

# MIM Notes



March 1 2005, N° 315

The Official Newsletter of the Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM)

Free

## Support Ward Churchill

*Don't slander him all over again*

By a contributor  
February 17, 2005

Many "socialists" and even "communists" in the united States have been strangely silent about Ward Churchill, which is an expression of the fact that their lines are really bourgeois. But some who have opened their mouths to "defend" him have seen fit to undermine him with the other hand.

Certain so-called leftists and socialists have been contributing to Ward Churchill's detractors' distortion of his ideas, while claiming to support Churchill in his struggle with the Colorado governor and legislators, and the Colorado University regents. Not content with making simplistic Liberal arguments in defense of Churchill's Constitutional "free speech" rights, some have gone as far as calling Churchill's arguments "reactionary," presumably to distance themselves from Churchill's unpopular ideas. Yet, they claim to be supporting Churchill as a matter of principle.

But these "leftists" aren't just trying to distance themselves from Churchill's

ideas; many actually mean what they say. This is a recent example from the World Socialist Web Site:

"This [Churchill's argument about the "technocratic corps" as being little Eichmanns] is a wrongheaded and deeply reactionary argument, whether it refers to top officials of investment firms or immigrant maintenance workers. The crimes of US imperialism are manifold, and seen from the perspective of a Native American, American history must appear a particularly bloody spectacle. Nonetheless, to identify the American people, from whom virtually all knowledge about the consequences of the Persian Gulf war and sanctions has been withheld, with the US war machine is a terrible political mistake and writes off the possibility of profound social change in America. Moreover, the essential callousness of Churchill's response to the bombings works in the opposite direction of cultivating humanitarian and generous impulses in the population." (David Walsh,

*Continued on page 4...*



For fliers and a petition, see <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/mn/sept112001/>

### THE 'COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY' MOVEMENT

**Western white man's greatest accomplishment in the 20th century**

The whole Ward Churchill furor about "little Eichmanns" and the huge propaganda blitz surrounding the taking of U.S. hostages in Iraq point up the urgent need to understand the collective responsibility of the white man in the industrialized imperialist countries. In particular, it is appropriate at this moment to point out the greatest accomplishment of the white man of the Western industrialized countries in the 20th century. The award goes to the German communists who for a time ran the government of Germany with the theme of "collective responsibility" for the crimes of Nazi Germany. Without that movement for "collective responsibility," the white man would have that much less basis for peace with the rest of the world.

The first official statement of the communist party (KPD) once legalized after World War II said:

"Not only Hitler is guilty of the crimes that have befallen humanity! Ten million Germans also bear part of the guilt, those who in 1932 in free elections voted for Hitler although we communists warned: 'Whoever votes for Hitler votes for war!'"

"Part of the guilt is also borne by those German men and women who, spineless and without resistance, watched Hitler grab power, watched how he destroyed all democratic organizations, especially those of the labor movement, and locked up, tortured, and murdered the best Germans.

"Guilty are all those Germans who saw in the armaments build up a 'Greater Germany' and perceived in bestial militarism, in marches and exercises, the sole sanctifying redemption of the nation."

Then, as now, there were those who wanted to whitewash countless oppressive actions carried out by ordinary

*Continued on page 5...*

## Announcing MIP-Kanada

### The Canadian vanguard party

On February 18, 2005, the glorious red banner of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism was hoisted over northern North America with the establishment of MIP-Kanada, a Maoist Internationalist Party. MIP-Kanada works closely with its fraternal parties in the other imperialist countries and maintains ties with its fraternal parties in the developing countries.

Kanada has plenty of parties calling themselves "socialist" or "communist" that cater to the demands of Canadians, but MIP-Kanada is the only party that upholds MIM's correct and scientific

view of Kanada as a country dominated by a labour aristocracy that supports imperialism because it has been bought off with a share of imperialist superprofits extracted from the Third World. White Canadians, like their American counterparts, constitute an oppressor nation that subjugates its internal semi-colonies, principally the First Nations. We spell "Canada" and "Canadian" with a "K" to symbolize the decadent, backward, pro-imperialist nature of Kanada's non-proletarian working class.

MIP-Kanada upholds MIM's positions

on the Canadian national question. Although Québec's struggle for sovereignty gets the most attention in the Canadian

media, MIP-Kanada sees the struggle of the First Nations for self-determination as the primary national struggle in Kanada and the only one that gets our support at this time. While recognizing Québec as a nation, we join our First Nations comrades in opposing Québec's independence as a move that would set back the independence of the First Nations and play into the hands of US imperialism. We will support any First Nations that demand their independence from Kanada and will offer them our assistance in establishing their own Maoist parties.

In addition, MIP-Kanada agrees with the majority of Canadians that Kanada does not have a distinct culture or a national identity. Anglophone Kanada in particular is merely an extension of the United States. Unlike the Canadian-chauvinist parties calling themselves Marxist that exaggerate Kanada's distinctness for opportunist ends, MIP-

*Continued on page 9...*

You are not on a mailing list. You will not receive this paper again unless you take action.

MIM  
PO Box 29670  
Los Angeles, CA 90029  
Return Service Requested

PRESORTED STANDARD  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
PERMIT #56365  
BOSTON, MA

**On the web: [www.etext.org/Politics/MIM](http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM)**

# King makes his move Nepal reaches critical point

Two weeks ago King Gyanendra of Nepal fired all his puppets and took full and open control of the political regime.(1) He imposed a total communications blackout, only now being somewhat relieved.

At the same time, the king ordered the arrest of bourgeois politicians planning demonstrations. Hundreds have been detained. As a result, Denmark has ceased its aid operations to Nepal and other countries are threatening to follow suit.

Currently, the United States, India and the European Union are making a show of slapping the king on the wrist for totally moving away from “democracy.” In actuality, they are letting King Gyanendra do their dirty work.

Without bourgeois political interlocutors, the monarchy’s army in Nepal is now openly speaking for itself as upholding “human rights” despite fears about what such an openly monarchist regime might intend.(2) As MIM reported previously, at least some bourgeois analysts believe that King Gyanendra is the only one with political capital with the military sufficient to launch any attacks on the Maoist rebels carrying out People’s War. Otherwise, we might expect that the imperialists would have assassinated the

king long ago and installed a new stooge.

As usual, the military strategy of an unpopular regime is to rely on higher technology weaponry than what the rebels have. King Gyanendra wasted no time by launching air strikes on his own people(3) after disposing of his own previous puppet government. Yet it is inevitable that in a Maoist People’s War, the people will learn to adjust to new weapons and seize new ones of their own.

Thanks to the secret nature of bourgeois diplomacy we can only speculate that the king did all this with the green light from U.S. imperialism. It’s only too cute that after the United States and others delivered their military aid to the monarchy, they criticized him slightly and withdrew ambassadors “for consultation,” a somewhat severe diplomatic move by diplomatic standards. This allows the imperialists to pretend to wash their hands of what follows.

Again, the king’s move only proves what MIM was saying before about the nature of U.S. allies in Nepal and globally. As usual, Uncle Sam finds the most bizarre and backward people to prop up—anybody as long as they are not communist.

In this case, the imperialists have



picked their typical lackey, someone on the wrong side of history. It is also the case that the petty-bourgeoisie of Amerika deserves some criticism for supporting god-kings like King Gyanendra in Nepal, when they themselves would never consent to living under a god-king.

The crunchy, feel-good granola-eaters of Amerika fantasize about lands distant and spiritually pure. They fantasize that the slave-owning Dalai Lama would have ruled better than Mao.

Now we see the result. For all who have praised the Dalai Lama, here is your comeuppance. You should now be in praise of King Gyanendra. Here is your chance to show that theocrats in countries that supposedly never want to change are

better than Maoists. The Hindu god Vishnu is supposedly incarnated in Nepal’s king.

As MIM said in MIM Notes 303, “the mode of production needs to advance in Nepal. The Maoists are right, and that’s why the political alternatives seem so ludicrous.” It’s obvious that no one can modernize Nepal except the Maoists.

Notes:

1. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south\\_asia/4226039.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/south_asia/4226039.stm)
2. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4269787](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4269787)
3. [http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2005/02/08/nepali\\_army\\_launches\\_air\\_strikes\\_against\\_rebels/](http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2005/02/08/nepali_army_launches_air_strikes_against_rebels/)

Production by MC12

## MIM Notes

The Official Newsletter of The Maoist Internationalist Movement  
ISSN 1540-8817

*MIM Notes* is the bi-weekly newsletter of the Maoist Internationalist Movement. MIM Notes is the official Party voice; more complete statements are published in our journal, *MIM Theory*. Material in *MIM Notes* is the Party’s position unless noted. *MIM Notes* accepts submissions and critiques from anyone. The editors reserve the right to edit submissions unless permission is specifically denied by the author; submissions are published anonymously unless authors insist on identification (prisoners are never identified by name). MIM is an underground party that does not publish the names of its comrades in order to avoid the state surveillance and repression that have historically been directed at communist parties and anti-imperialist movements. MCs, MIM comrades, are members of the Party. The Revolutionary Anti-Imperialist League (RAIL) is an anti-imperialist mass organization led by MIM (RCs are RAIL Comrades). MIM’s ten-point program is available to anyone who sends in a SASE.

The paper is free to all prisoners, as long as they write to us every 90 days to confirm their subscriptions. There are no individual subscriptions for people outside prison.

People who want to receive newspapers should become sponsors and distributors. Sponsors pay for papers, distributors get them onto the streets, and officers do both distribution and financial support. Annual cost is: 12 copies (Priority Mail), \$120; 25 (Priority Mail), \$150; 50 (Priority Mail), \$280; 100, \$380; 200, \$750; 900 (Express Mail), \$3,840; 900 (8-10 days), \$2,200. To become a sponsor or distributor, send anonymous money orders payable to “MIM.” Send to MIM, attn: Camb. branch, PO Box 400559, Cambridge, MA 02140. Or write [mim3@mim.org](mailto:mim3@mim.org).

Most back issues of MIM Notes are available free on our web site. The web site contains thousands of documents, with ordering information for many more.

MIM grants explicit permission to copy all or part of this newspaper for any reason, as long as we are credited.

For general correspondence, contact:

**MIM**  
**P.O. Box 29670**  
**Los Angeles, CA 90029-0670**  
**eMail: <[mim@mim.org](mailto:mim@mim.org)>**  
**WWW: <<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM>>**

## What is MIM?

The Maoist Internationalist Movement (MIM) is the collection of existing or emerging Maoist internationalist parties in the English-speaking imperialist countries and their English-speaking internal semi-colonies, as well as the existing or emerging Maoist Internationalist parties in Belgium, France and Quebec and the existing or emerging Spanish-speaking Maoist Internationalist parties of Aztlan, Puerto Rico and other territories of the U.S. Empire. MIM Notes is the newspaper of MIM. *Notas Rojas* is the newspaper of the Spanish-speaking parties or emerging parties of MIM. MIM upholds the revolutionary communist ideology of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and is an internationalist organization that works from the vantage point of the Third World proletariat. MIM struggles to end the oppression of all groups over other groups: classes, genders, nations. MIM knows this is only possibly by building public opinion to seize power through armed struggle. Revolution is a reality for North America as the military becomes over-extended in the government’s attempts to maintain world hegemony. MIM differs from other communist parties on three main questions: (1) MIM holds that after the proletariat seizes power in socialist revolution, the potential exists for capitalist restoration under the leadership of a new bourgeoisie within the communist party itself. In the case of the USSR, the bourgeoisie seized power after the death of Stalin in 1953; in China, it was after Mao’s death and the overthrow of the “Gang of Four” in 1976. (2) MIM upholds the Chinese Cultural Revolution as the farthest advance of communism in humyn history. (3) As Marx, Engels and Lenin formulated and MIM has reiterated through materialist analysis, imperialism extracts super-profits from the Third World and in part uses this wealth to buy off whole populations of oppressor nation so-called workers. These so-called workers bought off by imperialism form a new petty-bourgeoisie called the labor aristocracy. These classes are not the principal vehicles to advance Maoism within those countries because their standards of living depend on imperialism. At this time, imperialist super-profits create this situation in the Canada, Quebec, the United States, England, France, Belgium, Germany, Japan, Italy, Switzerland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Israel, Sweden and Denmark. MIM accepts people as members who agree on these basic principles and accept democratic centralism, the system of majority rule, on other questions of party line.

*“The theory of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin is universally applicable. We should regard it not as dogma, but as a guide to action. Studying it is not merely a matter of learning terms and phrases, but of learning Marxism-Leninism as the science of revolution.”*

- Mao Zedong, Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 208.

# Capitalism ruins sports: NHL cancels season

On February 16, the professional U.S. hockey league called “National Hockey League” (NHL) announced the cancellation of the season. The players and owners could not agree on salary caps per team, with players wanting \$49 million per team and owners wanting it to be \$6.5 million less.

Even on NBC television, the disgruntled fans led the announcer to point out how “big business” has made itself unpopular in this context. Fans spoke on TV about how they wanted the game played for its own sake.

MIM refers to this conflict as one of leisure-time dynamics. Although salaries make it possible to have professional sports, the public somehow still wants in the back of its mind that sports have intrinsic value, apart from money.

