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Voices Remain Steadfast in Iraq
Talking with Jeff Guntzel of Voices in the Wilderness

JENNIFER BING-CANAR

On March 19, as US forces were invading Iraq, Jennifer-Bing Canar from the AFSC Middle East Program in Chicago spoke with Jeff Guntzel, a member of Voices in the Wilderness. Voices has maintained a physical presence in Iraq since 1996.

Tell us a little bit about how and why Voices in the Wilderness formed.

GUNTZEL: Voices was founded by a small group of people who had been active in protesting what is now the first Gulf War in 1991. Although they moved on to other issues, in 1996 they started to recognize that that war hadn’t ended, but had become an economic war.

They decided after that they would attempt to go to Iraq and bring in symbolic amounts of medicine—the kinds of medicines that weren’t being allowed in under sanctions. After acquiring donated medicines, they wrote a letter to then-Attorney General Janet Reno and told her what they planned on doing and why. The Department of the Treasury wrote back saying that they would face up to 12 years in prison and up to $1 million in fines.

[Knowing the possible consequences] they went to Iraq in 1996 with about a duffle bag each of medicine, which we’ve done every delegation since. More than 60 delegations have gone into Iraq, breaking the law. Bringing a duffle bag of medicine is really only the beginning. We visit schools, hospitals, families, and UN officials in order to get information and stories. Very quickly our role became obvious: to take what we’re learning from these UN reports and UN officials who are not allowed to be “political” and bring them home, along with stories from ordinary Iraqis. In this way we can remind people that there are nearly 25 million people in Iraq who are not Saddam Hussein. Those stories can frame the awful and terrifying statistics about life under sanctions, about the bad water that’s going into the tap of most every home in Iraq, about the power outages, about the hospitals and their dilapidated state, about the education system, about malnutrition. Some would say that the humanitarian disaster was Saddam’s fault, some would say...
that was the fault of the US. I believe that both are responsible.

Why did you come to Voices in the Wilderness? What was your initial attraction or involvement?

GUNTZEL: At the time I was not an activist by any stretch of the imagination, but I did read the progressive rags and try to keep myself informed. I stumbled upon an article written by Roger Normand, who now works for the Center for Economic and Social Rights, about a trip to Iraq. He had just returned and was giving the details of what he saw there of life under sanctions for ordinary Iraqis. The article began with a quote from Madeleine Albright from the interview with Leslie Stahl on 60 Minutes. Albright was asked if the policy of sanctions was worth the price of the 500,000 children under the age of five who died as a result of sanctions (more than died at Hiroshima and Nagasaki). She famously responded: “It’s a difficult choice, but the price, we think, the price is worth it.”

This article gave me a sense that the economic war was more deadly than the Gulf War of 1991 that was fought with armies.

I started doing research on the Internet and found Voices in the Wilderness. I really liked that Voices in the Wilderness was a group of ordinary people going to Iraq who could then reach you through very simple stories. I wrote to [VITW founder] Kathy Kelly, and she asked me if I was interested in going to Iraq. It happened that there was a space open in a delegation leaving two months from then. Even though I figured there was a long waiting list of people far more qualified than myself, because I didn’t have a high school diploma (I was a dishwasher and a punk rock drummer), I just wanted to hear more. By October of 1998, I was in Baghdad.

What are some of the more memorable experiences that you had in Iraq? What are some of the stories that have stuck with you?

GUNTZEL: The stories that guide my activism may seem kind of small and insignificant. I spent a day in Basra with a delegation and with a fellow named Sattar. Before the Gulf War, he was a civil engineer.

Once the economy was destroyed, he couldn’t get work and started to drive businessmen and others (like our delegations) to make money. I’ve been to Iraq eight times and spent countless hours in his truck with him. He’s an amazing man, father of three, very gentle, really kind of an angel. Just like in Baghdad, the power goes out frequently in Basra. One day, Sattar and I were waiting in the hall when the power just went out, and it was just sweltering. We could hear the groan of someone trapped in the elevator. Sattar looked down and he said: sometimes I think this will never end.

After the Desert Fox bombing in 1998, I found that Iraqis I knew lost any grain of hopefulness they had. They said: “The United States can do whatever they want to us.” The less tangible aspects of sanctions are the social aspects of depression, hopelessness, anger from enforced deprivation—that keeps me motivated to try to end this, or at least to make people understand what’s happening there.

What impact has bringing people from the US and Europe to Iraq had on policy makers both in the US and in Iraq?

GUNTZEL: I see some evidence of an impact but not enough for the United States to give up its role as the sole supporter of this policy. Sanctions are a UN policy because the United States bullied people into supporting it, and because people allowed themselves to be bullied into supporting an incredibly destructive and disastrous policy.

I think the various groups who have sent delegations to Iraq (VITW, International Actions Center and others) have had a much larger effect on the debate in the public sphere. Local newspapers cover the re-turn of their hometown delegates, which makes people understand that something is going on that would motivate a person to break the law, go to Iraq and find out for themselves what’s going on. That’s had a very power effect.

When I joined up with Voices in 1998, there were just a handful of people working on the issue. A couple of years later, 60 organizations attended a conference on the topic, all of which are doing really good and creative work. In that sense, delegations have had a great effect.

In Iraq, those we deal with intimately say it’s had a great effect. It means a lot to them to have a sense of connection, to know that there’s this other America that disagrees with these policies. Iraqis love American movies, love American music, love American culture, and hate the American government. But it’s getting to the point where that hate for the American government could very easily trickle down to the American people because they understand that we have some responsibility for our government, less and less by the year it seems.

continued on page three
Voices was a part of setting up an Iraq Peace Team in Baghdad this fall. Can you describe this effort?

GUNTZEL: The Iraq Peace Team is an extension of our small delegations. Since 1996, Voices has been sending groups of five to 10 people every month or two to stay for two weeks inside Iraq. This escalation to war required something more permanent and bigger. The original goal was to fill the hotels with 100 people inside Baghdad once a war began. When it became clear that the war was going to build in increments, we started a permanent presence inside Iraq called the Iraq Peace Team.

