of those leaders would

be the president of the United States.

In any event, we must remember that, even if Iraq had had a full complement of WMD, they would not have been a threat to the United States in the absence of an irresistible desire for mass national suicide. The same of course applies to Libya.

And lest we forget, something called "oil" may also have been a factor. U.S. oil companies had long been eager to return to Libya, but had been stopped by the sanctions. This whole scenario is the kind of thing political leaders employ to sell a change of policy to the public, so that in this case, if the U.S. ends the sanctions, it won't be seen as "rewarding an evildoer," but because the evildoer has mended his ways.

Indeed, very shortly afterward, enough of the sanctions were lifted to allow the oil companies to travel to Libya and start exploring commercial possibilities.

Responsibility for Flight 103

The media accounts of Libya and its WMD predictably contained references to that country's alleged role in the bombing of Flight 103. This is a belief that is etched in marble and will probably remain that way forever. But the fact remains that, despite Libya's supposed admission of guilt and a Libyan man sitting in prison for the crime after being convicted by a court in The Hague in 2001, there's no proof or any good evidence of Libya's role in that tragedy.

In August 2003, it was announced that Libya had "formally accepted responsibility" for the PanAm bombing; nevertheless, it was clear that the Libyans were NOT admitting to actually planting the deadly bomb. Libyan Foreign Minister Mohammed Abderrahmane Chalgam told CNN that Libya wanted to know who was behind the bombing. "We want to go together ahead in the future to discover the reality of that story," he said.³ American and British officials pretended that the Libyans had indeed confessed their guilt; ergo, case closed, the U.S. and the U.K. had once again seen to it that justice triumphed, Libya would pay compensation to the victims' families, the U.S. would consider lifting sanctions against

Libya, everyone happy.

Then, on February 24, 2004, Libya's prime minister, Shokri Ghanem, implied in a BBC interview that his government's statements were not an admission of actual guilt. "We thought it was easier for us to buy peace and this is why we agreed to compensation," he said. "Therefore we said: 'Let us buy peace, let us put the whole case behind us and let us look forward.'"⁴

At the same time, Libya's foreign minister said: "Libya accepts responsibility for the actions and activities of its officials [a reference to the two Libyans tried in The Hague]. We did not say we accepted responsibility for the bombing of Pan Am."⁵

Not fair! cried the White House and Downing Street. Libya was not playing the game right. The Bush administration abruptly canceled plans to lift the travel ban and other restrictions on Libya that had been planned (in return for Libya scrapping its nuclear weapons program as well as the Lockerbie issue). "It's important for Libya to retract these statements," said the State Department, "and to make clear what their policy is as soon as possible."

The Libyan prime minister had of course made clear what he thought the truth was, but that was not what the State Department was asking for. They were asking to make the "policy" clear; *i.e.*, Are you still playing the game or not?

The head of the U.K. victims' families organization declared: "We don't understand the comments by prime minister Ghanem. Nobody knows why he has said this." The possibility that Ghanem simply wanted to inject some truth into the matter and clear Libya's name apparently was not an option to be considered.

Then, Libya quickly returned to the game, saying it wanted "to set the record straight and be perfectly clear" about its position on the Lockerbie bombing. Its August 2003 statement of accepting responsibility for the plane bombing was still valid. "Recent statements contradicting or casting doubt on these positions are inaccurate and regrettable," said the Libyan government. Just as quickly, the State Department, referring to the Libyan

statement, announced: "They have done what they needed to do."⁶

"Human kind cannot bear very much reality," wrote T.S. Eliot.

The Trial of the "Perpetrators"

The newspapers were filled with pictures of happy relatives of the victims of the PanAm bombing. A Libyan, Abdelbaset Ali Mohmed al Megrahi, had been found guilty of the crime the day before, January 31, 2001, by a Scottish court in The Hague, though his co-defendant, Al Amin Khalifa Fhimah, was acquitted. At long last there was going to be some kind of closure for the families.

But what was wrong with this picture? What was wrong was that the evidence against Megrahi was thin to the point of transparency. Coming the month after the (s)election of George W. Bush,

COMING THE MONTH AFTER THE (S)ELECTION OF GEORGE W. BUSH, THE HAGUE VERDICT COULD HAVE BEEN DUBBED SUPREME COURT II, ANOTHER INSTANCE OF NON-JUDICIAL FACTORS FATALLY CLOUDING JUDICIAL REASONING.

The Hague verdict could have been dubbed Supreme Court II, another instance of non-judicial factors fatally clouding judicial reasoning. The three Scottish judges could not have relished returning to the United Kingdom after finding both defendants innocent of the murder of 270 people, largely from the U.K. and the United States. Not to mention having to face dozens of hysterical victims' family members in the courtroom. The three judges also well knew the fervent desires of the White House and Downing Street as to the outcome. If both men had been acquitted, the United States and Great Britain would have had to answer for a decade of sanctions and ill will directed toward Libya.

One has to read the entire 26,000-word "Opinion of the Court," as well as be very familiar with the history of the case going back to 1988, to appreciate how questionable was the judges' verdict.

The key charge against Megrahi — the *sine qua non* was that in Malta he had placed explosives in a suitcase and tagged it so it would lead the following charmed life: 1) loaded aboard an Air Malta flight to Frankfurt without an accompanying passenger; 2) transferred in Frankfurt to the PanAm 103A flight to London without an accompanying passenger; and 3) transferred in London to the Pan Am 103 flight to New York without an accompanying passenger.

To the magic bullet of the JFK assassination, can we now add the magic suitcase?

This scenario by itself would have been a major feat and so unlikely to succeed that any terrorist with any common sense would have found a better way. But aside from anything else, we have this — as to the first step, loading the suitcase at Malta: There was no witness, no video, no document, no fingerprints, nothing to tie Megrahi to the particular brown Samsonite suitcase, no past history of terrorism, no forensic evidence of any kind linking him or Fhimah to such an act. And the court admitted it: "The absence of any explanation of the method by which the primary suitcase might have been placed on board KM180 [Air Malta] is a major difficulty for the Crown case."⁷

Moreover, under security requirements in 1988, unaccompanied baggage was subjected to special X-ray examinations, plus — because of recent arrests of suspected terrorists in Germany — the security personnel in Frankfurt were on the lookout specifically for a bomb secreted in a radio, which turned out to indeed be the method used with the Pan Am 103 bomb.

Requiring some sort of direct and credible testimony linking Megrahi to the bombing. The Hague court placed great — nay, paramount — weight upon the supposed identification of the Libyan by a shopkeeper in Malta, as the purchaser of the clothing found in the bomb suitcase. But this shopkeeper had earlier identified several other people as the culprit, including one who was a CIA agent.⁸ When he finally identified Megrahi from a photo, it was after Megrahi's photo had been in the world news for years. The

court acknowledged the possible danger inherent in such a verification: "These identifications were criticised *inter alia* on the ground that photographs of the accused have featured many times over the years in the media and accordingly purported identifications more than 10 years after the event are of little if any value."⁹

There were also major discrepancies between the shopkeeper's original description of the clothes buyer and Megrahi's actual appearance. The shopkeeper told police that the customer was "six feet or more in height" and "was about 50 years of age."

Megrahi is 5'8" tall and was 36 in 1988. The judges again acknowledged the weakness of their argument by conceding that the initial description "would not in a number of respects fit the first accused [Megrahi]" and that "it has to be accepted that there was a substantial discrepancy."¹⁰ Nevertheless, the judges went ahead and accepted the identification as accurate.

Before the indictment of the two Libyans in Washington in November 1991, the press had reported police findings that the clothing had been purchased on November 23, 1988.¹¹ But the indictment of Megrahi states that he made the purchase on December 7. Can this be because the investigators were able to document Megrahi being in Malta (where he worked for Libya Airlines) on that date but cannot do so for November 23?¹²

There is also this to be considered: If the bomber needed some clothing to wrap up an ultra-secret bomb in a suitcase, would he go to a clothing store in the city where he planned to carry out his dastardly deed, where he knew he'd likely be remembered as an obvious foreigner, and buy brand new, easily traceable items? Would an intelligence officer — which Megrahi was alleged to be — do this? Or even a common boob? Wouldn't it make more sense to use any old clothing, from anywhere?

Furthermore, after the world was repeatedly assured that these items of clothing were sold only on Malta, it was learned that at least one of the items was actually "sold at dozens of outlets throughout Europe, and it was impossible to trace the purchaser."¹³

The "Opinion of the Court" placed considerable weight on the suspicious



Seen in this courtroom drawing, Abdel Basset Ali Al-Megrahi, second left, and Lamen Khalifa Fhimah, second right, listen to the prosecution's closing arguments, flanked by Scottish police officers at the Scottish Court at Camp Zeist, Netherlands, Tuesday, January 9, 2001.

behavior of Megrahi prior to the fatal day, making much of his comings and goings abroad, phone calls to unknown parties for unknown reasons, the use of a pseudonym, etc.

The three judges tried to squeeze as much mileage out of these events as they could, as if they had no better case to make. But if Megrahi was indeed a member of Libyan intelligence, we must consider that intelligence agents have been known to act in mysterious ways, for whatever assignment they're on. The court, however, had no idea what assignment, if any, Megrahi was working on.

There is much more that is known about the case that makes the court verdict and written opinion questionable, although credit must be given the court for its frankness about what it was doing, even while it was doing it. "We are aware that in relation to certain aspects of the case there are a number of uncertainties and qualifications," the judges wrote. "We are also aware that there is a danger that by selecting parts of the evidence which seem to fit together and ignoring parts which might not fit, it is possible to read into a mass of conflicting evidence a pattern or conclusion which is not really justified."¹⁴

It is remarkable, given all that the

judges conceded was questionable or uncertain in the trial — not to mention all that was questionable or uncertain that they *didn't* concede — that at the end of the day they could still declare to the world that "There is nothing in the evidence which leaves us with any reasonable doubt as to the guilt of [Megrahi]."¹⁵

The *Guardian* of London later wrote that, two days before the verdict "senior Foreign Office officials briefed a group of journalists in London. They painted a picture of a bright new chapter in Britain's relations with Colonel Qaddafi's regime. They made it quite clear they assumed both the Libyans in the dock would be acquitted. The Foreign Office officials were not alone. Most independent observers believed it was impossible for the court to find the prosecution had proved its case against Megrahi beyond reasonable doubt."¹⁶

Alternative Scenario

There is, moreover, an alternative scenario, laying the blame on Iran and Syria, which is much better documented and makes a lot more sense, logistically and otherwise. Indeed, this was the Original Official Version, delivered with Olympian rectitude by the United States government — guaranteed, sworn to, scout's

honor, case closed — until the build-up to the Gulf War came along in 1990 and the support of Iran and Syria was needed.

Washington was anxious as well to achieve the release of American hostages held in Lebanon by groups close to Iran. Thus it was that the scurrying sound of backtracking became audible in the corridors of the White House.

Suddenly — or so it seemed — in October 1990, there was a New Official Version: It was Libya — the Arab state least supportive of the U.S. build-up to the Gulf War and the sanctions imposed against Iraq — that was behind the bombing after all, declared Washington.

The two Libyans were formally indicted in the U.S. and Scotland on November 14, 1991. "This was a Libyan government operation from start to finish," declared the State Department spokesman.¹⁷ "The Syrians took a bum rap on this," said President George H.W. Bush.¹⁸

Within the next 20 days, the remaining four American hostages in Lebanon were released along with the most prominent British hostage, Terry Waite.

The Original Official Version accused the PFLP-GC, a 1968 breakaway from a component of the Palestine Liberation Organization, of making the bomb and somehow placing it aboard the flight in Frankfurt.

The PFLP-GC was led by Ahmed Jabril, one of the world's leading terrorists, and was headquartered in, financed by, and closely supported by, Syria. The bombing was allegedly done at the behest of Iran as revenge for the U.S. shoot down of an Iranian passenger plane over the Persian Gulf on July 3, 1988, which claimed 290 lives.

The support for this scenario was, and remains, impressive, as the following sample indicates:

In April 1989, the FBI — in response to criticism that it was bungling the investigation — leaked to CBS the news that it had tentatively identified the person who unwittingly carried the bomb aboard. His name was Khalid Jaafar, a 21-year-old Lebanese-American. The report said that the bomb had been planted in Jaafar's suitcase by a member of the PFLP-GC, whose name was not revealed.¹⁹

In May, the State Department stated that the CIA was "confident" of the Iran-Syria-PFLP-GC account of events.²⁰

On September 20, The *Times* of London reported that "security officials from Britain, the United States and West Germany are totally satisfied that it was the PFLP-GC" behind the crime.

In December 1989, Scottish investigators announced that they had "hard evidence" of the involvement of the PFLP-GC in the bombing.²¹

A National Security Agency electronic intercept disclosed that Ali Akbar Mohtashemi, Iranian interior minister, had paid Palestinian terrorists \$10 million to gain revenge for the downed Iranian airplane.²² The intercept appears to have occurred in July 1988, shortly after the plane was shot down.

Israeli intelligence also intercepted a communication between Mohtashemi and the Iranian embassy in Beirut "indicating that Iran paid for the Lockerbie bombing."²³

Even after the Libyans had been indicted, Israeli officials declared that their intelligence analysts remained con-

against the two Libyans. This move, wrote the *Guardian*, reflected the concern of the Scottish legal profession, reaching into the Crown Office (Scotland's equivalent of the U.S. Attorney General's Office), that the bombing may not have been the work of Libya, but of Syrians, Iranians and PFLP-GC.²⁶

We must also ask why Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, writing in her 1993 memoirs about the U.S. bombing of Libya in 1986, with which Britain had cooperated, stated: "But the much vaunted Libyan counter-attack did not and could not take place. Qaddafi had not been destroyed but he had been humbled. There was a marked decline in Libyan-sponsored terrorism in succeeding years."²⁷

Key Question

A key question in the PFLP-GC version has always been: How did the bomb get aboard the plane in Frankfurt, or at some other point? One widely disseminated explanation was in a report, completed during the summer of 1989 and leaked in

the fall, which had been prepared by a New York investigating firm called Interfor. Headed by a former Israeli intelligence agent, Juval Aviv, Interfor — whose other clients included Fortune 500 companies, the FBI, IRS and Secret Service²⁸ — was hired by the law firm representing PanAm's insurance carrier.

The Interfor Report said that in the mid-1980s, a drug and arms smuggling operation was set up in various European cities, with

Frankfurt airport as the site of one of the drug routes. The Frankfurt operation was run by Manzer al-Kassar, a Syrian, the same man from whom Oliver North's shadowy network purchased large quantities of arms for the Contras. At the airport, according to the report, a courier would board a flight with checked luggage containing innocent items; after the luggage had passed all security checks, one or another accomplice Turkish baggage handler for PanAm would substitute an identical suitcase

SUDDENLY... IN OCTOBER 1990, THERE WAS A NEW OFFICIAL VERSION: IT WAS LIBYA — THE ARAB STATE LEAST SUPPORTIVE OF THE U.S. BUILD-UP TO THE GULF WAR AND THE SANCTIONS IMPOSED AGAINST IRAQ — THAT WAS BEHIND THE BOMBING AFTER ALL, DECLARED WASHINGTON.

vinced that the PFLP-GC bore primary responsibility for the bombing.²⁴

In 1992, Abu Sharif, a political adviser to PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat, stated that the PLO had compiled a secret report which concluded that the bombing of Pan Am 103 was the work of a "Middle Eastern country" other than Libya.²⁵

In February 1995, former Scottish Office minister Alan Stewart wrote to the British Foreign Secretary and the Lord Advocate, questioning the reliability of evidence which had led to the accusations

containing contraband; the passenger then picked up this suitcase upon arrival at the destination.

The only courier named by Interfor was Khalid Jaafar, who, as noted above, had been named by the FBI a few months earlier as the person who unwittingly carried the bomb aboard.

The Interfor Report spins a web much too lengthy and complex to go into here. The short version is that the CIA in Germany discovered the airport drug operation and learned also that Al-Kassar had the contacts to gain the release of American hostages in Lebanon. He had already done the same for French hostages. Thus it was that the CIA and the German Bundeskriminalamt (BKA, Federal Criminal Office) allowed the drug operation to continue in hopes of effecting the release of American hostages.

According to the Report, this same smuggling ring and its method of switching suitcases at the Frankfurt airport were used to smuggle the fatal bomb aboard Flight 103, under the eyes of the CIA and BKA.

In January 1990, Interfor gave three of the baggage handlers polygraphs and two of them were judged to be deceitful when denying any involvement in baggage switching. However, neither the U.S., U.K. or German investigators showed any interest in the results, or in questioning the baggage handlers. Instead, the polygrapher, James Keefe, was hauled before a Washington grand jury, and, as he puts it, "They were bent on destroying my credibility — not theirs" [the baggage handlers]. To Interfor, the lack of interest in the polygraph results and the attempt to intimidate Keefe was the strongest evidence of a cover-up by the various government authorities who did not want their permissive role in the baggage switching to be revealed.²⁹

Critics claimed that the Interfor Report had been inspired by PanAm's interest in proving that it was impossible for normal airline security to have prevented the loading of the bomb, thus removing the basis for accusing the airline of negligence.

The Report was the principal reason PanAm's attorneys served subpoenas on the FBI, CIA, DEA, State Department, National Security Council, and NSA, as well as, reportedly, the Defense Intelligence Agency and FAA, to turn over all documents relating to the crash

of 103 or to a drug operation preceding the crash. The government moved to quash the subpoenas on grounds of "national security," and refused to turn over a single document in open court, although it gave some to a judge to view privately.

The judge later commented that he was "troubled about certain parts" of what he'd read, that he didn't know quite what to do because I think some of the material may be significant."³⁰

Drugs Revelation

On October 30, 1990, NBC-TV News reported that "PanAm flights from Frankfurt, including 103, had been used a number of times by the DEA as part of its undercover operation to fly informants and suitcases of heroin into Detroit as part of a sting operation to catch dealers in Detroit."

The TV network reported that the DEA was looking into the possibility that a young man who lived in Michigan and regularly visited the Middle East may have unwittingly carried the bomb aboard Flight 103. His name was Khalid Jaafar. "Unidentified law enforcement sources" were cited as saying that Jaafar had been a DEA informant and was involved in a drug-sting operation based out of Cyprus. The DEA was investigating whether the PFLP-GC had tricked Jaafar into carrying a suitcase containing the bomb instead of the drugs he usually carried.

The NBC report quoted an airline source as saying: "Informants would put [suit]cases of heroin on the PanAm flights apparently without the usual security checks, through an arrangement between the DEA and German authorities."³¹

These revelations were enough to inspire a congressional hearing, held in December 1990, entitled, "Drug Enforcement Administration's Alleged Connection to the Pan Am Flight 103 Disaster."

The chairman of the committee, Cong. Robert Wise (D-W.Va.), began the hearing by lamenting the fact that the DEA and the Department of Justice had not made any of their field agents who were most knowledgeable about Flight 103 available to testify; that they had not provided requested written information, including the results of the DEA's investigation into the air disaster; and that "the FBI to this date has been totally uncooperative."

The two DEA officials who did testify admitted that the agency had, in fact, run "controlled drug deliveries" through Frankfurt airport with the cooperation of German authorities, using U.S. airlines, but insisted that no such operation had been conducted in December 1988. (The drug agency had said nothing of its sting operation to the President's Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism which had held hearings in the first months of 1990 in response to the Flight 103 bombing.)

The officials denied that the DEA had had any "association with Mr. Jaafar in any way, shape, or form." However, to questions concerning Jaafar's background, family, and his frequent trips to Lebanon, they asked to respond only in closed session. They made the same request in response to several other questions.³²

NBC News had reported on October 30 that the DEA had told law enforcement officers in Detroit not to talk to the media about Jaafar. The hearing ended after but one day, even though Wise had promised a "full-scale" investigation and indicated during the hearing that there would be more to come. What was said in the closed sessions remains closed.³³

One of the DEA officials who testified, Stephen Greene, himself had a reservation on Flight 103, but he canceled because of one or more of the several international warnings that had preceded the fateful day. He has described standing on the Heathrow tarmac, watching the doomed plane take off.³⁴

There have been many reports of heroin being found in the field around the crash, from "traces" to "a substantial quantity" found in a suitcase.³⁵ Two days after the NBC report, however, the *New York Times* quoted a "federal official" saying that "no hard drugs were aboard the aircraft."³⁶

The Film

In 1994, American filmmaker Allan Francovich completed a documentary, "The Maltese Double Cross," which presents Jaafar as an unwitting bomb carrier with ties to the DEA and the CIA. Showings of the film in Britain were canceled under threat of lawsuits, burglarized venues or arson attacks. When Channel 4 agreed to show the film, the Scottish Crown Office and the U.S. Embassy in London sent press packs to

the media, labeling the film "blatant propaganda" and attacking some of the film's interviewees, including Juval Aviv, the head of Interfor.³⁷

Aviv paid a price for his report and his outspokenness. Over a period of time, his New York office suffered a series of break-ins, the FBI visited his clients, his polygrapher was harassed, as mentioned above, and a contrived commercial fraud charge was brought against him. Even though Aviv eventually was cleared in court, it was a long, expensive, and painful ordeal.³⁸ Francovich also stated that he had learned that five CIA operatives had been sent to London and Cyprus to discredit the film while it was being made, that his office phones were tapped, that staff cars were sabotaged, and that one of his researchers narrowly escaped an attempt to force his vehicle into the path of an oncoming truck.⁴⁰

Government officials examining the Lockerbie bombing went so far as to ask the FBI to investigate the film. The Bureau later issued a highly derogatory opinion of it.⁴¹ The film's detractors made much of the fact that the film was initially funded jointly by a U.K. company (two-thirds) and a Libyan government investment arm (one third). Francovich said that he was fully aware of this and had taken pains to negotiate a guarantee of independence from any interference. On April 17, 1997, Allan Francovich suddenly died of a heart attack at age 56, upon arrival at Houston Airport.⁴¹ His film has had virtually no showings in the United States.

