

# Citizen FM



Citizen Free Media  
February 2003 Issue

#### Inside this issue:

Terrorism and the Four  
Freedoms (by Granny D)  
A Grain of Truth  
The Chance for Peace (words  
of Pres. Eisenhower, 1953)  
What is the Citizen FM?  
Nelson Madela speaks out  
(from Newsweek)  
News and updates  
How to get involved

#### Editor's note:

I'm glad you're reading Citizen FM! We have been compiling it from submissions. It costs nothing, has no staff, and depends on reader input.

Send submissions to:

[joincitizenfm@yahoo.com](mailto:joincitizenfm@yahoo.com)

The format? Anything! I would like to see more essays from readers. Up to now, every reader of Citizen FM has submitted something!

If this magazine seems too political this month, I apologize. I *am* a moderate person. I just happen to live in immoderate times.

Marc Maxson



## Terrorism and the Four Freedoms

By Doris Haddock,  
AlterNet September 28, 2001

The following is a speech given by 91 year-old Doris "Granny D" Haddock, who walked across the U.S. in 1999-2000 for campaign finance reform, in Unity, Maine on September 22, 2001.

It is hard to think clearly as we yet rock in the wake of the recent terrorist attacks on our cities and our people. But think clearly we must. Politics is a serious business. Not everyone cares to listen when people argue about the policies and practices of our political leaders. Americans would rather be painting their house or going to a good ball game than listening to a speech, and that is not a bad thing. We wouldn't get much done if we just argued politics all the time.

But there is a time for it, and this is that time. Our neighbors and children are being killed in great numbers because Americans are not in control of the American government, and haven't been for some time. And now we are being killed by our own airplanes, just as we were killed in our African embassies in 1998 by our own explosives, which we gave to the Islamic fundamentalists so that they would please kill our then enemies, the Russians.

And four months ago the current Bush administration gave \$43 million to the current Taliban Regime so that it would please kill our enemies, the heroin dealers of Afghanistan. Or was it to protect an oil pipeline? That's what we are now learning.

Our subcontracting of death has never done us much good, with Vietnam still the shining example, and with many other examples still bleeding in Central and South America, Africa, and in Southeast Asia.

The Coca-Cola company has been accused of financing the death squads in Columbia that kill union activists among the plantation workers. This so that our Coca-Cola is affordable to us. Wherever our large mining companies extract the value from foreign lands, we have a CIA and a military working to keep any leaders in power who will guarantee us a cheap labor supply and cheap mining products, at the expense of local people and their efforts toward democracy.

This is not who we want to be.

If you ask the common American to describe the America he or she wants

us to be, you will hear this: "We are the country that represents freedom, opportunity and fairness. We use our strength to help people around the world. We oppose brutal regimes and work toward world health and justice and democratic participation of all people. The Statue of Liberty is our beacon to the world."

The common American wants the American government to be that to be that every day, in every corner of the world.

The common American would never answer: "America is this: We use our powerful military forces, intelligence forces, and our huge financial power to extract from weaker countries what we need for our own, affordable lifestyle in the US. We will support any brutal regime so long as they provide us with the cheap labor and materials we need, and so long as they keep any competing political systems out of the region. We will finance the massacre of peasants and workers, the torture of journalist and clerics, and the rape of nature and the sky itself so that we may live pleasantly today in America."

The common American feels ill at such words. And yet, that is the vision of America that many people in the world carry in their angry hearts. They see their miserable lives and their precious children and land being sacrificed for our luxury. They see our US-made helicopters and jets and guns and rockets suppressing and killing them. Naturally, they celebrate when we are made to suffer.

The disconnection between their perception and ours is profound: Our people

are stunned at the idea that we are not universally loved.

In classrooms all over America this week and last, teachers and professors asked their students, "why do you suppose that some people around the world are so angry at us?" Many students no doubt suggested that differences in religion make some people intolerant and fanatically homicidal. What other reason could they have?

In a West Virginia college classroom last week, a friend of mine had something different to say.

"Look at it like this," he said to a classroom filled with honor students who couldn't imagine why America was under attack, except for reasons of religious extremism. "Imagine that West Virginia was a third world country," he said. "We have all this valuable coal, but there is one country, far away, that buys it all. They are the richest nation in the world, and they stay that way by getting our resources cheaply. They use their wealth to buy-off our government officials, and to kill or torture any worker here who tries to organize a union or clean up the government. How mad would we be toward that distant country, and just how innocent would we think its citizens are, who drive around in luxury cars and live in elegant homes and buy the best medicines for their children, and otherwise live a life in sparkling skyscrapers a life made affordable by the way they get resources from us? They admire their own democracy, turning a blind eye to what their government and their corporations do abroad."

The classroom was silent. "Well," he said, "that's pretty much what we do all over the world."

Someone at the back of the room said, "Well, we may not be perfect, but this attack didn't come from Central America or Africa or Southeast Asia, it came from wealthy people from the Mideast, for religious reasons.

The class soon remembered that the US had supported the brutal regime of the Shah of Iran so to better protect the supply of oil to the US, and that the brutality of the Shah led to the rise of the Ayatollah Khomeini and the camp of violent Islamic fundamentalists, of which Bin Laden was a product. The class was silent again. Then they began to discuss our problem, and they were in a position to come up with real answers.