Around 200 people have gone through Iraq since September. We currently have 14 there, which is down from 27 that we had just three or four days ago. Their job is to put a human face on Iraq, to help people understand what ordinary human beings are going through and to try to fill in some of the gray areas in this discussion. You can’t have an intelligent discussion about what to do with Iraq, with Saddam Hussein about weapons of mass destruction without bringing the Iraqi people into the picture. We have people from different communities, whose community newspapers (as well as national networks) want to talk to them. They are able to present a different side of things because they visit bomb sites, they talk with Iraqi people, and they’ve managed to maintain their independence.

One of the functions of the Iraq Peace Team is to send diaries home, and we put those diaries up in two places: on our website (iraqpeaceteam.org) and on a website called electroniciraq.net. And you can get on a mailing list for Voices and a mailing list for Electronic Iraq, which will send you an update every time there’s a new diary or opinion piece.

Can you talk a little bit about the distinction between the Iraq Peace Team and the human shields?

GUNTZEL: I preface that again by saying that I have no criticism for the knee jerk reaction to try to stop a war. But it’s a strategic thing. The human shield group who is there decided to go to the kind of infrastructure that was targeted during the first Gulf War and to chain themselves there:

---

Iraq Peace Team Diary

KATHY KELLY

Below is a brief excerpt from the Iraq Peace Team Diary entry on April 21, 2003, written as this Newsletter went to press. At the same time, we learned that Voices in the Wilderness members are banned from the Palestine Hotel, home not only to US Military’s Civil Operations Center (which informed IPT of their expulsion) but also the international press corps.

I’m sitting in Amman now because of Sattar. It was his story that persuaded me to leave.

For three weeks, we had waited anxiously for news about Sattar who, since 1996, has been our closest Iraqi companion. What a relief, four days ago, to see him finally walk into the hotel lobby.

When the war began, he took his family to live with relatives outside of Baghdad. After several days, he returned to check on the family home. A missile had hit a house nearby, and two brothers were missing. Sattar went to the Saddam Hospital in the impoverished and dangerous Al Thawra neighborhood to look for them. “I found it terrible,” he said. “Many, many people were asking for help... so I asked a doctor if he could use me.”

Sattar joined thirteen volunteers who assisted thirty-three physicians as they tended hundreds of patients. He worked at the hospital for 12 days. “There is one doctor, his name is Thamer,” said Sattar, with a measure of awe, “and he stayed in the operating room for two days and nights, without a break, performing 75 emergency operations. We heard gunfire outside, but fortunately several sheikhs and imams were able to protect the hospital.”

His eyes welled up with tears when describing what he saw on the roads while driving in Baghdad. “I saw myself many tanks protecting the Ministry of Oil. They need the maps, the information. But they do nothing to help the people, the hospitals, the food storage. American companies are already trying to repair the oil refineries so that they can produce 2 million to 6 million barrels per day; this will bring the price of oil down. They can control the price of oil to serve American interests.”

After 12 days, Sattar returned to his family to let them know he was all right and to bring his brother Ali back to Baghdad. At a checkpoint, a US soldier questioned him. “I was wearing blue jeans and, trying to be friendly, he touched my pant leg and said ‘These are good.’ I told him ‘Yes, but these were made in China, not in America.’” The soldier, surprised that Sattar spoke English, asked him, “Are you glad that we’re here?”

“I said, ‘No,’ - again, Sattar’s eyes filled with tears—... You have destroyed our homes, and our big home (Baghdad). Now you should go home.’”

“Sattar,” I asked, “what will you do now?” “Tomorrow,” he said, “I will go to Jordan and start driving again.”

I winced. A talented, courageous and kindly man, a well-educated civil engineer, one who never joined the Ba’ath party, must return to work as a driver, fetching more westerners to rebuild his war-torn country.

“Well, Sattar,” said Cathy Breen forlornly, “now you won’t have so many problems helping Americans cross the border.”

“You are right,” said Sattar. “This is your country now.”

Shortly after Sattar left, Cathy Breen and I decided to pack our bags.

Thomas Paine once said, “My country is the world. My religion is to do good.” I don’t want a country. But enormous work lies ahead, in the United States, trying to convince people that our over consumeristic and wasteful lifestyles aren’t worth the price paid by people we conquer.

While driving out of Iraq, a terrible stench filled the air. We’re told that many corpses of humans and cattle littered the ground of this area. It was on that stretch of the road that we passed a long line of US Army vehicles, headlights on, arriving to replace the Marines. The olive green convoy resembled a funeral procession. I felt a wave of relief that Voices in the Wilderness companions remain in Baghdad. Sometime, in the not so distant future, I hope to rejoin them. But, for now, I must find a way to say, clearly, “No, Sattar, Iraq is not my country.”

Kathy Kelly co-coordinates Voices in the Wilderness, and is a member of the Iraq Peace Team (www.iraqpeaceteam.org).
Color in the Anti-War Movement
Activists of Color Mobilize Against War at Home and Abroad

ELIZABETH (BETITA) MARTINEZ

The education, mobilization, organization, participation and leadership of people of color in the current movement against the US war on Iraq (and its aftermath) have become recognized as issues today much more than in previous anti-war movements. While that recognition is good and long overdue, it is just a first step.

So many questions wait to be answered—many of which are outlined in the Open Letter to Activists (below). Why is there relatively little color in the anti-war movement when the troops who fight and die are disproportionately black, brown and red? Why isn’t there more color at demonstrations when those who pay the biggest price for cutbacks in vital social services due to military costs are peoples of color? Why aren’t more people of color active in protests against the Bush doctrine when they have the most reason historically to distrust government policy, actions and statements?