Abu Talb

The DEA sting operation and Interfor's baggage-handler hypothesis both predicate the bomb suitcase being placed aboard the plane in Frankfurt without going through the normal security checks. In either case, it eliminates the need for the questionable triple-unaccompanied baggage scenario. With either scenario the clothing could still have been purchased in Malta, but in any event we don't need the Libyans for that.

Mohammed Abu Talb fits that and perhaps other pieces of the puzzle. The Palestinian had close ties to PFLP-GC cells in Germany which were making Toshiba radio-cassette bombs similar, if

not identical, to what was used to bring down 103. In October 1988, two months before Lockerbie, the German police raided these cells, finding several such bombs. In May 1989, Talb was arrested in Sweden, where he lived, and was later convicted of taking part in several bombings of the offices of American airline companies in Scandinavia. In his Swedish flat, police found large quantities of clothing made in Malta.

"YOUR GOVERNMENT AND OUR GOVERNMENT KNOW EXACTLY WHAT HAPPENED AT LOCKERBIE. BUT THEY ARE NOT GOING TO TELL YOU."

Police investigation of Talb disclosed that during October 1988 he had been to Cyprus and Malta, at least once in the company of Hafez Dalkamoni, the leader of the German PFLP-GC, who was arrested in the raid. The men met with PFLP-GC members who lived in Malta. Talb was also in Malta on November 23, which was originally reported as the date of the clothing purchase before the indictment of the Libyans, as mentioned earlier. After his arrest, Talb told investigators that between October and December 1988 he had retrieved and passed to another person a bomb that had been hidden in a building used by the PFLP-GC in Germany. Officials declined to identify the person to whom Talb said he had passed the bomb. A month later, however, he recanted his confession. Talb was reported to possess a brown Samsonite suitcase and have circled December 21 in a diary seized in his Swedish flat. After the raid upon his flat, his wife was heard to telephone Palestinian friends and say: "Get rid of the clothes."

In December 1989, Scottish police, in papers filed with Swedish legal officials, made Talb the only publicly identified suspect "in the murder or participation in the murder of 270 people"; the Palestinian subsequently became another of the several individuals to be identified by the Maltese shopkeeper from a photo as the clothing purchaser.⁴² Since that time, the world has scarcely heard of Abu Talb, who was sentenced to life in prison in Sweden, but never charged with any

thing to do with Lockerbie.

In Allan Francovich's film, members of Khalid Jaatar's family — which long had ties to the drug trade in Lebanon's notorious Bekaa Valley — are interviewed. In either halting English or translated Arabic, or paraphrased by the film's narrator, they drop many bits of information, but which are difficult to put together into a coherent whole. Amongst the bits ... Khalid had told his parents that he'd met Talb in Sweden and had been given Maltese clothing ... someone had given Khalid a tape recorder, or put one into his bag ... he was told to go to Germany to friends of PFLP-GC leader Ahmed Jabril who would help him earn some money ... he arrived in Germany with two kilos of

heroin ... "He didn't know it was a bomb. They gave him the drugs to take to Germany. He didn't know. Who wants to die?" ...

It cannot be stated with certainty what happened at Frankfurt airport on that fateful day, if, as seems most likely, that is the place where the bomb was placed into the system. Jaafar, as a DEA courier, could have arrived with his suitcase of heroin and bomb and was escorted through security by the proper authorities, or this was a day he was a courier for Manzer al-Kassar, and the baggage handlers did their usual switch.

Or perhaps we'll never know for sure what happened. On February 16, 1990, a group of British relatives of Lockerbie victims went to the American Embassy in London for a meeting with members of the President's Commission on Aviation Security and Terrorism. After the meeting, Britisher Martin Cadman was chatting with two of the commission members. He later reported what one of them had said to him: "Your government and our government know exactly what happened at Lockerbie. But they are not going to tell you."⁴³

Comments about The Hague Court Verdict

"The judges nearly agreed with the defense. In their verdict, they tossed out much of the prosecution witnesses' evidence as false or questionable

and said the prosecution had failed to prove crucial elements, including the route that the bomb suitcase took.” — *New York Times* analysis.⁴⁴

“It sure does look like they bent over backwards to find a way to convict, and you have to assume the political context of the case influenced them.” — Michael Scharf, professor, New England School of Law.⁴⁵ “I thought this was a very, very weak circumstantial case. I am absolutely astounded, astonished. I was extremely reluctant to believe that any Scottish judge would convict anyone, even a Libyan, on the basis of such evidence.” — Robert Black, Scottish law professor who was the architect of the Hague trial.⁴⁶

“A general pattern of the trial consisted in the fact that virtually all people presented by the prosecution as key witnesses were proven to lack credibility to a very high extent, in certain cases even having openly lied to the court.” “While the first accused was found ‘guilty,’ the second accused was found ‘not guilty.’ ... This is totally incomprehensible for any rational observer when one considers that the indictment in its very essence was based on the joint action of the two accused in Malta.”

“As to the undersigned’s knowledge, there is not a single piece of material evidence linking the two accused to the crime. In such a context, the guilty verdict in regard to the first accused appears to be arbitrary, even irrational. ... This leads the undersigned to the suspicion that political considerations may have been overriding a strictly judicial evaluation of the case ... Regrettably, through the conduct of the Court, disservice has been done to the important cause of international criminal justice.” — Hans Koechler, appointed as an international observer of the Lockerbie Trial by U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan.⁴⁷

So, let’s hope that Abdelbaset Ali Mohamed al Megrahi is really guilty. It would be a terrible shame if he spends the rest of his life in prison because back in 1990 Washington’s hegemonic plans for the Middle East needed a convenient enemy, which just happened to be his country.



William Blum is the author of Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II, Rogue State: A Guide to the World’s Only Superpower, and West-Bloc Dissident: A Cold War Memoir. www.killinghope.org

FURTHER READING

For further discussion of the 103 case, see the author’s article, “PanAm 103 & The Charge Against Libya: Case Closed or More Disinformation?” in the Winter 1999 issue, #66, of *CovertAction Quarterly*.

NOTES

1. *Washington Post*, Dec. 20, 2003. The two quotes are in two separate articles.
2. *Washington Post*, Dec. 21, 2003.
3. *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 17, 2003.
4. Channel NewsAsia (Asian TV News channel headquartered in Singapore), Feb. 25, 2004.
5. *Ibid*.
6. *Guardian* (London), Feb. 25, 2004; *Washington Post*, Feb. 25–27, 2004; for this and preceding paragraphs on the State Department-Libya exchange.
7. “Opinion of the Court,” Paragraph 39.
8. Mark Perry, *Eclipse: The Last Days of the CIA* (New York: Wm. Morrow, 1992), pp. 342–47.
9. “Opinion of the Court,” Par. 55.
10. “Opinion of the Court,” Par. 68.
11. See, e.g., *Sunday Times* (London), Nov. 12, 1989, p. 3.
12. For a detailed discussion of this issue, see *A Special Report from Private Eye: Lockerbie the Flight from Justice*, May/June 2001, pp. 20–22; *Private Eye* is a magazine published in London.
13. *Sunday Times* (London), Dec. 17, 1989, p. 14. Malta is, in fact, a major manufacturer of clothing sold throughout the world.
14. “Opinion of the Court,” Par. 89.
15. *Ibid*.
16. *Guardian* (London), June 19, 2001.
17. *New York Times*, Nov. 15, 1991.
18. *Los Angeles Times*, Nov. 15, 1991.
19. *New York Times*, April 13, 1989, p. 9; David Johnston, *Lockerbie: The Tragedy of Flight 103* (New York: 1989), pp. 157, 161–62.
20. *Washington Post*, May 11, 1989, p. 1.
21. *New York Times*, Dec. 16, 1989, p. 3.
22. Department of the Air Force — Air Intelligence

Agency intelligence summary report, March 4, 1991, released under an FOIA request made by lawyers for PanAm. Reports of the intercept appeared in the press long before the above document was released; see, e.g., *New York Times*, Sept. 27, 1989, p. 11, Oct. 31, 1989, p. 8; *Sunday Times*, Oct. 29, 1989, p. 4. But it wasn’t until Jan. 1995 that the exact text became widely publicized and caused a storm in the U.K., although ignored in the U.S.

23. *The Times* (London), Sept. 20, 1989, p. 1.
24. *New York Times*, Nov. 21, 1991, p. 14. It should be borne in mind, however, that Israel may have been influenced because of its hostility toward the PFLP-GC.
25. Reuters dispatch, datelined Tunis, Feb. 26, 1992.
26. *Guardian*, Feb. 24, 1995, p. 7.
27. Margaret Thatcher, *The Downing Street Years* (New York: 1993), pp. 448–49.
28. *National Law Journal* (New York), Sept. 25, 1995, p. A11, from papers filed in a New York court case.
29. *Barron’s* (New York), Dec. 17, 1990, pp. 19 and 22. A copy of the Interfor Report is in the author’s possession, but he has been unable to locate a complete copy of it on the Internet.
30. *Barron’s*, p. 18. *op. cit*.
31. *Times* (London), Nov. 1, 1990, p. 3; *Washington Times*, Oct. 31, 1990, p. 3.
32. Government Information, Justice, and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Dec. 18, 1990, *passim*.
33. *Ibid*.
34. The film, “The Maltese Double Cross” (see below).
35. *Sunday Times* (London), April 16, 1989 (traces); Johnston, *op. cit.*, p. 79 (substantial). “The Maltese Double Cross” film mentions other reports of drugs found, by a Scottish policeman and a mountain rescue man.
36. *New York Times*, Nov. 1, 1990.
37. *Financial Times* (London), May 12, 1995, p. 8 and article by John Ashton, leading Flight 103 investigator, in *The Mail on Sunday* (London), June 9, 1996.
38. Ashton, *op. cit.*; *Wall Street Journal*, Dec. 18, 1995, p. 1, and Dec. 18, 1996, p. B2.
39. *Guardian* (London), April 23, 1994, p. 5.
40. *Sunday Times* (London), May 7, 1995.
41. Francovich’s former wife told the author that he had not had any symptoms of a heart problem before.
42. Re: Abu Talb, all 1989: *New York Times*, Oct. 31, p. 1, Dec. 1, p. 12, Dec. 24, p. 1; *Sunday Times* (London), Nov. 12, p. 3, Dec. 5; *The Times* (London), Dec. 21, p. 5. Also Associated Press, July 11, 2000.
43. Cadman in “The Maltese Double Cross.” Also see *Guardian*, July 29, 1995, p. 27.
44. *New York Times*, Feb. 2, 2001.
45. *Ibid*.
46. *Electronic Telegraph UK News*, Feb. 4, 2001.
47. All quotations are from Koechler’s report of Feb. 3, 2001, easily found on the Internet.

Access of Evil: Genocide in Chiapas

John Steinbach
Philip Wheaton
Milton Shapiro

"The high season for the eviction of campesinos has begun." Thus began a January 25, 2004, report by investigative reporter Hermann Bellinghausen, writing for the progressive Mexican newspaper *La Jornada*.¹ The Mexican Government, serving the interests of transnational corporations representing financial, pharmaceutical, oil, agriculture and mining interests and in close collaboration with the U.S. government, is intent on crushing the Indigenous rebellion in Chiapas, Mexico, especially Montes Azules in and near the Lacandon Rainforest (Selva Lacandona). Forced expulsions of Indigenous communities have been carried out for many years. Despite the highly visible Zapatista-led Indigenous rebellion centered in Chiapas and the election of Vicente Fox on a platform of reform promises, expulsions and deadly repression continue. According to Centro de Investigaciones Económicas y Políticas de Acción Comunitaria (CIEPAC), as of 1998 the number of displaced campesinos in Chiapas totaled 21,159² and, as Bellinghausen points out, these expulsions continue. Forced expulsion of Indigenous communities like those being perpetrated in Montes Azules is considered Genocide under International Law and Mexico is a signatory to the International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, which expressly prohibits such acts.

Bellinghausen's article reported that about 500 Indigenous people have been violently evicted from their homes in the municipalities of Trinitaria, Suchiate and Montes Azules in Chiapas.³ At least 23 homes have been torched; over 500 residents, including 160 families, have been expelled from their communities; over 20 have been wounded and 60 taken pris-



The Zapatista refugees returning to their homes in the Zinacantan area of the Highlands of Chiapas on Sunday, April 25, 2004, after they had fled in fear of their lives on April 10th, following the armed attack on the Zapatista demonstration near Zinacantan.

oner. According to Bellinghausen, the Secretary of Government in Chiapas, Ruben Velazquez Lopez, the architect of the current expulsions, declared that "this government will allow no more invasions." "Invasion" is the Mexican government's term for the Indigenous occupation of approximately 28 communities living in Montes Azules.

The Indigenous Communities of Montes Azules

The successful Zapatista rebellion in

1994 and the subsequent negotiation and signing of the San Andres Accords seemed to represent the realization of hopes and dreams of the Indigenous Peoples of Mexico for true reform and autonomy. Since then, the gutting of the Accords by Congress, ratified by the Mexican Supreme Court, and more than ten years of "low-intensity" warfare in the region have had a chilling effect on the Indigenous communities of Southern Mexico and Chiapas. Despite these setbacks, the autonomous communities

Edinburgh-Chiapas Solidarity Group <http://www.edinchiapas.org.uk>

continue to resist.

Montes Azules is an area of immense potential wealth and strategic importance. It is one of the richest regions in the world in biodiversity, containing important mineral resources, oil deposits and Mexico's most important source of fresh water, and thus immense untapped potential for hydroelectric energy. The jungle habitat of the Lacandon Rainforest, where Montes Azules is located, has provided life and protection for Indigenous peoples for hundreds of years. Since the 1940s, the great majority of these have been Choles, Tzotziles, Tzeltales and Tojolabales, whose ancestral knowledge on the careful use of this biodiversity has protected this natural treasure. But since the 1970s, stepped-up logging by state-owned companies and exploitation of sub-surface riches by multinational corporations have led to the forced expulsion of the Indigenous and the plundering of these resources.⁴

The Mexican government argues that the great majority of the autonomous communities living in the Montes Azules Biosphere Reserve today — roughly half of which are Zapatista-affiliated⁵ — are not native to the Selva Lacandona but are “invaders” who have displaced the true natives, called Lacandones or Caribes. The historical facts are that the original Lacandones were eradicated 300 years ago by the Spanish while the current Caribes originated from eastern Campeche and migrated to the Lacandon jungle over the last two centuries.⁶ However, by 1978, out of a population of 12,000 Indigenous inhabitants, there was a huge disparity between the anti-government Indigenous and the Caribes: on the one hand, 62% Tzeltales and 32% Choles against only 6% of a nucleus of 66 “Lacandon” (Caribes) families.⁷

In order to get at the enormous wealth of the sub-soil resources, the huge forests first had to be cleared, roads built and police and military barracks erected. That is why, in 1974, the federal government created COFOLASA, a state-owned logging company that signed “contracts” — i.e., worked out deals —

with the Caribes for “the exploitation of 35,000 cubic meters of hardwoods annually, in exchange for payments of 5,000 pesos (about \$500) annually to each of the 66 families.”⁸ As is always the case in every country where governments are trying to take over Indian lands, they go after a small group or tribe and make their deals with them, excluding the great majority. Thus while “400 Caribes were awarded 614,321 hectares, 47 other Indigenous communities, including Tzeltales, Tzotziles, Choles and Tojolabales, with over 400 families (over 30,000 people) were left without any legal claim to their lands.”⁹ Such an enormous grant of

extracting the jungle's subsoil riches. In August 2001, when the EZLN announced they would not permit the dislocations of any more Indigenous communities from the Lacandon, the government quickly changed its tactics and put the Secretary of Agrarian Reform in charge of resolving the crisis. The Agrarian Reform Secretary gave the communities two choices — either initiate lawsuits in federal court against him (which would have been financially impossible for the poor Indigenous) or allow him to mediate the land disputes¹² between the (majority) Zapatista Indigenous communities and the (minority) Caribes, thus pitting one set of victims against another.

But the Zapatistas stood firm, claiming they have the right to live in the jungle in order to protect the Lacandon rainforest and to defend all Indigenous communities from being expelled. After 30 years of logging, cattle ranching and oil drilling, “the Selva Lacandona has suffered massive environmental destruction with more than 400,000 hectares leveled.”¹³

The current expulsions are facilitated by an effort to “generate confrontations between Zapatista communities or even the EZLN with the Caribes or Lacandones ... a new tactic in the old Trojan Horse strategy...”¹⁴ This strategy has three basic goals: the displacement of autonomous Indigenous communities of Montes Azules; the acquisition of natural resources and implementation of eco-tourism projects; and the “political and military debilitation of the EZLN and the dismantling of the Zapatista autonomous municipalities.”¹⁵ A recent example of such a confrontation is the April 24, 2004,¹⁶ conflict between the municipality of Zinacantan controlled by the nominally leftist Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD) and the Zapatista community of Los Altos. Corrupt officials of Zinacantan cut off water supplies to Los Altos, and when negotiations between the Zapatistas and the PRD failed, approximately 4,000 Zapatistas and supporters transported 45,000 liters of water to the besieged community. The Zinacantan

MONTES AZULES IS AN AREA OF IMMENSE POTENTIAL WEALTH AND STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE. IT IS ONE OF THE RICHEST REGIONS IN THE WORLD IN BIODIVERSITY, CONTAINING IMPORTANT MINERAL RESOURCES, OIL DEPOSITS AND MEXICO'S MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF FRESH WATER, AND THUS IMMENSE UNTAPPED POTENTIAL FOR HYDROELECTRIC ENERGY.

land to such a few Indians has never happened before in the history of Latin America. What this means is that the Mexican government selected a very small group who would serve as “government Indians” because of their willingness to collaborate with the logging company and foreign corporations. Falsely accusing the majority of the Indigenous communities as being the ones ruining the Selva Lacandona, “covers up the ones truly guilty of destroying 70% of the [jungle] over the last 40 years: private and para-state forest companies...”¹⁰

The amount of investment in the Lacandon exploitation during the 1980s reveals the escalating interest in the region. “Funds for the Selva Lacandona went from 21 million pesos in 1985, to more than 2 billion in 1988, to 35 billion in 1990,”¹¹ as the powers came closer to

authorities blocked the road with "cars and with rocks and logs" and attacked the Zapatistas with guns, rocks and machetes, injuring 35. One hundred nine families comprising approximately 500 persons were expelled from Los Altos and only recently returned under EZLN escort.

Plan Puebla Panama (PPP)

The current expulsions should also be understood in the context of Plan Puebla Panama (PPP), which *Corporation Watch* describes as "a development scheme that would turn all of southern Mexico and all of Central America into a corporate extraction paradise."¹⁷ Under the guise of creating new jobs and economic development, the central component of the PPP is development of an \$8 billion transportation infrastructure, including shipping ports, airports, pipelines, railroad tracks and highways, to facilitate the transportation of goods and extraction of raw materials between the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean and from southern Mexico to the entire continent. The plan envisions moving *maquiladoras* from the U.S. border to south Mexico, which has few environmental or occupational safety regulations and, largely due to NAFTA, a huge unemployed labor pool. The system of communal lands or *ejidos* is being privatized systematically for corporate exploitation, displacing tens of thousands of largely indigenous campesinos. Plans are already under way to construct a regional system of hydroelectric dams to provide energy for PPP, which will result in even more displacement.¹⁸ Sophie Style, writing in *Ecologist Magazine* notes, "As more and more [campesinos] abandon their land, and with it many of their traditions, the options are clear. Rather than migrating to the U.S., they can now become exploited salaried workers in Maquiladoras, or in the oil or agriculture industries, at the same time opening the way to corporations appropriating their land and the valuable resources in it." She continues: "If the indigenous populations refuse to leave their lands or give up control of these resources, military repression

may follow."¹⁹

Southern Mexico, especially Chiapas, contains great wealth of natural resources, especially water, oil, lumber, land and biodiversity riches. It is no accident that Montes Azules, in the name of environmental conservation, is the most heavily militarized state in Mexico with army, state and local police, and paramilitary death squads operating with impunity. In defense of the land, Zapatista and other Indigenous communities in the region stand defiantly in the path of the PPP juggernaut. The Fox administration, in collaboration with the U.S. government and corporate controlled "environmental" groups such as Conservation International (CI), is cynically attempting to portray the Indigenous resistance to PPP as environmental terrorism. According to *Corporation Watch*, "It is clear that although Fox cannot annihilate the Zapatistas militarily, his administration can successfully portray them as the environmental criminals deserving retribution."²⁰ The logic of the PPP process is simple and inexorable: drive the Indigenous communities off the land, privatize it, pilage it for corporate profit and exploit the

are occurring), but in reality the group serves as little more than a "front group" for transnational corporate exploitation.²¹ Around the world, Chiapas, Palawan (Philippines), Colombia, West Papua, Aceh (Indonesia), Madagascar and Papua New Guinea to name a few, have been targeted as biodiversity hotspots.