So must all Americans see America as the world see us, so that we can strive for justice and the peace that comes with justice.

The politics that killed six thousand people in New York last week is the politics of Mideast oil, the politics of the Shah of Iran and our support for him and his torture police supported so that we might secure cheap oil and an anti-Communist puppet at any price to the local people and at any price to their democracy. The Shah did not deliver peace or safety, but instead he delivered into the world the Ayatollah Khomeini and the present wave of violent Islamic undamentalists who are no more Islamic in their practices than America's radical right are Christian in their practices. Both radical fringes are beating the war drums and accusing everyone who is not exactly like them of

causing last week's horror. George Bush, has declared war on evil. That is a holy war as chilling as the Taliban's call for war on evil.

This is not a time for all good Americans to forget their political differences and rally behind the man in the White House. The man in the White House should apologize for the most serious breach of internal security in the nation's history, not disguise his failure in calls for war. Can he hope that the fiery explosions in New York and Washington and Pennsylvania will be more acceptable to us if they are placed in a larger context of explosions of our own making? I do not rally around that idea. It is "wag the dog" taken to an extreme level, for he is not covering up his failure with a fake war, but with a real one.

He has taken every opportunity to make the world less safe, first in North Korea and then in the Mideast and in Russia and in China. He needs a dangerous world to sell his military vision of the future. He is getting it. We must not go along with him.

The international community may soon have to rescue the Afghan people from the Taliban just as we had to rescue Europe from the Nazis, and rebuild it and let it find its way to self-government, but that is not the same issue and that will not resolve international terrorism at its roots. It is a diversion of our attention from Bush's catastrophic failure at home and abroad.

Sixty years and eight months ago Franklin Delano Roosevelt delivered his "four freedoms" State of the Nation speech to Congress as he prepared the nation for war. In it, he laid down the sensible

and humane preconditions for future world peace and democracy.

If Mr. Bush insists on preparing us for his war against evil, let him learn from that great speech.

Let me read you the final paragraphs:

"In the future days which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world."

Now Mr. Bush, do not tell us that we must prepare to lose our free speech rights and our rights to privacy, so that you and your corporate-military complex can continue to abuse the world safely. Do not take away our first freedom. You have installed your closest political associate as the head of FEMA, which has its own prison camps set up across America for any coming disturbances. We are indeed disturbed.

And now it seems we are to have an internal secret police, headed not by a law enforcement man but by Tom Ridge, and it is to be a cabinet-level position.

This puts it far above the FBI, our non-political, professional internal security police, which has been discredited in an intensive campaign this year.

"The second," FDR continued, "is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world."

Do not, Mr. Bush, let your vision of good and evil and your friends on the religious right overpower the religion of mainstream America, which is the religion of peace and justice. Do not

take away our second freedom.

"The third," said FDR, "is freedom from want, which, translated into world terms, means economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world. Unquote.

We cannot live peacefully if we do not work every day for the people, not the despots, of the world for justice, not for banking arrangements and trade agreements to fatten our already fat banks and corporations. Do not deprive the third world of this third freedom, for none of us are free if some of us are yet enslaved.

"The fourth is freedom," said FDR, "from fear, which, translated into world terms, means a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor anywhere in the world."

Let the US stop selling the weapons of death throughout the world. We have fallen far, far away from the vision of a peaceful, unarmed world. We are now the principle source of arms and high-tech weapons for all the despots of the world. Mr. Bush, you can only give us freedom from fear if the people of the world are free of fear. This the common American knows in his heart.

I remember Roosevelt's speech well. My husband and I no doubt discussed it at the dinner table. We had already been married

eleven years at the time. I hope I speak for many common Americans who cannot see our flag without getting emotional with love for it. Our dream is that it should always represent the best that human beings can do on this earth. This is a time for us to rally around its best values and its highest dreams.

To the terrorists, here is my message: you are not martyrs, but cowards. Your selfish, ego-maniacal greed for a place in heaven cannot be purchased with the deaths of other people. Look across the Khyber Pass toward the land of Gandhi, who taught us that violence makes justice harder to come by, not easier. Today in America, the work of terrorists makes the work harder for those who want reform America's policies and practices. You do not want to change American policies, or you would be using your millions to bring your message to us in ways that we can understand and act upon. You want only your shortcut to heaven. We have the same great God, the same Allah, and he shakes his head in sad disbelief at your spiritual immaturity.

"The ultimate weakness of violence," Dr. King taught us, "is that it is a descending spiral, begetting the very thing it seeks to destroy. Instead of diminishing evil, it multiplies it... Through violence you may murder the hater, but you do not murder hate. In fact, violence merely increases hate.... adding deeper darkness to a night already devoid of stars. Darkness cannot drive out hate; only love can do that."

Terrorism makes it hard for us to do the right thing, but do it we must.

Old "Fighting Bob" LaFollette, that great reformer, said that "war is the money-changer's opportunity, and the social reformer's doom." But we will not accept doom. We will keep going. It is a time for all of us to speak the truth with courage and hope. America is, despite all, still the best hope for the world. But we are a work in progress, and we all have some work to do right now. It is the work of peace, of frank education, of making our lives and our communities more sustainable and less dependent on the suffering of others, and of cleaning up a campaign finance system that has allowed our elected leaders to represent not our interests and values, but those of international corporations who are set on world domination and who have the resources to buy our government away from us if we will let them. We will not, so long as we live, and so long as our four freedoms are our guiding lights and inspiration.