Sports for their own sake and sex for its own sake are similar agenda items

when it comes to capitalism. In fact, with the existence of capitalism it is not possible to know when people have sex for its own sake and it is not possible to know who would be the champions in sports without the influence of having to entertain for money. As the professional basketball player Dennis Rodman explained, even he does not believe the NBA is about who is the best player or team. Instead it’s about who the owners believe they should promote because of their capability to sell tickets and boost TV ratings.

In this particular conflict over hockey, the fans with a refined sense of leisure time gain some insight into the fight against capitalism. They realize that capitalism is destroying something they value external to money.

In most circumstances, people with a refined sense of leisure are contributing

to capitalism’s stability. We call these people “gender aristocracy.” People who might otherwise be discontented find themselves entertained into apathy. Statistics on newspaper readership and TV viewing make it clear that such people are increasingly important while “hard news” reporting by MIM or the New York Times is less and less important in the majority-exploiter countries.

Another interesting point about the hockey season cancellation (and at the very least, the NHL has missed most of its season to negotiations thus far) is the salaries of the players, who average \$1.8 million a year in salary. There are many foolish or deceptive “Marxists” who say that income does not matter and that hockey players are “proletariat,” because they receive a paycheck and do not own the stadiums.

In contrast, genuine Marxists believe

that income derives from access to the means of production. High income generally comes from access to the means of production. In this case, high income is so high it is access to the means of production itself. \$1.8 million is not the means of subsistence. It is an amount to save in the form of access to the means of production—stocks, bonds and savings accounts. The annual interest from \$1.8 million in an account somewhere is sufficient to live on—proof that the average hockey player is not just petty-bourgeois but outright bourgeois. What matters is not who owns the skating rink but the fact that players are partners to the TV rights-access to the means of production in general, not particular lockerrooms or gyms.

Note: <http://www.940news.com/news.php?cat=9&id=n0216110A>

## Abolish the oppressor’s tool called ‘psychology’ Texas prisoners face professional brainwashing

By a comrade

A Texas prisoner has sent us a copy of his “Rational Self-Analysis” (RSA) worksheet. RSA is a simplistic psychological method used by quack business consultants and other charlatans trying to make an easy buck off of people’s insecurity. The method is designed to get people to disassociate themselves from things they “cannot” change and instead focus on the effects of their own actions. Like horoscopes, at a high enough level of generality these ideas may appear correct. For example, we should avoid ultraleft idealism, or the idea that we can take revolutionary action as if material conditions have already changed in the direction we want them to. But we do not say that we “cannot” change material conditions — just that we need to understand how much they have actually changed, and be scientific about how much change we can effect in a certain time period.

In this Texas prison, the counselor applying the RSA program is clearly just trying to get the prisoner to stop worrying about other prisoners’ conditions, to prevent the development of collective identity. Clearly, “an injury to one is an injury to all” would constitute a violation of the reprogramming the counselor is trying to impose.

The worksheet below says, “the way to change our feelings is not to change reality (this is impossible!) but to change our trouble causing patterns of thinking.” We agree that what we think and feel reflects the interaction of external events and our own consciousness and reaction to them. However, we must insist that our reactions in turn influence external events. If that were not the case, society would never change. The counselor wants

to break the dialectical connection between consciousness and conditions, to insist that the only correct approach for the prisoner is to accept all material conditions as unchanging “reality” and settle for adapting his behavior to survival within these conditions. We would agree that revolutionary prisoners need to put a very high priority on their own survival, and that idealism about the ability to affect conditions can lead to costly mistakes. But we reject the underlying philosophy in general and the shameless attempt to depoliticize this prisoner in particular.

We would like to see other examples of this or similar programs from other prisoners, so that we may expose them to prisoners and their supporters outside the walls.

Below is the excerpted text of the worksheet, with the prisoner’s responses as written shown in italics. The counselor’s “corrections,” marked in red pen, appear in [brackets].

### Rational Self-Analysis

#### The A-B-C Model:

If we look at our lives, most of what is going on in our heads is focused on situations or events of some kind. Thousands of events are occurring all of the time but only certain ones get our attention. These events are called Activating Events. We often think that these cause us to feel a certain way and we believe we cannot help feeling the way we do because they “made” us feel that way. We believe that our feelings/behaviors are the consequences of the event. But if that were true, then everyone would react to the same event the same way. However, the Consequences of the event, our feelings and behaviors, are

really caused by the Beliefs we hold about the event. The way to change our feelings is not to change reality (this is impossible!) but to change our trouble causing patterns of thinking. We need to create helpful, worthwhile, encouraging and useful Rational Responses that will help us feel and behave in healthy ways!

#### Worksheet

##### Rational Self-Analysis: A guide to help you challenge your self-talk

[Across the top, in red, the prison counselor has written, “Please try again!”]

A - Activating Event (Something happens):

*Prisoner: Officer did not feed another offender at chow.*

B - Beliefs, thoughts, self-talk (I tell myself something about “A”):

*Prisoner: The officer did this as a form of punishment but only because he believes he can get away with it.*

C - Consequences (I feel and do something):

Emotions (I feel):

Prisoner: Anger

Behaviors (I do): I question the officer as to why he didn’t feed the offender.

D - Dispute (Challenge) the above Beliefs by answering the following questions about each thought you listed

above. If your answer is no, explain why.  
A-live? Does this thought keep me safe?

*Prisoner: No. It lets the officer know that I did not like what he did.*

F-eel? Does this thought help me feel the way I want to feel?

Prisoner: Yes

[Counselor’s red pen: Please refer to “B” and “C”]

R-eal? Is this though true? Is it based on objective reality?

*Prisoner: Yes.*

O-thers? Does this thought keep me out of trouble with others?

*Prisoner: No. It places me in threat of retaliation.*

G-oals? Does this help me reach my goals?

*Prisoner: Yes.*

[Counselor’s red pen: Please refer to “B” and “C”. It is the responsibility of the other offender to deal with this problem. By becoming involved in another offender’s problem, you \*make\* it \*your\* problem.]

Create a Rational Response (New self-talk that is worthwhile, encouraging, useful, and helps you reach your goals):

*Prisoner: Instead of questioning officer about the incident, simply file a complaint against him.*



<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/rail/impkills.html>

# Support Ward Churchill

From page 1...

“The new McCarthyism: the witch-hunting of Ward Churchill,” <http://www.wsws.org/articles/2005/feb2005/chur-f11.shtml>)

What this particular example shows is that Trotskyists are worse than nothing. They are also worse than Liberals, like the ACLU, who do not claim to be socialist, yet still manage to support Ward Churchill without strongly attacking him with the other hand. David Walsh conflates the “technocratic corps” with the “American people” and repeats the vague bullshit about Churchill being “callous” toward the Trade Center victims (without mentioning how callous Madeline Albright was). And he deliberately misreads Ward Churchill as saying there is no opportunity for any Americans to change, when Churchill clearly acknowledges the existence of a minority of Americans (albeit tiny) who opposed the Iraq sanctions in more effective ways than those who either did nothing or too little to oppose the sanctions.

David Walsh also attributes Churchill’s observations on American genocide to Churchill’s being an American Indian: “seen from the perspective of a Native American, American history must appear a particularly bloody spectacle.” However, it is David Walsh and other Trotskyists who practice identity politics by quickly opposing any line that locates the bulk of the revolutionary forces outside the “American people.” Also, David Walsh lies about Americans not knowing the effects of the sanctions before 9/11. It’s as if David Walsh did not even read Churchill’s essay. As Churchill points out, Madeline Albright herself admitted on 60 Minutes in 1996 that half a million children died as a result of the sanctions. Peer-reviewed research on the child mortality effects of the sanctions appeared as early as 1992. David Walsh’s obnoxious nihilism with regard to what the American population could have known about the sanctions is exactly what Ward Churchill is talking about. And what could the American population have known, a decade before 9/11? Just looking at the Iraq sanctions:

On November 4, 1992, The Atlanta Journal and Constitution reported James Grant as saying Iraqi “children are in the greatest crisis, and 3 million people suffer from U.N. sanctions. He spoke of raw sewage and broken pumps, malnutrition and deaths from measles in a situation he called ‘very fragile.’” On September 24, 1992, The Toronto Star (Reuters) reported: “An international team of researchers estimated 46,900 children under age 5 died in Iraq between January and August, 1991, as an indirect effect of the bombing, civilian uprisings and a U.N. ordered economic embargo.” On September 24, 1992, USA TODAY reported: “Air attacks on Iraq during the

Persian Gulf war, and subsequent trade sanctions, increased by threefold the number of war-related infant and child deaths, a postwar study suggests.” On December 23, 1991, a St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri) editorial reported: “The sanctions have indeed been choking Iraqis to death. According to surveys, food prices in Iraq have risen more than 2,000 percent, per capita calorie intake has dropped to 1,500 calories from 3,000 before the war; cholera, typhoid, meningitis and diarrhea are epidemic; infant mortality has quadrupled and 118,000 children are at risk of death.”

On November 25, 1991, The Washington Post reported: “After more than a year of U.N.-imposed economic sanctions, Iraqis are accustomed to such shortages. But in what diplomats here say could become a major obstacle to U.S. efforts to sway Iraqi public opinion and influence government policy, Iraqis are expressing growing anger and resentment toward the United States for maintaining the economic blockade, now that Iraqi forces are out of Kuwait. . . . [Ayad Ramadhani, surgeon in Mosul, Iraq, said] ‘Your country is punishing our people. What the United States is doing is starving our children and depriving people of drugs and telling them to overthrow the government. This is torture, inhumane torture.’” On November 5, 1991, a St. Petersburg Times (Florida) editorial reported “George Bush repeatedly said we had no quarrel with the people of Iraq, but they are suffering from the continued economic sanctions imposed on them by the West and from the consequences of the air war. Eighty-eight thousand tons of bombs were dropped on the country, causing devastation that imperils the lives of thousands of children. . . . A group of Harvard doctors and public health workers visited Iraq last month and brought back harrowing statistics. After visiting 9,034 households in every region in Iraq, the team reached these conclusions: 900,000 Iraqi children are malnourished. The mortality rate for children is 380 percent greater than it was before the war.”

On December 19, 1990, The Herald Sun (Reuters) reported: “Iraq claimed today UN sanctions had killed 2042 Iraqi children under the age of five years since August because of shortages of food and medicine.” On the same day, The Christian Science Monitor (Boston, MA) (Reuters) reported the same thing.

There are hundred of other examples like these (not only before September 2001, but before 1996!), and these reactionary jokers like David Walsh have the nerve to claim the “American people” could not know have known anything about the consequences of the sanctions long before 9/11?

Robert Jensen, in an essay (“Ward Churchill: Right to Speak Out; Right About 9/11,” <http://www.counterpunch.com/>

jensen02142005.html) posted in several places on the Internet, also misrepresents the content of Ward Churchill’s “Some People Push Back” essay. This may be even more damaging than the foul WSWS trash because Robert Jensen, unlike David Walsh, purports to give Ward Churchill’s main argument “firm” support.

What Robert Jensen does which is so devastating is to interpret Churchill as supporting the Trade Center attacks as a matter of strategy, when Churchill is only counseling readers on how to avoid similar attacks in the future. Robert Jensen: “It’s hard to read that as anything other than an endorsement of the use of deadly force against all those involved in ‘the mighty engine of profit’ to which the military dimension of U.S. policy has always been enslaved,” apparently at the level of stock traders and above.” Jensen proceeds to discuss why “the attacks of 9/11 don’t meet the test” of necessary and justified violence. However, Ward Churchill never said the attacks were effective. On the contrary, Churchill said: “For it to have been otherwise, a far higher quality of character and intellect would have to prevail among average Americans than is actually the case. . . . it’s becoming increasingly apparent that the dosage of medicine administered was entirely insufficient to accomplish its purpose. Although there are undoubtedly exceptions, Americans for the most part still don’t get it.”

Also, Churchill only said the “little Eichmanns” had it coming morally from the viewpoint of those who carried out the Trade Center attacks (thus Churchill’s use of the word “penalty,” which has a punitive connotation), and in the sense that it was predictable based on a long history of American militarism and genocide. How much clearer can it get? Churchill said: “This might be seen as merely a matter of ‘vengeance’ or ‘retribution,’ and, unquestionably, America has earned it, even if it were to add up only to something so ultimately petty.” Read that again: “petty.”

## Petty

Petty, like Robert Jensen’s pathetic attempts to fabricate distinctions between stock traders on the exchange floor and higher-up brokers and portfolio managers, as if these people weren’t all parasites, as well as cogs in the machine, and didn’t have similar career goals and political aims. Petty, like Jensen’s claim that “high-level traders” bear more responsibility simply because their actions have more powerful immediate financial consequences. It’s as if Jensen were holding the high-level employees to a higher standard—perhaps because they are aware of the evil they are perpetrating (which reduces responsibility to a matter of subjective intentions). Jensen’s whole point about differing levels of responsibility covers up the fact that the low-level stock traders are also parasites and easily had

the leisure time to participate in the revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle. It obscures the fact that the low-level stock traders were just as aware of the consequences of the Iraq sanctions for Iraqi children, or did they not read newspapers or watch the news on TV? The bourgeoisie themselves were talking and worried about the consequences, more for pragmatic reasons, but still.