Conservation International focuses particularly on tropical and sub-tropical rainforests for "protection" against the traditional agricultural practices of the Indigenous inhabitants while ignoring the rapacious behavior of its multinational corporate patrons. For example, in August 2003, the Energy and Biodiversity Initiative, a CI creation, released a report entitled "Energy & Diversity: Integrating Biodiversity Conservation into Oil & Gas Development." With over 1,000 groups active in over 30 countries and hundreds of millions in assets and spending, CI is perhaps the world's largest and wealthiest "environmental" group. With an emphasis on "market solutions" and "privatization," and an incestuous relationship with some of the worst corporate environmental outlaws, CI (and its corporate controlled cousins like The Nature Conservancy, the World Wildlife Fund, and The World Conservation Union) is a Trojan Horse for the multinationals within the environmental movement.²²

In coordination with USAID, using satellite imagery and overflights, CI has been helping to identify and target certain Indigenous communities to the Mexican government for expulsion.²³ Using advanced satellite imagery and fixed-wing high-resolution digital photographs provided by the Agency for International Development, CI turned over to the "Lacandon" and the Mexican government photos of the Selva Lacandona showing the precise locations of the autonomous communities. The "Lacandon" with CI then demanded that the army expel all the "settlements and clearings in Montes Azules."²⁴ Ignacio Marsh, the CI Director for Chiapas admitted to "pressuring the [Mexican] government to stop the invasions or evict them," and that the autonomous Indigenous communities are "ignorant peoples whom [sic] are tricked and whom [sic] are sent."

IT IS NO ACCIDENT THAT MONTES AZULES, IN THE NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSERVATION, IS THE MOST HEAVILY MILITARIZED STATE IN MEXICO WITH ARMY, STATE AND LOCAL POLICE, AND PARAMILITARY DEATH SQUADS OPERATING WITH IMPUNITY.

plight of starving, hopeless refugees. The continuous "low-level" warfare in Southern Mexico, including the recent expulsions, is crucial to implementation of PPP.

Conservation International

Special scrutiny must be given to Conservation International's role in the expulsions. Founded in 1987 by transnational corporate executives representing Intel, McDonalds, BP, The Gap, Starbucks and others, CI's stated mission is to protect "biodiversity hotspots" (like the Selva Lacandona where many of the expulsions

"He [Marsh] doesn't consider them as being knowledgeable enough to manage the areas."²⁵

CI is also practicing "coercive" population control in Chiapas. According to Hermann Bellinghausen, "[CI], in their Maya Selva project has a population and environmental program, whose objective is to contain the 'overpopulation problem.' ... CI is holding reproductive health and gender workshops with women in the Selva. It has been testing various contraception methods 'in order to see which works best,' according to officials. [Injections of Depo Provera, a powerful synthetic hormone, and related Norplant, both having serious and sometimes permanent side-effects, and forced sterilization are long-favored coercive birth control techniques directed against native women and other women of color.]²⁶ 'Lacandon' women are excluded because 'there are very few of them left.' The objective is "eventually, the sterilization of indigenous women."²⁷ Betsy Hartmann, director of the Population and Development Program at Hampshire College, writes, "Increasingly, international conservation agencies like CI are embarking on what are called 'joint population-environment projects' which involve collaborations between family planning and conservation NGOs.... the main priority of many such projects is to reduce population growth through increased uptake of contraception. Ideologically, the projects also reinforce the message that it is population growth and the practices of the local people themselves that cause environmental degradation."²⁸

La Jornada has reported, "CI has been one of the principal pressures on the government for the 'relocation' of the communities within the Montes Azules [Chiapas] reserve." In March 2003 CI said, "... tolerance of invading groups of supposed Zapatistas increase the risks of communal conflict and accelerate the devastation of the last 500,000 hectares of the Lacandon Jungle's protected areas in Chiapas." But GATT Watchdog activist Aziz Choudry counters, "In the name of environmental protection, Conservation International is pitting Indigenous communities against each other, raising fears of conflict in the area."²⁹ Instead of recognizing stewardship of the Selva Lacandona by the Indigenous population as called for by the San Andres accords,



This photo shows a part of the convoy of hundreds of Mexican and international supporters who accompanied the returning Zapatistas.

Edinburgh-Chiapas Solidarity Group <http://www.edinchiapas.org.uk>

CI demands their expulsion, while simultaneously planning "eco-tourist" hotels there. CI's self-serving arguments notwithstanding, far from being the principal threat to the Lacandon ecosystem, the Indigenous communities of the region, who have vowed to resist neoliberalism, are the major obstacles standing in the path of massive corporate exploitation and environmental destruction.

Biopiracy – The New "Green Gold"

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of Conservation International's behavior is its promotion of bioprospecting as a means of preserving biodiversity. CI is "well known for its collaboration with pharmaceuticals in some of the most biodiverse countries in the world, in search of medicinal plant remedies some of which are later patented."³⁰ Biotech corporations have a much higher probability of finding pharmaceutically active organisms in these regions by exploiting traditional Indigenous knowledge than through random screening. CI's bioprospecting becomes biopiracy when its corporate backers offer the modern version of beads and trinkets to Indigenous communities in exchange for their traditional knowledge and wisdom. "Exploitative and unethical 'benefit sharing' agreements are drawn up, with a few

market-based community economic development programmes for the locals on the side: some ecotourism here, some fair trade coffee production there."³¹ These traditional remedies are then patented under intellectual "property" laws, reaping obscene profits for the pharmaceuticals and corporate largess for CI.

Chiapas, because of its immense biological diversity (Chiapas is located in a transitional zone linking tropical and temperate ecosystems with great local climatic variability), is increasingly a target of these biopirates. According to Global Exchange, "Mexico [especially Chiapas] is in the crosshairs of pharmaceutical and biotechnological corporations looking to harvest the 'green gold' of the region, and to tap into the indigenous knowledge that accompanies it."³² Grupo Pulsar, a huge biotechnology corporation intimately involved with CI and heavily into transgenic seeds, has several biological research stations located in the Selva Lacandona. Maya-ICBG, a U.S. government-funded corporate-controlled bioprospecting project, has been suspended due to strong resistance. Indigenous communities and traditional healers are fighting back. The Chiapas Council of Traditional Indigenous Midwives and Healers (COMPITCH), a

coalition of 12 traditional medicine organizations, has denounced such practices as biopiracy and is calling for an active moratorium.³³

Conservation International and the World Bank are promoting the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor [MBC], which would link protected biodiversity hotspots from Panama to Chiapas. "Investors [in the project] plan to create gene banks and create an inventory of active chemical compositions of each naturally occurring substance."³⁴ Critics see this project as a biological counterpart to PPP. Bill Weinberg sees a disturbing symmetry between PPP and MBC: "This symmetry raises the vision of these tropical forests surviving only as corporate administered genetic colonies in the midst of devastated zones of industrial sprawl."³⁵

The Role of the U.S.

Like an orchestra conductor, behind all the repression and disinformation directed at the Indigenous rebellion in southern Mexico, working to protect corporate "investments" in southern Mexico is the not so invisible hand of the U.S. Since 1836 there have been 11 U.S. military interventions into Mexico. When neo-liberal "structural adjustment" policies were implemented in the early 1980s, intervention took the form of "security assistance," between 1982 and 1990 more than \$500 million worth.³⁶ *La Jornada* reports that from 1988 to 1994 the Mexican government received over 7,000 armored Humvees, 78 helicopters, 78 planes, 1,615 machine guns, 360,000 grenades, 1,500 other military vehicles and vast quantities of other military field equipment.³⁷ Military assistance expanded under George Bush (#1) and intensified during the Clinton administration, especially after the Zapatista rebellion in 1994 and the collapse of the peso in 1995. According to the *San Francisco Chronicle* on February 14, 1994, following the Zapatista uprising, "there were conversations between officials of the Mexican and U.S. governments at the U.S. Embassy in Mexico City about the

need for development of counterinsurgency strategies."³⁸ In 1994, "Clinton hurriedly issued export licenses for \$64 million of additional military equipment," including four satellite-guided UH-60 Blackhawk helicopters, 23 tanks and 300 tons of additional equipment.³⁹ In 1996,

Chiapas, and secret files released under the Freedom of Information Act "disclosed that Mexico has been receiving support from military advisers from the U.S., Guatemala, Argentina and Israel."⁴¹

From 1984 to 1992, the U.S. trained at least 512 Mexican military students at the School of the Americas [SOA] and elsewhere, and approximately 500 at SOA in 1995 and 1996. "Many of these graduates are leading the counterinsurgency operations against the Indigenous in Oaxaca, Chiapas and other southern Mexican states."⁴² All of this is happening in addition to the support given Conservation International and Mexican "environmental" and "civic organizations" working to infiltrate and subvert the autonomous Indigenous communities.

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL AND THE WORLD BANK ARE PROMOTING THE MESOAMERICAN BIOLOGICAL CORRIDOR [MBC], WHICH WOULD LINK PROTECTED BIODIVERSITY HOTSPOTS FROM PANAMA TO CHIAPAS. "INVESTORS [IN THE PROJECT] PLAN TO CREATE GENE BANKS AND CREATE AN INVENTORY OF ACTIVE CHEMICAL COMPOSITIONS OF EACH NATURALLY OCCURRING SUBSTANCE." CRITICS SEE THIS PROJECT AS A BIOLOGICAL COUNTERPART TO PPP.

Conclusions

The Mexican government's brutal assault on the Indigenous autonomous communities of Montes Azules is an attempt to drive a wedge between the Zapatistas and the other Indigenous in the area, part

Mexico received an additional \$50 million in military equipment including over 100 additional UH-60 helicopters, 500 more armored personnel carriers (added to the Mexican fleet of over 7,000 APCs), and other sophisticated electronic equipment.

U.S. destabilization efforts were not limited to "security assistance." In early 1995, acting in response to the collapse of the Mexican peso and calls by Chase Manhattan Bank for the "elimination" of the Zapatistas, Clinton orchestrated a \$50 billion bailout of the Mexican economy. All this was followed immediately by a major U.S.-directed military offensive against all Zapatista communities designed to "contain [encircle] the Zapatistas militarily," while a "weakened and divided" Zapatista leadership would be forced to negotiate on the government's terms.⁴⁰ The U.S. has shared satellite and aerial photos of the region, and electronic intercept data. There have been reports of U.S. military advisers in

of a broader campaign to pave the way for PPP, Central America Free Trade Agreement [CAFTA], Free Trade of the Americas Agreement [FTAA] and other similar neo-liberal exploitation schemes. Much to the chagrin of the Chiapas state government, for the time being the focus of the expulsions seems to be on the non-Zapatista communities. The architect of the current expulsions, Ruben Velazquez Lopez, laments, "The invasions located in the Zapatista zone, where not even the federal government has managed to return the lands invaded in 1994 to their legitimate owners, are receiving a different treatment [not being expelled]."⁴³ The Zapatista autonomous communities and the EZLN have publicly opposed all expulsions, including the non-Zapatistas. According to the Committee of Indigenous Solidarity [CIS-DC Area Zapatistas], "Fox may be trying to provoke armed resistance by the Zapatistas in order to justify a crack-

down." On the other hand the Zapatistas face a desperate quandary: If the expulsions and attempts to provoke confrontations among the Indigenous communities continue, relatively unopposed, the Zapatista autonomous communities of Chiapas could soon face virtual isolation, leading to their elimination.

Autonomous peoples in Mexico and around the world continue to be threatened by the forces of international neoliberalism. For example, despite an appalling lack of international solidarity, the Punjab Tenants Organization, representing nearly a million Christian and Muslim Indigenous tenant workers threatened with expulsion by the Pakistani Army, are waging a heroic struggle against overwhelming odds.⁴⁴ While the media headlines focus on the anti-globalization protests in the streets of North America and Europe, the frontlines of the war are being fought in the jungles of Chiapas and elsewhere by the Indigenous peasants with nothing more to lose.

In Mexico, Zapatistas have continued their struggle against these forces with solid determination. So too must we continue our own struggle with that same commitment, not only to support the struggle of our Mexican compañeros and compañeras, but also to establish the Zapatista principles of dignity, justice, respect, inclusiveness, equality and collective decision making in our neighborhoods, organizations, workplaces, union halls, families, schools and churches.

At the Third National Indian Congress, representatives of more than 40 Indigenous groups released the following statement:

"For us, Indian Peoples, our Mother Earth is sacred, and so are all the beings, which inhabit her. They are not a commodity, which can be bought or sold. For this reason, we cannot accept the destruction of our territories through the imposition of mega-projects by the federal and state governments in our various regions throughout the country. We demand a moratorium on all projects that involve bioprospecting, mining, water mega-projects, and all biopiracy activities taking place in our lands and in our country,

until the Indian peoples have discussed in their own time the issues related to the control of their resources."⁴⁵



John Steinbach is a long-time grassroots activist from the Metro D.C. area, working in support of Native American sovereignty rights. Philip Wheaton is an Episcopal priest, Adviser and Board member of CovertAction Quarterly and a Central American and Caribbean historian. He has led six solidarity delegations to Chiapas since 1994.

Milton Shapiro is editor of the Mexican Information Service for Social Justice and has been on three solidarity delegations to Chiapas since 1994.

NOTES

1. Hermann Bellinghausen, "Chiapas Government to Continue Dislocations," *La Jornada*, Jan. 25, 2004. Translations by Irlandesa.
2. Gustavo Castro and Onécimo Hidaigo, *The Internally Displaced of the War in Chiapas*, Centro de Investigaciones Económicas y Políticas de Acción Comunitaria, CIEPAC, A.C., Aug. 28, 1999, www.ciepac.org/bulletins/ingles/lng168.html.
3. Bellinghausen, *op. cit.*
4. "Montes Azules: Special Report," Mexico Solidarity Network, July 21-27, 2003.
5. "The Case of Montes Azules," Global Exchange, Sept. 23, 2002.
6. *Ibid.*, Sub-section: "Myths and Realities."
7. Antonio Castillo, "Siege of Montes Azules: History of the Real Destruction of the Selva Lacandona," *La Jornada*, June 12, 2000.
8. "Montes Azules: Special Report," Mexico Solidarity Network, *op. cit.*
9. *Ibid.*
10. *La Jornada*, June 12, 2000, *op. cit.*
11. *Ibid.* (19th paragraph)
12. "Montes Azules: Special Report," *op. cit.*
13. *La Jornada*, June 12, 2000, *op. cit.*
14. José Merced Hernández Gómez, José Leopoldo Castro, B. Benedetta, Michael Chamberlin, Ernesto Ledesma Arronte, translated by Laura Raymond, "Conservation International: The Trojan Horse" [Center of Political Analysis and Social and Economic Research], June 2003, www.capise.org/eng/index.html.
15. Gomez, Castro, *et al.*
16. Zapatista Refugees Return to Zinacantan, British Indy Media, April 26, 2004, <http://www.indymedia.org.uk/en/regions/world/2004/04/290085.html>
17. Ryan Zinn, "The Lacandon Jungle's Last Stand Against Corporate Globalization," *Corporation Watch*, Sept. 26, 2002,

- www.corpwatch.org/issues/PID.jsp?articleid=4148
18. Sophie Style, "Down Mexico Way," *The Ecologist*, June 2001, www.chiapasnews.ukgateway.net/news/010528.html
 19. *Ibid.*
 20. Zinn, *op. cit.*
 21. Gomez, Castro, *et al.*
 22. Aziz Choudry, "Conservation International: privatizing nature, plundering biodiversity," *Seedling*, Oct. 2003, Genetic Resources Action International, GRAIN.
 23. Mexico Solidarity Network Collective.
 24. Hermann Bellinghausen, "They Want to Clear the Indigenous Out of Montes Azules," *La Jornada*, March 26, 2002, www.zmag.org/content/Chiapas/bellinghausen_march25-2002.cfm.
 25. Gomez, Castro, *et al.*
 26. Jay Heavner, "Broken Treaties, Empty Promises: An Introduction to Native American Women's Reproductive Health Issues," Native American Women's Health Education Resource Center, www.yvwi.usd.invnohi.net/articles/JHeavnerNAWReproductivelssues.htm.
 27. Bellinghausen, *op. cit.*
 28. Betsy Hartmann, "Conserving Racism: The Greening of Hate at Home and Abroad," Z-Net Daily Commentaries, Dec. 10, 2003, www.zmag.org/sustainers/content/2003-12/10hartmann.cfm.
 29. Choudry, *op. cit.*
 30. Style, *op. cit.*
 31. Choudry, *op. cit.*
 32. Global Exchange Collective, "Biopiracy: A New Threat to Indigenous and Culture in Mexico," Global Exchange, April 2001.
 33. *Ibid.*
 34. Choudry, *op. cit.*
 35. Bill Weinberg, "Biodiversity Inc.- Mexico Tries a New Tactic Against Chiapas Rebels: Conservation," *In These Times*, Aug. 21, 2003.
 36. Global Exchange Collective, *U.S. Militarization of Mexico*, www.globalexchange.org/countries/mexico/slope/section1.html.
 37. *Ibid.*
 38. "U.S. Considers Military Aid to Mexico In Revolt," *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb. 14, 1994, reported in S. Brian Willson, "The Slippery Slope: U.S. Military Moves Into Mexico" [Brianwillson.com, 1998], www.brianwillson.com/awolslippy.html.
 39. Global Exchange Collective, *op. cit.*
 40. *Op. cit.*
 41. *Op. cit.*
 42. *Op. cit.*
 43. Bellinghausen, *op. cit.*
 44. Tariq Ali, *The Clash of Fundamentalisms* (New York: Verso Press, 2002), pp. 266-70.
 45. Style, *op. cit.*

Acts of Evil: An Analysis of Hate Crime Report

Hussein Ibish



AP Photo/Pablo Martinez Monsivais

President George W. Bush escorts Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon, White House, April 14, 2004. Their hate mongering causes more hate crimes in the U.S.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Arab-American community has experienced a set of unprecedented challenges to its relationship with the broader American society and the government. Along with a rash of hate crimes and illegal discrimination, Arab-Americans have found themselves on the front lines of a host of derogations of civil liberties and new forms of discrimination in immigration policies and law enforcement. Perhaps most ominous of all, they are witnessing an intensifying spread of hatred and suspicion in popular culture and political discourse, with crude and overt anti-Arab and anti-Muslim sentiments increasingly spreading from the margins to the mainstream of American political culture.

Hate Crimes and Illegal Discrimination

The immediate weeks following the 9/11

attacks saw an extraordinary and alarming spike in hate crimes directed against Arab-Americans and Muslims, and those wrongly perceived to be Arab or Muslim. The American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC) documented over 700 instances of violent attacks against such persons in the first nine weeks following 9/11, ranging from vandalism and assault to several murders.¹ In many tragic instances, the violence was directed not against Arab or Muslim Americans, but against Sikh men, who traditionally wear beards and turbans.

The fact that Sikhs were a common target of some of the worst violence that was intended to have been directed against persons of Arab origin suggests a strong link between hate crimes and popular culture. No one with even a passing familiarity with the peoples of Asia would confuse a traditionally dressed Sikh man with a typical Middle

Eastern Arab, but those informed only by Hollywood stereotypes certainly might. The bearded, turbaned Islamic terrorists of countless films from the 1980s and '90s bear far more resemblance to Sikhs than to Arabs, and South Asian actors have frequently been cast as Arab terrorist villains in Hollywood films — actual Arabs perhaps not being sufficiently dark-skinned to convey the unsubtle message intended by producers.

According to ADC, after the ninth week following the 9/11 attacks, the rate of violence against Arab-Americans dropped dramatically, and settled into a pattern that has continued to the time of writing of this article.² It may or may not be coincidental that the decline in violence in effect coincided with the onset of hostilities directed against the Taliban government and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. At any rate, ADC found that the rate since then has been approximately 200 violent attacks per year, which is double the annual average during the years of the late 1990s. The rate seems to have remained stable at this level.

While ADC has not documented any additional increase in hate crimes directed against Arab-Americans in the past two years, the Council on American Islamic Relations (CAIR) did report a significant increase in anti-Muslim violence in 2003-04, mainly directed against mosques and Islamic centers around the country.³ It linked these attacks to tensions arising from the conflict in Iraq, and the intensification of hateful rhetoric in American popular culture.

ADC also reported a doubling of the incidence of confirmed reports of various forms of illegal discrimination, including employment and housing discrimination, during the past 2.5 years. Statistics from government agencies charged with documenting and combating such discrimination have reflected a similar trend in their various areas of concern, with the Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission (EEOC) creating a special category and prioritization for cases related to post-9/11 discrimination against Arab, Muslim and South Asian Americans.⁴

A new form of illegal discrimination emerged in the months following 9/11, as airline security randomly removed passengers from flights after boarding but before takeoff, at the insistence of nervous flight attendants, pilots or passengers. This discomfort was attributed only to the passenger's name or perceived ethnicity, since all passengers had, before boarding, successfully passed through at least three levels of security. In many cases, concern was based merely upon appearance and involved persons with origins in countries not only in the Middle East but also India, the Philippines and Guyana. The victims included an Arab-American member of Congress and a Secret Service agent. Following the filing of lawsuits against four major airlines by the American Civil Liberties Union on behalf of ADC and other groups, reports of such discrimination sharply declined, and the Department of Transportation's (DOT) own legal actions against airlines appears to have virtually eliminated the problem.⁵

The Assault on Civil Liberties

While government agencies such as the EEOC, DOT and the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department were both vigilant and effective in monitoring and combating hate crimes and illegal discrimination and prosecuting offenders, government leaders from President George W. Bush and many others were at pains to insist that collective blame against Arabs and/or Muslims was unacceptable, as the government reserved for itself the right to engage in wholesale discrimination. This most notably took the form of serious derogations of civil liberties, the most onerous of which have been aimed at the immigrant community among Arab and Muslim Americans.

A new set of government policies regarding immigration and immigration law enforcement amount to the reintroduction of systematic ethnic discrimina-

tion in American immigration policies for the first time in many decades. These policies include measures which discriminate against Arabs and Muslims with regard to alien registration, visa screening procedures, tracking foreign nationals already in the country, selectively deporting Middle Eastern so-called "absconders," and secretly detaining and deporting persons for minor visa violations often without due process.