[Forwarded by Jen Johnson]

## A grain of truth

There is a grassroots campaign underway to protest war in Iraq in a simple, but potentially powerful way.

Place 1/2 cup uncooked rice in a small plastic bag (a snack-size bag or sandwich bag work fine). Squeeze out excess air and seal the bag. Wrap it in a piece of paper on which you have written, "If your enemies are hungry, feed them. Romans 12:20. Please send

this rice to the people of Iraq; do not attack them."

Place the paper and bag of rice in an envelope (either a letter-sized or padded mailing envelope-both are the same cost to mail) and address them to:

President George Bush  
White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20500

Attach \$1.06 in postage. (Three 37-cent stamps equal \$1.11.) Drop this in the mail. It is important to act NOW - TODAY so that President Bush gets the letters ASAP, especially since the inspector's report comes out on the 27th.

In order for this protest to be effective, there must be hundreds of thousands of such rice deliveries to the White House. We can do this if you each forward this message to your friends and family. There is a positive history of this protest! In the 1950s, Fellowship of Reconciliation began a similar protest, which is credited with influencing President Eisenhower against attacking China.

Read on: "In the mid-1950s, the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation, learning of famine in the Chinese mainland, launched a 'Feed Thine Enemy' campaign. Members and friends mailed thousands of little bags of rice to the White House with a tag quote in the Bible, 'If thine enemy hunger, feed him.' As far as anyone knew for more than ten years, the campaign was an abject failure. The President did not acknowledge receipt of the bags publicly; certainly, no rice was ever sent to China.

"What nonviolent activists only learned a decade later was that the campaign played a significant, perhaps even determining role in preventing nuclear war. Twice while the campaign was on, President Eisenhower met with the Joint Chiefs of Staff to consider U.S. options in the conflict with China over two islands, Quemoy and Matsu. The generals twice recommended the use of nuclear weapons. President Eisenhower each time turned to his aide and asked how many little bags of rice had come in. When told they numbered in the tens of thousands, Eisenhower told the generals that as long as so many Americans were expressing active interest in having the U.S. feed the Chinese, he certainly wasn't going to consider using nuclear weapons against them."

[Multiple sources]

## Freedom of Assembly?

On February 15, 2003 hundreds of thousands of people will converge on New York City to stand with millions around the globe against the Bush Administration's plan for war on Iraq....

While we are still unable to announce a location for this march and rally, one thing is certain: **It is happening.** We urge all those who oppose the war crusade to continue mobilizing full speed ahead for February 15. Continue with your plans to come to New York City -- we are confident a permit will come through.

But we are facing a major fight over our basic democratic right to public protest. At our meeting today with lawyers for New York City and the NYPD, our request for a march permit was again refused. We have asked to assemble near the United Nations, march directly past the U.N., and then continue through Manhattan to a rally at Central Park. We are consulting with our lawyers and will announce our next step tomorrow, Wednesday, February 5.

With only 10 days remaining before February 15, the continued stonewalling by the police can only be seen as an active effort to prevent us from voicing our opposition to this war. We will not be silenced -- the streets of New York will be filled with a cry for peace.

What can you do? Make more phone calls (numbers below). Make your travel plans. Recruit your friends. Donate some money. Fill more buses, hand out more leaflets -- and we'll see you in New York City on February 15.

### CONTACTS:

NYC Mayor Michael Bloomberg:  
212-788-9600,  
212-788-3010,  
212-788-3040

NYC Police Commissioner Raymond W. Kelly:  
646-610-8526

NYPD Chief of Department Joseph Esposito:  
646-610-6710

To make a donation, download leaflets, view our ride or housing boards, endorse the February demonstration, or sign up for these updates, visit our website:

<http://www.unitedforpeace.org/feb15>

Buttons, stickers, posters, and leaflets are available at our New York City office, 330 West 42nd Street, 8th floor (between 8th & 9th Avenues) from 9-9 on weekdays and 10-6 on weekends. Phone: 646-473-8935

Thanks for your support -- together we can stop this war.

Sincerely, The February 15 organizing staff of United for Peace and Justice



## The Chance for Peace

The words of Dwight D. Eisenhower Washington, D.C. April 16, 1953

"Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed."

This world in arms is not spending money alone.

It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities.

It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals.

It is some fifty miles of concrete pavement.

We pay for a single fighter plane with a half million bushels of wheat.

We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

This is, I repeat, the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking.

This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron.

These plain and cruel truths define the peril and point the hope that come with this spring of 1953.

This is one of those times in the affairs of nations when the gravest choices must be made, if there is to be a turning toward a just and lasting peace.

---

## Untitled but no longer anonymous

By Marc Maxson

My father is quite different from me. He feels strongly about the US and about war, but unlike me, he supports both with two hands, a checkbook, and all his mind

and body. I ought to admire those qualities – his determination, resolve, and willingness to put into action his beliefs are traits that would demand my respect if they were in somebody else. But I have a hard time giving him that respect because of the direction his resolve takes him.

