U$ PUSHES SECRET WAR AGAINST IRAN, HEZBOLLAH

Amerika reaps the whirlwind

The United States has stepped up covert operations against Iran and Hezbollah as it tilts allegiances to keep from losing its grip on the Middle east. Since last August Amerikan troops have arrested hundreds of Iranians in Iraq, many of them food and medical aid workers. Amerikan commandos—known to have been operating in Iran since last year—have escalated spy operations in Iran and now follow Iranians back and forth across the border with Iraq. In Lebanon, the United States officially spends billions to support the puppet Siniora government, and on top of that provides secret support to Sunni groups that oppose Hezbollah. According to Seymore Hersh, these efforts are part of a conscious US policy to provoke strife between Sunnis and Shiites, in part to undermine Shiite Iran and Hezbollah (1).

This “divide and conquer” policy is of course nothing new. The Amerikans—before them the British—have undermined nothing new. The Amerikans—under Saddam Hussein. Since Tony Blair had said Saddam Hussein was responsible for 400,000 deaths in 24 years of rule,(2) we gather the imperialists could not put Saddam Hussein on trial for the other 399,000+ deaths, because the evidence for U.S. and British complicity would have come out at trial. Most crucial to the death toll was the U.S. arming of Iraq to fight Iran.

The U.S. media discussion of the hanging of Saddam Hussein and his associates went on for weeks in a pointless direction. Since there was religious shouting at the hangings and since one of the hangings ended up botched physically, the media talked about that instead of whether it was just for the imperialist war criminals who put Saddam Hussein in power in the first place to hang him.

The stupid liberals on National Public Radio (NPR) said that Arab reactions to the hangings indicated the “confusion” of the Arab people, instead media focussed on a different part of the trial and the plight of the Kurds under Saddam Hussein. Since Tony Blair had said Saddam Hussein was responsible for 400,000 deaths in 24 years of rule,(2) we gather the imperialists could not put Saddam Hussein on trial for the other 399,000+ deaths, because the evidence for U.S. and British complicity would have come out at trial. Most crucial to the death toll was the U.S. arming of Iraq to fight Iran.
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On December 30, 2006 U.S. lackey forces in Iraq hanged president Saddam Hussein, now a martyr for Third World independence. He followed his two sons Uday and Qusay and grandson Mustapha to the grave in the fight for Iraqi independence. Saddam Hussein killed thousands of communist-minded Iraqis to start his career with U.$. help, but he proved willing to put his own life on the line for his political approach, an important characteristic of an oppressed nation political leader at this time. Saddam Hussein could have followed the path of say an Imelda Marcos by fleeing to Hawaii or the like long ago, but he stayed put and fought for Iraq. The formal charge against Saddam Hussein was responsibility for murder of 148 people. The
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of cash selling weapons to both countries and their nervous neighbors. Both Saddam Hussein and Osama Bin Laden are by products of American meddling. The CIA funded and trained Hussein to overthrow Iraq nationalist (3) and Bin Laden to fight against the USSR in Afghanistan.

The imperialists often claim they are intervening in support of “democracy,” the rights of a national minority, winnins’ rights, etc. But because of their nature the imperialists cannot resolve conflicts among oppressed people; they can only exacerbate them. The current situation in Iraq and Afghanistan illustrates that. This is why Lenin, Stalin and Mao argued that conflicts among the people could be only be addressed after liberation from imperialism, under a socialist government. This is why Lenin, Stalin and Mao recognized the rights of nations to self-determination but argued that sometimes these rights could best be realized in a multinational state. This is why Americans who truly support the liberation of oppressed peoples should direct their fire towards their own government, and not directly or indirectly call for US “humanitarian” intervention. “The people united will never be defeated,” is not just a catchy chant.

Although we now learn that US troops have been arresting Iranians in Iraq since last August, the Bush administration first leaked this fact in early January, in the run-up to the State of the Union Speech. During that speech, Bush claimed that “Iran is providing material support for attacks on American troops,” a refrain echoed in State department and military press conferences over the next few weeks. The US Navy also sent an extra carrier group to patrol the seas off Iran in January. So it appears that one wing of the American bourgeoisie is accelerating its military and public-opinion preparations for war. On the other hand, the Hersh article represents push-back by the wing of the American bourgeoisie that does not want war with Iran and is tired of the war in Iraq. (Afghanistan is just fine, though, according to these “doves.”)

This push-back comes in part from US generals and spymasters who worry that the US military is already stretched near the breaking point. They also worry about “blow-back:” “bad guys” the US supports now against Iran and Hezbollah might someday turn against the United States—a la Saddam Hussein or Osama Bin Laden. And in part the push-back comes from the two terrors of US imperialism and militarism. The Bush administration’s claims about Iranian involvement in Iraq—and don’t like the fact that Cheney has subverted congressional oversight by keeping covert operations out of the hands of the CIA and military.

This debate is clearly about how best to preserve imperialism—or the careers of individual bourgeois politicians. The generals and spymasters are right to worry about “blow-back,” but they are wrong to think that oppressed peoples will warm to Amerika as long as the United States does not provoke them by using “excessive” military force. The daily conditions of life under imperialism create resistance to imperialism—and for that matter, the imperialists have shown themselves incapable of foregoing force to suppress the just demands of the oppressed when their interests are threatened. As for the politicians complaining they can’t trust the Bush administration, MIM suspects they are just laying the groundwork for “plausible deniability.” They whine now that Bush “lied” to them to get their endorsement of the Iraq invasion, when the facts debunking Bush’s justifications for the war were already public knowledge. When Hilary Clinton calls for “proof” that Iran is sending arms to Iraq, she is naming her price, telling Bush exactly what he needs to do to help her save face and earn her support for war in Iraq. Later, when 100,000s die as in Iraq she can always wash her hands by saying Bush deceived her.

MIM has no illusions that “enlightened” generals or bourgeois politicians can end US imperialism and militarism. Rather, we put our faith in the resistance of the oppressed masses themselves and their allies inside US borders. Although MIM’s resources are microscopic compared to the Democratic Party’s, MIM has done more to oppose the US invasion of Iraq than the Dems, who four years later can’t even pass a mealy-mouthed, non-binding resolution saying the war might not have been such a great idea after all. And the heroic Iraqis taking up arms against American aggression are doing the most to hasten the wars end and weaken US imperialism.

Notes:
3. Lando, pp. 25-47.

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 possible 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 human 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.”

Ice melting at North Pole
Capitalism a threat to humyn species

December 12—At a meeting of the American Geophysical Union in San Francisco experts warned that there may be no sea ice left at the North Pole by 2040. Reporting on research to be published in the scientific journal Geophysical Research Letters, scientists explained that the ice is melting at an unprecedented rate due to global warming—a direct result of humyn pollution of the environment. (1) The amount of Arctic sea ice is a key indicator of the rate and results of global warming.