The answers to such questions can be found, first and foremost, in the effects of white supremacy on white/colored relations. Secondly, they rise from the effects of white supremacy on communities of color in and of themselves. The absence of more color in the anti-war movement cannot be blamed solely on white activists; it also rests on organizing problems within communities of color.

Whites Only Need Organize

Throughout history, US peace and anti-war groups have been primarily composed of, and overwhelmingly led by, older white middle-class people. This year has seen little improvement. In the Bay Area, for example, one of the most racially diverse areas of the country, the four major coalitions that put on the big February 16 anti-war demonstration (February 15 elsewhere) fit that model.

In other areas, like New York City, the numbers were somewhat better. Organizations of color already existed to work on issues like Vieques in Puerto Rico, Black reparations or anti-Asian violence and welfare rights; they could exercise influence and demand participation. But that did not exempt them from encounters with white supremacy in the anti-war movement. (See box on this page.)

Problems Within Communities of Color

The second obstacle to full involvement of communities of color has to do with the communities themselves. We cannot blame whites for blocking our participation if we are not building effectively among our own people. In the end, a successful struggle against white exclusion and marginalization requires people of color to be so strong, so numerous and so effective that we simply cannot be ignored.

Barriers that exist to mobilizing communities of color against the war on Iraq and other forms of US militarism include issues

Open Letter to Activists

ELIZABETH (BETITA) MARTINEZ

Recognizing how racist dynamics prevent the movement from achieving its maximum unity and effectiveness, an Open Letter to Activists Concerning Racism in the Anti-War Movement went out from a group of individuals based in New York City February 2003. Many of the signers were active in organizing the demonstration in NYC, and they asserted that the anti-racist politics outlined in the letter were critical to achieving an event with unprecedented inclusion of the majority people-of-color communities in NYC (as well as labor and working class people) in both the leadership, the program and the entire demonstration. The racist dynamics discussed in the letter were and remain a powerful factor in cross-race work, preventing the fullest unity and effectiveness.

The letter listed many specific examples of how white supremacy/racist dynamics have alienated individuals and organizations, including:

- Refusing to acknowledge and accept leadership from activists and organizations of color;
- Starting coalitions without input from or honest outreach to people of color and then calling the coalition "citywide;"
- Using their greater financial or volunteer resources to dominate;
- Not calling on activists of color or favoring the most "articulate" at meetings;
- Using terms like "us" when the reference is to an all-white or predominantly white group;
- Failing to link the war abroad with the war at home—which targets primarily communities of color.

Some problems involve tactics. For example, whites planning civil disobedience may not understand that immigrants and others of color risk jail, deportation and police violence for participating.

The Open Letter sparked discussion around the country and a flood of emails to its authors. At least partly because the war on Iraq began not long after that and inevitably consumed attention, discussion of the Open Letter has not yet led to concrete measures being taken thus far.

The letter is available online at http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?SectionID=30&ItemID=3100; the authors can be e-mailed at antiracistmovement@yahoo.com.
of class, gender, sexuality, politics and others. Setting aside those general sources of contradiction, we find specific barriers to participation in the anti-war movement that include:

- the belief that anti-war activism can’t be a priority for people struggling with daily life problems of survival—paying the rent and doctors’ bills, dealing with bad schools, etc.
- distrust of “the left” and a dislike of working in a white-dominated movement
- for immigrants, fear of deportation and other anti-immigrant actions
- fear of repression by police, who target people of color
- fear of being labeled anti-American and, as a result, losing jobs or having trouble at school
- aggressive recruitment of low-income youth of color by the military
- fear of conflicts with family or friends

These problems are all real, and groups of color have combated them in various ways. Among Latinos, for example, organizing has been stimulated by church support; personal familiarity with US militarism in Latin America and its effects; the activism of Latina/o groups that began by working on immediate issues like immigrant rights and then linked them to the war; and the current high casualty rate of Latino soldiers in Iraq. A key factor has been bringing out the linkage between the foreign and domestic wars on peoples of color.

Creating a Color-full Anti-War Movement

One of the most inspiring moments for activists in the Bay Area came when the first contingent of color marched as a unit on February 16. We had Korean drummers beating Mexican rhythms while Puerto Ricans danced salsa with blacks and Filipinos, and a sizeable number of Chinese marched with Latinos as a result of organizing together for low-cost housing. Other groups of color, like Freedom Uprising in Oakland, have since emerged, with youth playing a major role.

Nationally, RJ911 (Racial Justice 911, meaning of course September 11, 2001) has emerged as a network of people of color—primarily organizations—against the war. It has had two national meetings in Los Angeles since December, and local RJ911 groups are emerging.

In the Bay Area, the Institute for Racial Justice 911 sponsored a National Week of Action last September. Photo courtesy of RJ911

MultiRacial Justice—a resource center to combat racism and help build a society free of racism, classism and other inequities—has been working to mobilize communities of color against the war in Iraq. With help from a grant from RESIST, the Institute will sponsor a statewide meeting with people from the African-American and Latino communities for joint strategizing and planning.

Few would disagree that building a multi-racial, multi-national, multi-lingual, multi-class movement is our best hope for restraining the current U.S. war and preventing future inhuman, illegal, and truly monstrous assaults by the world’s most frightening empire to date.

A social justice activist and organizer for over 40 years, Elizabeth (Bettita) Martinez is director of the Institute for MultiRacial Justice, which recently received a RESIST grant for work to increase participation of people of color in the anti-war movement. For more information, contact the Institute at 422 Valencia Street, San Francisco, CA 94110; www.multiracialjustice.org.

Activists Demand Justice

CCMEP Opposes Sanctions, Military Intervention

NANCY STOHLMAN

Since President Bush’s visit to Denver on September 27, 2002, the Colorado Campaign for Middle East Peace (CCMEP) has been spearheading the anti-war movement in Colorado. That day, more than 3,000 Coloradans traveled to Denver to protest Bush’s fundraising efforts for Republican congressional candidate Bob Beauprez. Many protested during their lunch hour, in suits and holding signs that said “No Blood For Oil.” A speaker told the crowd that the turnout was the “largest anti-war demonstration in Colorado since Nixon invaded Cambodia.”