My mother groaned when he tried to re-enlist in the first gulf war. He felt great esteem for America for what she had given him, and like the loyal husband he is, he wanted to run to her rescue when she called. Luckily, the army said it didn't have any need for a balding 45 year old white guy, even if he know a lot about protecting soldiers from chemical weapons.

That time passed. I grew up and forgot about it. But 11 years later my dad, now approaching his 60s, is eager to do all he can for a country that has given him opportunity and a good living. He was born a son to farmers, and he has done all in his power to leave the soil under his feet and off his hands. He joined the army, went to college, and became an engineer. I think he thinks that in another country, a farmer's son might not be so lucky as to become so well off. And so he defends this country and all that it does.

Funny how different I am. I grew up in this country and had great opportunity because of it. But while I am thankful for the many opportunities, I repay my debt to America by fighting to make the world better for everyone. What I owe America for my education I pay in efforts to stop countries that quash democracy, spread hunger (see Eisenhower's speech), and

exploit the poor. An essential part of that education was the ability to recognize moral and immoral actions. Right and wrong are lessons that go back to kindergarten, but I am amazed that doing the wrong thing can sound like the right thing when spin doctors get a hold of it. Starting a war is never a means to Peace. The motivation to start a war has always been gaining power, not protecting peace.

I owe something to this country for the opportunities it has bestowed upon me but what I owe is not allegiance. I owe it my leadership. It would be a better country if I stood up and said "NO" to war like the kind of brave leader that this country lacks. When a protest in Washington attracts 200,000 people but cannot find a political figure willing to exercise leadership by speaking before the crowd, we have a leadership crisis. When old people with mortgages and kids in college meet at church to organize against war, we have a crisis in leadership. When posterboard is on back-order at the local art supply store because of all the protests, there is a crisis in leadership. But when none of this is deemed newsworthy by the corporate media, we have need for Citizen FM.

Our democratic system strains when the ideas of a few are packaged and sold as the views of the majority by a few corporate media empires. But we have the right to turn off these sources. Thanks to our neighbors and the Internet, there are many alternative sources that can inform you. Word of mouth is still the strongest testimony. We should have never expected the corporate-owned mass

media to be the voice of the people. The only true voice of the people are the people themselves.

As part of my commitment to repay America the debt of gratitude I owe it for the wealth of opportunities it has afforded me, I am starting a movement to return the voice of the people back to the people. I am unplugging from the mass media and turning on the micromedia. News from communities across the world presented by ordinary people acting as observers in a forum like Citizen FM gives us a peek into the flavor of different individuals, not the agendas of a few rich and powerful media puppeteers. I may not be the first to learn about the big stories, but I will learn more about more stories. Help educate yourself and others about the real world by building communities out of the towns where you reside and connecting news from towns through micromedia operations, such as listservs, newsletters, photo exchanges, speaker exchanges, school field trips, and by traveling. A town with no community has no conscience. Leaders with isolated constituents are powerful and corruptible by the rich. So get out there and start organizing people into groups for the sole purpose of socializing and becoming again like a community. Once communities exist, we're all one step towards helping everyone in that community live better.

## How to talk to strangers

Yes! I am actually telling you to go talk to strangers in your community. Here are some

good conversation starters to get even the most reclusive people intertwined in discussion:

What is the most valuable/memorable experience that you have had in your life?

If you could compare yourself to any kitchen appliance, what would it be and why?

What song would you choose to be your "theme song" every time you entered a room?

What are lessons that you have taken away from your family?

Give me a weather forecast of how you are feeling now (cloudy, sunny, stormy) with respect to your job (or your family, school, the world, etc.).

If you could have dinner with one famous person (dead or alive) who would you choose and what would you ask?

What is the most important thing that a person can do to make a political impact in today's world?

What are your pet-peeves?

If you could make a living doing any job in the world, what would it be and why?

How important is money to you? How much are you willing to sacrifice for the standard of living that you hope to achieve?

What is the most embarrassing thing that you did as a child?

What is the meaning of your name?

What is your favorite state fair food?

Do you believe that there is life on other planets? Why or why not?

What is the most

impulsive decision that you have ever made? How did it turn out?

Describe the most recent movie you've seen that made an impact on your thinking.

Describe the most recent book you've read that made an impact on your thinking.

What personal quality do you think has the greatest influence on your ability to influence others?

By Jen Johnson

---

## What is Citizen FM?

What is this Citizen FM thing? Well, it did originate on a radio station at the name suggests. In the 80's and 90's a small public radio station in The Gambia, West Africa used to read the local newspapers over the radio each night in the three local languages. This allowed people who did not speak English to remain informed about the government, as well as allowed people in remote villages to get the same news that city folk could get from the papers. In that spirit, I have created a micromedia outlet where people can post their views and news from communities and countries alike. Many of these papers need to start before most people will become informed about the world beyond TV. It's free media – FM – media that costs next to nothing to produce and can represent the views of ordinary people that will ultimately help the mainstream media find a balance voice again.