Some experts believe we have not yet reached a point of no return, and that there is still a chance to restore balance to the earth’s atmosphere and restore the Arctic sea ice. (1) But it is clear that window of opportunity will not be around for long. Unlike previous warnings which suggested the North Pole would be ice-free by the end of this century, a time that might be far enough in the future for many people to ignore, the year 2040 will happen in the lifetime of most people reading this article.

This environmental change has serious, direct implications for Arctic wildlife and indigenous people living in the area. In addition, the accelerated global warming poses health risks to all humyns, beyond the destruction of the environment and wildlife. But in a quick survey of top mainstream news articles about this story, virtually all mentioned potential benefits of open shipping lanes year round and other commerce benefits, ignoring or downplaying negative effects.

Humyn activities such as burning fossil fuels and clearing forests have dramatically increased the amount of carbon dioxide in the Earth’s atmosphere, raising temperatures, resulting in what we call global warming. In addition to the many animal species that are threatened with extinction by global warming, the hazards from the atmosphere to humyns will require significant changes in the way people interact with the environment. The long term effects are not certain, but it is hard to imagine how anyone could find these dramatic changes in the earth’s environment to be anything but alarming.

According to the Union of Concerned Scientists: “In the last 10,000 years, the Earth’s average temperature hasn’t varied by more than 1.8°F (1°C). Scientists predict that continued global warming on the order of 2.5-10.4°F over the next 100 years ... is likely to result in:

# a rise in sea level between 3.5 and 34.6 in. (9-88 cm), leading to more coastal erosion, flooding during storms, and permanent inundation
# severe stress on many forests, wetlands, alpine regions, and other natural ecosystems
# greater threats to human health as mosquitoes and other disease-carrying insects and rodents spread diseases over larger geographical regions
# disruption of agriculture in some parts of the world due to increased temperature, water stress, and sea-level rise in low-lying areas such as Bangladesh or the Mississippi River delta.” (2)

But for all the urgency behind global warming, the real environmental crisis in the world today is not global warming but capitalism. A system that puts profit over humyn well being inevitably must ignore environmental threats, especially those that are caused by capitalist production and consumption. There are many ways to modify production and consumption to stop the humyn destruction of the environment, but few of them will benefit the capitalists and most will cost in the short run. Ignoring the long term benefit to humanity is a hallmark of capitalists who sponsor invasions of Third World countries, murdering tens of thousands of people in the name of establishing “stability” for exploitation of resources and labor.

As MIM wrote in 1997 in the MIM theory journal Environment, Society, Revolution: “The root cause of environmental problems is capitalism, the private ownership of the means of production by a relative handful of people. This essence of capitalism is one reason why capitalism creates environmental problems: while the majority of the world’s people have a material interest in maintaining a healthy planet, the small capitalist ruling class is not accountable to this majority, except in the indirect sense that the ruling class seeks to co-opt the demands of the majority in order to maintain the capitalist system. A second reason why capitalism creates environmental problems is that although the world’s resources are controlled by a relative handful of people, planning is not centralized under capitalism. Instead, production is anarchic; it is centered around making profits, not around meeting basic human needs in the short or long run. Much of what is produced by the capitalist system is unnecessary and wasteful, and the system is not fundamentally capable of incorporating long-term human survival as a need. Finally, the capitalist system does not distribute resources equitably. Under capitalism, many people do not have adequate resources for survival. Many environmental problem stem from this root problem.” (3)

As destruction of the earth’s environment continues it will become clear to more and more people that systemic changes are required to save this planet and the people who live on it. Revolutionary environmentalism is the only solution to this destruction—an environmentalism that fights to overthrow the system that puts profit over people.

Notes:
1. San Francisco Chronicle, December 12, 2006
3. MIM Theory 13, Environment, Society, Revolution.

Rabid dogs attack ‘pizza for pesos’

A U.S. pizza chain of 59 stores held a promotion in which it accepted payment of Mexican pesos for pizza. In response, running dogs of the labor aristocracy delivered countless death threats to the owner of “Pizza Patron” in January for “encouraging” “illegal immigration” to the United States by Mexicans. (1)

These death threats and twisted patriotism are the practice and the left-wing of parasitism talking about economic degradation of white workers is the theory. Lou Dobbs on CNN, Bob Afaakean, Che-Libs and most of those calling themselves “socialist” are the theory and KKK is the practice. The KKK has increased its recruiting lately on the strength of the immigration issue. (2)

If these crackers would stop foaming at the mouth long enough, they would be able to see printed facts that white people are the disproportionate share of retirees. In California, where the trend of the future is already in practice, Euro-American oppressors are 70% of retirees and a minority of working-age people. (3)

As of 2005, only 61.9% of the U.S. employed people in the age 16 to 39 age groups are whites but nearly 83% (as of 2003 statistics) of the people over 65 are whites. (4)

The Mexicans and Asian migrant workers in particular are disproportionately supporting the retired people in the United States, but Joe Blow garden-variety labor activist still talks as if there is a white working class being exploited and leading some kind of socialist revolution about to break out any minute.

These same rabid dogs of the labor aristocracy, Lou Dobbs included, are always talking about “competitiveness” and the “trade deficit” and bashing China for “unfair trade.” Yet here comes a U.S.-based entrepreneur who finally decides to do something to boost exports, and all the parasites come out in force to kill him. No wonder there is a trade deficit. Guess what crackers: if Mexicans don’t spend the pesos in the United States, they will spend them somewhere else. Welcome to capitalism, morons.

These parasites are so used to lording it over the rest of the world ranging from Iraq to Korea they get real up set when they actually see the people doing all the work. Dumb-ass crackers, if you want to ruin someone’s economy, you have no right to ruin ours. If you want grandma to have her social security cut, move your ass to the Sahara Desert; buy some land and set up a cracker republic. You’ll kill yourselves off in a matter of a few years and the rest of the world will live in peace.

Notes:
4. Unfortunately the Bureau of Labor Statistics is apt to count Latinos as “whites,” so the following alternative calculation has to be done. In the 16 to 39 age group, there are 11.6 million employed “Hispanics” employed, 14.5 million employed Blacks and Asians and the rest of 68.5 million aged 16 to 39 workers in 2005 were white. That means that whites were 61.9% of the 16 to 39 age workers.