Straight up, executives do not have more responsibility than lower-level employees. On the contrary, the exploited and oppressed cannot rely on the most powerful, and therefore most “responsible” parasites, like executives and the best-paid professionals, for change. The fact that the less “responsible” labor aristocracy who aren’t executives haven’t overthrown capitalism is an indictment on its own, but with a material basis in the labor aristocracy’s role in parasitism. Jensen is wrong to distance not only the American labor aristocracy, but also the stock traders, from “collective responsibility.” Totaled up, the labor aristocracy may have even more responsibility than the executives. To say they have less responsibility in comparison to parasites higher on the ladder is misleading. There is no end to this kind of logic. Eventually, we would just be holding a handful of individuals in the White House responsible. Even within the dominator’s own logic about “democracy” and elections, the people in the White House are the choice of the Americans.

Ward Churchill is right; the American population as a whole (but particularly the white oppressor nation) has had more than enough opportunity to be informed about imperialism, and more than enough opportunity to act, but they have not acted. Granted, many are too busy being decadent to be very well-informed. Yet, most were aware of the Iraq sanctions, for instance, but did absolutely nothing about them. For Jensen to speak of degree of responsibility here is ridiculous because American parasites hardly exhibit degrees of action in the first place. What it comes down to is that Jensen, under the pretext of “disagreeing” with Churchill’s writing in order to “demonstrate [true] solidarity,” portrays Churchill as having an unrefined terroristic mentality incapable of discriminating between different American parasites. But Churchill was not proposing terrorism as a strategy in the first place, so Jensen’s “disagreement” is just the same slander about Churchill’s supposed ulterior motives.

## Unprincipled cowards from the Internet purposefully misrepresent Ward Churchill's ideas Half-assed "defenses" of Churchill not enough

As of February 20, 2005, 8:40 AM GMT, a February 16, 2005, article entitled "Turnabout: Ward Churchill Now Target of Terrorists" (<http://www.chronwatch.com/content/contentDisplay.asp?aid=13089>) appears on the third page of Google news search results for: "Ward Churchill". The article, by Jeremy Robb, is posted on ChronWatch, which is intended to be critical of the "ultra liberal" bias of the San Francisco Chronicle, and initially appeared in the "Fun Stuff" section on the front page of ChronWatch. Under the pretext of "satire," the article reports that Al Qaeda has objected to being compared with Jews by implication of Churchill's describing the World Trade Center "technocratic corps" as "little Eichmanns." (Adolf Eichmann was a Nazi bureaucrat, who supposedly was just obeying orders.) Jeremy Robb falsely reports:

"In a printed statement, Churchill said 'I am shocked that I have become the target of Al Qaeda. I hate Americans as much, if not more, than they do. I only wish I could have been on one of those planes to prove how much I hate Americans. And I certainly would never insult these freedom fighters by comparing them to Jews.'"

Given the outright lies about Churchill going around in the blogosphere and the larger Internet, many will write off the ChronWatch article as being yet another

intentional, blatant distortion of Ward Churchill's "Some People Push Back" essay, this time under the pretext of parody or satire, and they will be right. The article is total bullshit, and the quote Jeremy Robb attributes to Churchill was just made up. But what's interesting is that Google's "computer algorithms without human intervention" portrays this as a news piece, like any other, and some persyns have actually interpreted it as such.(1) Elsewhere, the body of the article was reposted, without comment, on right-wing University of Haifa Professor Steven Plaut's blog.(2) However, the ChronWatch article does not actually parody anything in the San Francisco Chronicle. On the contrary, the Associated Press articles, covering Ward Churchill's struggle with the Colorado bureaucrats, in the San Francisco Chronicle, have distorted and in other ways misrepresented the content of Churchill's essay. Other blog posts, filled with shameless lies about Churchill and racist attacks (repeated off-line) having to do with his American Indian lineage, appear as legitimate "news" on Google.

In another example (<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/mn/sept112001/wardchurchill021705.html>) of a half-assed "defense" of Ward Churchill that actually undermines him, Steven Best, Assistant Professor at the University of Texas at El Paso, undermines Churchill's credibility by contributing to his

detractors' distortions of what he said.(3) According to Steven Best, "Churchill wrongly viewed the World Trade Center as a military target and absurdly judged everyone killed in the twin towers as 'little Eichmanns'."

But Churchill did not "judge everyone killed in the twin towers as 'little Eichmanns,'" only those whom he called the "technocratic corps." This is patently clear from just reading Churchill's description of the "little Eichmanns" in his essay.

Under the pretext of overcoming Churchill's alleged lack of "nuance" and even going as far as to contradict himself in the same paragraph, Steven Best falsely attributes statements to Ward Churchill, such as: "Churchill declared that the 2,977 people killed in the 'sterile sanctuary of the twin towers' were not innocent victims, but rather 'little Eichmanns.'" Without nuance or qualification, Churchill argued that those killed in the World Trade Center were as culpable for US violence as top Nazi bureaucrat Adolf Eichmann was for Hitler's 'final solution'" (emphasis mine). Not only does this clearly misrepresent what Churchill said right in his controversial essay, Steven Best had the nerve to write this more than a week after Churchill unnecessarily clarified: "It should be emphasized that I applied the 'little Eichmanns' characterization only to those described as 'technicians.'" Thus, it was

obviously not directed to the children, janitors, food service workers, firemen and random passers-by killed in the 9-1-1 attack. According to Pentagon logic, were simply part of the collateral damage" (emphasis mine).(4) Steven Best even notes this clarification. Yet, Best insists on insinuating that Churchill was "back-peddling."

From MIM's point of view, all Americans need to take collective responsibility for crimes of their government. Churchill's argument touched on a different subject—the golden rule that Americans supposedly love with Christian values. If "collateral" damage is OK for Americans to carry out as the government said during the Gulf Wars, then "collateral" damage certainly cannot be blamed when the terrorists took out a CIA office in the World Trade Center. Those people flying into the twin towers did nothing that Americans had not been doing for years and the only way for peace is for the main perpetrators to recognize that.

Steven Best feigns ignorance(5) on behalf of the bourgeoisie, not just the broad American labor aristocracy: "unlike Eichmann U.S. technocrats may be genuinely oblivious to the violent nature of the system for which they work." But not only are the "technocrats" responsible, so is the majority of the larger American population. As Deborah Frisch points out,

*Go to page 6...*

## THE 'COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY' MOVEMENT

*From page 1...*

Germans during World War II—actions that in no way could ever generate humyn harmony. The guises for this were many. Some called them "exploited workers." Others clung to "Aryan superiority." The various politicians in Germany after the war vied to evade the truth, the unpopular truth. It could be no other way, because parliamentary politicians win through flattery of the majority, so at those times when something absolutely unflattering has to be said about the majority, only a communist dictatorship guided by scientific principles has a chance of moving forward.

Aside from MIP-Amerika, MIP-Kanada, the Ghetto Liberation Political Party, the Russian Maoist Party and the movement to put the ALKQN on the Maoist road there are no organizations in the imperialist countries with a correct line to fight the propaganda of Bu\$h's "war on terror." There is no way to fight back against the propaganda without the ideology of collective responsibility. The terrorist attacks on ordinary Americans will appear as out-of-the-blue, unless we understand the oppressive actions of ordinary Americans costing millions of innocent civilian lives since World War II.

Eventually, the understanding of "collective responsibility" in Germany fell by the wayside. In the meantime, at least a partial purge of Nazis from responsible positions had occurred, a difficult struggle considering how many ordinary Germans had enthusiastically participated in Nazi oppression. In eastern Germany, various citizens of other Sovietized countries had to run the administration while Germans could not do it for themselves. At the time, there was no systematic theory for why the Germans could not do it themselves, only a political reality of Nazi history, a fact too obvious to evade, theory or no theory.

Soon after the end of World War II, Stalin died in 1953 and the political path of capitalist-roader Khrushchev was clear. There was never to be a summation of the German experience guided by revolutionary science. It is only with 50 years hindsight, and the principles developed in MIM's line, that we can now say that the "collective responsibility" movement of Germany in 1945 and 1946 was the greatest political advance of the Western white man in the 20th century.

Ironically, today, Ward Churchill finds himself criticized by many consciously and

unconsciously influenced by Marx writing about early capitalism. Yet it has been almost 160 years since Marx wrote the "Communist Manifesto" and over 80 years since Lenin explained why imperialist wealth may delay the revolution in the most industrialized countries. That means that we are overdue for a correct summation of history.

The award for the greatest accomplishment of the Western white can not go to the rebels of Paris in 1968, because there was no follow-up. The rebels had the physical opportunity to take power, but did not because of a lack of mission that the German comrades demonstrated in 1945 and 1946. The German comrades too had many flaws, but the one thing that they managed to do is still unparalleled elsewhere—provide political meaning to a majority on why it had been wrong.

The German communist example in 1945 continues to shine a brilliant light today. The German communists were not "terrorists" or "terrorist sympathizers" for talking about "collective responsibility" and that is something that even the ordinary American can understand, if

political activists unite behind the MIM line to put forward the explanation necessary. Just as today the various minorities scapegoated by the allies of the Bu\$h administration had nothing to do with 911, because it was Reagan and Bu\$h who armed and trained Al-Qaeda, so too the German comrades were involved with no terrorist armed actions while putting forward the "collective responsibility" line that advanced global peace. Certainly the ordinary Germans did suffer during and after World War II, but the German comrades held firm and did not try to evade their own responsibility for their own plight.

The German communist example also lights the path, because it proves that in any strategic situation no matter how dire, what matters is the overall strength of the international proletariat in the world, not inside a particular powerful imperialist country. There is no reason to give up the fight, and in some circumstances it is absolutely necessary to resist the majority bitterly.

Note: Weitz, Eric D. *Creating German Communism, 1890-1990: From Popular Protests to Socialist State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1997, p. 319.

# The collective responsibility movement for Amerika

## What could AmeriKKKans have known about the Iraq sanctions?

By a contributor  
February 18, 2005

Certain individuals, presuming to refute Ward Churchill's "Some People Push Back" essay that is causing the governor of Colorado to ask for Ward Churchill's resignation from the University of Colorado, are suggesting Amerikans could not have known about the effects of the Iraq sanctions long before 9/11, at least enough to act. The argument goes that since such people "did not know," they cannot hold moral responsibility as "little Eichmanns" as Ward Churchill charged. What counts as actionable information is the underlying question.

The low quality of the imperialist media's output is worth mentioning. Progressives should seek to raise the truth quotient in politics, and that includes raising the truth quotient in public opinion. News media, which both influences and reflects public opinion, can water down or otherwise distort the truth. To point out that the vast majority of Amerikans could have known about the child mortality effects of the sanctions against Iraq, for instance, is not to say that the media coverage of the Iraq sanctions was adequate politically. As Maria Alanis points out, mainstream media coverage of Iraq sanctions has been lacking, numerically speaking and otherwise, since September 11, 2001, yet more proof of the need for the oppressed to have their own independent institutions, including newspapers.(1)

Undoubtedly, an Iraqi child mortality figure repeated matter-of-factly by a news announcer on a bourgeois news program is not going to be really inspiring. [mim3@mim.org interjects: No one can find a reference for the alleged Stalin quote "An individual death is a tragedy. A million deaths is a statistic," but if he said it, it would surely be referring to his frustration in communicating with the public via statistics, not a belief that a

million deaths is unimportant. Quite the contrary, Stalin put the group above the individual as do all communists.]

Saying something like "according to the Iraqi government, this number of Iraqi children have died..." is obscuring things, too. But repeated exposure to such coverage should be enough motivation for even the densest Amerikan to delve a little bit more deeply into the Iraq sanctions question. That the vast majority of Amerikans did not is directly related to their parasitic privileges, decadence, and oppressor politics. Far from opposing the Iraq sanctions, most Amerikans have expressed support for the Iraq sanctions, lifted partially only in May 2003. And most of those who verbally opposed the Iraq sanctions failed to act in any way to oppose them.

Contrary to Robert Jensen's argument, low-level stock traders have just as much responsibility as high-level stock traders when both absolutely fail to act against imperialist militarism and genocide. To say only those high on the corporate and political ladders have great responsibility is opportunism and strategically disorienting. But let's leave aside for now what Amerikans did not do. Let's look at what they did do.

An October 22, 1990, telephone poll (before the Persian Gulf War began) conducted by Yankelovich Clancy Shulman shows that 56% of Amerikans wanted to "continue sanctions." 32% wanted to "take military action." Only 4% voluntarily indicated "neither." A November 1990 telephone poll conducted by the same marketing firm shows that 57% of Amerikans wanted to "continue sanctions." 35% wanted to "take military action." Only 1% voluntarily indicated "neither."

A July 31, 1991, Gallup telephone poll (after the Gulf War ended) shows that 52% of Amerikans supported "leaving the sanctions in place as long as Saddam

Hussein remains in power." 37% supported "allowing Iraq to sell some oil if the money goes to pay for food and medical supplies." Only 6% supported "lifting the sanctions to allow Iraq to resume."