I hope you will contribute. If

not here, somewhere. It is my dream that eventually everyone will be part of micromedia outlets like the Citizen FM. Groups of a few hundred people can regularly contribute to these micromagazines on a quarterly and monthly basis, and in the process give communities a voice. There are always important things to share, and many of them happen in our towns each day only they go unreported for lack of a Citizen of one's own. The plethora of voices making up many small papers paints a more realistic picture of the lives we all lead than the ones painted by Hollywood or CNN. This is more important now than ever, because only six media companies control nearly all the newspapers in the US. Ideally, I would love to see someone submitting a short news story about daily life from each major city and town where a Citizen FM reader resides. We will print the stuff as it comes, so there are more issues when there are more stories submitted.

So contribute already! And tell your friends to start receiving Citizen FM. [You can sign up by sending an email to [joincitizenfm@yahoo.com](mailto:joincitizenfm@yahoo.com).]

## Nelson Mandela speaks out

January 30, 2003

NEWSWEEK: Why are you speaking out on Iraq? Do you want to mediate, as you tried to on the Mideast a couple of years ago? It seems you are reentering the fray now. Nelson Mandela: If I am asked, by credible

organizations, to mediate, I will consider that very seriously. But a situation of this nature does not need an individual, it needs an organization like the United Nations to mediate. We must understand the seriousness of this situation. The United States has made serious mistakes in the conduct of its foreign affairs, which have had unfortunate repercussions long after the decisions were taken. Unqualified support of the Shah of Iran led directly to the Islamic revolution of 1979. Then the United States chose to arm and finance the [Islamic] mujahedin in Afghanistan instead of supporting and encouraging the moderate wing of the government of Afghanistan. That is what led to the Taliban in Afghanistan. But the most catastrophic action of the United States was to sabotage the decision that was painstakingly stitched together by the United Nations regarding the withdrawal of the Soviet Union from Afghanistan. If you look at those matters, you will come to the conclusion that the attitude of the United States of America is a threat to world peace. Because what [America] is saying is that if you are afraid of a veto in the Security Council, you can go outside and take action and violate the sovereignty of other countries. That is the message they are sending to the world. That must be condemned in the strongest terms. And you will notice that France, Germany, Russia, China are against this decision. It is clearly a decision that is motivated by George W. Bush's desire to please the arms and oil industries in the United States of America. If you look at those factors, you'll see that an individual

like myself, a man who has lost power and influence, can never be a suitable mediator.

NEWSWEEK: What about the argument that's being made about the threat of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and Saddam's efforts to build a nuclear weapons. After all, he has invaded other countries, he has fired missiles at Israel. On Thursday, President Bush is going to stand up in front of the United Nations and point to what he says is evidence of...

...Scott Ritter, a former United Nations arms inspector who is in Baghdad, has said that there is no evidence whatsoever of [development of weapons of] mass destruction. Neither Bush nor [British Prime Minister] Tony Blair has provided any evidence that such weapons exist. But what we know is that Israel has weapons of mass destruction. Nobody talks about that. Why should there be one standard for one country, especially because it is black, and another one for another country, Israel, that is white.

NEWSWEEK: So you see this as a racial question?

Well, that element is there. In fact, many people say quietly, but they don't have the courage to stand up and say publicly, that when there were white secretary generals you didn't find this question of the United States and Britain going out of the United Nations. But now that you've had black secretary generals like Boutros Boutros Ghali, like Kofi Annan, they do not respect the United Nations. They have contempt for it.

This is not my view, but that is what is being said by many people.

What kind of compromise can you see that might avoid the coming confrontation? There is one compromise and one only, and that is the United Nations. If the United States and Britain go to the United Nations and the United Nations says we have concrete evidence of the existence of these weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and we feel that we must do something about it, we would all support it.

NEWSWEEK: Do you think that the Bush administration's U.N. diplomatic effort now is genuine, or is the President just looking for political cover by speaking to the U.N. even as he remains intent on forging ahead unilaterally?

Well, there is no doubt that the United States now feels that they are the only superpower in the world and they can do what they like. And of course we must consider the men and the women around the president. Gen. Colin Powell commanded the United States army in peacetime and in wartime during the Gulf war. He knows the disastrous effect of international tension and war, when innocent people are going to die, young men are going to die. He knows and he showed this after September 11 last year. He went around briefing the allies of the United States of America and asking for their support for the war in Afghanistan. But people like Dick Cheney... I see yesterday there was an article that said he is the real president of the United States of America, I don't know how

true that is. Dick Cheney, [Defense secretary Donald] Rumsfeld, they are people who are unfortunately misleading the president. Because my impression of the president is that this is a man with whom you can do business. But it is the men who around him who are dinosaurs, who do not want him to belong to the modern age. The only man, the only person who wants to help Bush move to the modern era is Gen. Colin Powell, the secretary of State.

NEWSWEEK: I gather you are particularly concerned about Vice President Cheney?

Well, there is no doubt. He opposed the decision to release me from prison (laughs). The majority of the U.S. Congress was in favor of my release, and he opposed it. But it's not because of that. Quite clearly we are dealing with an arch-conservative in Dick Cheney.

I'm interested in your decision to speak out now about Iraq. When you left office, you said, "I'm going to go down to Transkei, and have a rest." Now maybe that was a joke at the time. But you've been very active. I really wanted to retire and rest and spend more time with my children, my grandchildren and of course with my wife.

But the problems are such that for anybody with a conscience who can use whatever influence he may have to try to bring about peace, it's difficult to say no.