With those heartwarming words, over 5,000 people came to Civic Center Park in Denver for a CCMEP anti-war demonstration on October 26th, 2002, National Day of Action Against War on Iraq. And just two days later, 1,000 people demonstrated against Bush’s final Republican campaign visits, once again in the middle of the workday.

Seeing the response from not only Denver but the world in response to the US’s foreign policy of aggression in the Middle East, Denver co-founded the Colorado Coalition Against War in Iraq, a loose coalition of peace and justice groups, in order to coordinate efforts. Other founding members include the Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center in Boulder, and the Pikes Peak Peace and Justice Center in Colorado Springs (both RESIST grantees). Together, the coalition coordinated several acts of public, symbolic civil disobedience, including “die-ins” in front of recruitment stations and Halliburton Oil Company. On Feb 15th, the coalition organized the demonstrations in Colorado Springs which received an unwarranted violent police response (unwarranted violent police responses were also seen in other places such as NYC on February 15.)

CCMEP is committed to education, and has brought speakers to Denver including Damacio Lopez, depleted uranium expert and Executive Director of the International Depleted Uranium Study Team, and Ramzy Baroud, editor of the Palestine Chronicle and author of Searching Jenin. CCMEP has begun a bi-monthly “Middle East Movie Night” at a local cafe, which is both a fundraiser for CCMEP, as well as a public forum for the education and discussion of non-mainstream information about the policies and situations in the Middle East.

When the escalated US attacks on Iraq began on March 19, 2003, CCMEP implemented its long-conceived contingency plans, including an “Emergency Response to War” Rally on the West Steps of the
Activists Demand Justice
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Capitol. Despite the recent blizzard, nearly 1,000 protestors dug their way out of their homes for the much needed public show of dissent, as well as camaraderie and mutual support.

The CCMEP website (ccmep.org) has had over 9,000,000 pages accessed since it's creation in 2000! Amy Goodman, of Democracy Now!, when hearing the name Colorado Campaign for Middle East Peace, was quoted as saying, "Is that the group that has the website that shows all the times we've bombed Iraq? [Iraq Bombing Page]. That is an excellent website." The website, which is updated daily, has also begun to function as a calendar of events for activists in Colorado, offering the most extensive lists of actions, trainings, and events.

Looking ahead, CCMEP is preparing another delegation of activists to go to Occupied Palestine and document the injustices in the city of Jayyus, as well as installing a new water pump in Jayyus, whose water supplies are threatened by the building of the Israeli Apartheid Wall.

Nancy Stohlman is an organizer with Colorado Campaign for Middle East Peace, which received a grant from RESIST last year. For more information, contact CCMEP, 901 West 14th Ave., Suite 7, Denver, CO 80204; www.ccmep.org.

Iraq Invasion Consistent with Policy

US Foreign Policy Built on Forms of Intervention

HENRY ROSEMONT, JR.

To some, the Bush Administration's crusade against Saddam Hussein appears to mark a significant shift in US foreign policy, away from a benevolent concern for the well-being of the world's peoples toward more narrow self-interest. But the current adventurism differs from the past only in its nakedness and ferocity; Bush is only doing overtly and more clumsily what his predecessors have usually done less conspicuously and hence with less immediate public outcry.

A close examination of US foreign policy since World War II reveals a very definite and consistent pattern: the US has intervened in the internal affairs of other nation states over a hundred times since 1945. The propaganda rhetoric has been that we have done so only to preserve or beget freedom, human rights, or democracy. The reality has been that our policies have not accomplished these goals, because they were designed and implemented to further the interest of the US (now largely trans-national) corporations, and the elites both at home and abroad who profit from their depredations. In this light, our policies—often illegal, always unjust—have been enormously successful, so long as we ignore the incalculable suffering endured by tens of millions of peoples the world over as the price paid for that "success."

CCMEP continues to be a leader in the community as a grassroots organization that maintains a full-time organizer, high school and college interns, a website that has become an international news resource, and a reputation that reaches across the globe.

Nancy Stohlman is an organizer with Colorado Campaign for Middle East Peace, which received a grant from RESIST last year. For more information, contact CCMEP, 901 West 14th Ave., Suite 7, Denver, CO 80204; www.ccmep.org.
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quickly fell off to expose the naked aggression for what it is, despite the consistent efforts of the media to clothe it in humanitarian rhetoric.

Less Overt Forms of Intervention

The directness of the current deployment of overwhelming military superiority to induce “shock and awe” in those standing in the way of the US juggernaut should not, however, lead us to think of intervention solely in terms of invasions and physical occupation of conquered nation states.

On the contrary, to comprehend the full extent of US responsibility for human suffering abroad through its foreign policies, and to appreciate why the US is so mistrusted when not hated abroad, it is necessary to see that intervention can take many forms.

For example, we did not directly attempt to destabilize the Indonesian government of President Sukarno in 1965 (although we did try seven years earlier). But we made it clear to General Suharto and his fellow thugs how much we appreciated their hardline stance against the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI)—legally contesting elections—and after they overthrew Sukarno themselves, we supplied them not only with much weaponry, but also the names of suspected PKI members compiled by our intelligence sources, which insured that the bloodbath which ensued after the coup would destroy the PKI and other progressive organizations once and for all. By even the most conservative estimates, over 500,000 people (mostly ethnic Chinese) were killed.

Indonesia is by no means a solitary instance of this less overt form of intervention. Other examples include: Italy and Greece in their first post-war elections; Afghanistan (providing money and arms to anti-Soviet forces, hence Osama bin Laden); the Congo (opposing Lumumba); Angola (supporting Savimbi); and all Latin American nations since World War II (before then we simply invaded them when we didn’t approve of their governments).