In May 1996, Madeline Albright did not dispute 500+ thousand Iraqi children dead from Iraq sanctions on 60 Minutes. A September 10, 1996, telephone poll conducted by the Los Angeles Times, several months after the 60 Minutes broadcast, shows that 16% of Amerikans supported continuing "economic sanctions against Iraq." 9% supported continuing "military operations against Iraq." 58% supported continuing "both economic sanctions and military operations."

A November 25, 1997, telephone poll by CBS News and New York Times shows that only 14% of DemoKKKrats supported making the Iraq sanctions "less restrictive." 80% said they should be "continued as they are now." 79% of Amerikans in general said they should be "continued as they are now." (RepubliKKKans were slightly worse than Demokrats, but independents made Amerikans as a whole more supportive than even Demokrats of making the Iraq sanctions less restrictive.)

The u.s. population as a whole, but particularly the oppressor Euro-Amerikan nation, is privileged compared with oppressed nations and even compared with imperialist countries like Russia. Polls conducted by the United States Information Agency, for example, show that Russians supported the Iraq sanctions less than Amerikans did. Amerikans obtain privileges from imperialist parasitism, so much so that the majority are exploiters. So, when the mainstream media consistently papers over the consequences of the Iraq sanctions for Iraqi children, that really is not surprising. For certain reasons, such representations of the Iraq sanctions correspond to the

interests of most Amerikans. Amerikans' supporting the Iraq sanctions was not an instance of false consciousness for most Amerikans. For anti-imperialists sorting out what demands to support and what demographics to work with, this is strategically important to know.

At the same time, however, the reactionary politics of the majority of Amerikans cannot be attributed to a lack of information. True, better information was available than in the mainstream media, but that is precisely the point. In "Some People Push Back," Ward Churchill notes that "as a whole, the American public greeted these [mainstream media!] revelations with yawns" and continued to engage in self-absorbed chauvinism and decadence, when they could have spent an hour finding and reading better information on the Iraq sanctions.

There are tons of non-mainstream sources on the Iraq sanctions, but it is interesting to see what even the mainstream sources were putting out.

One TV example is from Larry King Live on September 13, 1993.(2) General Norman Schwarzkopf did not dispute the fact that "the Iraqi children, the people, and the elderly are dying because of the sanctions," only saying "that the sanctions are applied by the United Nations." On Larry King Live, January 19, 1993, Pentagon spokesperson Pete Williams did not dispute that "allied bombing" had an effect on Iraqi children and wimmin.(3)

On November 3, 1992, CBS News' Bob Simon reported from Baghdad:

"Mr. Bush does not have many fan clubs anywhere in Iraq. He is remembered here as the man who bombed Iraqi children, as the man who's now making their lives miserable by keeping economic sanctions in force even though the war is now over. Even opponents to the regime have their own reasons for resenting Mr. Bush. He is remembered by them as the man who

*Go to next page...*

## Half-assed "defenses" of Churchill not enough

From page 5...

it is "[tempting] to agree that 'titans' of finance are more guilty than the rest of us. But even though they're better compensated than the rest of us, they're no more guilty, really. We're all little Eichmanns. Only the far left is willing to admit it."(6)

Steven Best asserts: "Left unqualified, Churchill's words can be read as an endorsement of terrorism and mass murder; thus, they had obvious inflammatory potential that the Right exploited to full advantage to launch a new round of Culture Wars." This is wrong. Churchill did indeed specify who the "little Eichmanns" were in his essay, and Churchill's words do not endorse terrorism or mass murder. It is only open reactionaries and idiots like Steven Best

with reading-comprehension problems who could "read" Churchill's essay in this way.

For those who still do not get it, if you are going to "defend" Ward Churchill, only to misrepresent what he said, just stay out of it. There may be a difference between distancing oneself from Churchill's ideas, and misrepresenting his ideas, but many "liberals and Leftists" have certainly crossed this line into fueling the gross distortion of Churchill's ideas. Steven Best says: "Numerous liberals and Leftists have defended Churchill's First Amendment rights, while offering more thoughtful and nuanced analyses of 9-11." But many so-called leftists have also contributed to the butchering of Churchill's essay.

Between now and the conclusion of the CU chancellor and regents' investigation in March is not the time for so-called nuance. But now is the time to defend Churchill thoroughly. Individuals who cannot do this should at least refrain from making questionable "interpretations" of Churchill's essay.

Notes:

1. [http://graffitiwall.radioleft.com/blog/\\_archives/2005/2/5/303426.html](http://graffitiwall.radioleft.com/blog/_archives/2005/2/5/303426.html)

2. <http://www.stevenplaut.blogspot.com/> (accessed February 20, 2005)

3. "Killing the Messenger: Ward Churchill's Sins Against the Empire," [http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full\\_article/best02102005/](http://www.pressaction.com/news/weblog/full_article/best02102005/)

4. "January 31 2005 statement from Ward Churchill," <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/mn/sept112001/wardchurchilljan2005.html> (scroll down)

5. A pattern exhibited by mouthpieces of the labor aristocracy (or even capitalists covering up for the labor aristocracy) who "defend" Ward Churchill for their own purposes, only to trash what he said and undermine his credibility. See: "Support Ward Churchill; don't slander him all over again," <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/agitation/iraq/sanctionspolls.html>

6. Deborah Frisch, "A Psychologist's Defense of Ward Churchill," <http://www.criticalhistory.com/index.php?itemid=753>

## What could AmeriKKans have known about the Iraq sanctions?: Part II

By a contributor  
February 20, 2005

"It should be noted that not one but two high United Nations officials attempting to coordinate delivery of humanitarian aid to Iraq resigned in succession as protests against US policy.

"One of them, former U.N. Assistant Secretary General Denis Halliday, repeatedly denounced what was happening as "a systematic program . . . of deliberate genocide." His statements appeared in the New York Times and other papers during the fall of 1998, so it can hardly be contended that the American public was "unaware" of them. Shortly thereafter, Secretary of State Madeline Albright openly confirmed Halliday's assessment. Asked during the widely-viewed TV program Meet the Press to respond to his "allegations," she calmly announced that she'd decided it was "worth the price" to see that U.S. objectives were achieved."(1)

The Amerikan population as a whole, the majority of whom are exploiters, had

and continue to have collective responsibility for Amerikan imperialist militarism and genocide. In his essay "Some People Push Back," Ward Churchill adequately points out that the Amerikan population, and particularly the "well-educated," had collective knowledge of the consequences of the sanctions against Iraq. However, Amerikans had knowledge of the child mortality and other undesirable effects of the Iraq sanctions even earlier than Dennis Halliday's statements in 1998, or 1996, the year of the 60 Minutes broadcast with Madeline Albright.

The following is aimed at those who are spreading lies to the effect that Amerikans could not have known anything substantial, before the September 11, 2001, attacks, about the consequences of the Iraq sanctions. The focus is on u.S. mainstream newspapers, and these are just a handful of the articles Amerikans read in just 1991-1995. Several other similar articles from 1990-1992 are mentioned in "Support Ward

Churchill; don't slander him all over again" (<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/mn/sep112001/wardchurchill021705.html>). The first part of "What could AmeriKKans have known about the Iraq sanctions?" (<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/agitation/iraq/sanctionspolls.html>) provides some television news media examples from 1991-1993. Keep in mind that this is not just about the viscerally repugnant effects of the Iraq sanctions, but rather a pattern of Amerikans, including leftists and even "socialists" (not to mention DemoKKKrats and RepubliKKans), denying and then feigning ignorance about the consequences of Amerikan imperialist militarism and genocide generally.

### Mainstream newspaper sources, 1991-1995

On March 28, 1993, the Washington Post reported for the more pragmatic Amerikan parasites:

"Economic sanctions don't work very well. They sound tough, but in practice

they often end up helping the very people who are supposed to be punished.

"None of the sanctions are working," said retired U.S. diplomat Robert B. Oakley, who just completed an assignment as special U.S. envoy in Somalia after serving at various times as ambassador to Pakistan, Zaire and Somalia."(2)

On June 19, 1992, columnist Charles Krauthammer, upholding military action as an alternative to sanctions, mentioned:

"almost a year and a half of the most severe sanctions in history, applied to a country devastated by war, U.S. intelligence agencies report that Hussein is stronger today than he was a year ago."(3)

The above is a case of pro-imperialist Amerikan parasites criticizing the Iraq sanctions for selfish pragmatic reasons, but it is revealing. Still, in 1996, 58% of telephoned Amerikans supported continuing "both economic sanctions and

*Go to next page...*

## The collective responsibility movement for Amerika

From previous page...

encouraged the Kurds and Shiites and other dissidents to rise up against Saddam Hussein when the war was over and then abandon them to the not-very-tender mercies of the regime."(4)

What the above illustrates is that, while Iraq did not support terrorism, the murderous Iraq sanctions were contributing to Iraqis' and possibly others' anger toward the united States. Other TV news programs dealt with the consequences of the Iraq sanctions more directly:

On November 21, 1992, CNN's Gale Young reported from Baghdad:

"The accord [U.N. accord allowing limited UNICEF aid in Iraq] was signed after UNICEF director James Grant toured Iraqi hospitals. Baghdad said these children are suffering from disease and malnutrition because it does not have the hard currency needed to import food and medicine, allowed under the terms of the embargo. . . . The United States tried, unsuccessfully, to block the UNICEF agreement saying it gave Iraq too much control. Baghdad, meanwhile, maneuvered to limit the number of U.N. guards allowed under the pact. But these power struggles are probably beyond the comprehension of most of the Iraqi children caught in the middle."(5)

On World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, January 16, 1992, Dennis Troute reported from Baghdad:

"The young suffer disproportionately because they depend on powdered milk which is scarce. Western analysts estimate that 30 percent of Iraqi children are malnourished. Infectious diseases are rampant, including cholera and typhoid, in part because power and water treatment plants have not been fully restored. Medicines are not supposed to be affected by the embargo, but they are in short supply all the same and doctors

are frustrated." (6)

Remarkably, Troute stated the above as facts, or attributed them to "Western analysts," not the Iraqi government.

On World News Tonight with Peter Jennings, July 4, 1991, ABC News' Dennis Troute reported from Washington, D.C.:

"Dr. Michael Viola and two other American doctors have just returned from Baghdad, their research and that of other foreign doctors shows that the infant mortality rate in many hospitals has more than tripled since last year. A recent study by UNICEF, the United Nations relief agency for children, reaches the same conclusion. Relief workers and Iraqis blame the shortages of food, as well as medicine and drinking water, on the international sanctions still in place against Baghdad. The sanctions prevent Iraq from selling oil and raising money for food and the expensive machinery needed to get sanitation facilities running again. The sanctions do allow emergency deliveries of food and medicine, but relief agencies say despite their best efforts they are falling far short of Iraq's needs. Here in Washington, the Bush Administration's own National Security analysts have warned the White House that large numbers of Iraqi children will die this summer without massive imports of food and medicine. The White House argues that the sanctions provide important leverage against Saddam Hussein, but American doctors, as well as Iraqis now are pointing out that Saddam Hussein is not the one going hungry." (7)

On Nightline, May 30, 1991, ABC News' Ted Koppel reported:

"Whatever pressure that may be putting on the Iraqi president, it is certainly a hardship on the Iraqi people. Indeed, a team of U.S. doctors recently returned from a tour of Iraq and predicted that the

impact of the sanctions is devastating, especially on the children. Similar projections have been made by UNICEF and by the International Red Cross." (8)

Dennis Troute followed up with:

"These undernourished children are victims of a war which had just started when they were born. They've become the subject of growing alarm for doctors both in Iraq and in the West. Relief workers talk about the real possibility of tens of thousands of deaths. . . . The sanctions against Iraq heighten the dangers confronting its children in several ways. Milk, medicine and chemicals needed to purify water are in short supply because the sanctions bar Iraq from selling its oil to purchase new stocks. That's true also of spare parts needed to fix generators damaged during the war. Without adequate power, it is impossible to treat sewage or to refrigerate food. The problem of food shortages is most acute among Iraq's poor. They were dependent on inexpensive foods subsidized by petroleum sales over the past decade. Now government milk rations have been cut by two-thirds. When there is food, they often cannot afford it. With the sanctions still in place, they see no relief in sight. . . . Infant mortality rates, which were three percent before the war, now are above 13 percent. Doctors expect them to get worse. An examination of death certificates at the children's hospital shows that the most frequent cause of death is marasmus, or a wasting away of tissue in an advanced state of malnutrition. Relief workers say problems are worsening because critical supplies in this country of 18 million are being exhausted much faster than they can ever be replaced." (8)

On World News Tonight with Peter

Jennings, May 21, 1991, ABC News' John McWethy reported from the State Department:

"The Harvard [S]tudy [T]eam predicts that 170,000 Iraqi children under the age of five will die in the next year from delayed effects of the war. They will die because in some parts of Iraq there is still no electricity, no sewage treatment, no functioning hospitals. There is already severe malnutrition the report says and widespread cases of cholera, typhoid and gastroenteritis. During the hot months of summer, the situation will get worse. Iraq's ability to help itself is severely limited because of the UN embargo prohibiting Iraq from selling its oil to the outside world."(9)

Again, there are hundreds of other examples like these in the mainstream newspaper and television news media. All of the above handful of selected TV examples were taken from just 1991-1993. It is wrong for opportunists to feign ignorance on behalf of the labor aristocracy in order to say the "American people" could not have known enough to act, not even enough to go out and get more information.

Notes:

1. Maria Alanis, "Media Coverage of Iraq Sanctions," October 20, 2003, [http://soc.hfac.uh.edu/artman/publish/article\\_29.shtml](http://soc.hfac.uh.edu/artman/publish/article_29.shtml) (accessed February 18, 2005).

2. Transcript #914 (the reference system of electronic source "Lexis-Nexis")

3. Transcript #743.

4. Transcript.

5. Transcript # 226 - 3.

6. Transcript.

7. Transcript.

8. Transcript.

9. Transcript.

## What could AmeriKKans have known about the Iraq sanctions?: Part II

From previous page...

military operations,” and 16% supported continuing “economic sanctions against Iraq” (poll by the Los Angeles Times, September 10, 1996). In 1992, three times as many Americans supported maintaining “economic sanctions” compared with giving “money to finance groups in Iraq that want to overthrow him” (poll by NBC News, March 2, 1992).

On July 24, 1991, USA TODAY reported:

“President Bush is looking for a way to relax U.N. sanctions against Iraq to halt ‘the suffering of innocent women and children,’ he said Tuesday. . . . Bush has been torn between reports of malnutrition and epidemics in Iraq and his vow to isolate Saddam Hussein’s government into oblivion.”(4)

It appeared that George H. W. Bush himself made decisions based on knowledge of “malnutrition and epidemics in Iraq.”

On December 18, 1991, The Washington Post reported:

“Iraq said more than 80,000 of its children under 5 have died because of shortages caused by U.N. sanctions imposed over its invasion of Kuwait. . . . Iraq said last month that 65,000 children had died because of shortages of food and medicine and 350,000 more were at risk this winter. The U.N. Children’s Fund said the figures were realistic.”(5)

On September 8, 1991, The Washington Post presented excerpts from letters sent from Iraq to the United States:

“Letters also describe the effect of sanctions in carefully chosen terms. ‘We are happy as a family. We enjoy reading by lamplight until our eyes are full of tears, then we sleep. Even in the daytime, we read when we have free time because there is no cooking gas, so we cook and make bread on kerosene space heaters. H — and I spend two or three hours making bread from flour more like animal feed than it is flour, but that is all that is available. More recently, of course, real flour is in the shops, but at outrageous prices. People are beginning to hunt deer out of malnourishment and hunger.’”(6)

“The most recent letters date from mid-July. This is the last one from one family: ‘I went to Amman for a few days. I tried to get immigration visas for myself and the family to any country in the world. My dear, life has become extremely difficult in Iraq. The prices continue to rise in a mad way beyond imagination but we manage in one way or another. God protect us from what will come next, it is bound to be worse.’”(6)

Feelings of distress resonated even among Iraqis in the United States who were against the Ba’ath Party. On July 24, 1991, an editorial in The Washington Post related:

“But the greatest anguish is being endured now, as Iraqi Americans watch the governments of the United States and the allies listen to multiplying reports of hunger and disease with seeming passivity

and indifference.

“The shortages of food and medicine in Iraq are at catastrophic levels. Children are dying daily from malnutrition, malnourishment and the absence of basic medical care and such common drugs as antibiotics. In addition to cholera, typhoid and gastroenteritis, previously unknown diseases in Iraq such as kwashiorkor and marasmus are killing children.”(7)

Other writers urged readers to consider the so-called unintended consequences of the Iraq sanctions. On November 21, 1993, William F. Woo commented in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri):

“Sanctions may be politically convenient or cheap for the nation imposing them, but their harsh effects upon civilian populations - despite so-called precautions to exempt food or medicine - make it important that moral considerations occur before they are ordered. They are the economic equivalent of warfare, and like the real warfare of guns and bombs they can add to the suffering of innocent people who already have troubles enough.”(8)

Perceptions of the sanctions-caused suffering were reflected elsewhere in the mainstream newspaper press. On August 1, 1993, the Chicago Sun-Times (Associated Press) reported:

“Ordinary Iraqis struggle to survive from day to day as the sanctions bite ever deeper, law and order inexorably breaks down and a once rigidly structured society collapses.

Beggars, virtually unknown in Baghdad before the war, crowd the streets. They ask for food, not money. Crime is endemic, despite severe penalties that make even car theft punishable by death.”(9)

On April 9, 1993, Plain Dealer (Cleveland, Ohio) (Wire Reports) reported that:

“Iraq’s labor minister said yesterday that U.N. trade sanctions and the effects of the Persian Gulf war have closed most factories in Iraq and caused record unemployment.

“Omed Medhat Mubarak said tens of thousands of factories have shut down since the war because of a shortage of raw materials and spare parts.”(10)

Of course, far more articles in just the month of April were dedicated to unemployment rates in the United States.

This was not because of a lack of “authoritative” reporting on the consequences of the Iraq sanctions. On July 16, 1991, USA TODAY reported:

“A U.N. humanitarian report Monday urged easing sanctions against Iraq, calling such a move ‘imperative’ for helping war-ravaged civilians. . . . Claims that 170,000 Iraqi children could die from war-related illness and starvation have been challenged, yet doctors agree malnutrition is rampant among Iraqi children.”(11)

On July 5, 1991, The Washington Post reported:

“Iraqi civilians, complaining that the country’s worsening economic crisis is

hurting them far more than the government, are expressing bewilderment and annoyance at U.S. insistence on continuing international trade sanctions. . . . Although they recognize that the U.S.

aim is to force the ouster of President Saddam Hussein — a goal many Iraqis support — they say this is not likely and in the meantime they are bearing the brunt of the economic hardship. As a result, many say, they are beginning to think that the Iraqi people, not the government, are the target of U.S. hostility. . . . One woman said she didn’t know what the word “embargo” means, “but we need food!”(12)

On October 22, 1991, The New York Times reported:

“A new public health study by American and other Western experts in Iraq says the country’s child mortality rate has nearly tripled and perhaps even quadrupled as a result of the Persian Gulf war, civil strife and international sanctions.

“Such an elevated mortality rate could mean tens of thousands of additional deaths in Iraq’s population of more than three million children under five years old, officials who took part in the survey said, although they declined in their study to make specific projections of overall deaths.”(13)

News articles were interspersed with disturbing editorials and letters to the editors. On October 25, 1991, Frances Farenthold related in USA TODAY:

“In May, I saw the wizened faces, the emaciated bodies, the parched skin of babies and children and the fearful expressions of their mothers in Iraqi hospitals. I smelled the stench of sewage and listened to the frantic pleas of exhausted and bedraggled doctors asking that sanctions be lifted.

“This week’s report indicates conditions have not improved; mortality rates have almost quadrupled since August 1990.”(14)

On April 26, 1993, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania) (Wire Dispatches) reported:

“Death rates among young children in Iraq have increased by more than 800 percent because of U.N. economic sanctions, Iraq said yesterday. . . . 362 Iraqi children under age 5 died of malnutrition, diarrhea and pneumonia. It said that figure was up to 3,419 children in March 1993, an increase of 844 percent. Iraq blames the increased death on shortages of food and medicine from the U.N. sanctions imposed after Iraq’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait.”(15)

On December 27, 1995, a Washington Post editorial reported:

“A study commissioned by the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization estimates that a half-million Iraqi children have died because of the international economic sanctions in effect since the end of the Gulf war. To this stunning toll must be added the malnutrition and disease affecting the many others, children and adults, who are still alive. It adds up to a

second Gulf war of historic proportions — a war whose immense civilian casualties apparently fall most conspicuously upon the young.”(16)

Estimates of Iraqi children dead from the sanctions varied, but they were consistently high. Total estimates as of 1996, reported in the mainstream newspaper press and elsewhere, were unquestionably higher than total American casualties in the Viet Nam War. On December 24, 1995, an editorial in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin) commented:

“Iraqi children’s suffering is the result of a policy championed by the United States. . . . The dimensions of Iraq’s plight, and especially the suffering of its children, were authoritatively documented earlier this month in The Lancet, the journal of the British Medical Society, by two researchers from Harvard University who visited Iraq in August under U.N. auspices. . . . ‘Water and sanitation systems have deteriorated, hospitals are functioning at 40% capacity, and the population is largely sustained by government rations which provide 1,000 calories per person per day. . . . Since August 1990, 567,000 children in Iraq have died as a consequence’ of the sanctions.”(17)

The mainstream newspaper press portrayed a struggle, even within the United Nations, over the Iraq sanctions. On December 29, 1995, the Times-Picayune (New Orleans, LA) reported:

“Sanctions on Iraq will remain in place until Baghdad complies with all U.N. Security Council resolutions, U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali said Thursday. But Boutros-Ghali said he hopes Baghdad will accept a U.N. offer to let Iraq sell \$2 billion worth of oil to buy badly needed food and medicine for its 20 million people. ‘These sanctions cause me pain,’ said the U.N. chief, referring to the misery the 5-year-old embargo has caused the Iraqi people. Russia, meanwhile, shipped 27 tons of food and medical supplies to Baghdad Thursday for Iraqi children who are reported to be suffering from malnutrition. Russian officials in Amman, Jordan, said the shipment was trucked to Iraq from Jordan because the United Nations refused to allow it to be airlifted to Baghdad.”(18)

On December 11, 1995, Barbara Crossette of The New York Times reported:

“The effects that five years of sanctions are having on children in Iraq has been a concern of UNICEF and other U.N. agencies. Experts say they believe that at least 500,000 children may have died because of the sanctions and because of President Saddam Hussein’s refusal to allow a United Nations-supervised sale of Iraqi oil to buy food, medicine and other emergency supplies.”(19)

On October 16, 1994, The Washington Post, as if anticipating Ward Churchill’s

Go to next page...

# On the formation of MIP-Kanada

by International Minister  
February 21 2005

MIM has been working with MIP-Kanada especially closely the last few years. Hoisting the red flag over Kanada February 18 2005 was not a casual event.

From our joint work, we know that the provisional Central Committee has the capability and determination to lead. This is not a case where MIM just received an email and a party arose. MIM would not encourage that; although no one can be stopped from setting up a party.

In the imperialist countries, the usual question in addition to ability is the desire to lead. The sugar-coated bullets lead to degeneration of many comrades.

At MIM, we also always assume a percentage of cops and other enemies in the party. As always we tell people to assume that when they deal with any MIM related party, they could be dealing with a cop or spy. Part of that understanding is breaking with Hoxha's metaphysics that chalks up enemies in the party to the Liberalism of party leaders, as if all-knowing party leaders could ever stop 100% of the infiltration of the enemy. So each persyn must become more adept at his/her own security in today's conditions. For now, communications from Kanada are still handled by

*Kanada is an imperialist  
oppressor nation of whites  
dominated by a labor  
aristocracy and traditional  
petty-bourgeois population  
numerically.*

mim3@mim.org.

There are a number of people floating about in Kanada that had contacted MIM. We hope they will work with MIM more closely.

The situation in England and Au\$tralia also cries out. We know there are many from those two places whose hearts are with MIM. It's a matter of dedicating oneself to arduous struggle for organization. The MIP-Kanada sets the self-reliant example.

Another party that needs to arise is from among the Latin Kings/Queens (ALKQN) already working with MIM. The example is there, but we all must redouble our efforts.

Where MIM's aid to the formation of parties has been insufficient, I'm sure everybody in MIM would like to apologize in advance. It really has been insufficient globally, for the Russians, ex-Yugoslavians, ALKQN etc. That's not to mention what should be done for the rest of the world.

From previous page...

"Some People Push Back" essay, reported:

"Signs of Iraq's agony — due in large part to the U.N. trade embargo, imposed after Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990 — are abundant in this once prosperous, oil-rich country. The health care system, once among the best in the Middle East, is in shambles; Baghdad's raw sewage is being dumped for the third straight year into the Tigris River, the main source of drinking water; more babies are dying of malnutrition; the proportion of young girls dropping out of elementary school is up to 17 percent from 2.3 percent; crime and corruption are up; the educated are leaving and the middle class is in ruins. . . . The sanctions also have generated anti-American sentiment among Iraqis that some observers fear could be exploited, either by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein — if he survives the U.S. challenge to his leadership — or by Islamic fundamentalists."(20) (emphasis mine)

The divergence between the u.s. governments' intentions with respect to the Iraq sanctions, and the "unintended" consequences of the sanctions, was apparent in other ways. The seeming lack of control gave pause to pro-imperialist pragmatists who were considering "military operations" against Iraq, but should also have motivated people to oppose the sanctions as part of exposing and resisting the crimes of imperialism. On May 22, 1991, Patrick E. Tyler in The New York Times reported the following: "The [Harvard University] medical team's report raises new questions about whether the Bush Administration's

postwar strategy of continued economic sanctions against Iraq will lead to rising mortality rates in the nation of 18 million, where health problems, disease and malnutrition are reported to be growing out of control.