© 2002 Newsweek, Inc

**News reprints from  
around the world  
about January anti-**

## **war protests in Washington, DC**

The Guardian (British Newspaper) Jan 20, 2003

"In the absence of turnstiles and ticket sales, exact numbers on these occasions are notoriously elusive. Police did not quarrel with the organisers' estimate of 500,000, though that seemed excessive. Certainly, there can hardly have been less than 100,000, especially bearing in mind the day's one undeniable statistic: the temperature never rose above -4C (25F), and the grass in front of the Capitol where everyone gathered was more like tundra. Many local people appeared briefly, heard a couple of the three dozen speeches, then retreated to their central heating."

"Some people, however, had come too far to make that an option. Adam Dekeyrel travelled down with two busloads of protesters on the 22-hour journey from Rochester, Minnesota. He insisted they were the vanguard of popular feeling: "There's a lot of people staying at home afraid to say anything," he said. "They're not likely to get involved because they don't know how to get involved." "

"...There was a small pro-Bush counter-demonstration on the Mall involving about three dozen people.

"There were no clashes - only two arrests were reported all day - but the minority did somehow look colder than everyone else. They invoked the patriotic dead by standing near the Vietnam war memorial, but many soldiers

who fought in Vietnam were also there, on the other side of the argument.

"...There was a big protest in Washington last October, almost ignored by the media. Stung by criticism of their coverage then, the main US papers yesterday gave this event lavish coverage."

---

WASHINGTON (Reuters) – “Hundreds of thousands of Americans opposed to waging war in Iraq rallied on Saturday in several cities demanding the White House back down and give U.N. weapons inspectors a chance.

Jessica Lange: "All this talk of war, all this rhetoric has been an excellent cover, an excellent camouflage, to turn back the clock on civil rights, on woman's rights, on social justice and on environmental policies."

Protesters later marched to a downtown Navy base to demand the right to inspect U.S. weapons of mass destruction."

---

## Quotes from the Good old days

"I want to tell you, ladies and gentleman, that there's not enough troops in the army to force the southern people to break down segregation and admit the Nigra race into our theaters, into our swimming pools, into our homes, and into our churches."— Strom Thurmond, then-governor of South Carolina, in a speech from his 1948 "Dixiecrat" presidential campaign.

[A word to foreigners from an Internet discussion group, 2001,]:

"I can't wait for the day the U.S. marches into Iraq and shows the world all the terror those poor people have suffered under that tyrant's cloud of evil. Maybe you can justify the rape of women and torturing of children but Americans don't. We will liberate the world from Terrorists and we will hunt down idiots like you. Go back to the middle east!!! We don't want you here! Go, Go. Why do you stay around Americans you hate? Why, because we offer the greatest standard of living the world has ever known. We are the greatest, richest, and bravest country in the world!! You can't get enough of us, you are in awe and full of jealousy wishing you could of been born an American."

---

## The Politics of Protest

The clarity of protesting is a bit like speaking through novacained lips. Protests demonstrate that a large number of people feel strongly about something, but protests cannot persuade people of their just moral and ethical positions. For this, one needs to pick up a pen (or keyboard if you prefer).

Most issues worthy of protest are complex. One must weigh the evidence on both sides, because if there was one clear side most people wouldn't bother with demonstrations. However, when protesters take to the streets with a complex message that has not yet been effectively presented

to the larger public in print or television, that public generally dismisses, ignores, or resists the message of the protesters. The reason is two-fold: (a) The slogans of the protesters are seldom the best and clearest arguments in support of the cause, and (b) the mass media extracts, simplifies, and edits the message of the protesters to meet its own devices. Thus, we cannot reply on the media alone to carry our message, no matter how many people join a movement.

There are recent examples of this. I believe the 2000 Seattle World Trade Organization protests involved a message that the public had never encountered. Its arguments were valid, but complicated. The inept mass media covered the protests with its own familiar language, neglecting to define terms such as "fair trade" or "globalization" with the precision that protesters employed them. Likewise, the Associated Press coverage of January protests described them in the context of the 60's anti-war protest, failing to examine the issue for what it is: A movement with even greater mandate and more dire circumstances. At the height of support for the Vietnam war in September 1964 (After the Gulf of Tonkin incidents) 58% of the public favored continuing the war in Vietnam (see Odom Istitute archives: [www.irss.unce.edu:80/data\\_archive/polls/pollsearch.html](http://www.irss.unce.edu:80/data_archive/polls/pollsearch.html)). In December, only 26% of those polled by the LA Times supported a unilateral war with Iraq, the type the US is likely to conduct (n=1305). Wouldn't you think that this war would have its greatest support before any casualties or reactionary terrorist attacks? And yet only a quarter support the unilateral war that

president Bush is selling.

The best thing we can do is keep the dialogue going. I often choose not to debate issues when I hear someone make a passionate but misinformed statement. Perhaps I owe it to them and to the cause to intervene, because to avoid doing so would be an affront to the people of the world that suffer because of our public ignorance.

However, if debate or writing is not your personal strength, seek out a medium that is. Whether you doodle anti-war images on bulletin boards or cover your car with bumper stickers, you are finally taking part in the community by exercising your voice.