In the weeks following the 9/11 attacks, the government arrested at least 5,000 Arab and Muslim men on technical immigration charges. As Professor David Cole of Georgetown University noted, "Many were arrested in secret, held with-

A NEW FORM OF ILLEGAL DISCRIMINATION EMERGED IN THE MONTHS FOLLOWING 9/11, AS AIRLINE SECURITY RANDOMLY REMOVED PASSENGERS FROM FLIGHTS AFTER BOARDING BUT BEFORE TAKEOFF, AT THE INSISTENCE OF NERVOUS FLIGHT ATTENDANTS, PILOTS OR PASSENGERS.

out charges, denied access to lawyers, presumed guilty until proven innocent, tried in secret, and kept locked up long after their cases were fully resolved." Cole points out, "Of the more than 5,000 foreign nationals subject to preventive detention, for example, none has been charged with being associated with al Qaeda or with complicity in the attacks of 9/11. Only three have been charged with any terrorist crime at all, and two of those three were acquitted of the terrorism charges at trial. The lone conviction is now under a cloud because the prosecution failed to disclose to the defense evidence that its principal witness lied on the stand"⁶

Among the most serious additional government legal actions directed against Arab and Muslim Americans post-9/11 have been abusive implementations of civil forfeiture and material witness powers employed to bypass normal protections of due process. The government has been using civil forfeiture pro-

cedures and other legal powers to freeze or seize the assets of Islamic charities, in most cases, without any criminal charges being filed and with no due process.⁷ This permits, in effect, the government to punish individuals and groups by freezing or seizing their assets without having to make a case against them in open court or present evidence of any kind, and amounts to an end run around due process provisions of the Constitution.

Similarly, the use of material witness detentions, which are meant to apply only in cases where an individual who has testimony vital to a prosecution is deemed in good faith to pose a serious flight risk, has been repeatedly used to jail members of the Arab and Muslim American communities without normal due process. The practice came under serious scrutiny following the notorious incarceration of a Muslim lawyer in Portland, Oregon, Brandon Mayfield, as a "material witness" for several weeks based on a false identification of a fingerprint on a plastic bag that seems to have been used by terrorists who conducted the 2004 Madrid train bombing. When it was revealed that Spanish

authorities had never agreed with the FBI's conclusion that the fingerprint belonged to Mayfield, and that his detention was impossible to justify and hard to explain without reference to his status as an American Muslim, the abusive nature of such arbitrary detentions became more widely recognized.⁸

Through such policies, the government has undermined its efforts to combat discrimination by individuals, groups and companies in the United States, and has given the public a dangerous mixed-message on discrimination. In effect, it has told Americans, "Do as I say, not as I do," by reserving to itself the right to discriminate against Arabs and Muslims. While government officials preach non-discrimination and agencies punish individuals and corporations known to have engaged in illegal discrimination, the logic of the attack on Arab-American and Muslim civil liberties is not lost on the American public. This logic can be summarized as, in effect: "Arabs and Muslims,

especially young Arab men, are by definition suspicious, potentially dangerous and of interest to the authorities." What message could be better calculated to promote fear and suspicion, and invite discrimination and violence based on these anxieties?

A Growing Culture of Hate

This prevailing climate of fear and suspicion has fueled a growing culture of hate against Arab-Americans, Muslims and Islam in the United States, which has been steadily creeping from the margins toward the mainstream of American popular culture. No aspect of anti-Arab defamation is new to the post-9/11 period, but its prevalence, intensity and proximity to centers of cultural and political power are unprecedented. The brutal reality is that such hatred is increasingly fostered by some elements of our government, our media, and other major national institutions. The inevitable consequences of such discourses of hatred can be felt not only in hate crimes and discrimination at home, but in crises abroad as well, for surely the soldiers and civilians accused of torturing and sexually humiliating Iraqi prisoners were reflecting, among other things, an irrational hatred against Arabs and Muslims.

Numerous government officials have made overtly hateful comments against Arabs and Muslims, including Gen. William G. Boykin, deputy undersecretary of defense for intelligence, who is in charge of the military intelligence officials accused of encouraging the abuse of Iraqi prisoners by guards to "soften them up" for interrogations. Boykin said of a Muslim Somali militia leader, "I knew my God was bigger than his. I knew that my God was a real God and his was an idol." Speaking in uniform before a Christian group in June 2003, Boykin claimed "radical Islamists" hate America "because we're a Christian nation, because our foundation and our roots are Judeo-Christian...and the enemy is a guy named Satan." Our "spiritual enemy," Boykin said, "will only be defeated if we come

against them in the name of Jesus."⁹

According to a 2002 column by Cal Thomas, Attorney General John Ashcroft told him that "Christianity is a faith in which God sends his son to die for you," while Islam is "a religion in which God requires you to send your son to die for him." Ashcroft later said that the reported remarks, "do not accurately reflect what I believe I said." But Thomas told the *New York Daily News*, "I wrote it down accurately and repeated it to make sure I had it right." Ashcroft never issued any further clarification.¹⁰

Several members of Congress have made anti-Arab or anti-Muslim remarks, but none has been censured by either the House or Senate. In one recent example, Rep. Peter King (R.-N.Y.) called American

NO ASPECT OF ANTI-ARAB DEFAMATION IS NEW TO THE POST-9/11 PERIOD, BUT ITS PREVALENCE, INTENSITY AND PROXIMITY TO CENTERS OF CULTURAL AND POLITICAL POWER ARE UNPRECEDENTED. THE BRUTAL REALITY IS THAT SUCH HATRED IS INCREASINGLY FOSTERED BY SOME ELEMENTS OF OUR GOVERNMENT, OUR MEDIA, AND OTHER MAJOR NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Muslims "an enemy living amongst us" and said that "no [American] Muslims are cooperating" with law enforcement officials to combat terrorism. He added: "I would say, you could say that 80-85 percent of mosques in this country are controlled by Islamic fundamentalists. Those who are in control. The average Muslim, no, they are loyal, but they don't work, they don't come forward, they don't tell the police [inaudible]."¹² Arab-baiting has also been used in attempts to tar Arab-American candidates as sympathizers with terrorism solely on the basis of their ethnicity, without producing much of an outcry.

Peter Kirsanow, one of President Bush's appointees to the United States

Commission on Civil Rights, has even gone so far as to raise the possibility of mass internment of Arab-Americans as a possible response to any further terrorist attacks on U.S. soil by persons of Arab ethnicity. Kirsanow raised the possibility of internment for camps for the mass detention of Arab-Americans at a Commission hearing in Detroit on July 19, 2002. He did not condemn this idea, but raised it as a serious and reasonable possibility in the event of future terrorist attacks against the United States. He also stated that if the perpetrators of any such attack "come from the same ethnic group that attacked the World Trade Center, you can forget about civil rights," and that "not too many people will be crying in their beer if there are more detentions, more stops, more profiling, there will be a groundswell of public opinion to banish civil rights."¹³

One of the most notable features of the increased climate of negativity facing Arab-Americans in the post 9/11 environment has been an increasingly vicious, sustained and coordinated attack by leaders of the evangelical Christian community. The Rev. Jerry Falwell told CBS's *60 Minutes* program that the Prophet Mohammed was a "terrorist." Rev. Pat Robertson of the *700 Club* said Mohammed was a "killer" and a "brigand." Leaders of the Southern Baptist Convention called Mohammed a "demon possessed pedophile."¹⁴

While this campaign of defamation has been criticized in many quarters, the evangelical preachers involved have by no means suffered significant social or political stigmas. The Rev. Robertson's organization was in receipt of many thousands of dollars in federal aid under the President's faith-based initiative programs. Rev. Graham was invited to give an Easter sermon at the Pentagon in 2003. None of these religious figures has been treated as a pariah as a result of their open bigotry, and all continue to be seen as legitimate public figures with an important contribution to the national conversation.

Elements of the mainstream media

have also increasingly included sentiments of overt bigotry. Right-wing talk radio, a major aspect of social and political discourse in the United States, has become a bastion of hatred, rage and incitement to violence against Arabs and Muslims. The most shocking recent example of this very widespread trend was Jay Severin, a highly rated host on Boston's WTKK-FM, demanding the killing of Muslims, telling a caller that, "I believe that Muslims in this country are a fifth column...The vast majority of Muslims in this country are very obviously loyal, not to the United States, but to their religion." He then told the caller, "You think we should befriend them; I think we should kill them."¹⁵ Sadly, the examples of similar excesses on American talk-radio are far too numerous to mention, and WTKK took no action whatsoever to discipline Severin or ensure he would not continue his call for mass murders. This case represents the tip of the iceberg of anti-Arab, anti-Muslim hate on American talk-radio today.

Too many newspapers routinely include hateful and defamatory commentary, including by syndicated columnists such as Ann Coulter, Cal Thomas, Michelle Malkin, and others who make a living by promoting hatred and discrimination. The *Wall Street Journal's* commentary section has a particularly shameful record of printing defamation and incitement, as do a number of tabloid papers, including the *New York Post*, *Boston Herald*, and *Chicago Sun-Times*.

The *National Review*, *Weekly Standard* and *Commentary*, among other magazines, have all made Arab and Muslim-bashing, and the promotion of avoidable wars and violence, a mainstay of their content.¹⁶

The web is filled with sites, both marginal and more mainstream, that make Arab and Muslim-bashing a central element in their content. The National Review Online (NRO.com), Worldnetdaily.com, Frontpagemag.com, and other sites that cannot be easily dismissed as representing and speaking only to a lunatic fringe, all feature outrageous and unrestrained attacks on Arabs and Muslims on a daily basis.

Decades of representations of Arabs and Arab-Americans as terrorists in literally hundreds of movies featuring thousands of such characters in recent decades, as exhaustively cataloged in

Jack Shaheen's book, *Reel Bad Arabs* (Interlink, 2001), cemented a firm connection in the minds of many Americans between Arabs and terrorism. Key recent examples include *True Lies*, *The Siege* and, perhaps the most vicious anti-Arab film ever made, *Rules of Engagement*. Such images are not countered by positive or even neutral images of Arabs and Arab-Americans. They are virtually nonexistent in our entertainment media, for which the Arab is invariably a villain or a buffoon, and usually a terrorist.

What Can Be Done

Urgent measures are required from our national institutions if we are to turn back from the path of fear, hate and discrimination that some in our society have been increasingly promoting. The government needs to recommit itself to treating all persons equally, and eliminating national security and immigration policies that amount to racial profiling or ethnic discrimination. Most senior law enforcement and counter-terrorism experts seem to understand that ethnicity is a false lead, and that such broad standards of identity reveal nothing relevant about whether or not someone could constitute a threat or a suspect. The virtual elimination of special registration by the Department of Homeland Security is clearly a step in the right direction, but numerous other government policies and practices need to be reformed or replaced before we can again claim that our country tries to treat everyone fairly. Senior government officials who openly express anti-Arab or anti-Muslim bigotry and hostility are unfit for office and should be dismissed, and the government should not host, promote or fund any organization which promotes anti-Arab or anti-Muslim sentiments, including through federally funded "faith-based" initiatives.

The mainstream media must take responsibility for their content, especially since representations of and what is being said about Arabs, Arab-Americans and Muslims in the mainstream American media is being watched carefully around the world and has a direct impact on our national security. The mainstream media should stop treating defamatory and hostile commentary by Arab and Muslim-bashers as a legitimate contribution to the national conversation.

Many publications clearly need to review their standards for columns and

contributions and adhere to a single standard when it comes to comments regarding all racial, ethnic, national origin and religious groups. Arab Americans, Muslims and others should not be subject to more lax standards of fairness and decency from editors, publishers and syndicates than Americans of European, African, Hispanic, Asian, Jewish or other backgrounds. A single standard of fairness needs to also be applied by filmmakers and television production companies.

Finally, it is time to hold accountable those who are instigating hatred against Arabs and Muslims as they are undermining fundamental American values and increasing the threat to our national security. We can no longer allow voices of hate and fear in our society to go unchallenged.



Hussein Ibish is Washington Correspondent for the Beirut-based Daily Star newspaper, and former communications director for the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee (ADC).

NOTES

1. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, "Report on Hate Crimes and Discrimination Against Arab Americans: The Post-September 11 Backlash Sept. 11, 2001 Oct. 11, 2002," Washington, D.C., 2003 (ADC) www.adc.org.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Council on American-Islamic Relations, "Unpatriotic Acts: The Status of Muslim Civil Rights in the United States 2004," Washington, D.C., 2004.
4. ADC, pp. 147-48, *op. cit.*
5. ADC, *op. cit.*
6. David Cole, "No More Roundups," *Washington Post*, June 16, 2004, p. A27.
7. ADC, p. 42, *op. cit.*
8. "Spain and U.S. at Odds on Mistaken Terror Arrest," *New York Times*, June 5, 2004, p. A1.
9. Clarence Page, "With This U.S. General, Who Needs Enemies?" *Newsday*, Oct. 21, 2003, p. A36.
10. "Ashcroft hit over reported remarks," *Daily News*, Feb. 10, 2002, p. 14.
11. *The Nation*, Nov. 11, 2002.
12. "King under fire for anti-Muslim remark," *India Abroad*, March 5, 2004, p. 8.
13. Chisun Lee, "Rounding up 'the enemy,'" *Village Voice*, p. 48.
14. ADC, pp.129-30, *op. cit.*
15. "Radio host says remarks misconstrued," *Boston Globe*, April 27, 2004, p. B2.
16. Alain Besancon, "What kind of religion is Islam?" *Commentary*, May 1, 2004, p. 42.

Liberty and Justice for All

"Changing the Guards"

Pre-prison notes (March 2004)

Kathy Kelly



From left to right: Studs Terkel, Kathy Kelly and Laurie Hasbrook singing Kathy's last tune before being taken off to Pekin prison.

www.vivw.org

"A Late Bloomer"

I grew up on the southwest side of Chicago, in an area Saul Bellow described as "rows and rows of bungalows and scrawny little parks." It was a secure environ. I thought mom, dad, the parish nuns and priests, Officer Friendly and the crossing guards were all part of a benign cabal to keep the Kelly kids happy. I barely knew that problems existed. In fact, the neighborhood could be seen as a crucible for some of the most severe problems afflicting society at that time, such as racism, sexism and militarism.

I attended a shared-time high school in which we attended a private school for part of the day and a public school during the other half. During the spring semesters, at the public school, there were occasional race riots. By the time I was a senior, we had policemen for hall guards. Police helicopters flew overhead, and police dogs sniffed the lockers. Sometimes mothers of students would cluster on the corner, watching students enter the school. I was stunned one morning when they called out racial epithets as Black students filed into the

entrance. I also remember a day when I sat in the back of a classroom, intently watching a teacher doing boardwork in the front of the room. I heard a commotion in the hallway, and then saw uniformed football players, one carrying another on his shoulders, racing down the third floor corridor screaming racial epithets. The teacher wafted over to the door, gently shut it, and returned to the blackboard, chalk raised, to balance the equation she'd been showing us. I couldn't see the board at that point. My eyes filled with tears and I had a lump in my throat, but at age 16, at a time when I considered my acne to be the biggest problem I could face, there was nothing in my repertoire that would prompt me to raise my voice, raise my hand, or to even quietly approach the teacher after school.

The private school, a small Catholic school, was staffed by teachers who helped us understand that the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was a saint and a prophet of our time. I remember learning that napalm defoliant sprayed on trees in Viet Nam, during the Viet Nam war, also fell on the backs of children. At an all school assembly we watched "Night and

Fog," a film about the Nazi death camps. The film made a deep impression on me. I never wanted to be a bystander in the face of an unspeakable evil. The emotional "grooves" were etched in my mind. I would yearn for a way to nonviolently resist cruelty and war, but I was a very late bloomer in terms of personal involvement.

During my senior year in college, at Loyola University, I submitted a paper about the Viet Nam war and felt quite proud of the professor's evaluation. I was ready to write papers, I'd cry over the *New York Times* headlines about the war, but I still wasn't involved in any activism. One evening I wandered over to the Mundelein campus, next door to Loyola, to hear Tom Cornell speak about the Viet Nam war. Cornell gave a compelling presentation about his conscientious objection to the war and his work with the Catholic Peace Fellowship. The next day, I picked up an application to join the Jesuit Volunteer Corps and subscribed to *Fellowship Magazine*. I never joined the volunteer corps, but at least I began reading alternative media reports. Finally, during graduate studies at the Chicago Theological Seminary, I reached a point at which I simply couldn't continue writing papers about the preferential option for the poor and singing, at liturgies, "Our God Hears the Cry of the Poor," and yet put off finding my way beyond Hyde Park to an area in Chicago where I knew people were running a soup kitchen and a Catholic Worker house of hospitality. I traveled up to the Uptown area, got to know the community there, and moved to that neighborhood about two months later. All I can say is that life became incredibly easy after that. I began to rub shoulders with some of the finest people in the world. The grass has never looked greener ever since.

It was a wonderful day, last winter, in

Baghdad, when Tom Cornell walked into our hotel, still dashing in his beret and trench coat, but leaning on a cane. He had come to join our Iraq Peace Team efforts as a member of a Pax Christi delegation.

In December of 1988, while I was in a county jail awaiting transport to Lexington FCI [Kentucky], I woke myself up very early each morning, before it became too noisy to concentrate, to read

dates of birth, their addresses, and dates of marriage.

The information simply wasn't forthcoming. Many of the men seemed honestly bewildered by the questions. Scotty's next task was to fingerprint each of the men, an awkward and humiliating process. After about an hour, Scotty put his head in his hands and said, "I f---in' hate my job." It was a painful moment, but it augured well for change. Scotty came

**MY OWN LOGIC TELLS ME THAT WHEN U.S. TROOPS
"CROSSED THE LINE," IN MARCH 2003, THEY TRESPASSED INTO A SOVEREIGN COUNTRY, IRAQ ... AT FORT BENNING, GEORGIA, WE CROSSED A LINE ONTO TWO FEET OF GOVERNMENT GRASS AT A PLACE WHERE IT'S BEYOND DISPUTE THAT GRADUATES OF THE MILITARY COMBAT TRAINING SCHOOL HAVE PARTICIPATED IN TORTURE, MAIMING, DISAPPEARANCE, MASSACRE AND ASSASSINATION WHEN THEY RETURNED TO THEIR OWN COUNTRIES.**

Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States*. I remember being absorbed by the book and particularly heartened by Zinn's conclusion that rooted hopes in a "changing of the guard." Zinn envisions a time when those who've soldiered for or protected establishment norms will change their minds, have a change of heart.

While I was on my top bunk, scribbling notes to friends, urging them to read or reread Zinn's book, nine Guatemalan migrant workers were brought into the Cass County jail for "processing." They had crossed into the U.S. illegally and were arrested after authorities discovered them huddled into a concealed space in the back end of a truck. Scotty, the guard on duty, grew increasingly frustrated trying to fill in the processing papers. I was called upon to translate, and even though my Spanish was inadequate it seemed worthwhile to intervene in order to give the new prisoners the phone number for an immigration lawyer. I watched as Scotty tried to elicit, from the men, information about their

from a family that had once farmed the land, in Harrison County, Missouri, but family farms had rapidly dissolved as he grew up. His best chance to feed his own family seemed to be taking on the role of "processing" humans, farmers from another land.

My own logic tells me that when U.S. troops "crossed the line," in March 2003, they trespassed into a sovereign country, Iraq, based on the theory and argument that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction posed an imminent threat to people in the U.S. Now it's clear that Iraq didn't pose even a distant threat to people here.

At Fort Benning, Georgia, we crossed a line onto two feet of government grass at a place where it's beyond dispute that graduates of the military combat training school have participated in torture, maiming, disappearance, massacre and assassination when they returned to their own countries.

The time-honored method of nonviolent civil disobedience has helped swell the numbers of people who clamor for

The most helpful book I've ever read in preparation for entering prisons or war zones is the late Dave Dellinger's riveting autobiography, *From Yale to Jail* (Pantheon Press, 1993). He concludes a chapter entitled "Prison Again" with an editorial he published in 1947, after his release from Lewisburg maximum-security penitentiary where he was incarcerated for two years because he publicly protested U.S. involvement in WWII. Dellinger wrote:

The atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki destroyed whatever claims the United States may have had to being either a "democratic" or a "peace-loving" nation. Without any semblance of a democratic decision — without even advance notice of what was taking place — the American people waked up one morning to discover that the United States government had committed one of the worst atrocities in history.

Hiroshima and Nagasaki were atomized at a time when the Japanese were suing desperately for peace. The American leaders were acting with almost inconceivable treachery by denying that they had received requests for peace, rumors of which had been trickling through censorship for months....

The "way of life" that destroyed Hiroshima and Nagasaki (and is reported to have roasted alive up to a million people in Tokyo in a single night) is international and dominates every nation of the world. But we live in the United States, so our struggle is here. With this "way of

closure of the SOA. In November 2003, 14,000 people proceeded to the gates of Fort Benning, solemnly carrying crosses in remembrance of the hundreds of thousands of people who were brutally and lethally punished. Yet even now, graduates of the military combat training school continually are implicated in human rights abuses after returning to their countries as alumni of this school. I remember joining (Rev.) Roy Bourgeois, MM, and a dozen others for a lengthy water only fast, at the gates of Fort Benning, in 1990. It's been a relief, then and now, to feel that we're trying our best to prevent any furtherance of a school that teaches people to terrify and subjugate brothers and sisters who live in the impoverished countries south of the United States.

Most of the time, when I've involved myself in situations likely to be difficult, the outcome directly depends on my attitude. If my approach signifies that I anticipate wasting my time or being miserable, if I think "I wish I could be elsewhere," I'll have a miserable time and be even more likely to wish I wasn't there. But if I approach a new experience seeking an opportunity to learn, to grow, to better understand people and to make a little bit of a positive difference in the lives of others, then it's more likely that's the direction in which next steps will evolve.