Religion to justify imperialism

Congressman condemns Muslims as threat to Americkkkan values

Representative Virgil Goode Jr. sent a letter to hundreds of voters in his Virginia district warning them that the recent election of a Muslim to Congress sets a dangerous precedent, specifically condemning Keith Ellison (a Minnesota Representative) for his plan to use the Koran during his swearing-in ceremony in January.(1) To satisfy the white trash rabble, Ellison offered to use Thomas Jefferson’s Koran.(2)

Goode’s letter, dated December 5, urged Americans to “wake up,” warning that there will “likely be many more Muslims elected to office and demanding the use of the Koran.” He went on: “I fear that in the next century we will have many more Muslims in the United States if we do not adopt the strict immigration policies that I believe are necessary to preserve the values and beliefs traditionally associated with the United States of America and to prevent our resources from being swamped.”

In reality, there is some small amount of separation of church and state in Congress: the official swearing in ceremony takes place without any religious books, and Congress members must swear to uphold the constitution. Members of Congress can then opt to use the Bible or Koran or other texts in private ceremonial events.

Ironically, Ellison isn’t any more of a recent immigrant and he converted to Islam in college. But the details don’t matter to politicians like Goode who find it useful to stir things up reactionary nationalist sentiments among Americans. Goode should have to answer for the violence that his letter is instigating. Ellison has received death threats and hostile calls and emails, something that no doubt increases with the public reactions to the_PAGE_4_letter. Ellison has received death threats and hostile calls and emails, something...

Ellison is a Democrat, and many congressional Democrats have stepped up to condemn Goode’s ridiculous statements. But this doesn’t mean the Democrats are better on questions of American values. Ellison got elected because he was able to put forward the mainstream pro-imperialist political positions that Americans in Minnesota support. Democrats cloak their imperialist positions with inclusive rhetoric, but in the end no one in Congress is calling for open borders or an end to American military and corporate plunder around the world. Greater inclusion of Muslim citizens in Congress will not do anything to end the mass murder and exploitation of Muslim citizens of Arab countries because this exploitation is not about religion: it is about borders and resources of other countries for the benefit of the United States of America.

According to the New York Times, Goode’s condemnation of Ellison followed vocal criticisms from Dennis Prager, a columnist and radio talk show host, who claimed Ellison’s use of the Koran at his swearing in ceremony would undermine American civil liberties. The New York Times quoted Prager: “Ellison’s doing so will embolden Islamic extremists and make new ones, as Islamists, rightly or wrongly, see the first sign of the realization of their greatest goal the Islamization of America,” said Mr. Prager, who said the Bible was the only relevant religious text in the United States. “If you are incapable of taking an oath on that book, don’t serve in Congress,” Mr. Prager said.

This episode underscores the strength of Christianity as a part of imperialism and particularly American imperialism. This is not to excuse other religions from their role in the oppression of people around the world. Religion is fundamentally a form of mysticism; all forms of religion encourage people to believe in something blindly, regardless of any evidence to the contrary. This belief promotes powerlessness: people should not trust in some higher power that their suffering on earth will be rewarded in an afterlife. Such trust discourages people from fighting against their oppressors, instead justifying the power of the oppressors as part of a grand plan.

Religion does not aid the people in struggle, but it just so happens that most of the Muslim people are in oppressed nations. Lately the imperialists use the word “Islam” as code language for attacks on oppressed nations, and we have to defeat this strategy.

In the United States, our stupid left-wing of parasitism seeks to rally Islam-bashers and equal opportunity exploiters with democratic values. The only struggle that can positively affect the majority of such people is a conspiratorial and authoritarian struggle. Our goody-goodies in the left-wing of parasitism have only the will to be steam-rolled. Only a small minority inside U.S. borders can understand the truth of the future of world peace directly and openly.

Notes:

FBI abused Patriot Act powers

Patriot Act in pursuit of suspected terrorists and spies.(3)

Previous to the announcements admitting FBI agents running amok, the FBI admitted that it was pursuing over 400 U.S. citizens. At the same time, it appears that the rule is that these people are not as exciting as the budget-sellers would like:

“FBI Deputy Director John Pistole said, ‘Many, if not most, of those cases are dealing with material support for terrorism. These are not bomb-throwers; these are people out there raising money or recruiting.’”(4)

In other words these are people trying to do what everyone else does in politics. FBI Director Mueller has made it quite clear that he opposes “radicalization,” not terrorism.(4)

The public still processes this sort of information the wrong way. What is important is not what the so-called terrorists are doing or not doing, but the budget for following people and inventing stories.

“Those include doubling the number of FBI intelligence analysts and tripling its linguists and putting analysts in all 56 bureau field offices. At the same time, the FBI has ramped up its regional joint terrorism task forces from 35 to 101 since September 11, expanding the number of federal, state and local agents assigned to them from 1,000 to nearly 4,000.”(4)

MIM has also confirmed a recent classified military discussion calling for the abolition of COINTELPRO.

Notes:
Libby trial shows decomposition of regime

Whether I. Lewis “Scooter” Libby turns out “innocent” in his current trial or not, CNN has correctly observed a “cloud” hanging over the trial.(1) At the last minute, Prince Cheney decided not to testify for Libby in order to distance himself from the connection to an investigation of the leak of a CIA officer’s identity, Valerie Plame. The risk of Cheney’s coming up for perjury in this case was too great for Cheney to risk, so he did not testify at Libby’s trial despite promising to do so. What is important about Cheney’s not testifying is that it shows he sometimes needs to let his underlings fry. This will cost him for the rest of his administration, regardless of the outcome of the Libby trial. In a dictatorship of the proletariat, individuals are less able to pursue office for profit, so conflicts like those over Libby will start to simmer down. The partisan divisions that led to the outing of the CIA officer Plame stem from bourgeois class conflicts underneath.

Even more important, the two leading Republican candidates for president have distanced themselves from the prevailing wisdom. Giuliani let it be known he does not believe the Iraq war will be won. Shortly thereafter, McCain found himself at a disadvantage concerning his official and MIM-like approval ratings from the public. His reason he gave was that he could not work with Congress anymore. Certain figures in the Bush regime also have MIM-like levels of approval. Bush himself is just a notch above MIM level unpopularity. One more shot could sink the ship. We at MIM are not too eager to see this shot delivered, because it would just bring new imperialists to power. Nonetheless, in naming the trend of ultra-reaction that we have seen in recent years, MIM has found some use in discussing monarchism. The ditching of the Bill of Rights and the effete response from the left-wing of parasitism left us contemplating the nature of oppositional elite minorities in monarchies. Such a strategy gets MIM away from thinking in dumbocratic terms of watering down the truth in order to attract 51% of the American public, a bourgeois public. The illness of a large portion of U.S. society that would not miss a beat if Bush named himself global emperor. The spread of parasitic bureaucracies such as that spies outnumber communists, socialists etc. more than 10 to 1 has pushed MIM forward toward developing the theory of fighting within the world’s ruling class, Amerikkka, that centers on “persynal offense.” When we do not take “persynal offense” at MIM when things go too far, we are seen as bloodlessly theoretical. We should delegitimize imperialism overall and also maneuver for the international proletariat and it is possible to do both at the same time.