Protests are a strong visual, but that are ineffective if the viewing public has an inaccurate understanding of the issues that prompt us to assemble. Thus, it is up to us to find ways of maintaining the dialogue that can change minds. People are not anvils. The forces that generate popular support for an unjust war are the same that people can use to prevent it.

By Marc Maxson

## Excerpts from **198 Methods of Nonviolent Action**

[http://www.aeinstein.org/  
Resources/198\\_methods.pdf](http://www.aeinstein.org/Resources/198_methods.pdf)

Practitioners of nonviolent struggle have an entire arsenal of "nonviolent weapons" at their disposal. Listed below are 198 of them, classified into three broad categories: nonviolent protest and

persuasion, noncooperation (social, economic, and political), and nonviolent intervention. A description and historical examples of each can be found in volume two of *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* by Gene Sharp.

1. Public Speeches
2. Letters of opposition or support
3. Declarations by organizations and institutions
4. Signed public statements
5. Declarations of indictment and intention
6. Group or mass petitions
9. Leaflets, pamphlets, and books
10. Newspapers and journals
19. Wearing of symbols
20. Prayer and worship
21. Delivering symbolic objects
31. "Haunting" officials
36. Performances of plays and music
50. Teach-ins
55. Social boycott
56. Selective social boycott
70. Protest emigration (hijrat)
73. Policy of austerity
141. Civil disobedience of "illegitimate" laws
159. The fast
190. Alternative markets
191. Alternative transportation systems
192. Alternative economic institutions
193. Overloading of administrative systems

---

### From Michael Moore's **"Bowling for Columbine"** **"What a wonderful world"**

1953: U.S. overthrows Prime Minister Mossadeq of Iran. U.S. installs Shah as dictator.  
1954: U.S. overthrows democratically-elected President Arbenz of Guatemala. 200,000 civilians killed.

1963: U.S. backs assassination of South Vietnamese President Diem.

1963-1975: American military kills 4 million civilians in Southeast Asia.

September 11, 1973: U.S. stages coup in Chile.

Democratically elected president Salvador Allende assassinated. Dictator Augusto Pinochet installed. 5,000 Chileans murdered.

1977: U.S. backs military rulers of El Salvador. 70,000 Salvadorans and four American nuns killed.

1980's: U.S. trains Osama bin Laden and fellow terrorists to kill Soviets. CIA gives them \$3 billion.

1981: Reagan administration trains and funds "contras". 30,000 Nicaraguans die.

1982: U.S. provides billions in aid to Saddam Hussein for weapons to kill Iranians.

1983: White House secretly gives Iran weapons to help them kill Iraqis.

1989: CIA agent Manuel Noriega (also serving as President of Panama) disobeys orders from Washington. U.S. invades Panama and removes Noriega. 3,000 Panamanian civilian casualties

1990: Iraq invades Kuwait with weapons from U.S.

1991: U.S. enters Iraq. Bush reinstates dictator of Kuwait.

1998: Clinton bombs "weapons factory" in Sudan. Factory turns out to be making aspirin.

1991 to present: American planes bomb Iraq on a weekly basis. U.N. estimates 500,000 Iraqi children die from bombing and sanctions.

2000-01: U.S. gives Taliban-ruled Afghanistan \$245 million in "aid".

September 11, 2001: Osama Bin Laden uses his expert CIA training to murder 3,000 people.

# Government 'intelligence' report on Iraq revealed as plagiarism

The British government's latest report on Iraq's non-compliance with weapons inspections, which claims to draw on "intelligence material", has been revealed as a wholesale plagiarism of three old and publicly-available articles, one of them by a graduate student in California. The compiler did not even clean up the typos or standardize the spelling.

The dossier, released by the British government on Monday, is entitled "Iraq - Its Infrastructure Of Concealment, Deception And Intimidation". It is reproduced online at <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page7111.asp> (references below to page numbers relate to the downloadable Word version).

The first sentence of the document claims that it draws "upon a number of sources, including intelligence material". This is somewhat misleading. The bulk of the 19-page document (pp.6-16) is directly copied without acknowledgement from an article in last September's Middle East Review of International Affairs entitled "Iraq's Security and Intelligence Network: A Guide and Analysis".

<http://meria.idc.ac.il/journal/2002/issue3/jv6n3a1.html>

The author of the piece is Ibrahim al-Marashi, a postgraduate student at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He has confirmed that his permission was not sought; in fact, he didn't even know about the British document until Glen Rangwala, a Cambridge-based Iraq

analyst, mentioned it to him.

Apart from the obvious criticism that the British government has plagiarised texts without acknowledgement, passing them off as the work of its intelligence services, there are two further serious problems. Firstly, it suggests that the UK at least may not have any independent sources of information on Iraq's internal politics – they just draw upon publicly available data. If they do have independent sources, their intelligence is not being used in the government's public 'case for war'. Thus any further claims to information based on "intelligence data" must be treated with even more scepticism.

Secondly, the information presented as being an accurate statement of the current state of Iraq's security organisations may not be anything of the sort. Marashi - the real and unwitting author of much of the document - has as his primary source the documents captured in 1991 for the Iraq Research and Documentation Project. His own focus is the activities of Iraq's intelligence agencies in Kuwait, Aug90-Jan91 - this is the subject of his thesis. As a result, the information presented as relevant to how Iraqi agencies are currently engaged with Unmovic is 12 years old.