This weekend, I'm preparing for an April 6, 2004, entry into the Pekin FCI (Federal Correctional Institute) in Peoria. I'm one of several dozen people who, on November 22, 2003, crossed the line at the U.S. Army's military combat training school in Fort Benning, Georgia. With caring friends, I've shared gentle and sometimes nervous laughter as we try to make the best of a difficult reality. Yesterday, a friend joked about a cartoon he'd seen that showed "the boss" in jail and the unnerved assistants asking, "How long can we say, 'Sorry, he's away from his desk.'"

I could be harmed in prison, but that certainly could have happened to me sometime in Baghdad last year when there were bombs falling in the city. I

don't feel anxiety beyond the normal fear of the unknown.

Whenever I began a new year as a teacher, no matter how many years I'd been teaching before, my stomach was in knots before the first day. "I can't do this," I'd think. "I'm an imposter!" But once the first hour had ended, I relaxed and enjoyed the work. This isn't to say that schools are like prisons. Rather, it's to acknowledge the normal anxieties that crop up when you face a new setting. I'll suddenly be interacting with people that I've never met before. I'll be in a place that's unfamiliar. I won't be in my own bed, I won't be going to get the paper every morning. But it's not something that seems terribly onerous. The cruelty of prison rests in locking up people who are often already feeling remorse and low self-esteem because of past actions and

I COULD BE HARMED IN PRISON, BUT THAT CERTAINLY COULD HAVE HAPPENED TO ME SOMETIME IN BAGHDAD LAST YEAR WHEN THERE WERE BOMBS FALLING IN THE CITY. I DON'T FEEL ANXIETY BEYOND THE NORMAL FEAR OF THE UNKNOWN.

then heaping upon them more reasons to feel badly about themselves and almost no means to improve their situation. Parents separated from their children, feeling that they've screwed up their lives, are often snarled at by counselors and guards who say they should have thought about their loved ones before they started causing trouble. People who've committed crimes, often nonviolent crimes which they honestly regret (mainly related to drug use and drug trade), should be helped to prevent them from harming themselves or others through drug traffic. But why take away every freedom and why employ other human beings to act as "human zookeepers"?

Past experience of imprisonment left me feeling somewhat insulated from feelings of low self-esteem. Tonight, I'm proud that I crossed the line at the U.S.

Navy's Project ELF facility to say that we shouldn't be pouring money into a nuclear weapon facility that fast-tracks Tomahawk Cruise missiles to kill and maim people in Iraq. I'm proud that I crossed the line at the gates of Fort Benning, Georgia, a U.S. Army base which houses a military combat training school called WHINSEC. This school, formerly called the School of the Americas, teaches students from Latin America how to engage in horrible activities upon return to their home countries. Past graduates have been responsible for massacres, assassinations and tortures. People should be crossing these lines every day of the week. No shame, no stigma here.

But I do feel troubled because I've been so distanced, in recent years, from some of the poorest people in our country. I need to better understand what's happening to them. Am I right when I guess that the media successfully pressure them to consume, to buy, to have brand name this and that? Does this corporate push to buy certain lines of clothing, cosmetics, and cars push people further into an underground economy because they can't get a stake in the above-ground economies? Are they further disadvantaged because our education system has

abysmally failed them? Thinking of how George Fox, who helped found the Quaker faith, would stand on church pews during sermons and urge people to trod gently over the Earth, seeing that of god in everyone, I've nurtured a fantasy related to courtrooms. Suppose one were to stand up on a courtroom bench, risk contempt of court, and ask, "Could we just take a minute to analyze our setting here with a live graph? How many in this courtroom are making money off of the criminal justice system and how many are feeding this system? I'll bet that the people making money would be, primarily, white and well educated. They're the lawyers, the judges, the courtroom personnel. And I'll bet that the people feeding the system, as though they were the raw material to keep the well paid criminal justice system employees in business, would be African-American, Hispanic and



Dorothy Pagosa, former prisoner for seeking to close the SOA, gives some words of wisdom to Kathy and Dave.

www.viva.org

Asian. If convicted, the "criminals" could find themselves earning 18 cents per hour laboring, within the prison industrial complex, for major U.S. corporations who can hire prison labor without ever having to worry about paid vacations, benefits, overtime, hiring supervisors, or renting workspace. The prison-industrial complex resembles enslavement and might be a precursor to fascism.

"I want to nonviolently defy this system."

In 1988, upon entering the Cass County jail in Harrison, Missouri, my heart sank as I realized how intensely the other 12 women in the cell, a dingy area called "the bullpen," didn't want to see a new person encroach on the minimal space allotted to them. Most had already been there for many weeks. The bullpen was meant to be a small holding cell area, but because the jail was so overcrowded, the six bunk beds, exposed toilet, metal table and spray-mist shower with a ripped curtain became housing for women prisoners awaiting transport. I had just been released from the hospital following major surgery for a lung collapse caused by a congenital abnormality. Friends said that in my prison uniform I could have posed for a Soviet poster charging the U.S. with abusing prisoners.

The women prisoners glaring at me in the "bullpen" were seeing a 90-pound woman with pink eye, a runny nose, tangled hair, an obnoxious cough, and a facial rash. Eyeing the top bunk assigned to me, I wondered how I'd heave myself up there without stepping on another woman's bed. And how could I stuff the lumpy mattress I carried into the prison issue casing when I could barely bend down to tie my shoes? At that point, the

most intimidating woman in the bullpen laughed, rolled her eyes and said, "I don't know what I did so wrong to be locked up with this white mother—ker that's got AIDS!" My heart sank.

I managed to occupy the top bunk and, over the next hours, the women closest to me were curious and then kindly, asking me how I'd ended up in the bullpen. We found small ways to be helpful to one another. For instance, I had my "week-at-a-glance" address book with me which included a small map of the U.S. Together, other inmates and I found the various federal prisons to which each of us could be sent. I started to feel better. Within three days, all of the women treated me with affection, calling me "Missiles" for short. (I made a mental note not to trivialize our action in planting corn at nuclear missile silo sites but

THE PRISON-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX RESEMBLES ENSLAVEMENT AND MIGHT BE A PRECURSOR TO FASCISM.

decided not to argue with the nickname.) "Missiles," said the woman who had first erupted upon seeing me, "I tried my hardest not to like you, but I just can't help myself, — I like you."

Major Nick and Sergeant Roy, the officers responsible for running the Cass County jail, were stingy beyond belief when it came to spending the federal

life" ("death" would be more appropriate) there can be no truce nor quarter. The prejudices of patriotism, the pressures of our friends, and the fear of unpopularity, imprisonment or death should not hold us back any longer ... The American system has been destroying human life in peace and in war, at home and abroad, for decades...

The sudden murder of 300,000 Japanese is consistent with the ethics of a society which is bringing up millions of its own children in city slums...

There is no solution short of all-out war. But there must be one major difference between our war and the war that has just ended. The war against the Axis was fought as a military campaign against people, with all the destructive fury, violent hatred, regimentation and dishonesty of military warfare. The combatants were conscripts rather than free men. Every day that war went on they were compelled to act in contradiction to the ideals which motivated many of them. Therefore, "victory" was predestined to be a hollow farce, putting an end to killing that never should have been begun, but entrenching white imperialism as the tyrant of the Pacific, and contributing unemployment, slums, and class hatred to the United States. The American people won half the world and lost their souls.

The war for total brotherhood must be a nonviolent war carried on by methods worthy of the ideals we seek to serve. The acts we perform must



An interview with Kathy Kelly and fellow prisoner Dave Corcoran.

www.vivaw.org

money sent to them as reimbursement for housing federal prisoners awaiting transport. We never had adequate supplies of toilet paper, paper towels, cleaning supplies, or eating utensils. In the two months I spent there, they never had a guard who was "free" to take us outside for fresh air. Painted battleship grey, with bars on three sides of the enclosure, and fluorescent lights that were never turned off, the "bullpen" was one of the worst places the prison system in the U.S. maintained.

One day a woman came into the cell who had been charged with DUI, driving under the influence. Her lawyer came to bail her out the next day. As she left, I asked if she could leave behind her newspaper. "Oh honey," she said, "you all shouldn't have to read yesterday's news. I'll get them to send in today's paper." I politely said that we'd rather have the old one because when we ran out of toilet paper we used newspaper.

As soon as she was outside, she slapped a lawsuit against the prison for failing to respect human rights. As soon as Major Nick learned of it, he stormed into "the bullpen." "Which one of you all bitches in this here bullpen had the nerve to say

that we do not GIVE you toilet paper?" he bellowed. I expected a chorus of angry responses, but instead heard, "Musta' been Missiles. She thinks she's living in some kind of hotel!" I was stunned. I felt like a general leading the charge who looks behind, asking, "Where are the troops?" Major Nick polled each woman in the cell. "Have you EVER had an experience in this bullpen where your needs were not met?!" Each woman avowed that Major Nick and Sergeant Roy took

WHEN YOU WITNESS, FIRST HAND, SERIOUS AND DREADFUL ABUSES OF FELLOW HUMAN BEINGS, AND WHEN YOU HAVE A CHANCE TO RAISE YOUR VOICE AND PERHAPS ALLEVIATE THEIR AFFLICTIONS, HOW CAN YOU KEEP QUIET?

good care of them. When my turn came, I listed the items they didn't supply, told him how awful the slop they fed us had been, complained about the miasmic cloud of cigarette smoke hovering over us, and assured Major Nick that he

shouldn't run a kennel for dogs much less a place where human beings lived.

Hours later, after a glass of kool-aid was spilled on the metal table and we had no paper towels to clean it up, women began shouting, "Guard! Guard! We need paper towels." No paper towels arrived. A sticky puddle trickled over the cell.

Months later, at the Lexington, Kentucky, maximum-security prison where I served the remainder of my sentence, I asked one of the women to help me understand what had happened that day. She helped me see how much power Major Nick and Sergeant Roy had over each of the women. These jailers could interfere with their chances to get "good time," to see their children before they were transported to a faraway prison, to see or talk with a lawyer, to meet with a clergy person, to purchase commissary items, or to get a box sent into the prison with tube socks and an undershirt. I had plenty of "connections" on the outside and had nothing to lose, with a relatively short (one year) sentence and a statement on record that I wouldn't pay any fines. Of all of us in that cell, I was the most privileged in terms of education and financial security.

The story has become a metaphor for me. Who had the biggest responsibility, in "the bullpen," to raise her voice? To whom much is given, much is required. When you witness, first hand, serious and dreadful abuses of fellow human beings,

and when you have a chance to raise your voice and perhaps alleviate their afflictions, how can you keep quiet?

In our world, many of us who live in the U.S. are perched, quite by accident, amidst inordinately luxurious surroundings, relative to the rest of the world. We're the luckiest. We're the most blessed. And we have the greatest responsibility to build a better world.

What hope can we find for becoming many more than we are now, which will certainly be necessary for achieving social change? Again, I return to an encounter within the U.S. prison system to spotlight a possible arrow toward change.

On Monday, March 29, I'll go to Madison, Wisconsin, to face a one-month jail sentence for refusing to pay a \$150 fine for trespassing at the Navy's ELF/Trident transmitter-site located in the northern woods of Wisconsin. ELF (extremely low-frequency waves) is used to trigger nuclear missiles. The ELF system is also used to trigger Cruise missiles. Cruise missiles were the weapon of choice among war planners as the "Shock and Awe" campaign against Iraq was developed. On January 26, 2003, the *Sun Herald* of Sydney, Australia, reported: "The U.S. intends to shatter Iraq 'physically, emotionally and psychologically' by raining down on its people as many as 800 cruise missiles in two days." "There will not be a safe place in Baghdad," a Pentagon official told CBS News February 8, 2003. "We want them to quit, not to fight," said Harlan Ullman, author of the "shock and awe" attack plan, "so that you have this simultaneous effect — rather like the nuclear weapons at Hiroshima — not taking days or weeks but minutes." Mr. Ullman told the *Sun Herald*, "You take the city down. By that I mean you get rid of their power and water. In two, three, four, five days they are physically, emotionally and psychologically exhausted."

I felt deep dismay, in Baghdad, as the bombs thundered down on the city, morning, noon and night, during the U.S.

Iraq last winter. At home, I never worry about bombs exploding nearby, nor do I wonder how to pay for food, clothing and rent. People in Iraq and in many of our neighboring southern countries must constantly preoccupy themselves with ways to survive circumstances over which they have very little control. Their lives are directly afflicted by our desires to be "better off" than the rest of the world, taking other people's resources at cut-rate prices. We need to slow down, reflect more, learn to live more simply. Ironically, although the prison system is entirely wrongheaded and cruel, it will give me a chance to do just that.

From previous imprisonment, I recall a world of imprisoned beauty, and yet most of the women I met landed there because of ugly circumstances which they had tried to escape through drug use, drug sales, or both. Not all peace activists can be part of civil disobedience actions resulting in prison sentences. But for those who can, entering the prisons offers an opportunity to better understand how the once lauded war on poverty has become a war against the poor.

Those of us who "do time" for crossing the line at Fort Benning will be away from our desks, but we won't be away from our work.

ALMOST EVERY TIME I'VE CROSSED THE BORDER TO LEAVE IRAQ, I'VE FELT AS THOUGH I'M LEAVING AN ENORMOUS PRISON. IT TAKES ME ABOUT EIGHT SECONDS TO READJUST TO HAVING ELECTRICITY ...

invasion and occupation of Iraq. I also promised myself a nonviolently defiant visit to a military facility that helped launch those bombs, at the earliest opportunity, upon return to the U.S. "Don't do the crime if you can't do the time," is a line we often hear. I'm ready.

Almost every time I've crossed the border to leave Iraq, I've felt as though I'm leaving an enormous prison. It takes me about eight seconds to readjust to having electricity; I nearly genuflected in front of the thermostat when I returned home after a chilly stretch of weeks in

When I'm at home in Chicago, where my three-bedroom apartment is also the "office" for Voices in the Wilderness, my companions and I work quite hard, almost every day of the week, answering phones and correspondence, updating websites, helping organize cross-country bus tours, speaking engagements and staying in touch with the small group of people who represent us in Iraq.

Some have asked if the time I'll spend in prison wouldn't be better spent working on the Voices campaign. Will the campaign be diminished with me "away

be the responsible acts of free men, not the irresponsible acts of conscripts under orders. We must fight against institutions but not against people...

We can expect to face tear gas, clubs and bullets. But we must refuse to hate, punish or kill in return. We must respect the owners, policemen, conservatives and strike-breakers for what they are — potentially decent people who have been conditioned by a sick society into playing anti-social roles, the basic inhumanity of which they do not understand.

This is a diseased world in which it is impossible for anyone to be fully human. One way or another, everyone who lives in the modern world is sick or maladjusted. Slick businessmen and bosses, parasitical coupon clippers, socially blind lawyers, scientists and clergymen are as much victims of "a world they never made," as are the rough and irresponsible elements of America's great slums. The only way we can begin to break the vicious cycle of blindness, hatred and inequality is to combine an uncompromising war upon evil institutions with an unending kindness and love of every individual — including the individuals who defend existing institutions.

This is total war. But it is a war in which our allegiance transcends nationalities and classes. Every act we perform today must reflect the kind of human relationships we are fighting to establish tomorrow.



Kathy Kelly in Iraq, 2003.

from my desk?"

I don't think the campaign will suffer. In January 1996, we began efforts to end economic sanctions against Iraq by carrying medicine and medical relief supplies to Iraq in open defiance of the U.N./U.S. economic sanctions. Since that time, we've been blessed with a steady stream of exceptionally capable and competent volunteers. Many who've helped coordinate Voices work have been young people who were drawn to work in a setting where they could assume responsibility very quickly and learn a great deal about how to develop international delegations, peace team efforts and creative outreach so that we can become many more than we are now. They've been intensely involved in the further invention of nonviolence.

As Iraqis endured the awful years of U.S./U.N. imposed economic sanctions, other peace groups with greater resources and more well developed organization were drawn to our fledgling efforts to nonviolently resist the economic sanctions. They directed their skills and capabilities toward building a very strong network of people dedicated toward ending economic war and eventual full-scale military war against Iraq.

Our teams also began developing friendly, even familial relationships with ordinary Iraqi people. Team members would return to the U.S., from Iraq, unable to answer questions about why Iraqis would hate us so much. Rather, we felt a bit bewildered, wondering why do

they love us so much? We wanted people to understand that Saddam Hussein wasn't the only person living in Iraq, and we hoped to lessen the growing fear and hatred of Saddam's Iraq, knowing most wars are predicated on such emotions.

Angered by media pundits who foster paranoid fears of Arabs amongst western audiences, columnist Patrick Seale observes that "A whole intellectual industry has sprung up in Western think-tanks, university departments, and among media pundits, seeking to dissect and understand the 'violence,' 'hate' and 'fanaticism' which the Arab and Muslim world is said to direct against the West." ("Why Is the West Afraid of Arabs?" Patrick Seale, *Al-Hayat*, January 30, 2004.)

Afraid that we'll be attacked by Islamist terrorists from abroad and fearful of criminals who might attack us here at home, decent people in the U.S. have increasingly allowed "authorities" to determine how we can become more secure. We're told that our safety hinges on rounding up criminals and holding them behind bars, walls, razor wire and heavily armed guards. We're told we must accept Guantanamo and set aside uneasiness over supermax prisons because if we object we'll lessen our own safety. We forget that traffic accidents cause the greatest number of deaths, yearly, in the U.S. Some of the other frightening "killers" are acid rain, marketing of alcohol, firearms and tobacco, and manufacture of weapons.



Kathy Kelly is a co-coordinator of Voices in the Wilderness. (www.vitw.org) 773-784-8065. To learn more about how to become part of efforts to close the SOA, visit www.soaw.org.

Kathy will also spend time in prison for crossing the line at Project ELF, a U.S. Navy nuclear weapon facility in northern Wisconsin which helped fast-track Tomahawk Cruise missiles that attacked Iraq during the "Shock and Awe" campaign. To learn more about the campaign to shut down Project ELF, visit www.nukewatch.com. Her April-August prison notes are going to appear in CAQ #78.

FIGHT

The Prison-Industrial Complex!

It feeds on one of the highest incarceration rates, and produces some of the highest rates of recidivism in the world. Finally, there's something you can do about it.

Blow the refreshing winds of critical social and political thought into the American concentration camps for just \$15 per year. Give a prisoner a gift subscription to **CovertAction Quarterly**.

methods of interrogation, including its techniques of torture and demand the U.S. follow Israel's war agenda in the Middle East. Israel has acknowledged state-sanctioned physical and mental abuse of prisoners in interrogation, which has broad public support.¹² The U.S. follows suit by imprisoning the wives and daughters of wanted Iraqi Baathists.

Richard Perle, highly influential in Donald Rumsfeld's Defense Department, advocates the Israeli tactics of offensive bombing of adversaries. "In 1981 the Israelis faced an urgent choice: Should they allow Saddam Hussein to fuel a French-built nuclear reactor near Baghdad or destroy it? The Israelis decided to strike preemptively. Everything we know [sic] about Saddam Hussein forces [sic] President Bush to make a similar choice: to take a pre-emptive action or wait, possibly until it is too late."¹³

Another prominent colon, Senator Joseph Lieberman (D.-Conn.), called on the U.S. to bomb Syria, Iraq and Iran immediately after 9/11, echoing Prime Minister Sharon's policy advice to President Bush. Alan Dershowitz, Harvard law professor, publicly endorsed both torture and repressive legislation in the U.S. — modeled on the Israeli system of unlimited detention of Palestinians.¹⁴

The colon's subordinate U.S. policy to Israel's foreign policy needs, independent of circumstances and the extremities to which Israel's colonial policies push it. Moreover, as representatives of the hegemonic power in the U.S., they even try to micro-manage security measures — torture in interrogation —

as well as becoming vociferous advocates of a generalized Middle East war. The colons have successfully influenced the U.S. government to block any EU initiatives toward international mediation, as well as the U.S.-sponsored Mitchell Plan, advocating peace observers in the Occupied Territories. In a word, the U.S., despite its occasional and inconsequential criticism of Israel's excesses, has not only been an unconditional supporter of Israel, but it has done so in the context of a prolonged bloody repression and occu-

pation of Palestinian territories, to which Washington is a party to securing. Israeli hegemony over the U.S. via its colons is a formidable weapon for neutralizing the U.S.'s NATO allies, Arab petroleum clients, the vast majority of the General Assembly of the United Nations and even its own public on certain Middle Eastern issues.

Even more dangerous is the irrational paranoia which the colons import from Israel to the U.S., such as all Arabs are suspect; Middle Eastern adversaries should be threatened if not bombed; secret military tribunals and summary justice should be meted out to suspected terrorists. The mass media are especially tuned to pick up the Israeli paranoid syndrome: magnifying every threat, featuring Israeli resolution and efficiency against Arab "terrorists." The paranoid style of politics has led to Israel's attacks on Arab countries in the Middle East, espionage on the U.S., illegal purchase of nuclear devices in the U.S. and unremitting violence against Palestinians and Lebanese. The danger is that the assimilation of the paranoid style by the U.S. has vast con-

because of insecurity and the proximity of violence, which neither the Shin Bet, the Army or the settlers are capable of preventing. Enlightened Israelis are especially embittered by the enormous costs of the settlement movement.¹⁵

Israel's Colonial Style: The U.S. Pays Tribute to the State of Israel

In the face of Israel's defiance of world public opinion, and its refusal to permit any international humanitarian organization to examine the results of its murderous destruction of the towns and refugee camps in the Occupied Territories, who is financing the Israeli state and why does that financing continue in the face of world opprobrium?

The attempt by the United Nations to investigate Israel's near total destruction of Jenin in the spring of 2003 has evoked the hostility of the entire Israeli political class. Shimon Peres (the self-styled Labor moderate in Sharon's government) accused the 170-plus member United Nations Organization of "blood libel."