The strategy connected to taking “persynal offense” reflects the times we live in and the lack of a vibrant proletariat able to overthrow imperialism from within. It is the task of the MIM to reflect the interests of the international proletariat, not the 51% within U.S. borders. At the moment we are not able to unseat the imperialists in our wildest dreams; however, we are capable of taking “persynal offense” when individual imperialists overstep the boundaries of a normal bourgeois state. Quo while retaining majority support. Even in monarchies there is constant maneuvering of family alliances for power. Our strategy and tactics hit at the individual and patronage level. By doing so we can maneuver for advantage for the international proletariat and decide what is a “normal” bourgeois.

People of the social-democratic or “revolutionary” sort who act as if Euro-Americans can understand, much less side with the international proletariat are doing nothing but drag down the possibilities for progress. Euro-Americans will only understand far down the road after the structure of power in which their benefit has been yanked out of them, like a huge splinter in the eye. In the meantime, conspiratorial tactics are necessary. Those who believe in the majority, those who believe there is no state or that their lifestyle rises above it somehow—various such fools have to be kept away from the struggle. And when they inevitably ask why the proletarian struggle is secret, we should smile, because Marx already told us that exploitation is the “dirty secret” of capitalism. Our opponents who ask this question are already won over to the imperialist reformist line, an implicit belief in the exploiter majority—this despite how the 60 million voted for Bush just two years ago.

Notes:

Reality about the Democrats and the Iraq war

The Democratic Party is not about opposing imperialist wars in principle. The public cannot count on that party to tell the public the truth about weapons of mass destruction, oil and Kurds when it is necessary. That’s why candidate for president John Edwards has to say now that he was “fooled” by Bush into supporting the Iraq war (1) when he voted for it in the Senate. Politicians such as presidential candidate Edwards only say what the public wants to hear and that is why we activists need vanguard parties as explained by Lenin. It should also go without saying we do not need leaders like Edwards, Kerry and Clinton who could be fooled by Bush. A poll now shows 70% disapprove of how Bush is handling the war in Iraq, (2) but only a bare majority favors pulling out within 12 months. There is no better indicator of the weakness of anti-war opinion than the poll concerning Hillary Clinton.

Perceived as “to the right” of Edwards, Obama and Gore on the war, Clinton nonetheless has 76% support among Democrats who oppose the war. That was an ingenious little poll to do. If we take these Democrats who supposedly oppose the war, we see it’s not a high priority with them, because they still support Hillary Clinton; even though she voted for the war and still does not favor a pullout now.

The monopoly television networks are talking about the Iraq war non-stop. The overall poll numbers against the war are pretty high, but even at this moment achieved by the heroism of the Iraqi people in defeating the occupiers, the feeling against the war is tepid. If 76% of Democrats opposed to the war still want Hillary Clinton, obviously the Iraq war is not that important to tens of millions of people. The U.S. public never fully mobilizes to oppose an imperialist war.

Sentiment this widespread against a U.S. war we rarely see. It’s important now that we see it that it not be overstated. The other organizations in the United States calling themselves socialist or communist generally bought into dumbocracy, and pander to the hopeless majority. Doing so serves the interests of politicians like Hillary Clinton. We at MIM instead attach a proper priority to opposing the imperialist wars, and we don’t care if only 20% agree with us. The rest should only be handled by authoritarian means. The Iraqi people’s bullets are what are convincing Americans.

Notes:
2. “Clinton out in front with 24-point lead on rival,” http://www.guardian.co.uk/usa/story/0,1995778,00.html
J. Arch Getty and Oleg V. Naumov
*The Road to Terror: Stalin and the Self-Destruction of the Bolsheviks, 1932-1939*

We agree with the rather pointed observation of Roy A. Medvedev that from the point of view of Western Liberalism this is the first comprehensive study of the Great Terror of the 1930s in Stalin’s Soviet Union. What is left unspoken is that this round of history-writing on Stalin destroys all the previous Western so-called scholarship on Stalin and that is why it is “first.”

Past writings on Stalin in the West served to justify the Cold War and Western military and spying expenditures in particular. They had little relationship to reality. Perhaps the current agenda of Getty is to taunt the Russians into releasing more NKVD/KGB archives, because “The Road to Terror” basing itself on party archives excluding those of the secret police in the Soviet Union. That’s not to say that the party is not foremost, but with the publication of Getty’s works, the cold war Liberals may find themselves spurred to dig up some “dirt” or egg on the Russians to open them.

The agenda of opening the secret police archives is not one MIM can parse easily. After all, it remains true that Russians have more to gain from leaving open the possibility of returning to the road of Lenin and Stalin than the West does by reading about secret police methods—from the point of view of the proletariat. The Russians may soon return to the Soviet road, but the Americans surely will not. Hence, the question of opening the secret police archives more than they are now is one of whether Westerners would benefit from that or suffer from having secrets revealed to the Western imperialists.

Getty is a Liberal echoing post-modernism on “Master Narratives” (pp. 17-18 and onwards) for some purposes in handling Stalin. Yet Getty is really the first bourgeois scholar to look at Soviet government documents and read them seriously with an eye to pseudo-theories and ideologies propagated by the West. We at MIM pointed out before that our critic Robert Tucker understands some aspects of Marxist-Leninist ideology of Stalin’s day, but Getty provides a more complete picture of implementation and administration, including crucial statistics on imprisonment and execution, each step of the way under Stalin.

Though Getty nowhere addresses the comparative statistical evidence on imprisonment, informed and careful readers will realize that there is no chance to find Stalin more repressive than contemporary America by total numbers except for 1937 and 1938, when there was a round of executions that added up to the six digits. If we start in 1923, when Lenin became incapacitated, we will find 414 executions a year, ranging up to a high of 20,201 in 1930 if we exclude 1937 and 1938. (p. 588) These “ordinary years” involved more death penalties than the United States applies in an ordinary year percentage-wise and absolutely, but not so much more that we can say the United States is more “freedom-loving” than Stalin’s Soviet Union was. The United States puts so many more people in prison for so much longer that the percentage of life-years of the population spent under imprisonment repression is higher in the United States than Stalin’s Soviet Union was, even if we count each execution as a repression of a whole life-time, the equivalent of 75 years imprisonment. Those of us concerned about what states allow greater liberty to their own populations have no reason to prefer the United States over Stalin’s Soviet Union.