Moreover, this second covert form of intervention is ongoing, as the Colombian government continues to murder its citizens with US support. Less violently—but potentially far more dangerous—the US consistently hinders efforts by South Korean governments to negotiate with their Northern brethren for the peaceful reunification of the peninsula; a peaceful unified Korea would reduce US influence in East Asian affairs.

A third pattern of US foreign policy which may legitimately be considered interventionist is the systematic attempt to isolate “rogue states” when other efforts are unsuccessful, inconvenient, or potentially embarrassing.

After more direct actions in Cuba failed to topple Castro’s government (Bay of Pigs invasion, assassination attempts, etc.), the sanctions were strengthened and enforced with a vengeance, continuing to this day. In Vietnam, not only did we renge on Kissinger’s promise to rebuild the country after the war, we placed enormous diplomatic and economic pressures on all countries outside the Soviet Bloc not to do so either. After allowing Hussein to slaughter Shites in the South and Kurds in the North at the conclusion of the 1991 Gulf War we imposed sanctions that have led—by the State Department’s own estimates—to the starvation of 5,000 Iraqi children each month for 12 years. (Hussein and his fellow gangsters, however, did not seem to lose any weight.) The immeasurable misery accompanying the sanctions falls almost solely on the civilian peoples in these (and other) affected countries, especially the poor, the children, the sick and the elderly. What is humanitarian about such policies? How do they promote freedom, human rights, or democracy?

Against this indictment, apologists for the foreign policy establishment will allow that some mistakes were made, of course, but that our motives were pure. Such apologies can easily appeal to us, because the alternative suggests that we should feel a profound sense of shame for the atrocities in our name.

Which Side Are We On?

But it is anger and not shame that is called for, because the record shows fairly clearly that we have almost always supported the “wrong side,” and worse, that much evidence was available at the time of intervention to suggest assisting the other side—which simultaneously shows he extent to which statements justifying US foreign policies have necessitated a great suppression of information, greater distortion of the “facts,” and much outright lying.

There are numerous examples of where history might read very differently today had we not supported the “wrong side,” but one recent case may stand duty for many, and at the same time reveal how much successive administrations and the media manipulate the good will of the American peoples by constraining discussions of

US foreign policies have necessitated a great suppression of information, greater distortion of the “facts,” and much outright lying.

During the early 1980s, Oxfam praised the Sandinista government for the support and assistance it gave the organization and its humanitarian relief efforts in Nicaragua. Amnesty International described some human rights abuses there, but not that they were far fewer in number and severity than in any other Central American country at the time, save Costa Rica. Even the right-wing media reported the large number of schools and clinics being built. Yet when the issue of Nicaragua came before the US Congress, after mining its harbors—an act of war—the only question for discussion was whether or not to continue supporting the Contras which had been initiated by the Reagan administration. That is to say, out of 535 members of the US Congress, not one could ask: why don’t we support the Sandinistas (as the Nicaraguan people did in the 1984 elections)? The US government continued to supply the Contras covertly, pumped money into the later elections sufficient to defeat the Sandinistas, and since then have altogether ignored the Nicaraguan peoples, leaving them in miserable poverty.

US interventionism remains unchanged today. Ever since last autumn the Bush administration has unceasingly insisted that Hussein had, or was very shortly to continue on page eight
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have, nuclear, chemical and/or biological weapons that posed an "imminent threat" to the US and other nations, because he would use them, madman that he is. Never mind that no hard evidence was ever produced to support the weapons claim. Never mind that if the administration did have such evidence it was seriously threatening the safety of US citizens by not giving it to the UN inspectors so that they could destroy the weapons before they were used. And never mind that no nation bordering or proximate to Iraq (save Israel, perhaps) believed they were under "imminent threat." What the constant rhetoric accomplished was obliging opponents of US war aims to argue only that if there were weapons, they were few, and any threat was not "imminent." No other dissenting opinion could be widely voiced, be it concern for any hopes of stability in the Middle East, the meta-sovereignty of the United Nations, nor even the basic morality of inflicting certain death on innocent civilians and US and allied soldiers even if the promotion of democracy for the survivors was truly the goal.

Reflecting on these matters can easily lead to cynicism or despair, but it is anger, hope, and commitment to fundamental political change that are needed. Anger at what has been done to so many peoples around the world in the name of every US citizen, and anger at the gap—nay, yawning chasm—between the ideals professed by the US government and the realities it practices.

Hope is also called for, because the historical record shows that despite our strong and consistent support for the Batistas, Diems, Pinochets and Suhartos of this world—and Saddam himself before he got uppity—insurgent groups more committed to justice and equality arose, and successfully challenged the dictators. Surely such insurgencies against US-supported authoritarian governments will rise again, and will need assistance from us, rather than invasion, subversion, or sanctions.

And commitment to fundamental political change is necessary in order to realize this hope, for a number of reasons. First, until such changes come about, the US budget will continue to be tilted heavily toward the military. With fully a fifth of our children growing up in poverty, an increasing number of people without health care, and virtually no resources committed to the rehabilitation of prisoners, we do not need to spend money on cluster bombs, daisy-cutters, or other weaponry to rain on innocents abroad.

Second, the peoples of the world who currently endure the suffering caused by US policies look to us to alleviate their misery. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, a divided Europe, and a currently weakened UN, it falls on US citizenship to check US brutality. If we don't do it, who will?

A third reason for political commitment lies in the fact that today the transnational corporations, foisting a consumptive economy on every part of the globe, pose a very great and real threat to the ideals of justice and human rights. They are altogether undemocratic, and largely rigidly hierarchical and authoritarian, and solely concerned about profits. Consequently, only governments—and a strengthened UN—can check them.

Justice Demands Action

It is tempting to fall back on the incisive old saying, "If voting could really change things, the government would make it illegal." But unlike most other peoples worldwide who struggle for justice and equality, US citizens can change their government without having to put their lives at stake in an armed uprising, which makes the effort obligatory. The new Office of Homeland Security—especially if it is armed with a second "PATRIOT Act"—may be expected to deter such efforts by further eroding our civil liberties, but this only makes more clear that the real "imminent threat" to the American peoples comes from their own government.