It's quite striking that even Marashi's typographical errors and anomolous uses of grammar are incorporated into the Downing Street document. For example, on p.13, the British dossier incorporates a misplaced comma:

"Saddam appointed, Sabir 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Duri as head"..

Likewise, Marashi's piece also states:

"Saddam appointed, Sabir 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Duri as head"..

The other sources that are extensively plagiarised in the document are two authors from Jane's Intelligence Review:

Ken Gause (an international security analyst from Alexandria, Virginia), "Can the Iraqi Security Apparatus save Saddam" (November 2002), pp.8-13.

Sean Boyne, "Inside Iraq's Security Network", in 2 parts during 1997.

None of the sources are acknowledged, leading the reader to believe that the information is a result of direct investigative work, rather than simply copied from pre-existing internet sources.

The fact that the texts of these three authors are copied directly results in a proliferation of different transliterations (eg different spellings of Ba'th, depending on which author is being copied).

There are two types of changes incorporated into the British document.

Firstly, numbers are increased or are rounded up. So, for example, the section on "Fedayeen Saddam" (pp.15-16) is directly copied from Boyne, almost word for word. The only substantive difference is that Boyne estimates the personnel of the organisation to be 18,000-40,000 (Gause similarly estimates 10-40,000). The British dossier instead writes "30,000 to 40,000". A similar bumping up of figures occurs with the description of the Directorate of Military Intelligence.

The second type of change in the British dossier is that it replaces particular words to make the claim sound stronger. So, for example, most of p.9 on the functions of the Mukhabarat is copied directly from Marashi's article, except that when Marashi writes of its role in

"monitoring foreign embassies in Iraq" this becomes in the British dossier:

"spying on foreign embassies in Iraq".

Similarly, on that same page, whilst Marashi writes of the Mukhabarat:

"aiding opposition groups in hostile regimes"

- the British dossier renders this as:

"supporting terrorist organisations in hostile regimes".

Further examples from the section on "Fedayeen Saddam" include how a reference to how, in Boyne's original text, its personnel are

"recruited from regions loyal to Saddam", referring to their original grouping as "some 10,000-15,000 'bullies and country bumpkins.'"

becomes in the British government's text a reference to how its personnel are:

"press ganged from regions known to be loyal to Saddam" ... "some 10,000-15,000 bullies."

Clearly, a reference to the "country bumpkins" would not have the rhetorical effect that the British government was aiming for.

Finally, there is one serious substantive mistake in the British text, in that it muddles up Boyne's description of General Security (al-Amn al-Amm) and places it in its section on p.14 of Military Security (al-Amn al-Askari). The result is complete confusion: it starts on p.14 by relating how Military Security was created in 1992 (in a piece copied from Marashi), then goes onto talk about the movement of its headquarters - in 1990 (in a piece copied from Boyne on the activities of General Security). The result is that it gets the description of

the Military Security Service wholly wrong, claiming that its head is Taha al-Ahbab (whilst really he was head of General Security in 1997; Military Security was headed by Thabet Khalil).

For reference, here are a few other summary comments on the British document.

Official authors are (in Word Properties) P. Hamill, J. Pratt, A. Blackshaw, and M. Khan.

p.1 is the summary.

pp.2-5 are a repetition of Blix's comments to the Security Council on the difficulties they were encountering, with further claims about the activities of al-Mukhabarat. These are not backed up, eg the claim that car crashes are organised to prevent the speedy arrival of inspectors.

p.6 is a simplified version of Marashi's diagram at: <http://cns.miis.edu/research/iraq/pdfs/iraqint.pdf>

p.7 is copied (top) from Gause (on the Presidential Secretariat), and (middle and bottom) from Boyne (on the National Security Council).

p.8 is entirely copied from Boyne (on the National Security Council).

p.9 is copied from Marashi (on al-Mukhabarat), except for the final section, which is insubstantial.

p.10 is entirely copied from Marashi (on General Security), except for the final section, which is insubstantial.

p.11 is entirely copied from Marashi (on Special Security), except for the top section (on General Security), which is insubstantial.

p.12 is entirely copied from Marashi (on Special Security).

p.13 is copied from Gause (on Special Protection) and Marashi (Military Intelligence).

p.14 is wrongly copied from Boyne (on Military Security) and from Marashi (on the Special Republican Guard).

p.15 is copied from Gause and Boyne (on al-Hadi project / project 858).

pp.15-16 is copied from Boyne (on Fedayeen Saddam).

A final section, on the Tribal Chiefs' Bureau, seems to be copied from a different piece by Cordesman.

For more information please contact Glen Rangwala +44(0)1223 335759 or [gr10009@cam.ac.uk](mailto:gr10009@cam.ac.uk)

I implore you, the American people, to stand behind our war on Iraq....



With our array of spy satellites...



Our network of paid Iraqi informants...



Our state-of-the-art intelligence processing centers...



and by exploiting our burrowing underground "baby nuke" capability at facilities suspected of being able to manufacture anything...



We were able to come up with this!



Sir, isn't that just a bottle of rat poison?



Just RAT POISON? Are you blind? This one vial could plague the whole city of New York with cramps and indigestion if it got in the water supply!



Um, actually GE dumped gallons of it years ago and New Yorkers just got irritable.