The question of who is financing the Israeli state is basic because Israel as we know it today is not a viable state without massive external support. Billions of dollars are raised from a variety of Jewish and non-Jewish institutions to sustain the Israeli war machine, its policy of generous subsidies for Jews enticed to settle in colonies in the Occupied Territories and in Israel, with the world's 20th highest living standards for Israel's Jewish citizens.¹⁶ Without external aid Israel's economy would require severe cutbacks in

living standard and working conditions, leading to the likely flight of most Israeli professionals, businessmen and recent overseas immigrants. The Israeli military budget would be reduced and Israel would be obligated to reduce its military interventions in the Arab East and the Occupied Territories. Israel would cease being a rentier state living on overseas subsidies and would be obligated to engage in productive activity — a return to farming, manufacture and services minus the exploitation of low-paid Asian maids,

ISRAEL HAS ACKNOWLEDGED STATE-SANCTIONED PHYSICAL AND MENTAL ABUSE OF PRISONERS IN INTERROGATION, WHICH HAS BROAD PUBLIC SUPPORT. THE U.S. FOLLOWS SUIT BY IMPRISONING THE WIVES AND DAUGHTERS OF WANTED IRAQI BAATHISTS.

sequences not only for the Mideast but for the rest of the world and ultimately to democratic freedom in the U.S.

What the intellectual colons and other Israeli publicists forget to mention is that Israeli security policy in the Occupied Territories is a total disaster: Israeli bus stations, public malls, five-star hotels, pizzerias and all of its frontiers have been attacked and hundreds of Israeli citizens have been killed and injured. Tens of thousands of educated Israelis flee the country precisely

imported Eastern European farm workers and Palestinian construction laborers.

Europe continues to privilege the importation of Israeli exports and financial services, despite overt and malicious attacks by leaders of both Israeli parties. Prominent Jewish organizations in France and England, linked to major parties, have muted any efforts to use the "trade card" to pressure Israel to accept European Union or United Nations mediation. European trade and financial ties to Israel, however, are not the basic prop for the Israeli war machine. The principal basis for long-term, large-scale financial support is found in the U.S., among public and private institutions.

In the United States there are essentially four basic sources of financial, ideological and political support for the Israeli rentier economy:

1. Wealthy Jewish contributors and powerful disciplined fundraising organizations.
2. The U.S. government — both Congress and the Presidency.
3. The mass media — particularly the *New York Times*, Hollywood and the major television networks.
4. Some trade union bosses and heads of union pension funds.

There is substantial overlap in these four institutional configurations. For example, Jewish supporters in the Israeli lobby work closely with congressional leaders to secure long-term, large-scale U.S. military and economic aid for Israel. Most of the mass media and a few trade unions are influenced by unconditional supporters of the Israeli war machine and its rentier economy.

In the political sphere, pro-Israeli politicians and powerful Jewish organizations have joined forces with pro-Israel ultra right-wing mass-based Christian fundamentalists and powerful political leaders tied to the military — industrial complex like Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Vice President Dick Cheney.

Israel's unconditional support of

Washington's anti-communism and subsequent anti-terrorist military offensive has strengthened ideological and military ties between U.S. right-wing political

U.S. TAXPAYERS HAVE BEEN FUNDING THE ISRAELI WAR MACHINE WITH ABOUT \$6 BILLION A YEAR OF DIRECT ASSISTANCE FOR OVER 35 YEARS. RANK AND FILE TRADE UNION MEMBERS MIGHT BE SURPRISED TO LEARN THAT THEIR PENSION FUNDS HAVE BEEN INVESTED IN ISRAEL BONDS WITH BELOW NORMAL RATES OF RETURN AND HIGHER RISK.

leaders, pro-Israeli politicians and the leaders of the leading Jewish organizations. The politics of Washington's new imperialism coincides splendidly with the Sharon-Peres conquest and destruction of the Occupied Territories. It is not surprising that four of the leading advocates of Washington's permanent war doctrine and Israeli aggression are Paul Wolfowitz, Douglas Feith, Elliott Abrams and Richard Perle.

The mass media in the U.S., particularly the "respectable" *New York Times*, have been in the forefront of propagandizing Israeli conquest and destruction as a "defensive," "anti-terrorist war." Not a single voice or editorial in the *New York Times* has spoken of the mass killing of Palestinian civilians and Israel's destruction of priceless historical and religious sites that go back over 2,000 years.¹⁷ While Israel's war machine destroys ancient monasteries and the heritage of world culture, the pro-Israeli mass media in the U.S. ignore the Church's protests at the Israeli shelling of the Church of the Nativity and the murder of those seeking sanctuary.

U.S. taxpayers have been funding the Israeli war machine with about \$6 billion a year of direct assistance for over 35 years. Rank and file trade union members might be surprised to learn that their pension funds have been invested in

Israel bonds with below normal rates of return and higher risk. Despite the poor investment quality of Israeli bonds, some of the largest U.S. trade unions, employee pension funds and major multinational corporations have collectively loaned billions of dollars to the Israeli regime. In all cases, the decisions to purchase a foreign government's bonds are made by the trade union bosses and corporate fund managers without consulting union membership or stockholders.¹⁸

Nathan Zirkin, a financial director of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, when asked if his union would continue to purchase Israel bonds despite Israel's repression and arrest of Palestinian trade unionists and activists, replied "Absolutely. The Palestinians didn't have a damn thing until Israel came in."¹⁹

Some of the trade unions which are purchasers of Israeli bonds are controlled or influenced by the Mafia. The Teamsters union is the biggest purchaser of Israeli bonds; it is also the union which has seen more senior officials indicted for Mafia ties, illicit use of union funds and massive robbery of membership pension funds. In this case the trade union Mafioso were buying favorable propaganda from the mass media and support from the "respectable" Jewish organizations via the purchase of Israeli bonds.

The most notorious case is the former International Ladies Garment Workers Union (ILGWU), now called UNITE, a union whose members are 95% Black, Hispanic, and Chinese, most earning at or below the minimum wage. UNITE's leadership and high-level staff are overwhelmingly pro-Israel and earn between \$100,000 and \$350,000 a year plus expenses.²⁰ Clearly the Jewish trade union bosses have a greater affinity for the State of Israel and its oppression of Palestinian workers than they have with their own poorly organized workers, employed under some of the worst working conditions in the U.S.

Israeli bond promoters, with support from Mafia-influenced corrupt trade union bosses, have sold hundreds of

millions of dollars of Israel bonds to 1,500 labor organizations at interest rates below those of other available securities and well below what most investors would expect from loans to an economically troubled foreign government like Israel.

Three factors account for the U.S. trade union bosses channeling their members' pension funds and union dues into Israeli bonds: (1) political protection and respectability in being associated with Israel and its lobbyists — this is especially important to Mafia-linked and corrupt officials; (2) ideological and ethnic ties between Jewish trade union leaders and Israel; (3) the use of Israeli bonds to launder funds obtained illicitly by union bosses. The main organization selling Israeli bonds managed to settle money-laundering cases brought by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission "out of court."

Accomplices to Genocide

In Israel two out of three Israelis (65%) polled in late April 2002 supported Sharon and almost 90% believed the regime's propaganda that the U.N. commission to investigate Israeli devastation of the Occupied Territories "will not be fair to Israel." The Israeli public, the U.S. trade union bosses, and political and financial elites who finance Sharon are accomplices to the crimes against the Palestinian people. Obviously the shrinking minority of Jews in Israel who oppose the military machine have little or no influence in policy, in the media and in securing overseas financial support.

Because of powerful unconditional external financial and military support primarily from influential Jews in the U.S., Christian fundamentalists, the military industrial complex, the Pentagon extremists, and corrupt U.S. trade unionists, Israel is able to defy world public opinion, slander humanitarian organizations and human rights leaders, and brazenly continue its genocidal policies. Israeli leaders know "their people": They know they have unconditional supporters who have already been tested. They know that their bankers, professionals and fundamentalists will back them up to the last murdered Palestinian: The march of the 100,000 in Washington in the midst of the Jenin massacre proved it. The huge turnout of politicians at the annual AIPAC conference during the massacres in the Rafah refugee camp in the Gaza Strip

confirms that they support the butchers of Rafah.

Fabrication of the Iraq War Threat: U.S. Zionists in Action

There is growing debate and criticism in the U.S. Congress and media of the Bush administration's fabricated evidence of Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction. Even more serious, the investigation and testimony of top U.S. military and civilian officials in the Pentagon and State Department reveal profound differences and divisions between themselves and the "political appointees." The testimony and evidence of these professionals' revelations are crucial to understanding the structure of real power in the White House. It is in times of crisis and division in the governing class that we the public are given insights into who governs for whom.

After years of U.N. inspections, and more than a year of thousands of searches and interviews by over a thousand U.S. military, intelligence and scientific inspectors it has been definitively demonstrated that Iraq did not possess weapons of mass destruction (or even a useful national defense), a point now practically conceded by some members of the Bush administration. This raises the next key question: Who in the Bush regime provided the fabricated evidence and for what purpose?

The initial response of the Bush apologists was to attribute the fabrications to "bureaucratic errors" and "communication failures" or, as Wolfowitz cynically claimed, to "secure a consensus for the war policy."²¹ CIA Director George Tenet became the self-confessed scapegoat for the "mistakes" and eventually had to "resign." As the investigations progressed, however, testimony from a multiplicity of high level sources in the Bush regime revealed that there were two channels of policy-making and advisers, the formal structure made up of career professional military and civilians in the Pentagon and State Department and a parallel structure made up of political appointees. From all available evidence it was the "unofficial" political advisers, organized by Wolfowitz, Feith and Rumsfeld in the Office of Special Planning (OSP), who were the source of the fabricated evidence, which was used to "justify" the invasion and occupation of Iraq. The OSP was headed by Abram Shulsky

and included other neo-conservatives, who have virtually no professional knowledge or qualification in intelligence and military affairs. Douglas Feith, Undersecretary of Defense, and Paul Wolfowitz set up the OSP. Shulsky is an avid follower and protégé of Richard Perle, the well-known militarist and long time supporter of military attacks on Arab regimes in the Middle East.

According to the testimony of a Pentagon insider, Lt. Col. Karen Kwiatkowski, who worked in the office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Near East and South Asia Division and Special Plans in the Pentagon, "...in terms of Israel and Iraq all primary staff work was conducted by political appointees, in the case of Israel a desk officer appointee from the Washington Institute for Near East Policy and in the case of Iraq, Abe Shulsky." Equally important, the ex-Pentagon official describes the existence of "cross-agency cliques." She describes how the members of a variety of neo-conservative and pro-Israel organizations (Project for a New American Century, the Center for Security Policy and the American Enterprise Institute), who are now in the Bush regime, only interact among themselves across the various agencies. She points out that major decisions result from "groupthink" the uncritical acceptance of prevailing points of view and the uncritical acceptance of extremely narrow and isolated views." She was forced to resign by her chief after she told him that "some folks [the cliques and networks] in the Pentagon may be sitting beside Hussein in the war crimes tribunal" for their destructive war and occupation policies.²²

What is very clear is that the OSP and its directors Feith and Wolfowitz were specifically responsible for the fabricated evidence of the "Weapons of Mass Destruction" that justified the war.

The OSP and the other members of the networks that operated throughout key U.S. agencies shared a right-wing pro-militarist ideology and were fanatically pro-Israel. Feith and Perle authored an infamous policy paper in 1996 for Likud Party extremist Benjamin Netanyahu, entitled "A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm," which called for the destruction of Saddam Hussein. The OSP was an arm of the Wolfowitz-Feith policy of furthering the policies of the

most extremist groups of the Sharon regime, forging close ties with a parallel ad hoc intelligence operation in the Israeli regime according to a report from the British newspaper, *The Guardian*.²³

The finger clearly points to Zionist zealots who directed the OSP, like Abram Shulsky and Feith, as the source for the “phony intelligence” which led to the war that Wolfowitz and Rumsfeld were seeking.

To understand the central role of the Zionist ideologues in shaping U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East it is important to frame it in the context of U.S.-Israel relations and the powerful influence of the pro-Israel lobby inside of the U.S. As Patrick Seale describes in the liberal U.S. bi-weekly *The Nation*, “The Friends of Ariel Sharon (among the Jewish pro-Israel zealots) loathe Arabs and Muslims... What they wished for was an improvement in Israel’s military and strategic environment.”²⁴ The U.S. invasion of Iraq and its aggressive military posture toward most Arab regimes in the Middle East has made the names of these Zionist policymakers known to the world. Wolfowitz and Feith are second and third in command of the Pentagon. Their protégés in the OSP include Abram Shulsky, Richard Perle of the Defense Policy Board, and Elliott Abrams (a defender of the Guatemalan genocide of the 1980s), senior director for Middle East affairs for the National Security Council. Washington’s most influential pro-Israel zealots include William Kristol and Robert Kagan of the *The National Standard*, the Pipes family and a large number of pro-Israel institutes which work closely with and share the outlook of the right-wing Zionists in the Pentagon.

The Zionist Power Configuration in the United States

C. Wright Mills once wrote that the U.S. “power elite” ruled by denying it held power. The Zionist elite follows this formula, but defends it by accusing its adversaries of being “anti-Semites” and pursuing retributive measures that would please former Senator Joseph McCarthy. The Zionist power configuration (ZPC) cannot be understood merely as the “Jewish lobby” or even the AIPAC, as formidable as it is with its 150 full-time functionaries. The ZPC can best be understood as a complex network of inter-related formal and informal groupings, operating at the national, regional and

local levels and directly and systematically subordinated to the State of Israel, its power holders and key decision makers. Influence is wielded via virulently attacking critics and pushing pro-Israel “news” and commentaries. The fourth circle of influence is through local and sectoral organizations (professional bodies, trade unions, pension funds, etc.), both those affiliated with national apparatus and those embedded in local “civil society.” This is probably the most serious threat as it inhibits average U.S. citizens from voicing their doubts and criticisms of Israeli policy. All over the U.S., local editors, critical intellectuals and activists and even doctors have been branded as “neo-Nazis” and have suffered threatening phone calls and visits by local pro-Israel zealots. The consequences usually stop discussion and/or intimidate local citizens advocating an independent and democratic foreign policy.

The ZPC in Action: The Iraq War

The major theoretical strategist of U.S. World Empire is Paul Wolfowitz, who first presented a detailed outline of action in 1992. The argument for permanent wars, unilateral action and colonial conquest was spelled out for the first Bush administration, and later supported implicitly during the Clinton administration’s continued military attacks against Iraq, its unconditional backing of Israel’s war against the Palestinians, the Balkan wars, the de facto takeover of the ex-Communist states of Eastern Europe, the Baltic states and the South-Central Republics of the ex-USSR. The Clinton administration’s vigorous intervention in favor of Yeltsin’s seizure of power and backing of the Russian oligarchs played a major role in dismembering and weakening its former adversary to world domination. Clinton’s unconditional support for Israel and more important the formulation of a Mideast strategy convergent with Israeli foreign policy was tied to two sets of policies: destroying the military and economic power of one of Israel’s main critics in the Mideast (Iraq) via economic boycotts, arms inspections and unilateral disarmament of Iraq, while Israel stock-piled nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; financing and arming Israeli expansion and colonization of Arab Palestine. Direct Zionist influence over U.S. Mideast policy was shaped by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright

who justified the U.S. induced deaths of 500,000 Iraqi children during her tenure in office, declaring “It was worth it.” Secretary of Defense William Cohen was instrumental in promoting Israeli military dominance in the Middle East and Richard Holbrooke, a closet Zionist was one of the most influential Clinton advisers on the Middle East “peace negotiations.” President Clinton and the Democrats laid the basis for the eventual capture of U.S. foreign policy-making by the Zionists in the subsequent Bush administration by accepting Zionists in strategic foreign policy positions influencing Mideast policy and shaping U.S. policy to fit Israeli expansionist aims.

The Bush regime represented a qualitative advance in Zionist power in U.S. policies, both foreign and domestic. The key economic policymaker was Alan Greenspan, head of the U.S. Central Bank (Federal Reserve Board), a long-time crony of Wall Street financial interests and promoter of the major pro-Israeli investment houses – responsible for the speculative boom and bust economy of the 1990s. Paul Wolfowitz, Undersecretary of Defense was the architect of the U.S. war policy for the Middle East. Richard Perle, the vituperative influential civilian militarist whose hatred of Arabs was matched by his blind tirades against the professional military commanders and intelligence agencies who refused to subordinate U.S. military policy to Israel’s regional interests, was head of the Defense Policy Board. Douglas Feith, Assistant Secretary of Defense, a fanatical Zionist and lifetime defender of Israel’s interests and consultant with right-wing Israeli regimes, was the principal planner and successful propagandist for the U.S. attack on Iraq. David Frum, the major policy speech writer for Bush and author of Bush’s infamous “Axis of Evil” speech, which made explicit and operational “Bush’s policy” of permanent wars against Arab nations and other critics of Israeli power, is a Canadian Zionist. Elliott Abrams, a racist Zionist (he condemns American Jews who marry Gentiles)²⁵ and a long-term proponent of the Israel First doctrine within the Zionist elite was put in charge of Middle East policy despite being a convicted felon for his role in the Central American Iran-Contra (Drugs for Guns) Scandal, and an intellectual architect of the Guatemalan genocide of 1981-1983.

Their influence on U.S. Middle East policy far exceeds their formal positions because they are backed by an array of influential Zionist academic ideologues, political pundits and directors of war think-tanks who are given constant access to the opinion pages of the major U.S. newspapers, or interviewed as Middle East "experts" on pro-Israeli television and radio shows — advancing their war propaganda designed to promote U.S. defense of Israel's Middle East agenda. These policy and opinion makers, backed by the mass media, have been working in close consultation and in tandem with the major Jewish organizations in the U.S. and in close "consultations" with top officials in the Sharon regime. Mossad agents, Israeli diplomats and key officials in the Sharon regime have free access to the offices of the Zionist officials in Washington and exchange information on how to optimize Israeli interests.

Prior to the U.S. invasion of Iraq, all the Zionists in key policy positions and their counterparts in Congress backed a U.S. war with Iraq; after 9/11, Wolfowitz and Senator Lieberman immediately proposed a war against Iraq — demanding that the Intelligence agencies "find" the connection and accusing the military of being cowards, for not engaging in war to "protect" Israel. Despite Herculean efforts by Feith, *et al.*, to twist CIA and MI-6 reports to serve their pro-war Israeli line, their bellicose rhetoric lacked substance. They then invented the, now admitted, BIG LIE (by Wolfowitz) of the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction threat to U.S. security. To pursue this line the Zionists in the Pentagon bypassed the traditional military/intelligence agencies and created their own propaganda — "intelligence" agency or "Office of Special Plans" run by fellow Zionist fanatic Abram Shulsky, under the control of Douglas Feith, which worked closely with Ahmed Chalabi and the Mossad in "cooking" the data on WMD to fit the plans of their Zionist bosses in the Pentagon. The Mossad was later chastised for "intelligence failures" by the Israeli Knesset after the release of the Steinitz Report on March 29, 2004, but their Zionist counterparts in the Pentagon, Shulsky, Wolfowitz, Feith and Abrams, were never called to account, their collaboration with the Mossad never questioned, nor was an investigation of their pursuit of Israel's



Jerry Zawada, Kathy Kelly and Doug Johnson at the Kuwait/Iraq border, February 2003. *"Action was one in which we carried a huge banner to the edge of the No Man's Land, stating 'Courage for Peace, Not for War,' along with enlarged vinyl photos of ordinary Iraqi People. We delivered a letter, through U.N. workers, to troops on the other side of the border, telling them that we were fasting and praying, on the Iraq side, in hopes that they would not trespass into a sovereign country, placing themselves and Iraqis at risk, and that they would instead choose conscientious objection to war. Charlie Litekey (not in this photo) stood up on a rusted out old frame that we turned into a platform and shouted out the contents of our letter. Weather was extremely dramatic, — sandstorm, then rainstorm, then duststorm, alternately cold and hot. It was a good way to prepare ourselves for the storms to come."*

interests ever even raised.

Wolfowitz claimed that the invading army would be welcomed as liberators (evoking the liberation of Paris). Perle claimed "the Arabs" would offer little or no resistance (being a "tribal" society). Robert Kagan claimed that "one big

bomb" would silence the Arab street and public opinion. Feith and Wolfowitz promoted the massive purge of the entire Iraqi civil service, professions, universities, schools and hospitals of Baathists, as well as the dismantling and dismissal of 400,000 Iraqi military and police per-

caption by Kathy Kelly — photo by Lorna Tychostup / www.LornaTychostup.com

sonnel — over the shocked objections of experienced senior U.S. military officers who had expected to work with the surrendered military and administrative structure of Iraq to control the colony. This opened the way for the pillage of Iraq's complex infrastructure and historic treasures and libraries, as well as the growth of criminal gangs involved in theft, kidnap for ransom, murder and rape — activities virtually unknown under the tight Baathist regime. Rumsfeld dismissed the massive destruction of Iraqi society as the “messiness of freedom.”

Many top U.S. military officials objected, as did the first U.S. pro-consul, former General Jay Garner. But the Zionists in the Pentagon and their partners in crime, Rumsfeld and Cheney, were determined to dismantle the secular Iraqi state. This was the result of a policy to turn Iraq into a desert kingdom — a loose collection of at least three “tribal” client mini-states based on ethnicities, religious-tribal loyalties forever incapable of opposing Israeli expansionism.²⁶ Instead of easy conquest, the “Israel First” Pentagonistas provoked a massive popular opposition, unified the religious and secular groups in opposition to the U.S. occupation, and swelled the ranks of the armed resistance with thousands of discharged armed professionals. In the course of pursuing a policy of strengthening Israel's regional position, the Zionists weakened the U.S. colonial occupation and medium term plans to convert Iraq into a U.S. oil colony. The result has been thousands of U.S. military and client collaborators dead, maimed and wounded, and a burgeoning worldwide opposition, particularly in the Arab East, and among several hundred million Muslims.