The words of RESIST's first Call ring as true today as when they were originally put forth in 1967: "Now is the time to resist illegitimate authority... until such times as the United States ceases to be a terror in the politics among nations."

Henry Rosemont, Jr. was a supporter of RESIST's first "Call to Resist Illegitimate Authority" and has been a Board member since 1969.

---

US Bombing Interventions Since WW II

Below is a list of the countries that the U.S. has bombed since the end of World War II, compiled by historian William Blum. In no instance did a democratic government, respectful of human rights, result.

- China 1945-46
- Korea 1950-53
- China 1950-53
- Guatemala 1954
- Indonesia 1958
- Cuba 1959-60
- Guatemala 1960
- Congo 1964
- Peru 1965
- Laos 1964-73
- Vietnam 1961-73
- Cambodia 1969-70
- Guatemala 1967-69
- Grenada 1983
- Libya 1986
- El Salvador 1980s
- Nicaragua 1980s
- Panama 1989
- Iraq 1991-present
- Sudan 1998
- Afghanistan 1998-present
- Yugoslavia 1999
Whose Standards?

Judging A Tale of Two Movements

MICHAEL ALBERT

When a New York Times correspondent indicated on its front page on February 16, 2003, that there were now only two superpowers in the world — the U.S. and public opinion — dissidents everywhere trumpeted the article as recognizing activism’s stature and importance. But did we understand the broader implications?

The Times observation indicates what we all should already have known — that there is a war in the world. It is between an agenda that aggrandizes the rich and powerful at the expense of the poor and weak — and a contrary agenda that diminishes differences in income, wealth, and power on the road to equity and self-management.

The conflict between these agendas rages in neighborhoods, communities, counties, countries, and regions, and across the whole planet. Advocates of justice are getting stronger, but we cannot yet reverse the rising tides of repression, violence, and impoverishment. We cannot yet win big victories for peace, redistribution, and justice. And so if we go to bed each night measuring our day’s labors by whether we have won major victories against the behemoth, then each night we will go to bed weeping over our inadequacy and moaning at the power of the world’s centers of power and their ability to ignore our demands. Worse, weeping and moaning will diminish our energies and make us unattractive to those others we seek to reach.

The Best and Worst of Times

In one sense, this is the best of times. We have seen not only the largest simultaneous peaceful legal demonstrations worldwide in history, but massive civil disobedience, coordinated resistance, city-wide, regional, and national teach-ins, protests, and marches, and what is ultimately most important, local outreach in towns, on streets, in schools, and everywhere.

More, the tone and tenor of this upsurge is diversifying. People are seeing the necessity to not only oppose this war, but to oppose all imperial war. People are seeing the need to not only seek peace now, but to seek pervasive and lasting peace, and not just peace but also justice. People are seeing the need to not only reject the barbaric, the colonial, and the domineering, but to propose and advocate positive alternatives to capitalism, patriarchy, and racism.

A movement is growing that can persist to fight again and again, amassing strength as it goes. By the standard of winning big changes every day, this movement will lose, lose, lose, for awhile. But by the standard of daily growing bigger, broader, more committed, and more competent, it will win, win, win. And as a result of those continuing achievements, it will begin engineering a trajectory of smaller and then larger changes in society that will each in turn improve people’s lives and create conditions for still more improvements, right up to establishing an alternative world we can all celebrate.

But this is also the worst of times. We have seen, in recent weeks, despite our activism, not only a gigantic assault on a defenseless country but a celebration of that assault as if it were a major human achievement. On top of missiles, bombers, helicopters, and tanks we have suffered a media that reports war like it was soccer, that obscures context and substance to highlight dismissive details, and that lies and denies and even fabricates news so that it is fit to print in the eyes of the masters.

Mainstream media presents what suits itself and the other masters. It obscures what doesn’t. Media mystification so swamps the air waves, the sound waves, and the byways, that any person not directly plugged into alternative avenues of thought and not sustained by a community that ratifies true information and analysis, cannot help but to some degree succumb to the fear and loathing and triumphalism screaming forth from every orifice of society. It is no wonder that at least temporarily imperial thoughts occupy many people’s minds, not only despite people having a social conscience, but even, amazingly, in pursuit of manifesting such a conscience.

This is an age of wisdom. The taxi driver and meat packer, the nurse and train steward, the dishwasher, maid, and drugstore cashier, the truck driver and the assembler all know that injustice pervades the hierarchies of wealth and power they daily encounter at work, in court, dealing with doctors, and in every other pursuit that crosses paths with the wealthy and powerful. They know too, even if they don’t always want to admit it, that Bush is braindead, that elections are sham choices between advocates of the powerful that occur despite our desires, and that at the bottom of reality TV and pervading unreal news reporting there lies profit and power. The public is becoming poetic. The commercial and the crass, broadcast everywhere and requiring our attention at every moment if we are to be part of society, are nonetheless ultimately losing the battle for our hearts and minds. People are gaining awareness, consciousness, and even, ever so slowly, confidence.

But this is also an age of foolishness. As if to spite the very idea of thoughtfulness and wisdom, all too many people with advanced degrees, with decades of education and reading, and with access to unlimited information; all too many people who monopolize legal and medical and engineering and administrative information; and certainly all too many economists and political scientists and managers and newspaper journalists overwhelmingly prattle the most nonsensical propaganda.

We are liberating a country that we are subjugating. We are beacons of freedom in a world that fears our every move. We favor democracy as we install colonial rulers and ignore the will of whole populations. Our bombs are the sounds of freedom, not of violent silence. Those with the highest education pontificate against fact, lecture against reason, and preach against
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the slightest sense of moral decency. It is not only that in America the more we watch the less we know; it is also the more education we have, the stupider we tend to be—not surprisingly.