Of course, when it comes to wars made on other countries, there is no comparison, with just the number of civilians killed in Lebanon in July and August 2006 by U.S.-backed Zionists comparable to the executions by secret police under Stalin in any year. The difference being that Israel and Lebanon are much smaller populations than the 140 million and growing population that Stalin dealt with. Getty mentions that Stalin-era modernization compares with what Americans did in colonial times (p. 7) which includes decimation of the indigenous peoples of Africa and North America.

In 1937, the Germans passed disinformation through Czechoslovakia believed by England and Russian emigres that the Russians had a fascist coup about to happen in the military. A bloodbath followed with a real emergency crackdown which Getty claims ended up being completely arbitrary and decided at the local level with quotas for executions coming from Stalin. As MIM has pointed out, the fascist coup rumors turned out true in several other European countries that fell to fascist subversion. Getty says over and over again that Stalin and his Politburo fell for “paranoia,” but clearly the rest of Europe was not “paranoid” enough about fascism.

Though Getty himself uses a “civil tone” and has kind words and references even for British disinformation agents like Robert Conquest, MIM would say Getty’s work is rather destructive, and dovetailing with the upsurge of post-modernism. While adopting an absolutist Liberal human-rights posture without demonstrating that such a posture has been adopted anywhere in the world successfully, Getty condemns Stalin. To this day, MIM can say that people like Getty are idealists, condemning Stalin from on-high. Nonetheless, Getty’s work is much more “reality-based” than the Western academic work that preceded him.

In the past, the Western left-wing of parasitism bought into the military establishment’s stories about Stalin’s “totalitarianism” and the like, at least 50% of the way. The left-wing of parasitism proved gullible when it came to the claims of libertarians, anarchists and the right-wing of parasitism against Stalin. Without its own compass, the left-wing of parasitism in the West had no way of knowing that so many claims about Stalin were just too far off to become any further “untherted from reality” as George F. Will puts it. MIM is not surprised, because these same people have no grip on reality capable of telling them that the minimum wage worker of the West is in fact petty-bourgeoisie, an international exploiter. People unable to tell that the West is one petty-bourgeois mass with a sprinkling of lumpen workers and imperialists are not going to have the capability to judge Stalin correctly either.

One question that Getty is right to raise is whether or not the public at-large can really interpret a question such as “Trotskyism.” Mao said that Stalin distrusted the masses too much and documentary evidence would be hard to refute along these lines, with Molotov saying that the Soviet Union just could not fall to confusion the way the rest of Europe did and thus “we did not trust.” So the question arises when the Politburo puts out the call for vigilance against “Trotskyism,” should the Politburo be obliged to refer to people with concrete organizational ties (p. 21) or can it refer to a general line that Trotskyism upholds and let lower levels of the party and the people decide what that is. According to many, if we put out a general call to attack “Trotskyism,” as a line, even Soviet masses knowledgeable of their own history do not really know what that is and simply make use of the day’s theme to exact revenge on personal enemies that they will conveniently dub “Trotskyist.”

This notion also came up in the Cultural Revolution, that people who do not go deeply into political line and instead continued with their clan or career feuds. As a response, one coming from Mao suggests that leaders should protect the people. At the same time, he trusted the people enough to let them fight out their line struggles. Likewise in the Soviet Union, Stalin made completely democratic use of informers (who could be anybody) and local party “troikas” to draw up execution lists of the so-called “Great Terror” of 1937-8.

While Bolshevik Central Committee members themselves had long ago accepted that blood is the price of revolution, one might wonder if the people outside the Central Committee should become involved in the “Great Terror” and the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, the real democratic impulse was to let people become involved in life-and-death issues themselves. It was so during the American Revolution of 1776 and even more so in the American Civil War.

In 1937 and 1938 there was no use of legal channels. At the same time, one cannot say that anyone could guarantee their own safety. It was a case where the Central Committee majority itself found itself executed or retired bit by bit. So we cannot say that this fit of violence protected a particular elite. Stalin’s own family faced purges and of course, Bukharin was among his closest friends. If we believe books published on the matter, including by a self-accused assassin, Stalin himself died from an assassin’s work aided by Beria.

So one view of reducing the distinction between rulers and ruled is to let the ruled take part in life-and-death questions. Let all rulers take the risk of being justly or unjustly executed. That is why there is some truth to Getty’s charge of “self-defense of the Bolsheviks.” In reality, based on prison statistics, we cannot say American politics is more freedom-loving than Stalin-era politics in the Soviet Union. Nor does the United States preserve an
Critics say to await proletarian seizure of Soviet archives

MIM received the following letter from a critic in Europe.

Dear MIM:

In your review of Getty’s 1999 book about Stalin, “The Road to Terror,” you do not challenge Getty’s figures of 600,000 executions under Stalin in 1937-38, which is based on evidence Getty found in Soviet archives. We need to be careful about assuming that everything “from the archives” is true. Firstly, look who controlled the archives since Stalin’s death. Khodorkovsky built his anti-Stalin line by distributing documents from the Stalin era among senior figures in the Party which “proved” Stalin’s alleged crimes, presumably these documents were then archived. Can we assume all these documents were authentic?

Cutler and Richard Velshi also released documents from the archives “strategically,” to undermine Soviet “conservatives” who had some patriotic nostalgia for Stalin (e.g. he released a document that “proved” that Stalin ordered the Katyn massacre). You might also want to note a pioneer agreement on exchanging archival information and microfilms and on organizing microfilming was signed on April 17, 1992, between the State Committee for Archival Affairs under the government of the Russian Federation (now the Federal Archive of Russia - Rosarkhiv), the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, “according to the Hoover Institution itself.”

Finally, the Washington Times published evidence that a document found in the Russian archives in 1993 regarding Vietnam MIAs was a forgery, probably planted for political reasons. Susan Katz Keating discusses this in her book “Prisoners of Hope.” I don’t have full details on this but it is another reason to treat Soviet archival evidence with some skepticism. I have not heard of any tests being made on the authenticity of even bigger role of participation to the people via its concept of so-called democracy. While Americans pull a lever every two years to choose between candidates with no difference, Soviet citizens could monitor their officials and get them executed, too. This was their most extreme. What the Liberal critics really object to is that the Soviet elite under Stalin faced even greater risk than the people below. At the same time, it’s not hard to see why this approach might enmoral a people to its government despite widespread abuse. This same jibe in the very title of Getty’s book and in all the magazine pulp articles on the Cultural Revolution says that the communists destroyed their own party. In the Cultural Revolution in particular this disorder came with new ideas and rejection of all authorities they think they themselves. All of Stalin’s closest aides and friends also said they never knew if they would be executed after visiting him.

Getty and the like of Italy’s Gramsci suggest that “hegemony” is the preferable road to “domination.” In such a view, in normal times, one should be able to set up a more smoothly operating system of class hegemony that is more stable than the more risky strategies of direct repression.