The Israel First Pentagonistas successfully promoted the idea that the Israeli military and intelligence experts had a lot to teach their ignorant American counterparts on “urban warfare” and “information gathering” drawing on Israel's wealth of experience. Over 50 years, Israel expelled and destroyed

Palestinian communities and developed interrogation and torture techniques on Palestinian and Lebanese captives.²⁷ The purpose of the Pentagon Zionists was to deepen the ties with Israel's security apparatus as part of a middle term goal of making “the cause of Israel as the cause of America” (as prostrate presidential candidate Kerry has pledged).²⁸ The long-term goal was to leverage military security and to co-manufacture military weaponry between the U.S. and Israel into the Grand Scheme of a Greater Middle East U.S.-Israel Co-Prosperity Sphere. Imperial Israel would then have

THE ZIONISTS IN THE PENTAGON AND THEIR PARTNERS IN CRIME, RUMSFELD AND CHENEY, WERE DETERMINED TO DISMANTLE THE SECULAR IRAQI STATE. THIS WAS THE RESULT OF A POLICY TO TURN IRAQ INTO A DESERT KINGDOM — A LOOSE COLLECTION OF AT LEAST THREE “TRIBAL” CLIENT MINI-STATES BASED ON ETHNICITIES, RELIGIOUS-TRIBAL LOYALTIES FOREVER INCAPABLE OF OPPOSING ISRAELI EXPANSIONISM.

access to water, oil, capital and markets, which the heavily subsidized rentier militarist state lacks at the present.

The Torture Apparatus

The torture-interrogation techniques taught by the Israeli instructors converged nicely with, updated and refined the older CIA torture manuals, more specifically introducing specificities pertaining to torturing Muslims and especially Arabs.²⁹ Once again the Zionist-Israeli priorities undermined U.S. imperialist policies: The photo revelations of U.S. soldiers torturing, raping and humiliating Iraqi prisoners discredited the U.S. occupation worldwide, heightened Arab and Muslim resistance throughout the Middle East and discredited the Bush

regime. Congressional hearings and mass media reports even provoked a burst of public disapproval of the invasion of Iraq and Bush's handling of the occupation. Throughout the country there were calls, including from members of Congress, for Rumsfeld's resignation. Curiously enough, there were virtually no calls for the resignation of the Israel First Pentagonistas — who were equally implicated and responsible for the mass torture of Muslim detainees. According to *Newsweek*, Douglas Feith was in charge of setting policy on Iraqi detainees.³⁰ Even in the face of this horrible crime

against humanity, even in the general national outcry to investigate, impeach and hold responsible those involved, the top Zionist co-architects of the war, the responsible heads (numbers 2 and 3) of Pentagon intelligence in the Iraq war involved in ordering the torture have escaped critical scrutiny, protected as they are up to now by the pro-Israel pundits, political fundraisers, presidential campaign fundraisers and influentials.

Nevertheless, the widespread condemnation of these war crimes, the media exposure of the systematic lies of the Pentagonistas and the fear that the highly influential and visible role of the Israel Firsters has raised alarm

bells among some of the most astute congressional Zionists, fearful of an anti-Israel backlash,³¹ Senator Frank Lautenberg (D.-N.J.), a committed Zionist, called for the “replacement” of Wolfowitz and Feith. “The men in charge have let down the soldiers in uniform. Simply replacing Secretary Rumsfeld will change little at the Pentagon if his discredited team of advisers remains in high-level positions. It is time for us to bring in new civilian leadership at the Defense Department” (*Newsday*, May 13, 2004). Lautenberg makes it abundantly clear that the Pentagon Zionists are central to the whole U.S. war effort, from beating the war drums, to cooking the data, designing the war strategy, to micromanaging the business of interro-

gation-torture.

Several former top U.S. military professionals objected to the Zionist control over U.S. policy and their close network of collaborators. Lt. Col. Kwiatkowski has given us an inside picture of the Feith/Shulsky operation, whose links to the Mossad seemed closer than to the U.S. military. The Rumsfeld-Zionist group's monopolization of military policy, war strategy, military calculations and military promotions all alienated the military high command. Some who clearly foresaw the disastrous consequences of the policies of the Israel First crowd on U.S. global ambitions were silenced and marginalized. It is likely that the torture photos release to the media was deliberately encouraged or promoted by highly placed military officials or former officials as a way of discrediting Rumsfeld and the Pentagon Zionists.³² This move severely undercuts the war effort, which more and more of the military high command sees as destined to fail and are determined not to become the Neo-Cons' scapegoats. However, to gain an "honorable" withdrawal they must know that they have to remove Rumsfeld and his Zionist colleagues, whose criteria for evaluating the war has less to do with the aims of the U.S. military and more to do with Israeli expansionist goals in the Middle East.

While the Pentagon Zionists and the powerful network of pro-Israel Jewish organizations have seen their Iraqi serial war strategy collapse, they have succeeded in securing presidential economic sanctions against Syria and bind U.S. political support to Sharon's destruction and annexation of the remnant of Palestine. Moreover, the leading Jewish organizations were able to secure a near unanimous vote in Congress (407 to 9) in favor of Bush's declaration supporting Israel's "new borders" in Palestine.³³ Once again the Zionist lobby has demonstrated its power — even turning Bush and the U.S. Congress into self-effacing political idiots before Sharon. After Bush put all of his limited credibility in Mideast politics in his "Road Map" for a Middle East peace accord, Sharon unilaterally declared a policy of "annexation and separation" and told Bush to swallow it. All the major U.S. Jewish organizations back Sharon's plan. Bush submits and endorses this, clearly demonstrating the slavish complicity of U.S. policymakers.

During the invasion and occupation

ARE YOU MOVING?

PLEASE, please, please —

**If a move is coming up,
make us the second
place you notify after
the
Post Office.**

Please note:

**THE POSTAL SERVICE
DOES NOT FORWARD
THIS MAGAZINE.**

of Iraq, some Congress members have been critical of the war. Hundreds of thousands of people have demonstrated their disapproval. Many Jewish-Americans have participated in the protests and in some cases have led the protests. Yet many of these progressive Jews refuse to allow criticism of Israeli complicity in the war to be included in the demonstrations. While the U.S. pursues the war in Iraq, the Israeli government has been equally brutal: engaging in pre-meditated assassination of Palestinian leaders, systematically destroying thousands of homes, farms, orchards, stores, schools, mosques and factories, and killing and maiming thousands of Palestinians activists, civilian women and children. They resort to the routine hooding, manacled and torture of detainees. All the major pro-Israel Jewish groups in the U.S., have defended all these crimes against humanity, successfully pressured both major parties, the Congress and President to say nothing:

no protest, no investigation, no punishment. By its blind support for Israeli colonial brutality the U.S. has alienated several hundred million Muslims, millions of Arabs of all faiths, the great majority of Europeans, Africans and Asians, heightening U.S. global isolation. At a time when Muslims and Arabs are conquered and persecuted, thousands jailed and many "disappeared" by the U.S., Israeli and European governments, Secretary of State Colin Powell convenes a meeting in Europe on the rising danger of ... "anti-Semitism"! And the U.N., under Kofi Annan, follows suit with its own meeting on "anti-Semitism" during

the ongoing devastation in the Rafah refugee camps in the Gaza Strip. The major Jewish organizations repeat the Sharon line "anti-Zionists" are "anti-Semites" — and it becomes the established policy in the U.S. and in some countries of Europe ... to the point that individuals critical of Zionism are fired, cultural institutions pressured into censoring anti-Zionist events and creating a

general culture of fear of offending the hegemonic Jewish organizations. Even Webster's recent dictionary equates anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism.³⁴

Conclusion

The problems of peace and war, humane treatment of all racial and ethnic groups, of allocating foreign aid to those in the Third World who need it most and not to an aggressive colonial state with the 20th highest per capita income should be foremost on our agenda. Confronting Zionists, Israel and its overseas loyalists requires us to face up to the inter-related challenges of opposing U.S. military and economic imperialism and its class and ethno-religious backers, regardless of their Biblical claims of being a special people with a unique history, cause or claims on humankind. Many profound questions are pending and will certainly be raised after the Iraqi military debacle, which cost so many U.S. lives and bled

ONCE AGAIN THE ZIONIST LOBBY HAS DEMONSTRATED ITS POWER — EVEN TURNING BUSH AND THE U.S. CONGRESS INTO SELF-EFFACING POLITICAL IDIOTS BEFORE SHARON. AFTER BUSH PUT ALL OF HIS LIMITED CREDIBILITY IN MIDEAST POLITICS IN HIS "ROAD MAP" FOR A MIDDLE EAST PEACE ACCORD, SHARON UNILATERALLY DECLARED A POLICY OF "ANNEXATION AND SEPARATION" AND TOLD BUSH TO SWALLOW IT.

the budget of so many billions that should have been spent on tens of millions of U.S. citizens and residents without health care and adequate living standards. There will certainly be a call for a congressional investigation to answer questions about "Why did the U.S. launch the war?" and above all "Who was responsible?" There will be one series of questions, however, which will provoke

the most vehement and concerted opposition to questions raised about the role of the Pentagon Zionists, their advisers, collaborators and supporters in and out of the Bush regime.

This line of inquiry will predictably be opposed by the neo-conservatives, liberals and Jewish organizations and their non-Jewish allies in and out of the government, including those who did a magnificent job of exposing the non-Zionist militarists in the Bush administration, but curiously enough forgot to even mention the Zionist cohorts and their ideological and organized backers in "civil society."³⁵

The inquiry could serve as an educational experience in informing U.S. citizens on the profoundly undemocratic nature of decision-making in questions of war and peace, the threats that civilian-militarists represent in relation to international law and the rights of national self-determination and the real threat of highly organized internal elites who become transmission belts for colonial mini-states carving out regional empires.

There are two lines of inquiry with regard to the disastrous Zionist influence on U.S. war policy in the Middle East. One line, on the right, comes from the "nationalist" empire builders who see the problem of Zionist power in terms of the negative effect that the war has had on U.S. empire building.³⁶ They are likely to testify that the Israeli loyalists isolated the U.S. from its European and other conservative allies, by pushing for a unilateral military conquest strategy, instead of engaging in joint diplomatic and economic strategies and pressuring Israel to act like a "normal state," by negotiating a "peace for land" two-state solution.

In a word, the conservatives (political, military and intelligence officials) will argue that the Zionists, by putting Israel in the center of their policy making, undermined U.S. empire building, draining troops, resources, money and public support to support Israel's quest for regional domination.³⁷

Another line of inquiry, from the left or progressive side, is likely to address the question of Zionist power over war

and peace in the Middle East and elsewhere by focusing on the usurpation of democratic rights of U.S. citizens in the making of foreign policy: the fact that a small elite of several thousand highly organized, affluent and well-funded lobbyists can control the voting behavior of Congress members, intimidate or defeat political representatives who criticize Israel's colonial policies, and who buy, silence and/or intimidate media outlets and public spokespeople who dare to raise questions about Iraqi-Israeli interconnects. The progressive critique will be directed not only at the role of the Pentagon Zionists in twisting U.S. war policy to favor Israel but their whole world view drawn on the Israeli view of its relation to the world: a paranoid and self-serving vision of external enemies everywhere and unreliable allies, of perpetual repudiation of international law, covenants and the Geneva Accords, of shrill polemics and deep penetration of ostensible allies' military and intelligence apparatuses. Progressives will attack the Israeli view that labels adversarial states mortal enemies who only understand force and that considers negotiation a cynical device to neutralize critics, to disarm adversaries in order to create new "facts on the ground" through force and violence. Progressives will have to courageously make the connection between the Pentagon Zionists, their affinity for Israeli ideology and their destruction of diplomacy, international law and cooperation.

The inquiry will have to point out that a great deal is at stake beyond law and peace: that the architects of the Iraqi war planned a series of aggressive wars of conquest based on the principle of domination by violence, torture, collective punishment, total war on civilian populations, their homes, hospitals, cultural heritage, churches and mosques, means of livelihood and educational institutions—these are the highest crimes against humanity. Crimes against humanity are inevitable in "total wars" based on ideologies of exclusive ethno-religious loyalties, whether Jewish, Christian, Hindu or Muslim. The worst crimes are committed by those who claim to be a divinely chosen people, a people with "righteous" claims of supreme victimhood. Righteous victimology, linked to ethno-religious loyalties and directed by fanatical civilian militarists with advanced weaponry is the greatest threat to world peace and

humanity. Progressives must forcefully reject "righteous victimology" by exposing its contemporary imperialist agenda and the fact that many descendants of victims have now become brutal executioners. They must reject "special exemptions" in naming Zionist power brokers and decision makers, especially by their Jewish colleagues on the Left. Selective criticism not only weakens the political substance and credibility of the critique, but is morally reprehensible as it denies an important truth — the politics of the Zionist architects of U.S. imperial policy making. The progressives must reject all imperial politics with or without Israeli design. They must return to republican principles, but in so doing progressives have to point to the incompatibility between a democratic republic and empire building, between narrow, explicit or implicit, ethno-religious loyalties and internationalism, between expansionist capitalism and democratic socialism. In order to pursue the progressive line of inquiry and alternative political perspective we should expect a prolonged, vitriolic and irrational assault.

The first line of ideological counter-attack, particularly by the ZPCs, will be the "labeling" tactic — hard hitting critical analysis will be labeled "anti-Semitism" to inhibit readers and listeners from discussing the evidence and substance of the issues. The examination of linkages between the Israel-centered Pentagonistas and the Israeli state will be labeled "pages from the 'Protocols of Zion'" and other such spurious analogies.

The second line of counter-attack will be to conflate Zionist power today with the not too distant past (1940s-1950s) when Zionism was only one of several views among U.S. Jewry and when it was less organized and influential in politics, the media and economy. The purpose of this dishonest amalgamation is to polemicize by citing past examples of relative Zionist weakness and to falsely attribute to the critics a world view of a worldwide, long-term Jewish conspiracy.

The third line of counter-attack and the most morally reprehensible is to conflate the victims of the Holocaust with the state terrorists of the Israeli state and their intellectual apologists and supporters among U.S. Zionists. The use of "blood ties" to make this connection when there is no social-economic-political similarity only reveals the irrational

mystical and reactionary nature of the current ideology of the Zionist right. The purpose of course is to secure public acquiescence with Israeli and U.S. Zionist crimes against humanity by presenting their actions in terms of "defensive" or "survival" tactics in the face of another holocaust-in-the-making. No evidence is needed — just breathless, vicious invective about the holocaust-in-the-making deniers. For the Zionist ideologues Israel is presented as the incarnation of universal values of democracy, liberty and justice and those who criticize Israel are then labeled as supporters of "Arab" dictatorships, repression, injustice and terrorism. The stated universal values are worth upholding but abundant evidence exists that they are not practiced in Israel where Arabs — both Muslim and Christian — are treated as second-class citizens, and death, destruction and ethnic genocide are daily fare for the Palestinians, and Israel's nuclear arms threaten its Middle East neighbors.³⁸

Finally, one will hear from Zionists the "relativist" argument: "Israel's crimes are no worse than many countries in the world." Except that few countries (except the U.S.) are engaged in colonizing a neighbor, bombing adversaries with impunity (and killing massive numbers of innocent bystanders), storing nuclear warheads with an offensive doctrine, securing half of U.S. foreign aid including its most advanced technology, controlling U.S. congressional voting on Mideast issues, shaping the Mideast political agenda for both presidential candidates, routinely torturing thousands of political prisoners (and sending advisers throughout the world), and practicing the totalitarian law of collective punishment for popular resistance.

There are many and profound reasons to single out Israel for condemnation, because while many countries practice some of the Israeli injustices, Israel and its overseas network in the U.S. contain a whole configuration of power relations which threaten not only the oppressed people of Palestine but the rights of people throughout the world.

Facing this ideological attack will not be easy because media access is totally unequal. The opposition is well organized, strategically located and well financed. But the crimes and failures of policy particularly as the Iraqi debacle deepens and many more Americans

become open and increasingly involved in seeking answers, the critics of the Israel-Zionist-Pentagon connection have a grand opportunity to expose and weaken the ties that bind. Moreover, outside the U.S. we have mass public opinion in our favor. In Latin America, Europe, Africa, Asia – the great majority see Israel as a threat, not a force for peace. Secular, democratic Jews anywhere else in the world should have no problem criticizing U.S. Zionists and their leading policy-makers in the Pentagon. Nowhere except in North America do the Israeli-centered Zionists have such power as they have in the U.S. Even in Israel there is a minority of Jews who openly despise the Pentagon-Zionists and their proposed serial wars; they especially despise Zionist ideologues like Richard Perle and Douglas Feith who, from afar, are willing to sacrifice the last Jewish soldier for their megalomaniacal idea of “Greater Israel.”

In this battle of ideas we have many allies around the world, our ideas and questions are relevant and will resonate in this time of deep anxiety among the American people. Let’s move ahead and de-colonize our country, our minds and politics as a first step in reconstituting a democratic republic, free of entangling colonial and neo-imperial alliances!



Professor James Petras has 50 books and over 300 articles to his credit. His work has been translated into 30 languages

Robin Eastman Abaya is a politically active physician and writer and lecturer on imperialism and anti imperialism.

NOTES

1. Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, David Wurmser, et al., *A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm*, Institute of Advanced Strategic and Political Studies, 1996.
2. *CovertAction Quarterly*, No. 72, Spring 2002.
3. Bob Mattingly, “US Unions Bankroll Israeli Aggression”, *Socialist Action*, August 2002 and Russell Mokhiber, “Bonds of Affection: When it comes to Investing, Israel’s Friends Lose Interest,” *Multinational Monitor*, April 1988.
4. James Bamford, *Body of Secrets: Anatomy of the Ultra-Secret National Security Agency* (New York: Doubleday, 2001).
5. James Ennes, *Assault on the Liberty* (Random House, 1980); See also statements by Ward Boston, Jr., Captain, JAGG USN (Ret), Jan. 9, 2004 and Admiral Thomas Moorer, USN (Ret), Jan. 11, 2003.

6. *Washington Report on Mideast Affairs*, “Pro Israel PAC Contributions to 2002 Congressional Candidates,” June 2003.
7. See Carl Cameron Investigates (Parts 1-4), Fox News Network, Dec. 17, 2001.
8. Carl Cameron Reports, Fox News Dec. 12, 2001.
9. Reuters News, “French Report: US Busts Big Israeli Spy Ring,” March 5, 2002.
10. Richard Reid, the ex con and would-be shoe bomber, convicted for trying to blow up an American Airlines passenger jet over the Atlantic in December 2001, managed to enter Israel on an El Al flight despite his unusual background, BBC News, Dec. 28, 2001.
11. See Gordon Thomas and Martin Dillon, *Robert Maxwell, Israel’s Superspy: The Life and Murder of a Media Mogul* (New York: Carol and Graf, 2002) for in-depth discussion of the powerful media links with Israel.
12. Glenn Frankel, “Prison Tactics A Longtime Dilemma for Israel,” *Washington Post*, June 16, 2004; p. A1.
13. *New York Times*, Dec. 28, 2001, p. 19.
14. CBS News, Sept. 20, 2002.
15. Gideon Levy, “Compensate settlers for what?” *Haaretz*, June 15, 2004.
16. U.S. Financial Aid to Israel: Facts, Figures and Impacts, *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 2004.
17. William Dalrymple, *From the Holy Mountain*, [Harper Collins, 1997]. Chapter 5 chronicles the systematic devastation of the ancient Orthodox Christian communities in Israel and the Occupied Territories, including the Armenians.
18. “Israel Bonds Raise \$130 million from U.S. Labor,” *Jerusalem Post*, July 25, 2001. See also “El Al Moves to Avoid Tiff with Big Labor – Sharon Steps in,” *Forward*, Feb. 21, 2003.
19. Russell Mokhiber, “Bonds of Affection,” *Multinational Monitor*, 1988 (multinationalmonitor.org.)
20. Rachel Donadio, “Talking the Talk at Jewish Labor Dinner,” *Forward*, March 22, 2004. See also Robert Fitch, “The Question of Corruption,” *Metro Labor Press Association*, Oct. 21, 1999, and Robert Fitch, Testimony, U.S. House of Representatives, Hearing on Workplace Competitiveness, March 31, 1998.
21. Paul Wolfowitz in *Vanity Fair* interview, July 2003. “the issue of weapons of mass destruction” was chosen “for bureaucratic reasons because it could be one reason [for invading Iraq] that everyone could agree on.”
22. Jim Lobe, “Insider fires a broadside at Rumsfeld’s Office,” *Asia Times*, August 7, 2003. Lt. Col. Kwiatkowski remarked, “I suggested to my boss that if this [evidence for invading Iraq] was as good as it got, some folks on the Pentagon’s E ring may be sitting beside Hussein in the war crimes tribunal.”
23. Julian Borger, “The Spies Who Pushed for War,” *Guardian* U.K., July 7, 2003.
24. Patrick Seale, “A Costly Friendship,” *The Nation*, July 2, 2003.
25. Elliott Abrams, *Faith or Fear: How Jews Can Survive in Christian America*, Simon and Schuster, 1997.
26. *A Clean Break*, op. cit. See also Leslie Gelb, “The

Three-State Solution”, *New York Times*, Nov. 25, 2003 and Seymour Hersh, “Israeli Activity in Kurdish Northern Iraq, Plan B,” *New Yorker*, June 28, 2004.

27. Frankel, op. cit.

28. John Kerry, “The Cause of Israel is the Cause of America,” Article originally appeared in the Brown Students for Israel publication “Perspectives: An Israel Review,” Fall 2003.

29. Matthew Clark, “Concrete, Razor Wire, ID cards,” *Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 8, 2003.

30. *Newsweek*, June 7, 2004, p. 35.