Here in the USA, we have belief and incredulity. We have light and darkness. We have hope and despair. Looked at one way we have everything before us. Looked at another way we have nothing before us. Considering our aspirations, we are all going directly to heaven. Considering the bones and bodies accumulating in our name, we are all going directly to hell. It wasn’t only in Dickens’ time that it was the best of times, that it was the worst of times.

Where Are We Going Next

So, which is it? Is history on a road to a worse past or on a road to a better future?

Is democracy coming to the USA...real democracy, for the first time? Or fascism?

It depends whose calculus we use to judge. It depends whether we use the localist’s or the globalist’s measuring stick. It depends whether we use apocalyptic or sober analysis. It depends whether we let the media make us pessimistic, or we let our minds see the realistic.

There is a war on. It is not new, but it is heating up. Our side is getting stronger, much stronger. And not surprisingly, that means the other side is showing its fangs. We shouldn’t exaggerate our gains, but neither should we underplay them. We shouldn’t think we are on the verge of massive victories and as a result adversely evaluate ourselves against attaining such victories now. We should instead see that while we are still relatively small we are nonetheless on a path of continuing growth of numbers, continuing diversification of methods, continuing enlargement of insights, continuing espousal of positive aspirations, and we should judge ourselves daily by whether, with ups and downs, we can keep moving on that path.

Wrong standards will yield a depressing decay of our efforts. Right standards will yield a calm continuation of our efforts. Given that simple reality, surely we can all set standards sensibly.

Michael Albert is the editor of Z Magazine. This article is reprinted with permission from the online resource ZNet.org. For more information, contact www.zmag.org.

Iraq Peace Team members are joined by a Japanese peace delegation at the Al-Taji Electrical Facility in December 2002 to highlight the necessity of electricity for Iraqi people and their survival. The plant was bombed in 1991, Photo by Bitta Mostofi

The Iraq Peace Team has decided to stand in solidarity, hear what the Iraqis are hearing, feel what they’re feeling—the bombs exploding all over the place, the oil fires and the smoke, the sore throats, the exhaustion. Our role is to tell the stories, to be a voice. We don’t think we can stop this war from happening. We’re there trying to put the human face on war because we want, ultimately, for this to be a lesson that can be applied to all wars: To show how destructive and violent war is, and tell how it tears apart communities, destroys homes and lives. We hope to document the lasting effects of that destruction as the war winds down, whenever it winds down.

Some of the Peace Team members recently returned to the United States after they had been in Iraq for the beginning of the US-led invasion. What are some of the stories that they are sharing?

GUNTZEL: They’re definitely trying to communicate the destruction as they’ve seen it, and they’re trying to communicate the words of Iraqis who have either been victims of the destruction or have witnessed it. Many Iraqis are asking: is this how you liberate us? We’ve visited people who were torn apart by cluster bombs, we’ve visited people who had their windows in their home blown out by a nearby bomb and were injured by the flying glass. One young girl had a bomb fall through her bedroom, where she’s got a poster of some American pop star on her wall.

We’re hearing from the group that the Iraqis absolutely want Saddam Hussein gone, and they see that this will likely happen from this invasion. Even so, they don’t want invaders, and they don’t want occupation. Some of them are saying very clearly, without a government gun to their head, that they will resist the invaders. This is an indicator of some of the complexities that the US government plans to shoot its way out of.

Given where we are at this point in the war, what do you think the message of those who are protesting in the streets should be? Should the message be calling for a cease-fire and humanitarian aid, as Jesse Jackson and Bishop Sprague and others in Chicago have been suggesting? Some people have talked about using the international criminal court and pursuing that kind of route. What do you think are some of the important messages to be saying at this point?

GUNTZEL: We need to stay [demonstrating] on the streets, because it must go down in history that this war happened completely without the consent of the American people and the world. Regardless of what successes are claimed when the war is over, it should always be regarded as a catastrophe because it was not wanted and was a result of many presidents’ failed policies. This is not just about George Bush. The door was kicked wide open for him by previous presidents to do what he has done.

Personally, I think we must call for humanitarian aid to be allowed in, if that means
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a cease-fire. I’m thinking strictly about friends in Basra, friends in Baghdad, friends in Mosul who are cut off right now. I think they would want me to demand that the humanitarian aid be allowed in.

We’re trying to load up a truck with medicine and drive it to Baghdad. We plan to release an open letter to the aid agencies and to the Pentagon that makes the point that we can’t postpone the aid until things are secured. It’s our responsibility, as an occupying force (and I feel horrible even saying that) to take care of these people.

What are your worst fears of what might be yet in store for the people in Iraq?

GUNTZEL: One of my biggest fears ties in with one of my greatest hopes. My greatest hope is that the war will end quickly with as little civilian death as possible, with as little destruction to Baghdad and Basra, cities I love deeply. My greatest fear is that, if it’s over quickly, it will be regarded as a success. If it’s regarded as a success, this will be held up to get people pumped up for the next adventure to Syria, to Iran, to wherever.

Tell us a little bit how people can be supportive of Voices in the Wilderness.

GUNTZEL: Voices is run out of an apartment, so donating financially is always important. We are dependent on small donations for the entire existence of the campaign. People can make checks out to Voices in the Wilderness or they can donate on our website through PayPal.

Hosting speakers and community events is the most helpful thing. We now have hundreds of people who have traveled to Iraq on our website. You can see a list of them, you can contact them through our office or you can contact them directly. We want to share stories and are always willing to help with resources, offering people supplies, that kind of thing.

Jennifer Bing-Canar is the director of the Chicago AFSC Middle East Program, a former RESIST grantee. Jeff Guntzel has been the Co-Coordinator at Voices in the Wilderness since 1998. For more information, contact VITW, 1460 West Carmen Avenue Chicago, IL 60640; www.nonviolence.org/vitw.

Resources for Activists

Below is a short list of resources for activists and others interested in finding more information about the current situation in Iraq and opposition to US-led military aggression and sanctions. For more information, contact the groups at the addresses listed below.