The trouble comes in evaluating a context of war and even normal patterns of everyday violence. If we accept that the Stalin era came with three-quarters of a million executions including over 600,000 in 1937 and 1938 in which anyone who showed the slightest wavering could end up dead, then the question remains whether that is actually a higher level of violence than in other societies. No doubt from a point of view of the world intellectual petty-bourgeoisie mindful of its rights to “dissent” and waver, 1937 and 1938 were stains on the reputation of communism. Where we question the Liberals is not on that point but whether...
Former prisoners sue U.S. government officials over torture

by MC17

Former detainees in Iraq and Afghanistan are suing Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and three other American officials, for acts of torture they endured at the hands of American military interrogators. The nine plaintiffs were held in American-run facilities in 2003 and 2004, enduring physical and psychological torture before being released without even being charged with a crime.

At a hearing in federal court on December 8, lawyers for the former prisoners first needed to convince the court that the case should be heard. Although Rumsfeld personally approved some of the torture methods used against these prisoners, and the other officials named were in positions of authority over this torture, the American criminal justice system claims that these cases can not be brought to American courts by foreigners. According to lawyers for the defense, non-citizens confined in prisons outside the U.S. do not have legal standing to sue for what in the United States would be violations of their civil rights.

The U.S. government’s argument amounts to saying that people residing outside of U.S. borders should not have any civil rights protection, even if the violation of those rights is done by the American government itself. This is consistent with the American protectionist politics that provide rights and privileges for American citizens (favoring white citizens) at the expense of the majority of the world’s people—including us. This is taught in our schools and in every aspect of media that Americans are superior to the rest of the World’s people—we are harder working; we are smarter, and so we deserve more. This is convenient justification for the wealth enjoyed by American citizens, brought home from the plunder of Third World countries. And rather than protest against the American government, the money brought home pays for redneck Americans patrolling the border to keep out the riff-raff. Flag waving supporters cheer on military invasions around the world, looking for terrorists in every non-white face.

What does it mean to have civil rights? The protection against abuse by the government (which frankly is often ignored even with regard to American citizens based on nationality and political considerations) or a right to take the American military to court is a good test of whether American law means anything at all.

The lead lawyer for the plaintiffs argued only that American laws against torture should apply to those held under exclusively American control in other countries. The lead lawyer for the plaintiffs argued that American military can not be prosecuted for crimes, so if they are not responsible to American laws they are essentially without any oversight for criminal actions.

The American government legitimizes this with a simple argument: The U.S. hasn’t killed any of the Palestinians, we are helping the Palestinians, we are trying to help them and they need our help. The American government should be saying that American law means anything at all.

Notes:
- New York Times, 12Dec06.
U.S. imperialism backs down on Korea for now

February 15, 2007

U.S. imperialism brokered a deal with Korea on its nuclear weapons in six country talks, referred to as “six-party talks.” The U.S. imperialists backed down from previous bargaining positions and the Chinese state-capitalist regime provided a face-saving gesture for the U.S. imperialists by giving the Koreans a talking to. The imperialists say the deal offers Korea one million tons of oil for closing its nuclear facilities and staying put with what the CIA believes is six to eight nuclear bombs. (1)

The U.S. imperialist press debated itself on the new deal. The reactionary think tank called the Heritage Foundation and the “National Review” that usually support President Bush say that the Bush administration caved in and took Clinton’s policy on Korea. (2)

The ultra-reactionary dogs such as John Bolton now being forced out of the UN said the deal was “rewarding” the “bad behavior” of detonating nuclear weapons. The Australian imperialists put it this way: “Bolton, once close to the Administration, told reporters the deal made him the ‘saddest man in Washington’, which is not surprising given he has always fervently believed the only solution to the threat posed by North Korea was regime change.” (3)

At the same time, the reactionaries also admitted that in the end, the imperialists did move them a little farther out of Kim’s range! The old-style tip that the northern regimes and it is a question of some theoretical concern why the Korean bourgeoisie has not shown much independence to this day. Note:


Korean lackey regime shows some life

February 23, 2007

The U.S. puppet regime in southern Korea showed some signs of life by negotiating for transfer of power over the country talks, referred to as “six-party talks.” The U.S. imperialists backed down from previous bargaining positions and the Chinese state-capitalist regime provided a face-saving gesture for the U.S. imperialists by giving the Koreans a talking to. The imperialists say the deal offers Korea one million tons of oil for closing its nuclear facilities and staying put with what the CIA believes is six to eight nuclear bombs. (1)

The U.S. imperialist press debated itself on the new deal. The reactionary think tank called the Heritage Foundation and the “National Review” that usually support President Bush say that the Bush administration caved in and took Clinton’s policy on Korea. (2)

The ultra-reactionary dogs such as John Bolton now being forced out of the UN said the deal was “rewarding” the “bad behavior” of detonating nuclear weapons. The Australian imperialists put it this way: “Bolton, once close to the Administration, told reporters the deal made him the ‘saddest man in Washington’, which is not surprising given he has always fervently believed the only solution to the threat posed by North Korea was regime change.” (3)

At the same time, the reactionaries also admitted that in the end, the imperialists did move them a little farther out of Kim’s range! The old-style tip that the northern regimes and it is a question of some theoretical concern why the Korean bourgeoisie has not shown much independence to this day. Note:

Under Lock & Key
News from Prisons & Prisoners

IMU Political Repression

It’s been quite a while since I have written or had any contact with you all, I believe since 2002. At that time I was being housed in Oregon’s maximum security housing (IMU), I was finally released in 2004, but have been continually harassed by the corruption guards. Upon being released from IMU I found that 80% of my property was missing and was told I must have given it away; a typical answer received from these snakes on a consistent basis.

While I was in IMU, some of my property was confiscated and deemed a threat to the institution and among the property taken was all of my stuff from IMU, including my address book. That is the reason I have lost contact with the komrades. I have recently ran into a komrade at the prison I am at and again obtained the address, so I am writing to you from that contact. I would like to start getting the newsletter “IMU Notes” again and the journal if it’s a possibility.

an OR Prisoner, October 2006

AR Segregation conditions: another name for SHU

I want to say thank you on behalf of myself and others for the newspapers. We are all in Ad-Seg in 8′x10′ cells, and our conditions are similar to those of SHU prisoners. We get only one or two hours of out-of-cell exercise per week, weather permitting, and assuming the guards feel like letting us out. During the summer we have yard two or three times per week, but with winter here, they don’t want to give us that luxury.