"Senior Bush Administration officials have said in the past that they will not allow Iraqi civilians to starve as Washington calibrates a postwar pressure campaign to keep tight trade sanctions on Iraq to force President Saddam Hussein from power. But the Harvard study suggests that a combination of disease, food shortages and high prices is already causing thousands of deaths."(21)

This is just a sample of the newspaper pieces, from 1991-1995, covering the murderous consequences of the sanctions against Iraq. The mainstream newspaper press and television news media continued to report on the consequences of the Iraq sanctions in 1996-2003.

Notes:

1. "Some People Push Back: On the Justice of Roosting Chickens," <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/mn/sept112001/somepeoplepushback.html>

2. Stuart Auerbach, "Are Sanctions More Harmful Than Helpful?; Experts Say Embargoes Enrich Targets, Hurt Poor," Washington Post, March 28, 1993, LexisNexis.

3. Charles Krauthammer, "The Sanctions Fallacy; They are no alternative to military force," Washington Post, June 19, 1992.

Also printed in:

Charles Krauthammer, "The Failure of

## The Canadian vanguard party

From page 1...

Kanada exists mainly to carry out revolutionary activities, such as propaganda, that are tactically easier for a party operating within Kanada's artificial borders. Our responsibilities and aims, however, do not stop at the 49th parallel. We are internationalists committed to promoting Maoist revolution all over the world.

Together with our comrades in MIP-Amerika, with whom we currently share resources, we oppose armed struggle in the imperialist countries at this time. Instead, we devote our energies to legal struggles that contribute to the fulfilment

of MIM's central task: "to create public opinion and the independent institutions of the oppressed to seize power."

MIP-Kanada operates in both English and French and welcomes Canadians who endorse MIM's three main points. Comrades are invited to work and struggle with us.

**DOWN WITH IMPERIALISM!  
LONG LIVE MARXISM-LENINISM-  
MAOISM!  
PROLETARIANS OF THE WORLD,  
UNITE!**

**Provisional Central Committee  
of MIP-Kanada  
February 18, 2005**

**To read MIM's analysis of Canadian political questions, go to:  
<http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/countries/canada/>**

**You'll read:**

\* Using Kanada as a reference point for the national question  
\* Canadian bourgeoisie getting ready to give up sovereignty

\* Mohawks and the Quebecois national question

\* Position paper on Quebec as another potential imperialist country

\* On Kanada's referendum of 1992

Sanctions," Chicago Sun-Times, June 21, 1992.

Charles Krauthammer, "FORSAKE THE FANTASY THAT SANCTIONS WORK," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), June 21, 1992.

Charles Krauthammer, "Sanctions are still no replacement for military force," St. Petersburg Times (Florida), June 22, 1992.

Charles Krauthammer, "Let's learn from litany of sanctions," Atlanta Journal and Constitution, June 22, 1992.

And others.

4. Jessica Lee and Lee Michael Katz, "Bush may ease Iraqi sanctions," USA TODAY, July 24, 1991.

5. Washington Post, "Iraq Blames Sanctions for Deaths," December 18, 1991.

6. Yasmine Bahrani, "...and Sorrow In the Mail; Letters From Baghdad: Painting A Portrait of Bitter Desolation," Washington Post, September 8, 1991.

7. Rend Francke, "How to Help Iraq's Innocents," Washington Post, July 24, 1991.

8. William F. Woo, "ECONOMIC WARFARE, TOO, HAS VICTIMS," St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri), November 21, 1993.

9. Dilip Ganguly, "In Iraq; Sanctions Bite Into Society's Strictness," Chicago Sun-Times (Associated Press), August 1, 1993.

10. Jordan Amman, "UNEMPLOYMENT SOARS IN IRAQ FROM SANCTIONS," Plain Dealer (Cleveland, Ohio) (Wire Reports), April 9, 1993.

11. Lee Michael Katz, "U.N. report: Ease Iraq sanctions // Says civilians on 'brink of calamity,'" USA TODAY, July 16, 1991.

12. Caryle Murphy, "Iraqis Say Sanctions Hurt the Wrong People; Saddam 'Has Everything' but Others Suffer," Washington Post, July 5, 1991.

13. Patrick E. Tyler, "Study Says Iraq's Child Mortality Rate Has Tripled," New York Times, October 22, 1991.

14. Frances Farenthold, "USA must share blame," USA TODAY, October 25, 1991.

15. "SANCTIONS BLAMED," Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania) (Wire Dispatches), April 26, 1993.

16. "The War Against Iraq's Children," Washington Post, December 27, 1995.

17. Richard Foster, "In U.S.-Iraqi face-off, it's the children who do the dying," Milwaukee Journal Sentinel (Wisconsin), December 24, 1995.

18. "IRAQI SANCTIONS WILL STAY, U.N. CHIEF SAYS," Times-Picayune (New Orleans, LA), December 29, 1995.

19. Barbara Crossette (New York Times), "Children's welfare has been brutalized by warfare, UNICEF says," Houston Chronicle, December 11, 1995.

20. Caryle Murphy, "Sanctions Mean Hardship, Anger For Iraqi Civilians; Diplomats Say U.N. Measures May Hurt Stability of Region," Washington Post, October 16, 1994.

21. Patrick E. Tyler, "Health Crisis Said to Grip Iraq In Wake of War's Destruction," New York Times, May 22, 1991.

## Federal prisoner demands education

I've been incarcerated ever since I was 19. I'm now 30 years old. All remedies have been exhausted. So they say that I will die behind these bars. I need to study so that I can demonstrate to others by writing and speech that the judicial system is a fraud.

The Dred Scott ruling remains true: "the black man has no rights that the white man is bound to respect." Instead of appealing to this system we should discredit it.

— a Federal prisoner in Colorado, 6 January, 2005

MIM responds: Our Free Books for Prisoners program is designed to give prisoners the chance for both an honest education on the history of the oppressed, and to become activists, organizers and educators, using their knowledge to bring others into political consciousness and participation. We Maoists are doing the work of making democratic participation an option for one of the most underrepresented groups in this so-called free society.

Prisoners: We distribute books in exchange for political work, so when you write, tell us how you want to contribute.

People on the outside: Join our book of the month club! You send us one political, legal, or historical book each month, and we'll get that book to a prisoner who needs it.

## One Small Account of Torture and a Lesson for CO's

I am currently housed at the WSP/IMU [Washington State Penitentiary/ Intensive Management Unit]. I have been at the receiving end of much abuse by Washington State prison officials since 1987.

I have been psychologically and physically abused, as well as tortured much over the years.

On 8/2/01, here at WSP, I was blasted directly in the face with O/C [Oleoresin Capsicum commonly known as Pepper Spray]. I was in no defensive or offensive posture, when I didn't even know the QRT (Quick Response Team) was at my cell or that I was being ordered to cuff up. In any case, immediately upon receiving a large burst directly in the face I jumped up from my Seg cell bed, said, "you won", or something to that effect, put my hands behind my back to cuff up and was clearly cooperating. At that time, Sgt. Gains gave me another burst directly to the face. This all occurred in around a ten second period. Two bursts in a row is generally not considered acceptable, but I was not doing anything defensively or offensively and was cooperating fully when I received a second large burst directly to the face. I was then cuffed and cold water was sprayed from a hose over my face for about thirty seconds. I was then paraded by an outside wall lined with prison staff by the QRT escorting me and placed in a seclusion room in the BMU (Behavior Management/Modification Unit). It was a strip cell with a hole in the floor to defecate in. Counselors Brad Graham and Cathy Bly refused to let me use a wet towel or rag to clean my face, arms and genitals which felt on fire, [instead they stood there] laughing at me. I then lost it and four points were approved, however I was six pointed for torture purposes. I was six pointed on the standard metal table they use, which is also part of the torture process they use on a regular basis.

# Under Lock & Key

## News from Prisons & Prisoners

They put each limb in leather restraints, which is called four pointing and was approved. However, I was six pointed, which involved a leather strap being placed around my lower knees, around the metal table, then tightened all the way and a second leather belt strap was placed over my chest, then tightened around the table. They would give me the required limb releases as required, but would leave the leather belt straps tightened and would not release them as the law required. This caused a great deal of severe pain and discomfort. In fact, my right knee clearly was damaged and this results in severe knee pain. I was in six points for five days.

The first couple nights O/C spray was dripped in my eyes and once on my nipples. During the five days I was psychologically and physically abused. I have got documents that clearly show I was six pointed when only four points were approved, but many staff tried to cover up that I was six pointed. It shows I did not receive the required releases as is required by law concerning the leather belt straps. They attempted to cover up that I was six pointed but I have documents that clearly show I was while restrained on the table. The video tape of the QRT cell extraction is also available.

Torture is much more common than most would think and I can document other acts of torture.

The Department of Corrections is a state sponsored organization for the criminal abuse of prisoners. Over the years I have assaulted many staff, mainly all male. I have thrown things and spit on female staff. I am no longer going to respond in that fashion to their mistreatment. But rather use my mind to shed light on their abuses and to attempt to make change for the better.

— a Washington Prisoner, February 2005

MIM responds: OC has been linked to numerous deaths in prisons and on the street by police in the US. It was outlawed in 1972 by the United Nations Biological Weapons Convention. For more on the danger of OC see Under Lock & Key in MIM Notes 149.

We commend this comrade's resolution to take a more productive approach to the torture s/he has faced for years. Spending your life in a cage for years never knowing when your tormentors will choose to attack can have a lot of negative effects on a persyn. One understandable outcome is that you might become easily agitated and ready to fight anyone. And this is a lesson for those correctional officers who want to keep themselves safe at work. Anyone who reads our literature and reads Under Lock and Key might get insight into the fact that the more work a person does with MIM the less likely they are to get in fights with guards and other prisoners. This is because once someone becomes a part of the struggle for a better society, getting beat up or tortured is no longer just another bad day in a fucked up situation. Each injury suffered and each lost battle is a potential set back for the movement.

So for all those CO's that browse thru MIM Notes as it passes through the prison mail room: Unless you value the interests of state repression over your own safety, please do

yourself a favor and don't prevent MIM from reaching the people in your facility. Better yet, if you really want to protect yourself, stop reinforcing the hyper-violent amerikan prison culture by forcing people into situations where they feel they have little choice but to fight as a means of self-defense.

## 26,000 Murderers, Rapists and Child Molesters

As a three strikes lifer with a bird's-eye view of the California prison system, a single subject captured the attention of the entire population — Proposition 66. Liberation. Justice. A chance to be free again.

After months of hope founded on very promising poll numbers, the fear-merchants relied on smear-tactics to cheat us out of a chance to go home.

"I can't believe the people didn't see through the governor's lies," said Thomas Wallen, a three striker from Kern County. He's serving 26 years to life for receiving stolen property. "There are thousands of us buried alive for minor crimes."

Gov. Schwarzenegger relied of "patently false" numbers in his anti- Proposition 66 attack ads by claiming 26,000 murderers, rapists and child molesters would be set free if the initiative passed. He abandoned the truth in his war-on-justice.

In this election, the truth lost by seven points.

Nonetheless, hope remains. The underlying injustice of three strikes still exists. This law has been in place for too long, includes too many, and has survived each and every challenge. No other sentencing mandate receives as much criticism. No other law sends drug addicts and shoplifters to prison for life alongside murderers and molesters.

Eventually, this law has to be amended.

Despite the "mathematically impossible" numbers advanced by the opponents of Proposition 66, only 7,400 three strikers exist — 4,100 of whom would have been the sole recipients of being re-sentenced.

This is a bitter defeat.

It's not so much that we lost, but how the opposition accomplished the task. Far from infallible, we make easy targets. What's worse, they showcased hard core predators and sexual deviants to keep the rest of us incarcerated.

Most three strikers have lengthy rap sheets. In my case, I committed a robbery and two burglaries in my late teens and early '20s. These are the strike priors qualifying me for a life sentence under the "any" felony provision of California's three strikes.

My third strike was a nonviolent drug offense.

No matter how bad my criminal past looks on paper, I paid my debt for those crimes. We all did. That is the point; three strikers aren't murderers, rapists or child molesters. That's a lie.

It's sad, how the politics of fear works.

The defeat of Proposition 66 has merely delayed the inevitable. They stole an election with a pumped up actor-turned-politician who

would say anything to look tough-on-crime. Cruel and unusual punishment.

If we truly deserved our sentences, why would corrections officials send mental health workers around in the days leading up to the election to find out if we were alright?

The answer is simple.

It's one thing to pay your debt to society for serious and violent felonies — like we did when we were younger. Mine were committed in the mid '80s. It's simply indescribable to receive a life sentence years later for a crime that carries a year or two in every other circumstance. It's enough to drive a person mad.

If a shoplifter deserves a life sentence for stealing a bottle of aspirin, how much time should the governor receive for stealing an election with "patently false" numbers Superior Court Judge Raymond Cadei called "mathematically impossible."

Schwarzenegger cooked the books, just like Enron.

- a prisoner at Susanville, November 2004

## MIM on Prisons & Prisoners

MIM seeks to build public opinion against Amerika's criminal injustice system, and to eventually replace the bourgeois injustice system with proletarian justice. The bourgeois injustice system imprisons and executes a disproportionately large and growing number of oppressed people while letting the biggest mass murderers — the imperialists and their lackeys — roam free. Imperialism is not opposed to murder or theft, it only insists that these crimes be committed in the interests of the bourgeoisie.

"All U.S. citizens are criminals — accomplices and accessories to the crimes of U.S. oppression globally until the day U.S. imperialism is overcome. All U.S. citizens should start from the point of view that they are reforming criminals."

MIM does not advocate that all prisoners go free today; we have a more effective program for fighting crime as was demonstrated in China prior to the restoration of capitalism there in 1976. We say that all prisoners are political prisoners because under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, all imprisonment is substantively political. It is our responsibility to exert revolutionary leadership and conduct political agitation and organization among prisoners — whose material conditions make them an overwhelmingly revolutionary group. Some prisoners should and will work on self-criticism under a future dictatorship of the proletariat in those cases in which prisoners really did do something wrong by proletarian standards.

## Guards beat prisoners to death

In October 2004 two inmates were murdered, beaten to death by so called “peace” officers here at Lancaster. To cover up their crime they (Lancaster CDC) conducted a phony war on drug search and in the process re-arrested two inmates for drugs. Now catch this. This administration claims that the people who they “caught” with the drugs sold the drugs to the people who were murdered and that the people who were murdered overdosed on the drugs. Now the people who allegedly sold the drugs are being accused of the murders. As if these people can’t see that these now dead people are severely wounded from the outside and that an autopsy would shoot their accusations down completely.

- a prisoner in California, November 2004

## Frivolous lockdowns and repression at Salinas Valley

For the past few years this prison (Salinas Valley State Prison – The New Soledad), has been under intense investigation by the internal affairs and inspector generals office, two so-called watch dog groups that are propped up by CDC. Several incidents of inmates being beaten, property being destroyed or outright stolen, and vandalism, led to pressure being applied by state Senator Gloria Romero, who chairs the select committee on the California Correctional System.

Romero’s questioning led to the investigation, which in turn caused then Warden Caden (who has since “retired”) to reveal facts surrounding a police prison gang called “the Green Wall.” This bonafide gang made it their cause to “rough-up” rebellious captives and retaliate against prisoners that “disrespect” staff. Most of these most outlandish events took place before my arrival here in April of 2004. I recently read documented accounts of several incidents compiled by an organization that protests and demonstrates for prisoners rights. Most recently, seven officers (including a sergeant and lieutenant) were fired by CDC for beating an inmate, falsifying documents, and lying during an interview. The so-called mainstream media has paid little attention to these events, as they continue to develop.

During my time here, a pattern of frivolous lockdowns has manifest. On a regular basis, the administration will lockdown the entire yard for weeks at a time, based upon an “alleged” kite [letter] being received. The most minor displays of stalwart character are a cause for extended lockdown. An example is the “interview process” being employed

by the administration here. Whenever an incident occurs, or when they (pigs) supposedly “hear” of a potential incident, they will lockdown the yard for a “threat assessment.” During which time, everyone is required to participate in a confidential interview with the pig, to answer a list of questions! Imagine that!

I was shocked that the overwhelming majority of “inmates,” without hesitation submitted themselves to these interviews. I immediately began organizing brothers to protest and refuse this blatant “snitch” policy! It is a violation of my Fifth Amendment rights, as well as my “Miranda” rights to remain silent. Beyond this, it is an attempt to de-sensitize the convict class to suspect activity. They desire to make it normal program to see inmates in the office, with the pig, with the door closed, answering questions and signing paperwork.

Their intent was made obvious (even to those initially blind) when they began to back track on the answering of questions, but striving to enforce that everyone at least “come to the office.” This way, it is virtually impossible to distinguish who may be telling, and those who simply submit to “suspect” activity.

The true demonstration is to stand firm, refusing to participate in the interview process, and refusing to play a part in undermining the solidarity of the convict class. A small collective stood with me, which began to grow and develop with agitation. Of course, the pigs repression came, but pressure has a dual nature: it will bust a pipe, but it is also responsible for the formation of diamonds, a valued gem, and hardest known natural substance to man! Their repression only helped to sharpen the understanding of the people, and move me to redouble my efforts to see truth succeed. I have since been locked in ad-seg for alleged weapons possession, weapons which I have never seen (to this day!).

My activism coupled with the spirit to get out front and pull the people forward, has moved CDC to oppress and repress me — locking me up for faulty “investigations,” for a few months at a time; carting away all of my literature and paperwork, for weeks at a time — but it only motivates me to agitate and educate those in my surroundings, while all the time building and destroying in dialectical process toward staunch revolutionary perfection!

-a prisoner in California, February 2005

## Prisoner abuse at Corcoran

I’m here at Corcoran korruptional facility SHU and I’ve been here since 1999 for a bogus attempted battery on five rotten pigs while I

was in handcuffs already behind my back.

Since my arrival here at corrupted Corcoran SHU in April 1999 I have been assaulted many times [by the guards], either while I’m in hand cuffs or in the ruse of an emergency cell extraction which has left me with 13 stitches in my head and a trumped up DA charge against me of battery on a pig with a weapon. The DA rejected that shit as soon as they sent it to them, this was nothing but a cover up tactic that is always used when these cowards pull a low down move on a convict or inmates.

Now here is my current issue with these clowns. In June 2003 while I was under the guise of being escorted to the law library by corrupted officials, as soon as they had me in the darkened rotunda area, two pigs took me to the ground head first, then commenced to punch and kick me from head to toe. Another corrupted official who worked in the control booth just stood there watching the whole incident. Then once they were satisfied from all the blood they seen coming from my mouth, nose and eye area they pushed the alarm, then all of a sudden here comes the rest of that corrupted crew. They come right in front of where I’m laying on my stomach bleeding profusely from mouth, nose and eye area. One of them starts spraying pepper spray for no reason other than just for sport, all into my bleeding areas.

Then they put me in the shower with the hot water running so it would aggravate the pepper spray more. Then they refused to allow me any medical attention, just put me back into my cell.

Around 5pm the next day I was pulled out of my cell and taken to the interview room down the hallway where I was interviewed on camera for over an hour. Then I was escorted to the facility’s hospital where I got x-rayed, physically examined and given pain medicine, Tylenol and ice packs.

I filed a law suit against all the players but I was unable to make any copies because they corrupt kops would not give me any access to the law library. So I sent the court my only copy of everything.

-a prisoner at Corcoran, December 2004



## Join the fight against the injustice system

While we fight to end the criminal injustice system MIM engages in reformist battles to improve the lives of prisoners. Below are some of the campaigns we are currently waging, and ways people behind the bars and on the outside can get involved. More info can be found on our prison web site: <http://www.etext.org/Politics/MIM/agitation/prisons>

**Stop Censorship in Prison:** Prisons frequently censor books, newspapers and magazines coming from MIM’s books for prisoners program. We need help from lawyers, paralegals and jailhouse lawyers to fight this censorship.

**Books for Prisoners:** This program focuses on political education of prisoners. Send donations of books and money for our Books for Prisoners program.

**End the Three Strikes laws:** This campaign is actively fighting the repressive California laws, but similar laws exist in other states. Write to us to request a petition to collect signatures. Send articles and information on three strike laws.

**Shut Down the Control Units:** Across the country there are a growing number of prison control units. These are permanently designated prisons or cells in prisons that lock prisoners up in solitary or small group confinement for 22 or more hours a day with no congregate dining, exercise or other services, and virtually no programs for prisoners. Prisoners are placed in control units for extended periods of time. These units cause both mental and physical problems for prisoners.

Write to us to request a petition to collect signatures. Get your organization to sign the statement demanding control units be shut down. Send us information about where there are control units in your state. Include the names of the prisons as well as the number of control unit beds/cells in each prison if that is known. Send us anti-control unit artwork.

**MIM’s Re-Lease on Life Program:** This program provides support for our comrades who have been recently released from the prison system, to help them meet their basic needs and also continue with their revolutionary organizing on the outside. We need funds, housing, and job resources. We also need prisoner’s input on the following survey questions:

1. What are the biggest challenges you face being released from prison?
2. How can these problems be addressed?
3. What are the important elements of a successful release program?

## Facts on US imprisonment

The facts about imprisonment in the United States are that the United States has been the world’s leading prison-state per capita for the last 25 years, with a brief exception during Boris Yeltsin’s declaration of a state of emergency.(1)

That means that while Reagan was talking about a Soviet “evil empire” he was the head of a state that imprisoned more people per capita. In supposedly “hard-line” Bulgaria of the Soviet bloc of the 1980s, the imprisonment rate was less than half that of the United States.(2,3)

To find a comparison with U.S. imprisonment of Black people, there is no statistic in any country that compares including apartheid South Africa of the era before Mandela was president. The last situation remotely comparable to the situation today was under Stalin during war time. The majority of prisoners are non-violent offenders(4) and the U.S. Government now holds about a half million more prisoners than China; even though China is four times our population.(5)

The rednecks tell MIM that we live in a “free country.” They live in an Orwellian 1984 situation where freedom is imprisonment.

Notes: 1. Marc Mauer, “Americans Behind Bars: The International Use of Incarceration 1993,” The Prison Sentencing Project, 918 F. St. NW, Suite 501, Washington, DC 20004 (202) 628-0871 Reference: SRI: R8965-2, 1994

2. Ibid., 1992 report.

3. United Nations Development Programme, “Human Development Report 1994,.” Oxford University Press, p. 186.

4. Figure of 51.2 percent for state prisoners there for non-violent offenses. Abstract of the United States 1993, p. 211.

5. Atlantic Monthly December, 1998.



## Irak: Las elecciones son una fase nueva en la ocupación yanqui

Por: Carlos Varea (\*).  
www.eldiariointernacional.com

La Junta Electoral iraquí presentaba finalmente el sábado 13 de febrero los resultados de los comicios celebrados en Irak el pasado 30 de enero. Los resultados se ajustan a lo previsto, esencialmente un reparto de los 275 escaños de la nueva Asamblea Nacional entre las formaciones asociadas a los ocupantes y que han formado parte de las instancias previas instauradas por EEUU y Reino Unido tras la invasión de Irak, primero del Consejo Gubernativo y, a partir de junio de 2004, del denominado Gobierno Interino, presidido por Iyad Alawi [1].

El número oficial de participantes en los comicios ha sido fijado finalmente en 8.456.266 votantes, sobre un total de inscritos de 14,7 millones, es decir el 59%. De los 20 millones de potenciales votantes se habían inscrito para poder hacerlo 14 millones, según fuentes oficiales, es decir el 70%. Calcúlese el porcentaje final total de participación: en torno al 42%.

Lo más relevante es que la coalición, si no exclusivamente shi'í (incluye formaciones de otras comunidades y confesiones), si articulada en torno a la figura del gran ayatollah as-Sistani y las dos principales formaciones confesionales shi'ies (el Congreso Supremo de la Revolución Islámica en Irak, CSRII y ad-Dawa), la Alianza Unida Iraquí (AUI), ha obtenido, según declaraciones propias, menos votos de los esperados: 1,9 millones. La AUI ha logrado así el 47,6% de los casi 8,5 millones de votos emitidos, el 60% de ellos en Bagdad (donde votó el 51% de los inscritos) y el resto en las nueve provincias del sur del país, donde el promedio de participación fue del 72% [2].

Hay discrepancias en la asignación del número de escaños, pero la AUI contará según el reparto de la Junta Electoral con 132, es decir carecerá de mayoría absoluta en la Cámara (fijada en dos tercios) pero será la fuerza principal. Efecto colateral inevitable de la estrategia de desmantelamiento confesional y sectario del Estado iraquí seguida por la Administración Bush, este hecho solo atenuará parcialmente la poderosa irrupción de Irán en el escenario interno iraquí, dada la estrecha relación con este país que mantienen tanto la propia jerarquía shi'í iraquí (as-Sistani es iraní), como las dos formaciones principales de la lista vencedora, el CSRII y ad-Dawa (que incluso combatieron al lado de Teherán durante la guerra irano-iraquí).

La siguiente lista más votada ha sido la de la coalición —de los otrora enemigos— Unión Patriótica del Kurdistan (UPK, de Talaban) y el Partido Democrático del Kurdistan (PDK, liderado por Barzani), la denominada Alianza Kurda, con el 25,4% de los votos y que tiene asignados 71 escaños. La tercera es la del actual primer ministro Alawi, la Lista Iraquí, con el 13,6% de los votos y 38 escaños. La cuarta más votada es la encabezada por el actual presidente interino del país, Ghazi al-Yawar, sunní, que contará con cinco escaños. Al-Yawar probablemente ha recogido el limitado voto de las provincias centrales del país, con un porcentaje mínimo de participación en la de al-Anbar (con capital en ar-Ramadi y donde se localiza Faluya), el 2%, y máximo en la de Salah al-Din, con el 29%. Las provincias caracterizadas como de “mayoría sunní” por los medios de comunicación suman siete millones de iraquíes, un cuarto de la población total del país.

Otras siete candidaturas se reparten el resto de escaños de la Asamblea, entre ellas la del Partido Comunista (Unión del Pueblo, con dos) y una lista de seguidores del clérigo Moqtadar as-Sadr (lista Nacional Independiente, con otros dos), quien se desvinculó de la lista promovida por as-Sistani, pero que, respetando el liderazgo religioso de la jerarquía shi'í (al-Marja'iyah, integrada por cuatro ayatollahs), no llamó al boicot activo de los comicios [3]. Esta lista de seguidores de as-Sadr ha recibido su apoyo mayoritariamente en la provincia de Maysan, donde el porcentaje de participación ha sido el máximo estatal, como en el Kurdistan, del 85% [4]. Tras las elecciones, as-Sadr ha pedido un calendario para la retirada de las tropas de ocupación [5] y

probablemente espera canalizar de nuevo a su favor la oposición mayoritaria a la presencia de los ocupantes entre el electorado shi'í a medida que se evidencia que la Asamblea y el nuevo gobierno, como ya se ha adelantado, no pedirá a EEUU y demás países ocupantes el fin de su presencia en el país [6].

Una situación de interinidad

Estos resultados electorales, se les otorgue la fiabilidad que se quiera (las denuncias de irregularidades han sido muchas, particularmente en la disputada ciudad de Kirkuk [7], que la coalición UPK-PDK reivindicará como capital de un ampliado Kurdistan iraquí), prefiguran un panorama político en Irak para el próximo año complejo, que habrá de resolverse con un reparto equilibrado de cargos entre las tres listas más votadas, en una atmósfera que no pierde su carácter de interinidad.

Así, el nuevo parlamento habrá de estar constituido para el primero de marzo y habrá de abordar la formación de un nuevo gobierno y la redacción de una nueva Constitución basada en la denominada Ley Administrativa Transitoria, un texto provisional aprobado hace ahora un año que, según el calendario establecido por la Autoridad Provisional de la Coalición antes de su disolución en junio de 2004, habrá de someterse a referéndum el 15 de octubre. Tras ello, se convocarán nuevamente elecciones generales el 15 de diciembre para elegir otra nueva Asamblea y un nuevo gobierno, ya por cinco años.

La Administración Bush sin duda participará activamente en lograr un acuerdo entre los triunfadores en lo que respecta a la designación de los cargos de primer ministro y presidente del país. Alawi ha procurado en estos días —con visita a Irbil incluida— que los partidos kurdos le apoyen en su intento de mantenerse como primer ministro, haciendo valer para ello su carácter de puente —“shi'í laico” [sic]— entre las dos listas más votadas. La alianza UPK-PDK postula a Jalal Talabani, líder de la UPK, como presidente del país. Por su parte la coalición ganadora ha insistido en que quiere para sí el cargo de primer ministro, designando para éste a Ibrahim al-Jaafari, máximo dirigente de ad-Dawa y actual vicepresidente del país [8]. Presentado como un moderado por medios occidentales, al-Jaafari, exilado en Irán desde los años 80, pertenecía a la denominada “rama londinense” de ad-Dawa, más proclive que la parte de dirección del partido asentada en Teherán a asociarse a los planes de EEUU y Reino Unido de invasión de Irak.

Fuentes kurdas avanzaban un acuerdo preliminar por el cual la Alianza Kurda finalmente apoyaría a un primer ministro de la lista shi'í y no a Alawi, a cambio de que la presidencia del país se otorgue a Talabani [9], un hombre con muy buenas relaciones con Irán, Turquía e Israel.

Las líneas de mayor tensión entre la Alianza Kurda y la Alianza Unida Iraquí de as-Sistani es la reivindicación federalista de la primera y la imposición de la ley islámica como exclusiva fuente de legislación en la nueva constitución de la segunda, ya expresada abiertamente tras los comicios [10]. La posibilidad de acuerdo, aquél derivado de la presión estadounidense y del sometimiento a la lógica de los ocupantes de unos y de otros en esta nueva etapa de dominación, que cabe imaginar como caracterizada por una división territorial de facto de Irak, mientras se ajustan para 2006 los acuerdos sobre la presencia militar indefinida de EEUU y Reino Unido y la privatización de los hidrocarburos. En suma, la gestión y reparto en clave neocolonial del crudo iraquí.

Por su parte, las formaciones que llamaron al boicot de las pasadas elecciones en Irak, agrupadas en el Congreso Fundacional Nacional Iraquí, han emitido un comunicado el 14 de febrero al término de una nueva reunión mantenida en Bagdad. Entre las formaciones y personalidades reunidas se encontraba un representante de Moqtadar as-Sadr, junto a la Asociación de Ulemas Musulmanes y formaciones laicas y nacionalistas (incluido el Partido Baaz). El comunicado, avanzado por Al-Jazeera, exige de la comunidad internacional “[...] un calendario internacionalmente garantizado para la retirada de

las tropas extranjeras” y fija las dos condiciones de su participación en un “[...] proceso de reconciliación nacional y redacción de la [nueva] Constitución”: que se ponga fin a la designación de cargos según “[...] criterios religiosos, raciales o étnicos” y “[...] el reconocimiento del derecho del pueblo a resistir” la ocupación. El comunicado declara como “ilegítimo” el gobierno iraquí que surge de unas elecciones que son caracterizadas como “fraudulentas” y con limitado grado de participación popular.

Continuidad de la presencia extranjera

Debido a este carácter de interinidad de las nuevas instancias iraquíes surgidas del 30 de enero, no se espera que EEUU discuta con el gobierno iraquí que ha de ser ahora constituido el denominado Status of Forces Agreement (“Acuerdo sobre el estatuto de las fuerzas [extranjeras en Irak]”) [11], es decir, un calendario de retirada parcial y escalonada de las tropas de ocupación y la formalización de su presencia definitiva en el país por medio del establecimiento de hasta 14 bases militares estadounidenses y británicas, asociadas —se afirma— a puntos neurálgicos de extracción, producción y exportación de crudo y gas iraquíes [12]. En cualquier caso, todas las declaraciones más recientes de miembros de la Administración Bush y del propio presidente coinciden en el mantenimiento de la presencia de las tropas estadounidenses más allá, cuando menos, de este año 2005, máximo cuando se confirma lo poco que avanza el proceso de formación y adiestramiento de los nuevos cuerpos de seguridad iraquíes, hasta el punto que el Pentágono ha renunciado a dar cifras concretas sobre esta materia [13].

Mandos militares estadounidenses han reconocido que el nivel de violencia el día de las elecciones fue muy superior al inicialmente admitido, entre 200 y 300 ataques, cuando el vicesecretario de Defensa Wolfowitz limitó el número de acciones a ocho ataques suicidas [14]. El segundo mando del Comando Central de EEUU, el general Lance Smith, ha señalado que la actividad insurgente se mantiene tras las elecciones en niveles similares a las semanas anteriores. En diciembre murieron en combate 55 militares de EEUU (58 en diciembre) con una distribución territorial amplia, a los que hay que sumar otros 52 fallecidos en “incidentes no hostiles” [15]. Desde el 1 de mayo de 2003 han muerto en combate 1.019 militares de EEUU. En el transcurso de los primeros quince días de este mes han muerto en combate al menos 15 militares estadounidenses.

Además han muerto por la actividad insurgente 10 británicos, un italiano (en Nasiriyah el día 19 de enero) y ocho ucranianos y un kazaco (todos ellos en la provincia de Wasit). Los militares británicos murieron el mismo día de las elecciones por el derribo de un avión de transporte C-130 a 30 kilómetros al noroeste de la capital, una práctica que empieza a preocupar a las autoridades de ocupación por su carácter creciente y porque los insurgentes estarían utilizando misiles relativamente sofisticados tierra-aire SAM y MANPADS (Man Portable Air Defense Systems), provenientes de arsenales clandestinos del ejército iraquí [16].

Tras las elecciones, mandos estadounidenses indicaban a la cadena CNN que el Pentágono ha elevado hasta entre 13.000 y 17.000 la cifra oficial de insurgentes (antes limitada a 5.000), en su mayoría, según los oficiales, militantes o cuadros militares baasistas; menos de un millar serían seguidores de az-Zarqawi.

Escándalos petrolíferos

Nada parece indicar que el nuevo gobierno iraquí se salga del guión establecido por EEUU y Reino Unido. Sobre el terreno seguirán los más de 40.000 asesores civiles y militares estadounidenses que, impuestos por Paul Bremer y designados para cinco años, supervisarán igualmente cada una de las decisiones —si es que cabe calificarlas como tales— de las nuevas instancias iraquíes [17].

Al igual que en la faceta securitaria, no cabe imaginar que el nuevo gobierno iraquí altere la intervención de EEUU en la gestión de la renta petrolífera. El actual ministro de Finanzas —antes

mencionado como candidato del CSRII a primer ministro—, Adil Abd al-Mahdi, se manifestaba partidario el pasado mes de diciembre, durante una visita a Washington, de la aprobación por el nuevo gobierno iraquí de una ley de privatización del sector petrolífero que permitiera a las compañías extranjeras invertir —y ser por tanto propietarias— en cualquier tramo de la explotación energética del país. Contratos en esa línea ya estarían siendo aprobados de manera encubierta en estos meses durante su gestión al frente del ministerio, incluidos aquellos por valor de 450 millones de dólares para la explotación de los yacimientos de Suba-Luhais y Hamrin [18].

Lo cierto es que las alharacas y fuegos de artificios lanzados con motivo de las elecciones del 30 de enero han permitido tapar el escándalo del informe presentado ese mismo día por Stuart Bowen, Inspector General de EEUU para la Reconstrucción de Irak, relativo a 8,8 mil millones de dólares obtenidos por la venta de crudo durante los 14 meses de mandato de la Autoridad Provisional de la Coalición (APC) y cuyo destino se desconoce, además de un cifra indeterminada de hasta 800 millones de dólares (de ellos, al menos 500 millones también procedentes de la venta de crudo iraquí, el resto de fondos del Pentágono) otorgados a mandos militares estadounidenses para actividades de emergencia sobre el terreno y sin necesidad de ser justificados [19].

(18-02-2005).

(\*) Carlos Varea es coordinador de la Campaña Estatal contra la Ocupación y por la Soberanía de Irak, CEOSI (www.nodo50.org/irak)

Notas:

1. Véase el texto de Carlos Varea en Rebelión del 4 de febrero de 2005, “Tras las elecciones en Ira: No perder el hilo”: <http://www.rebellion.org/noticia.php?id=10986>.

2. Según datos oficiales iraquíes.

3. AFP, 4 de febrero de 2005.

4. Financial Times (edición electrónica), 10 de febrero de 2005. En esta provincia los seguidores de as-Sadr habrían llegado a un acuerdo de control de la seguridad con los militares británicos.

5. AFP, 4 de febrero de 2005.

6. El mismo martes día 1 de febrero, el actual presidente interino de Irak, Ghazi al-Yawar, dejaba bien claro que “[...] carece absolutamente de sentido” una petición por parte de las nuevas instancias iraquíes de una salida de las fuerzas de ocupación “[...] en este caos y con este vacío [actual] de poder” (Associated Press, 1 de febrero de 2005). Al-Yawar indicó que “[h]acia finales de este año podríamos ver una reducción del número de fuerzas extranjeras”. De igual tenor se han manifestado otros responsables iraquíes, entre ellos, el ministro interino de Defensa, Hazem Shaalan. Más significativa sin duda es la posición mostrada poco después por quienes supuestamente son los ganadores de los comicios: Mohammad Juzai, uno de sus portavoces de la jerarquía shi'í, ha confirmado que ésta no solicitará la salida de las tropas de ocupación por el momento, según informa The Washington Post el 3 de febrero.

7. IslamOnline.net y agencias, 12 de febrero de 2005. Las denuncias parten de organizaciones árabes y turcomanas que afirman que estas comunidades no han podido votar.

8. Al-Jazeera, 16 de febrero de 2005. Al-Jaafari ha desplazado al candidato del CSRII, el actual ministro de Finanzas, Adil Abd al-Mahdi.

9. Reuters, 13 de febrero de 2005.

10. The Jordan Times, 9 de febrero de 2005.

11. Escobar, J. “The Roving Eye. The Shi'ites' Fautian Pact”, Asian Times (www.atimes.com), febrero de 2005.

12. Al-Moktar, S. “Oil in the election”, Al-Ahram Weekly Online, febrero de 2005.

13. The Independent, 13 de febrero de 2005.

14. UPI, 9 de febrero de 2005.

15. Datos oficiales recogidos en Iraq Coalition Casualties Count.

16. India Daily, 9 de febrero de 2005.

17. Phyllis Bennis, UFPJ Talking Points 29: “Reading the elections”, 1 de febrero de 2005.

18. The News Standar, 8 de febrero de 2005.

19. The Guardian, 8 de febrero de 2005. Otros 1,4 mil millones de dólares fueron transferidos también por la APC de Bremer al gobierno autónomo del Kurdistan in que se conozca su destino final.