American Friends Service Committee, Middle East Program, 637 S. Dearborn, 3rd Floor, Chicago, IL 60605; www.afsc.org. The Middle East Program concentrates on creating awareness and deeper understanding of Arabs and Arab culture in the US in order to challenge stereotypes and racism against Middle Easterners.

American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, 4201 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20008; www.adc.org. Organization that works to protect the civil rights of American-Arabs. Website contains resources on a variety of issues pertaining to the Arab population.

Colorado Campaign for Middle East Peace, 901 West 14th Avenue, Suite 7, Denver, CO 80204; www.ccme.org. Dedicated to ending the US-led sanctions and bombings against Iraq, and ending US support for illegal occupation of Palestinian territories in accordance with international law. CCMEP is a RESIST grantee.

Education for Peace in Iraq Center (EPIC), 1101 Pennsylvania Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20003; www.epic-usa.org. EPIC is dedicated to improving humanitarian conditions in Iraq and defending the human rights of the Iraqi people.

Institute for Policy Studies, 733 15th St NW, Suite 1020, Washington DC, 20005; www.ips-dc.org. A multi-issue progressive think tank. IPS houses the Foreign Policy in Focus, a collaboration with the Interhemispheric Resource Center, which offers policymakers and journalists ready analysis of breaking world events.

National Network To End The War Against Iraq, PO Box 60428, Washington, DC 20039; endthewar@endthewar.org. A nation-wide coalition of over 140 peace and justice, student and faith-based organizations united to work for a common cause: ending the illegal, unjust, and inhumane war being waged against the people of Iraq by member states of the United Nations, led by the United States. The Network is a RESIST grantee.

Not in Our Name, c/o WILPF, 339 Lafayette St, New York, NY 10012; www.notinourname.net. Initiated with a Pledge of Resistance, the group works against US aggressions abroad and the war on immigrants at home.

Racial Justice 9-11, 2473 Valentine Ave, Bronx, NY, 10458; www.rj911.org. A national network of organizations that seeks to build the power of people of color communities within the anti-war movement.

September Eleventh Families for Peaceful Tomorrows, 5111 Telegraph #185, Oakland, CA 94609; www.peacefultomorrows.org. An advocacy organization founded by family members of September Eleventh victims. Its mission is to seek effective nonviolent responses to terrorism, and identify a commonality with all people similarly affected by violence throughout the world.

United for Peace & Justice, P.O. Box 607, Times Square Station, New York, NY 10108; www.unitedforpeace.org. An umbrella organization that since October 2002 has helped to network over 70 national, regional, and local peace groups.

Veterans for Peace, World Community Center, 438 North Skinker, St. Louis, MO 63130; www.veteransforpeace.org. An educational and humanitarian organization dedicated to the abolition of war.

Voices in the Wilderness, P.O. Box 634, 5315 N Clark St, Chicago, IL 60640; info@vitw.org. A joint US/UK campaign to end the economic sanctions and military warfare against the people of Iraq.
GRANTS

Resist awards grants six times a year to groups throughout the United States engaged in activism for social and economic justice. In this issue of the Newsletter we list a few grant recipients from our April 2003 allocation cycle. For information, contact the groups at the addresses below.

Colorado ADAPT
201 S. Cherokee Street, Denver, CO 80223; www.freeourpeople.org

Colorado ADAPT is the headquarters and the birthplace of national ADAPT. Colorado ADAPT began with the battle over public transit in Denver. After getting lifts on buses in Denver, ADAPT moved on to organizing communities around the country around access to public transportation for people with disabilities. Currently, ADAPT is working to enable people with disabilities to have a choice regarding where they live and receive services.

Colorado ADAPT recently received a $2,000 grant for general support to enable it to continue to challenge barriers to the enactment of disability rights through direct action and legislation. The group also received an accessibility grant of $3,000 which will provide support personnel to enable its members to participate in the Free Our People march which seeks access to in-home care for people with disabilities and an end to Medicaid's bias towards institutional (specifically nursing home) care.

Nodudol for Korean Community Development
37-48 61st Street, Woodside, NY 11377; www.nodudol.com

Through its work, Nodudol seeks to bridge the divisions of war, nation, gender, class and language, and to create a more inclusive definition of what it means to be Korean in the United States. Nodudol's work extends beyond the Korean community to struggle in solidarity with other people of color as part of the larger movement for progressive social change.

A RESIST grant of $3,000 will provide funding for general support for this organization. Working to build a politically active Korean community through campaigns for increased social, economic, and educational justice.

Interfaith Alliance of Idaho
PO Box 15893, Boise ID 83715; tiaidaho@yahoo.com

The Interfaith Alliance of Idaho (TIA-ID) has been working for the last five years to build an inclusive interfaith political perspective in response to attempts to use religion to justify conservative political policies or violent opposition. Working in coalition, TIA-ID pushes local and statewide initiatives to better represent multi-racial, religious, and class communities, from farmworker minimum wage ordinances to documenting the emergence of hate groups in Idaho and their recruiting techniques.

RESIST awarded the Interfaith Alliance of Idaho $2,000 for the Overcoming Hate: Looking Within project. This project challenges community and faith organizations to examine the interrelations between racism, classism, sexism, and heterosexism in order to strength progressive organizing.

California Prison Focus
2924 16th Street, #307, San Francisco, CA. 94103; www.prisons.org

California Prison Focus, a statewide prisoners’ rights organizing group, works to expose and challenge human rights abuses in lockdown prisons and medical neglect of prisoners with HIV and hepatitis C. The organization focuses public attention on conditions within California prisons to bring together communities both inside and outside prison walls to organize for systemic change of prison policies.

RESIST awarded California Prison Focus a Mike Riegle Tribute Grant of $3,000 for general support. The Riegle Grant is given in memory of the life and work of local activist Mike Riegle. Mike was a supporter of prisoners’ rights, gay and lesbian liberation, and the radical movement for justice.