I know it is cruel and unusual punishment for the guards to maliciously or deliberately violate our rights. Here in the Max, we have written grievances about this issue but nothing gets done. A lot of times the grievances “mysteriously” get lost. Usually, if the authorities here notice that a prisoner is intelligent about policy and does not make waves, they will leave him alone. But I’ve learned that if you really mess with the administration by complaining or filing grievances, they will retaliate. I’ve seen them hold people’s mail an extra week or more, or shake cells down and write up infractions for small items.

We don’t get paid for any labor, only $6 at Christmas time, and the only way to get out of the Max is to go to the hole. – an Arkansas prisoner.

Ohio DRC censors

MIM Theory

I am enclosing MIM Theory 11: Amerikkkan Prisons on Trial. It was rejected by the Skreening Committee of the Department of Retribution and Corruption for the State of Oppression (ODRC). They have determined that this material is anti-American and I am not permitted to receive anti-American material in the land of the free. I am returning the anti-American material so it can be put to good anti-American use.

The global capitalists’ running dogs are cowards who fear the truth and the people, and they had to resort to message control because your material was truthful and critical. Mao Zedong said: “the Communist Party does not fear criticism because we are Marxists, the truth is on our side, and the basic masses, the workers and the peasants, are on our side.” (12 March, 1957)

We can bear criticism because that criticism makes us more responsive to the truth and to the people. Reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries cannot bear criticism, cannot have their shortcomings displayed. They know that they are enemies of the people and enemies of the truth, and they resort to repressive means because they live in constant fear of the truth and the people. They know that if the truth and the people converge, revolution will result.

So the pig establishment can temporarily obstruct your revolutionary work, but in the end they have nothing of substance to offer, no persuasive ideas. They may impose themselves for a short time, but in the final analysis we know and they know they are seriously fucked.

an Ohio prisoner

Inhuman treatment in AZ control unit

Clench fist salute!

I would very much like to be placed on the mailing list for the revolutionary MIM Notes. I am incarcerated at the SMU-1 facility in Florence, AZ under conditions that violate human rights. Prison officials here expose us to human waste by serving our food trays from the same cart they use to carry wet toilet brushes. There is roach and rodent infestation here to the point that roaches have crawled on our faces while we try to sleep at night, and mice are running in and out of the cell area. We prisoners have organized amongst ourselves and filed grievance complaints about these conditions, but the administration has done little in response.

Please help

- a prisoner in the Florence, AZ SMU

CA Kern Valley deplorable conditions

Revolutionary greetings to all comrades in the belly of the beast. I write from Kern Valley State Prison where I am locked captive in the hole. The conditions here are as expected, deplorable, the food is next to nothing, venom in the water, that at night the rodents come into your cell. There is no physical access to law library, only the page system. These are some things that need to be appealed. Those of you who have action currently to law resources should start to find ways to remedy these issues.

So many people here are fighting cases of assault on peace officers, and many say it was the officer who did the assault. It may be a trend here of excessive force, a closer look from an attorney may find it as so. Luckily the DA here in Kern County is so swamped in cases and this county so broke that no DA referrals are being picked up, no matter what the case - weapons, assault on peace officer, battery, etc. They are not being picked up because there are too many prisoners in the county and lack of funds. So the excessive force and false reverse of blame is not going as planned - luckily innocent people are not being sent out to hang like the days of old.

The shaving razors issued here are tiny and defected so that every time one shaves you cut yourself with nicks and cuts. We do not get laundry every week as prescribed. A class action is in the works. This prison should not have been opened in the first place. Just a heads up should you find yourself in this filthy dungeon.

- a California prisoner, November 2006
California officers assault prisoners and lock them in hole

I want to thank you for responding to my letter in such a timely fashion. I was very impressed with how your organization approaches one of the biggest problems in this imperialistic society - prisoners and the officers who work for them, basically run California. This is how not only California, but the United States, “handles the problems.”

I am also well aware of the very crucial mistake in my young life at the age of 16, which cost me very dearly. I’ve been incarcerated for twelve years now but still have time ahead of me. The part of your pamphlet that caught my eye was about the prison conditions. I am currently in the hole due to an assault/battery that was committed against me by a lieutenant. To justify the situation, they put me in the hole and said I committed battery on him.

This is an example of the endless situations that officers get away with. It’s kind of sad when you think about it, because society doesn’t care about today’s prisoner. I also like the part of the pamphlet mentioning censorship. Certain type of literature can get you into trouble if caught with. The Art of War, Guerrilla Warfare, and great books such as these are not allowed and can get you a long time lock up in the hole.

- a California prisoner, November 2006

Censorship for ‘violent revolutionary message’

Your [letter] to me (whatever it was) has been denied. The powers that be decided that the “violent revolutionary message” is anti per CCR Title 15 3128(f). Gee, what could be worse than language and often found demeanor of the common guard especially when grouped together. Chuckle, it is true I often deny myself this ubiquitous finding of when you think about it, because society doesn’t care about today’s prisoner. I also like the part of the pamphlet mentioning censorship. Certain type of literature can get you into trouble if caught with. The Art of War, Guerrilla Warfare, and great books such as these are not allowed and can get you a long time lock up in the hole.

- a California prisoner, October 2006

Facts on U$ 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 “evil empire” how 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 known for a huge 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:
2. Ibid, 1992 report
4. Figure of 51.2 percent for state prisoners there for non-violent offenses. Abstract of the United States 1993, p. 211.
Declaración de pricipios con respecto a la guerra contra Irak

Por el Ministro de Relaciones Internacionales del Movimiento Maoísta Internacionalista (MIM)

 Hoy, al extenderse la larga guerra contra Irak hacia Bagdad como resultado de los primeros ataques de misiles después del vencimiento del plazo otorgado a Irak por el ultimatum de Bush, el MIM lamenta de antemano la pérdida de vidas en Irak. No importa si EE.UU. logra la victoria en sólo un día o si el pueblo iraquí se esfuerza por pulverizar a cientos de miles de soldados invasores. Esta pérdida de vidas no es necesaria; la especie humana podrá lograr la paz sólo a través de una perspectiva maoísta.

Falta de argumentos morales Condenada hasta por los reaccionarios como el Papa y el presidente de Francia Chirac, esta guerra claramente no tiene ninguna base moral. Lleva toda la sociedad occidental en unirse contra Irak. Al fin y al cabo, tanto Chirac como Bush pertenecen a la misma ala reaccionaria de la burguesía. Chirac proviene del equivalente francés del Partido Republicano de EE.UU. La mera verdad es que la paz mundial se dada sólo cuando el internacionalismo se apodere de nuestra especie. El eje central de esta idea se explica en términos cristianos como la “ley dorada” - es decir, la necesidad de ponermos en el lugar de nuestros prójimos. Si se ignora la aplicación internacionalista de la “ley dorada” entre las naciones no dejaremos de sembrar la guerra y cosechar el terrorismo.