31. See *Haaretz*, April 24, 2004, where Israeli deputy ambassador to U.N. Arye Mekel complained that criticisms “only enhance suspicions ... linking us with Iraq where we have no business,” and Nathan Guttman, “Prominent U.S. Jews and Israel Blamed for Start of Iraq War,” *Haaretz*, May 31, 2004.

32. Martin Sieff, “Army, CIA want torture truths exposed,” *United Press International*, May 18, 2004.

33. “Sharon Praises U.S. on West Bank Refugees,” *Haaretz*, June 25, 2004.

34. Xavier Ternisien, “Des responsables communautaires protestent contre un ‘plan’ israélien incitant les juifs français à émigrer,” *Le Monde*, June 17, 2004.

Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, 2002: Expands the definition of anti-Semitism to include, “...opposition to Zionism, sympathy with opponents of the State of Israel.” And furthermore a recent forum of Catholic-Jewish intellectuals meeting in Buenos Aires declared that “anti-Zionism has become a form of anti-Semitism.” Quoted in *Haaretz*, July 9, 2004.

35. In the entire body of exposés by Seymour Hersh in the *New Yorker* during April – June 2004, the role of the Zionist Pentagonistas is not discussed.

36. On June 16, 2004, 27 retired top diplomats and top military officials released a statement calling for Bush’s electoral defeat and in May 2004 a more specific open letter to President Bush signed by 60 retired diplomats referred to the damage the U.S. Zionist relationship had done to U.S. prestige and influence in the Muslim world and in Europe.

37. U.S. Senator Ernest “Fritz” Hollings [D-S.C.], “Bush’s failed Mideast policy is creating more terrorism,” May 6, 2004 and “Why we’re in Iraq,” June 23, 2004 press release.

38. Yulie Khromchenko, “Poll, 64% of Israeli Jews support encouraging Arabs to leave,” *Haaretz*, June 22, 2004. Citing a survey by the Haifa University National Security Study Center, a remarkable 25% of Jewish Israelis would support the banned racist Kach Party in an election.

**Please Subscribe
Today!**

www.covertactionquarterly.org

Back Issues

Number 1 (1978) Philip Agee on CIA; Cuban exile trial; "Consumer research" in Jamaica.

Number 2 (1978) CIA recruits diplomats; Researching CIA officers; Cuban double agent in CIA; CIA North Carolina demolit. training base.

Number 3 (1979) CIA attacks CAIB; Top Secret Army spy manual; CAIB CIA poster; CIA in Mexico; Australia US spy satellite base; John Paisley mystery death.

Number 4 (1979) Spying on allies: Secret Italy cable; CIA in Spain; CIA Africa recruiting; Angola; Subversive academics in Southern Africa; CIA and human rights; CIA firearms authority; Intelligence budgets; In Search of Enemies.

Number 5 (1979) U.S. intelligence in SE Asia; Chinese diverted Soviet weapons from Vietnam; CIA in Denmark & Sweden; Grenada; AIFLD; CIA officer and JFK assassination evidence theft.

Number 6 (1979) Caribbean; Cuban exile terrorists; CIA Nicaragua plans; CIA's secret "Perspectives for Intelligence"; U.S. helps South Africa surveillance; CIA uses cockroaches.

Number 7 (1979-80) CIA and media: Destabilization in Jamaica; Robert Moss; CIA propaganda budget; UNITA - Savimbi in U.S., his secret letters; Iran; CIA uses pigeons.

Number 8 (1980) CIA vs. Philip Agee; Naming Names legislation - CAIB statement before Congress; Zimbabwe; Northern Ireland; CIA Florida recruiting; CIA assassinations.

Number 9 (1990) Intel. Tech: NSA in Norway, Glomar Explorer; Mind control; NSA; Jamaica; Hmong in Guyana; South Africa forgery; Canada bombing; CBW research; Intel. tech. politics.

Number 10 (1980) Caribbean: Jamaica, Guyana, Grenada; Antigua; Dominica; Cuban exiles; The Spike; CIA deep cover manual.

Number 11 (1980) Right-wing terror; S. Korea; KCIA; Portugal; Guyana; Caribbean; AFIO; NSA interview; CIA stamp; CIA assassinations.

Number 12 (1981) El Salvador; Guatemala; New Right/US intel.; Senate terrorism comm.; Wm. Casey; Mozambique; Norway; mail surveillance.

Number 13 (1981) Secret South Africa documents; Namibia; Mercenaries; Ku Klux Klan coup attempt; Globe Aero; Angola; Mozambique; BOSS; Central America; Max Hugel; Stanley Sporkin; Thomas Pauken; mail surveillance.

Number 14-15 (1981) Index to Numbers 1-12; Intelligence legislation; Extended Naming Names; Deep cover businessmen.

Number 16 (1982) Green Beret El Salvador torture; Argentine death squads; CIA media operations; Constantine Menges; Seychelles; Angola; Mozambique; Ku Klux Klan coup attempt; Nugan Hand; CIA germ warfare.

Number 17 (1982) CBW history; "Yellow rain"; Cuban dengue epidemic; Scott Barnes in Laos; Bangkok mystery death; Executive mercenaries; CIA and academia; CIA assassinations.

Number 18 (1983) CIA & religion; Nicaragua "Secret" war; Miskitos; Opus Dei; Guatemala; El Salvador; Institute of Linguistics; World Medical Relief; AID; CIA & BOSS; South African torture; Vietnam; Suriname; "Free Lebanon"; Court &

NSA; Spying on Canada; Heritage Foundation.

Number 19 (1983) CIA and media history; "Plot" on Pope; Grenada airport; NSA spies on Canadian journalist; Georgie Anne Geyer; CIA legends.

Number 20 (1984) Grenada invasion; Nicaragua; Ft. Huachuca; Israel and South Korea in Central America; KAL Flight 007; CIA assassinations.

Number 21 (1984) Salvadoran election: NY Times/Time/Newsweek distortions; Nicaragua; Israel in Central America; Accuracy in Media; Rev. Moon; CIA occult research.

Number 22 (1984) Mercenaries; Terrorism; Soldier of Fortune; CAIB Special Forces investigation; Privatizing Nicaragua war; CIA terror manual; Secret GAO DoD/CIA Honduras report; US-South African terror; Stefano Delle Chiaie.

Number 23 (1985) Pope Plot/Bulg. Connection; Claire Sterling; CIA, Turk. & Ital. neofascists.

Number 24 (1985) State repression; Infiltrators and provocateurs; Sanctuary movement; American Indian Movement; Leonard Peltier; NASSCO strike; Arnaud de Borchgrave and Rev. Moon; Robert Moss; Tetra Tech.

Number 25 (1986) U.S., Nazis, Vatican; Klaus Barbie's Bolivian coup; Nazi doctors in U.S.; Brazil torture; Knights of Malta; Greek civil war/Eleni; WACL supplies contras.

Number 26 (1986) US terror; Vernon Walters; Libya bombing; Contra agents; Israel & South Africa; Jon. Pollard; CIA & Costa Rica; Duarte; Nicaragua; Greece; Index to Nos. 13-25.

Number 27 (1987) Religious Right: Nuclear war theology; Christian underground; Fatima; Religious Right and Blacks; NY Times/Pope plot; Samora Machel; Carlucci; Southern Air Transport; Iran-Contra documents; Michael Ledeen.

Number 28 (1987) CIA, drugs, secret wars: S.E. Asia, Afghanistan, Central America, Nugan Hand; MKULTRA/Canada; Delta Force; AIDS and CBW.

Number 29 (1988) Pacific: Philippines, Fiji, New Zealand, Belau, Kanaky, Vanuatu, Maori in Hawaii; atom testing; media on Nicaragua; Reader's Digest; CIA in Cuba; Tibet; FBI-CIA surveils Gorbachev; Philip Agee on Veil; AIDS.

Number 30 (1988) Middle East: Intifada, Israeli arms sales, chemical & nuclear warfare, Israel in Africa & Central America; Disinformation & Libya; CIA's William Buckley; Afghan contra lobby.

Number 31 (1989) Domestic surveillance: FBI, CIA on campus; Office of Public Diplomacy; Geronimo Pratt; Lexington prison; Puerto Rico; Intl. Freedom Foundation; Disinformation.

Number 32 (1989) Tenth Anniversary Issue: Best of CAIB. 27 condensed articles: Naming Names; CIA and NSA at home, abroad, in the media; Philip Agee.

Number 33 (1990) Bush Issue: CIA Bush agents, secret team; Terrorism Task Force; Reagan's CIA; Skull and Bones; NED in Nicaragua; El Salvador election; Chile; Cuba; Republicans and Nazis; Rise of national security state.

Number 34 (1990) Panama invasion; Noriega-CIA; South African death squads; FBI-CIA and Martin Luther King, Jr. assassination; NED in Nicaragua; U.S. and Pol Pot; Philippines; Operation CHAOS; Taiwan's agents; Council for National Policy.

Number 35 (1990) Changes in Eastern Europe; Reinhard Gehlen; Destabilization of USSR; NED in Lithuania; Balkan nationalists; Free Congress Foundation; Cuba; Iran-Contra; 1965

Indonesia massacres; CIA banking.

Number 36 (1991) Racism and national security; FBI vs. Arab-Americans and Black officials; Chad, Uganda, South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Zaire; Haiti; Panama; Gulf War; COINTELPRO "art"; National security humor.

Number 37 (1991) Gulf War: Media; CIA Iraq broadcasting; U.S. trading with enemy; UN; Nuclear war evangelicals; Domestic costs; North Korea next?; Libya; Iran; Illegal arms deals; Georgie Anne Geyer; Journalists and CIA.

Number 38 (1991) DoD-CIA foreign/U.S. student recruitment; Rochester Institute of Technology; Harvard; Militarism in academia resources; Judi Bari; Arif Durrani; Rev. Moon and academia; Targeting environmentalists; CIABase review.

Number 39 (1991-92) "Good" agencies: NED; Peace Corps; USAID/AIDS; USIA; National Cancer Institute/biowarfare; World Bank; Population control; Danny Casolaro; FBI & Supreme Court; Robert Gates; USSR destabilization; BCCI.

Number 40 (1992) Native American struggle history; Toxic dumps; Leonard Peltier; Hollywood's racism; Guatemala; Rigoberta Menchu interview; Pol Pot returns; East Timor massacre; U.S. in Pacific, GATT; David Duke in India.

Number 41 (1992) Next enemies; LA Uprising; Nuclear threats; Bush and CIA; Bush family preys together; UN: U.S. Tool; Eqbal Ahmad; Nuclear proliferation; Environmentalist attacked; Dissent as subversion.

Number 42 (1992) Phil Agee on CIA; Peru; Fluoride; VP Bush & CIA; Nicaragua; Special Ops.; Drug war; CIA vs. Hen. Gonzalez; Bush inaugural speech leak; Moon buys university.

Number 43 (1992-93) Chemical and biological warfare: Zimbabwe, South Africa, anthrax; Gulf War Syndrome; Agent Orange; Scientific racism; "Yellow Rain"/Wall Street Journal; Yugoslavia destabilization; Religious Right; Somalia.

Number 44 (1993) Public Relations: Hill & Knowlton, Burson-Marsteller; Clinton Cabinet; Somalia; Rio Summit; BCCI-CIA; Clinton National Security Act; Religious Right's anti-gay plans.

Number 45 (1993) South African Right global links; Chris Hani assassination; German Neo-Nazis; HIV Haitians; Russia; ADL spying list; Pelican Bay prison; Ireland's youth; Police vs. black youth; Angola profiteers; Benjamin Chavis.

Number 46 (1993) Economic intelligence; CIA's assassination record; Israel and the bomb; NSA Clipper Chip; School of Americas; Ex-adviser on El Salvador; Private prisons; Delta death row; Savannah River; France's Groupe Bull; CIA banking.

Number 47 (1993-94) FBI vs. Judi Bari; Russian coup; Rocky Flats; NAFTA; Howard Zinn on FBI; Dave Dellinger on 90s; Cold War quiz; Allen Ginsberg on CIA; Mumia Abu-Jamal; World Bank/IMF; Evergreen Air.

Number 48 (1994) Chiapas uprising; CIA and NAFTA; Haiti; Iran-Contra Report; L.A.-8; Mercenaries in Azerbaijan; Council for National Policy; Guatemala and drugs; Reader survey.

Number 49 (1994) Montesinos and Fujimori; Sudan; Operation Gladio; Human atom testing; Armenia and Azerbaijan; South Africa's left; El Salvador death squads.

Number 50 (1994) Operation Condor; Clinton crime bill; Liberty lobby; Monfort meatpackers; Low intensity Democracy; NRO & intel. budget.

Number 51 (1994-95) U.S. in Haiti; Canadian intelligence abets Neo-Nazis; Brookhaven and cancer; Bulgaria; Population; Women's asylum rights; CIA budget; Paramilitary vacations; Bud McFarlane.

Number 52 (1995) Rwanda; Proposition 187; Militia movement; Neo-Nazis and anti-abortion; Groom Lake; Wall Street vs. Mexico; Human radiation; Corporations fund research; NSA in cyberspace; Far Right/spies internet resources; Union Carbide's Warren Anderson.

Number 53 (1995) Gulf War Syndrome; Militias and the military; Frank Donner; Arab bashing; Hiroshima: Cold War bomb; Iraqi embargo; Guatemala; Bhopal; Secret FISA court; Antiterrorism Act; Fourth Amendment mugged.

Number 54 (1995) Noam Chomsky on corporate propaganda; Bosnia; Kurdistan; Sasakawa obit; NAFTA layoffs; Prison labor; AFL-CIO in Russia; Private security guards; Walter Reuther.

Number 55 (1996) Police vs. citizen review; Corporate assault on FDA; PR industry vs. activists; Colin Powell; UN at 50/Fidel Castro; Economic intelligence; Spain's dirty war; East Timor - Britain Arms Indonesia; Bosnia.

Number 56 (1996) Noam Chomsky; High-tech surveillance; Militarizing the border; Pepper gas; Guyana; Yugoslavia; Russian nationalism; U.S. and Korea; La Belle bombing.

Number 57 (1996) Racism in the ranks; White collar crime; Common Law courts; INS detention centers; Buying Russian elections; Noam Chomsky on Haiti; U.S.-Israel; Anonymous remailers; Nuclear proliferation in space.

Number 58 (1996) Pilger on Burma; Estrogen & endocrine; Crime & capital globalization; "Counter-Terrorism" documents; Church burnings; AID & environment; Brookhaven; AIDS.

Number 59 (1996-97) Surveillance: ECHELON; NSA's business plan; NIMA; Spooks in the internet; Canadian spies; Privatizing welfare;

Mexico and SOA; Afghanistan; CIA and drugs.

Number 60 (1997) Cassini plutonium missing; Japan and Peru; MRTA; Prison labor; Unionbusting; Universities and business; Colombia; Sudan; FBI-CIA teamwork.

Number 61 (1997) Turkey's state killers; Privatizing Hanford; Spying on activists; U.S. torture manuals; Arming Mexico's drug war; NSA, Russia and Dudayev; NATO moves East; Spooks in Congress.

Number 62 (1997) U.S. and Pol Pot; Paramilitary policing; Selling SWAT; Mercenary armies and minerals; Mad Cow disease; Free radio; Che and the CIA; Visit to CIA; Vaclav Havel.

Number 63 (1997) Right-wing think tanks; South African torture; chemical-biological warfare; NSA's Crypto AG; Promise Keepers.

Number 64 (1998) Vietnam; Iraq sanctions; Political control technology; Jihad; Pinochet; Drug war fungus; Burma-Singapore heroin trade.

Number 65 (1998) Philip Agee, Ramsey Clark; Mumia Abu-Jamal; Serb demonization; Bosnia TV disinformation; Media evasions; NGOs in Latin America; Russian reform"; War on Cuba; Assata Shakur; Ron Ridenhour; CIA vs. Daniel Tsang; CIA mistaken identities

Number 66 (1998-99) Pinochet; Palestinian Authority; Tomahawks; Sudan; Pentagon bucks; PanAm 103; Laurent Kabila interview; Algeria; Richard Holbrooke; NATO; Iztetbegovitch; FBI's D.C. "espionage" trial.

Number 67 (1999) Mumia Abu-Jamal; NATO bombing and "Greater Albania"; Humanitarian intervention in Kosovo; Roma people; William Walker; Richard Holbrooke; Ocalan; Police militarization; Tupac Shakur; CIA and labor; CIA drug smuggling; Leonard Peltier.

Number 68 (1999) East Timor; Colombia; Panama; Cuba vs. U.S.; Serbia; NATO in Kosovo; KLA and drugs; MPRI; Urban Warrior; Homeland defense; Poverty globalization.

Number 69 (2000) Congo; Chechnya; Colombia;

Ecuador; Iraqi oil; Depleted uranium; Yugoslavia; India; Cyprus; Bosnia-Herzegovina; Seattle/WTO; "Emergency management;" Hunger politics; Global water; Climate; Prison-industrial complex; Military civil disturbance planning; CIA and Cold War.

Number 70 (2001) Bush and environment; Mullah Aid; Dick Held; Non-lethal weapons; Summit of the Americas; Israeli Nukes; Kissinger; Star Wars; Yugoslavia; Antonin Scalia; Bush and Blair; Rep. Rob Simmons; 10 Worst Corporations; Statement by Leonard Peltier.

Number 71 (2001) Depleted uranium; Political Islam; Plan Puebla-Panama; USA Patriot Act; War Criminals; Israel and Hamas; Palestinian right of return; Domestic Anthrax; Plan Colombia; CIA visa machine; DoD vs. environment.

Number 72 (2002) Police violence; ISI, CIA & Taliban; Palestine; Venezuela plotting & coup; Earl Silbert & Enron; US Designs on Iraq; Argentina bankrupted; Attack on Indian Parliament; Global rollback; Elie Hobeika.

Number 73 (2002) Torture; Jenin and Amnesty International; Academia & CIA; Pakistan; 50 Years of Coups-Iran to Venezuela; Plutonium in Space; U'wa vs. Occidental; Why Nato?

Number 74 (2002) Jenin and Human Rights Watch; George Soros stage-managing imperialism; Religious fascists and the CIA in Bosnia; End of Posse Comitatus; Brown & Root; James Petras on Argentina; Rwanda injustice; Revving up Bush's war machine; Smashing the Kurds.

Number 75 (2003) Homeland Security Phoenix-Style; Space-Based Imperialism; First Nations Fight Back; Tobacco Smokescreen; Denver Police Files; Victory For Judi Bari; Bhopal; Presidential Deceits; When Will Bush Fall?

Number 76 (2004) Edward Said Presente; Haiti's Murderous Army Reborn; "Gene Bombs"; Guantanamo Detainees; Racist War/Media on Iraq; IBM and Apartheid; Racism, Sexism, Militarism and John Kerry; World Social Forum, India.

9/11 COVER-UP CONTINUES-

Why Richard Clarke's "apology" is misleading. He is not talking about and the National

Commission on 9/11 is not looking at the following:

- Islamists of Afghanistan –CIA – Carter administration
- Islamists of Iran – CIA – Carter administration
- al-Qaeda — Saudi — CIA — Reagan administration collaboration in Afghanistan and Sudan
- al-Qaeda — Saudi — CIA — Bush I administration collaboration in Afghanistan and Sudan
- al-Qaeda — CIA — Clinton administration collaborations in Albania, Algeria, Bosnia, Chechnya, Iraq, Libya, Sudan.

For comprehensive reading on the subjects mentioned above, please refer to our back issues list, pp. 47-8.

Subscription, Books & Back Issue Order Form

PLEASE INDICATE:

- ☐ New Sub.
☐ Renewal
☐ Gift Sub.

Name/address/phone of Gift Recipient:

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

(4 issues/year) US currency only, please.

- U.S., Mexico: ☐ \$22 (four) ☐ \$41 (eight)
Canada: ☐ \$27 (four) ☐ \$50 (eight)
All Other: ☐ \$30 (four) ☐ \$59 (eight)
Prisoners: ☐ \$15 (four) ☐ \$29 (eight)

Institutions, public and private, add \$15.

BACK ISSUES: All back issues available. Some older issues as good quality photocopy only.

- ☐ \$295 Complete Set; plus shipping:
(\$25 US & Mexico, \$40 Canada, \$80 All Other)
☐ \$135 For 25 issues (+\$20 shipping outside U.S.)
☐ \$55 For 10 issues (+\$15 shipping outside U.S.)
☐ \$30 For five issues (+\$10 shipping outside U.S.)
☐ \$6 For one issue (+\$2 shipping outside U.S.)

Specify requested issue numbers below:

BOOKS:

- ☐ \$20 *Rogue State* (2001) by William Blum (signed)
☐ \$25 *Killing Hope* (2001) by William Blum (signed)

Please add \$10 shipping outside US/Mexico.

CREDIT CARD ORDERS, PLEASE SPECIFY:

- ☐ VISA ☐ MASTERCARD

Name on card: _____

No.: _____

Exp: _____ Signature: _____

Card Billing Address: _____

Tel: _____

email: _____

My total order is: \$ _____
(Payable to Covert Action Quarterly)

Please make a tax-deductible contribution
of: \$ _____

(Payable to: Alliance for Global Justice)

Place order by fax, phone, mail or email. (See below).

CovertAction Publications, 1500 Massachusetts Ave. NW, # 732, Washington, DC, 20005
Phone: 202-331-9763; Fax: 202-331-9751; email: info@covertactionquarterly.org



A former Iraqi serviceman awaiting back salary is arrested by U.S. soldiers.

GI Special #2B21

War Protest at the Democratic National Convention, Boston. July 25, 2004



Project Censored Top 25 Stories' award winner

W W W . c o v e r t a c t i o n q u a r t e r l y . o r g

People's tax dollars at work: U.S. soldier removes donkey, Najaf, August 13, 2004.

(AP Photo/Khalid Moham