Sin embargo, no somos pacifistas. La violencia de Bush no contribuye a una solución internacionalista. Al contrario, la violencia de Bush consistía en acabar con la esclavitud y otras causas de enfrentamientos nacionales. Lincoln usó la violencia en contra de las causas de la violencia. El tipo de violencia que usa Bush no hace más que usar la furia de los pueblos del mundo. Los que entienden esto entenderán fácilmente cómo es que Stalin usó la violencia para reprimir a tan gente mientras que se espera que el progreso de vida de su pueblo aumentó. Siendo reaccionario, Bush no tiene ningún tipo de plan o capacidad para utilizar la violencia con el fin de reducir la violencia. La falta de tal plan es tan evidente que muchos creen que la verdadera causa de la guerra es intercambiar “sangre por petróleo.”

Cuando se trata de problemas internacionales y de la paz la única cosa “moral” es lo que promueve la continuidad de la paz y la guerra. En los tiempos convencionales, si el estado de Israel fuera un país “moral” hace mucho se hubiera logrado la paz en el Medio Oriente ya que las fuerzas armadas de este país son mucho más poderosas que las de otros países a su alrededor. Al igual que el acercamiento de Israel, los esfuerzos de Bush para convertir a todo el tercer mundo en una gigantesca Franja de Gaza están condenados a un fracaso.

A primera vista parece que la cuestión de la paz y la guerra se puede plantear fácilmente en términos morales y tácticos. Pero esto es una equivocación. Un hecho científico es que Israel no está en paz con sus vecinos. EE.UU. gasta más en sus fuerzas armadas que todos los países del mundo combinados y también tiene la economía más grande del mundo. Sin embargo, EE.UU. sufre ataques terroristas por personas que si fueron oportunistas, escogerían blancos más fáciles. Estos también son hechos científicos que señalan algo sobre el método de Israel y EE.UU.

Bush busca aliviar las preocupaciones morales cuando dice que el Tío Sam quiere que la guerra sea lo más corta posible y que espera dejar a Irak con una feliz democracia después de la guerra. Los que conocen el amor que los pueblos del tercer mundo profesan hacia la autodeterminación y los que saben algo sobre Irak entienden el porqué del odio iraquí hacia los yanquis. Pero la capacidad de Bush para establecer una “democracia” en Irak aparenda ser una cuestión de “táctica” pero de hecho se confunden las cuestiones tácticas (utilitarias) con las cuestiones morales. A menudo se oye decir que el debate ideológico es más desordenado que el debate científico pero en este caso la moralidad de la “paz mundial” no es un tema controvertido. Lo controvertido es la ciencia de cómo lograr la paz mundial.

Lamentamos la muerte de los inocentes iraquíes. El pueblo iraquí es una víctima de la más espantosa potencia imperialista durante toda la historia: Los Estados Unidos de América. Lo que busca el pueblo de Irak es una autodeterminación — un motivo saludable y natural perseguido por George Washington. Por esta razón el nacionalismo iraquí no se puede comparar con el nacionalismo hebreo de los yanquis que se oponen a las “papas a la francesa” y utilizan el nacionalismo como pretexto para asesinar a la gente de Irak. También lamentamos la muerte de los soldados yanquis que son demasiado jóvenes e ignorantes y que no entienden los asuntos mundiales ni tampoco saben porque tienen que morir en Irak (claro, algunos ya han muerto entrenando para esta guerra). Sin embargo, a diferencia de los iraquíes, los yanquis no se dan cuenta de su oportunidad para evitar este fin. A lo mejor pasaron demasiado tiempo vieando www.nakednews.com (el noticiero principal entre hombres entre los 18 y los 34 años en el cual las representadoras salen desnudas) y no prestaron atención a los asuntos políticos. O quizás se la hayan pasado leyendo historias románticas de aventuras militares. Sea cual fuera la razón, los soldados yanquis han tenido la oportunidad económica de aprender más y poder sacar a su país de la guerra. Pero en esto han fracasado.

La capacidad y el crecimiento económico de la humanidad son casi ilimitados pero la población de EE.UU. se la pasa leyendo novelas románticas de baja calidad y jugando juegos electrónicos en vez de dedicarse a la cooperación económica que lograría la paz mundial. Una y otra vez los líderes yanquis e israelíes dicen que la solución es asesinar a más gente del tercer mundo. Logran asesinar a mucha gente, incluyendo a los suyos mediante el “fuego amigable” y no logran conseguir la “democracia” ni la paz ni la cooperación económica.

De cualquier modo, tanto los líderes yanquis como el 70% de la población de EE.UU. que los apoya, (1) le están “buscando tres pies al gato.” Está bien claro que los yanquis no respetan más que la “buscando tres pies al gato.” Está bien claro que los yanquis no respetan más que la “derechos humanos” de los que tanto se preocupan. (2) ¡Esto sí que es buscarle tres pies al gato! La verdad es que cada habitante de este planeta vive gracias a la tolerancia de otras una regla que adquiere mayor importancia conforme va encogiéndose el planeta. Estaremos mejor cuanto más pronto entendamos esto.

Mientras algunas empresas se ganan la vida vendiendo bombas, nosotros, los participantes del movimiento estadounidense de paz, vivimos bajo la eterna amenaza de la guerra y el terrorismo a causa de lo que hace la mayoría yanqui. Pero los que componemos la minoría estamos hartos de sus guerras por el petróleo, su apoyo a las diarias masacres israelíes en contra de los palestinos. Estamos hartos de sus ganancias en el mercado de armas y de todo lo demás que nos priva el derecho de vivir en paz y sin el terrorismo. Si la mayoría imperialista de EE.UU. quiere cambiar las cosas (“cambiar el régimen”) en Irak, que se muden a Irak.

Bajo la democracia la mayoría sólo determina lo que pasa entre los que votan, y no en países a miles de kilómetros de aquí. Si los tantos yanquis cabeceados quieren un “cambio de régimen” en Irak, que se muden a Bagdad.

Nosotros que somos la minoría que busca la paz tenemos un derecho no-negociable a vivir sin la violencia causada por el deseo de la mayoría de estructurar el mundo según la imagen de Ronald McDonald. Si los yanquis quieren una guerra para quitarles el velo a las mujeres afganas y creen que saben cómo lograrlo, que se muden ahí también. Si los yanquis no quieren que Kim Jong-il fabrique armas nucleares (ya que los otros consumidores porque bajo el capitalismo no hay otra ley que esta. Cualquier cosa que quieran hacer estos yanquis, deberían hacerla sin poner en peligro el hecho del resto del mundo a vivir en paz.

19 Marzo, 2003. Traducido por Céulas de Estudio para la Liberación de Aztlan y América Latina (CELAAL)

Fuentes consultadas: