

The Michigan Socialist

Vol. 2, No.3 Fall 2005



Socialist Party Statement on the Bush Regime's Crimes in New Orleans P.2

War, Peace and Exit Planning in Ann Arbor by Ben Burgis, p.8

Liberation or World Domination? A New Precedent for American Imperialism by Matt Erard, p.12

The Michigan Socialist is the voice of the Socialist Party of Michigan, a feminist and revolutionary democratic socialist party of the working class. For more information, check us out at <http://www.spmichigan.org>



Socialist Party of Michigan Statement on the Crisis in New Orleans

We of the Socialist Party of Michigan want to express our most sincere solidarity and sympathy with all the victims of Hurricane Katrina. At the same time we are outraged, as are millions of other Americans, at the cavalier and arrogant attitudes, the bureaucratic bungling, the total insensitivity, the petty jurisdictional squabbling, and the absolute dysfunction that have characterized the behavior of the capitalist politicians and governmental functionaries of both major political parties.

While thousands die of thirst, drowning, exposure and starvation in New Orleans, and thousands more suffer in Mississippi and Alabama, the politicians and bureaucrats at all levels of government haggle over who is supposed to contact

whom and who did or did not do what. The city officials of New Orleans did not really grasp the scope of the calamity and they were slow to fully react, but at a certain point they probably did all they could under the circumstances, which was almost nothing given the immense scale of the catastrophe. They angrily demanded action from the federal government, the only level of authority that could conceivably mobilize the response that was needed, but even at the city level the main concern seems to increasingly have been "restoring law and order", which really means "don't touch the rich man's property". The Louisiana governor wrung her hands over "lawlessness", and the criminal Bush regime postured, tried to cover up its incompetence, and called for "zero tolerance" for so-called "looters".



Tragically, not all lives could have been saved in this catastrophe no matter what was done. But the lack of real, comprehensive planning or even close to adequate action taken by city, state, and federal officials, both before and after the hurricane hit, to evacuate and protect the community residents in New Orleans who were and are without the resources to leave, is a crime against humanity and a gross and utter failure of the social system of capitalism and its willingness to act decisively for the benefit of working people and the poor.

While many heroic efforts beyond the call of duty were carried out by rank and file rescue workers and public servants, as well as by private citizens and charities acting on their own, no attempts were made by those in charge at the top to help the 20% of the New Orleans population who had no cars, money, or place to evacuate to. The sick, young, disabled, poor and elderly, mostly African American, were forgotten, or just dismissed as too much trouble to save. City evacuation "plans" left them there to die, and put the

resources into saving the survivors after the storm had passed, instead of helping them get out before. This 20% (or about 100,000) were those who are most affected by capitalism, with an average per capita income of 1/3 of that of the white population of New Orleans. The working people of America continue to bare the brunt of the lack of concern by government to invest adequately in infrastructure and natural disaster planning.

Money for the levees was cut and diverted to tax breaks for the rich (such as many of those able to flee New Orleans and those who have adequate insurance) and for the illegal and imperialist war in Iraq. Not enough National Guard troops were available to help in the storm crisis because they are in Iraq, along with their trucks and equipment. Meanwhile, Bush and the others whine that "no one expected the levees to break ..." -- a direct and utter lie. Studies done over years and years have shown and warned about how vulnerable New Orleans is.

We have seen and heard enough bullshit.
We demand total, unlimited action now!



The Socialist Party of Michigan calls for and demands the following, immediately and at a minimum - things that should have been done in the first place:

Declare an immediate national emergency and federalize all governmental levels in the affected area. Mobilize the entire federal government and the entire armed forces of all kinds. Bypass the bureaucratic red tape. Immediately issue executive orders commandeering ALL needed resources within at least a 1000 mile radius from the disaster area --- non-perishable, ready to eat food; baby formulas and bottles; bottled water and means to purify and boil water; clothing, diapers, tents, tarps, sleeping bags, blankets, etc.; basic life saving medicines and drugs; all hospitals and clinics, private and public;

all means of public and private transport, including buses and bus fleets of all kinds, semi trucks, truck fleets, aircraft, helicopters, trains, boats, etc.; all construction materials, construction companies and crews; generators of all sizes; flashlights and batteries; all fuel and gasoline; all buildings, warehouses and large luxury homes to use for shelter; all hotel and motel rooms; portable/chemical toilets; portable showers and hot water; anti-bacterial lotions and hand cleaner, along with paper and cloth towels; anything else that is necessary. Pay reasonable amounts for all these resources as soon as possible, but no price gouging.

Call for massive volunteer forces and all NGO's and mobilize the labor movement from all around the country. Mobilize human service professionals and therapists from everywhere, as well as all types of medical personnel. Accept the generous offer from Cuba to send over 1100 medical personnel and 26 tons of supplies. Hire the unemployed from all around the country, especially hurricane victims themselves. Pay a decent wage of at least twelve dollars an hour, untaxed, for as long as the crisis lasts, which will be many months at least.

Set up staging areas for workers of all kinds and soldiers to gather and coordinate. Full rank and file input into planning and execution. Decisions on the ground to be made by the rank and file doing the work and intervention. Bring all road transportation means to the staging areas. Plan the building of relief camps and refugee centers and organize crews to build them. Democratic, on-the-spot self government in camps and centers. Deputize and arm residents to



patrol and defend their own communities against genuinely predatory crime and sociopathic violence. For full democratic cooperation between these deputized forces and rank and file troops.

Establish a matrix of supply bases near the disaster area. Establish delivery crews and convoys. Seize all materials and supplies within the 1000 mile radius and ship them to the supply bases and building crews. Open all warehouses with needed materials and commandeer the company trucks of Walmart, Costco, K-Mart, etc.!

Ship the materials and distribute them to refugee camps and to the city itself directly. Then, each truck, bus, train, airplane, helicopter, etc., pick up passengers/refugees and evacuate them out of New Orleans to safe areas. Every means of rescue must double alternately as a means of delivery and supply. No jurisdictional or job description nonsense, not in an emergency of this scale.

Establish government-imposed price controls at every level of the system to

stop oil companies or other businesses from using the hurricane as an excuse for gouging working people at the pump or at stores. Prosecute gougers to the fullest extent of the law. No diversion of cops or troops from search and rescue to protecting the "property rights" of abandoned stores from hurricane victims taking what they need. All law enforcement and military vehicles to carry relief supplies at all times, and distribute them. Total amnesty for any one arrested for "looting", and serious criminal prosecution of any cops or troops involved in acts of brutality or murder against them. Full criminal prosecution of military officers, police officials, or political figures who issue "shoot to kill" orders. For the right, and duty, of rank and file enforcers to refuse these orders and to arrest superiors who issue them. For the right of self defense against such police or other forces. The "looted" goods can't ever be sold anyway, they are storm damaged and are covered by insurance in most cases.

Cancel all debts of the victims, including credit cards and mortgages. Absolutely

protect the rights of homeowners and city residents to return to New Orleans and other destroyed places and to rebuild. No "eminent domain" takeovers by predatory corporations or governments.



Guaranteed employment at living, union wages for victims who can work. A guaranteed living compensation for all victims who can not work for whatever reason.

All the above, and more, must be ordered immediately and simultaneously. In addition:

Around 40% of the Mississippi and Louisiana National Guardsmen are in Iraq being misused in a war for oil and empire instead of in the Mississippi and Louisiana saving lives. Bring all the troops home now! Bring all their equipment home too.

Funds for Hurricane research and the National Hurricane center have been cut by the Bush Administration and should be restored; call for large-scale public investment in the construction of low cost, scattered site, community-based, high-quality housing that will sustain flooding and hurricane damage; call for the creation of fully funded public transportation systems between cities, with fares set low enough to be a viable alternative to the use of the automobile; end to the portrayal of "looters" in racial undertones; call to all community organizers across the country to come to the aid of those most in need in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and other affected states.

Sign and implement the Kyoto accord and end environmental degradation! Honor the Earth and she will honor us. Super storms like Katrina are made more likely by global warming. They are very likely the product of the violation of environmental balance, caused by predatory human actions. We must learn from the traditions of our Native American sisters and brothers.

We also must re-build New Orleans and build new levees, stronger than ever. We must restore natural wetlands, beaches, barrier islands and other natural barriers to storm damage. We must provide full funding for grants to re-build homes and compensate for lost livelihoods for those dispossessed in the whole multi-state

disaster area, whether they have "insurance" or not.

If the government will not do these things immediately and without hesitation, then the people have the right to take matters into their own hands to carry them out. To some extent this has already been done. No one who can help should wait for "orders" from above. People should just do what they can and what is right.

In any event, a massive, united, multi-faceted movement of the working people and the oppressed must be built to organize our common struggles against the destructive capitalist system, and to strengthen our own sense and our own reality of community, during normal times and during disasters. In the end, capitalism cannot and will not provide security and prosperity for the overwhelming majority of humankind,

either against "natural" disasters or the un-natural decay of a degenerate social system.

For a government of democratic councils and assemblies of working people, soldiers, and the oppressed! No faith or trust in the capitalist system or its state! Invoke and implement the spirit and power of the Declaration of Independence!

[Note: Socialist Party of Michigan member Sam Mesik and Socialist Party of New Jersey member Sean White are down in New Orleans now volunteering with EBS (an anti-authoritarian mutual aid group operating a free clinic there-- www.dominantfiction.com/EBS.html) in the face of the hostility of the local police and authorities. The next issue of "The Michigan Socialist" should include an update on their activities.]





War, Peace and “Exit Planning” in Ann Arbor by Ben Burgis

Unable to make it to the main event in D.C., I found myself in Ann Arbor on Saturday, September 24th, for the historic anti-war protest of 300,000 people, including large contingents of Iraq veterans, trade unionists and others. Even in Ann Arbor, we had 'over 500 people' according to the Ann Arbor news, which sounds right--and is pretty good for local protests in mid-Michigan (especially with so many people who would otherwise go on buses to D.C. last weekend).

I'd had mixed feelings about going, since the main organizing slogan for the Ann Arbor event was beyond awful--"we demand an exit strategy," which is the sort of thing that even people who basically support the war could go along with. Since a meeting with Congressman Dingell was scheduled at the end of the rally, I assume that the slogan was designed to appear respectable enough so as not to scare off the Congressman--a moderate hawk who voted against the initial invasion but strongly supports the continued occupation/war of counter-insurgency against the Iraqi people.

There was some talk of taking security precautions to guarantee that no one would try to rush the stage when Dingell

spoke (which, more's the pity, wasn't a problem...a few incidents like that would do him good). It was pointed out by multiple people that the slogans of marches aren't really determined in practice by the official organizers (in this case the rather contemptible Michigan Peace Works, whose pre-invasion slogan had been "negotiation, not military action") but by the signs and chants of the people at the march itself, and that the overriding message that any one seeing or hearing about it (and 90% of the people participating) would take away anyway was simple opposition to the war, not whatever nuanced slogan the organizers chose to express it.

There were feeder marches from the U of M campus and from one of the local high schools marching to the take-off site for the main march. I joined the U of M students at their feeder march take-off site, because it was the only location I knew in Ann Arbor (the student union, where we have most SPMI meetings). The feeder march was fairly small (maybe 20-30 people) and the politics were in many ways worse than the main march. A large slice of the participants were from the Campus Democrats, who were clearly unused to and uncomfortable with participating in such events in many ways. When one of the more militant non-white students started a chant of "hey hey, ho ho, George W. has got to go", some of the campus Dems around me looked uncomfortable, laughed ruefully and said "it's too late." The idea of driving some one out of office in between elections through domestic resistance (despite the historical precedent a few decades ago)--or even simply using the slogan of impeachment as a way to highlight W.'s war crimes and crimes against humanity

and what should happen to him (even if you think it won't)--simply doesn't enter into these people's worldview. To them, politics is for trained professionals and the only thing the rest of us can do about is vote.

When we got to the main march site things were looking considerably better. There were hundreds of people there already, making signs, drumming, getting set up. There was a New Orleans-style jazz band playing up front. Despite my dislike of the official leaders of the Ann Arbor peace movement, I have to say that it was still heartening to go to this. There was (despite, not because of, the organizers having a slogan to the right of where most of the American people are at, at this point) an incredibly outpouring of people and energy at this thing, more so than I've seen in any of the anti-war demo's since Feb. 15, 2003 (when we had 4,000 or so people marching in a state-wide demo in Lansing, the largest such event at the state capitol since the Vietnam era). So many anti-war protests since then have seemed like efforts by the hard core (whether liberal pacifists or radical 'direct action' kids) to keep the embers burning. (Granted, most of that has been in East Lansing or Kalamazoo, but I think the observation holds across the state.) This seemed more like the spirit of Feb.15 again--a real outpouring of popular opposition with a life of its own. There were groups from no less than 8 area high schools participating, there were Muslims in traditional garb, U of M students, a large contingent of Veterans for Peace, etc., etc., etc. There was a table with poster board and markers to make signs, so I made one with "FUCK 'EXIT STRATEGIES'--BRING THE TROOPS HOME NOW!"

in huge letters, accompanied by a little drawing of one stick figure asking another stick figure, "excuse me, sir, when do you plan on running out of napalm?" I marched with that sign the whole time, and got a few strange looks from liberal types, but no negative comments and several enthusiastically positive comments, including (hilariously) one from an official Michigan Peace Works march monitor.

(This is something that a few words should be said about: the presence of these sorts of monitors, which MPW and similar groups are fond of, says a lot about the authoritarian underbelly of this type of liberal pacifist. Although self-appointed, they believe that being the first people to get a permit means they own the event, and they have a right/duty to police the ranks of protest participants and give them orders. I don't, and although when and whether to do so in any given context is a tactical question, I think disobeying 'march monitors' can be an important form of civil disobedience.)

It's also worth noting that even the people who accepted MPW's b.s. also had some much more supportable slogans in the mix, without realizing the contradiction: e.g. the truck with the jazz



band on it had one banner with "we

demand an exit strategy" and another one saying "no blood for oil."



Now, kids, let's think about this...which is it? If it's a war for corporate oil profits, then how can you support sticking around long enough to make sure the local puppet government supported and installed by the colonialist oil men is ready to take the reigns? If the U.S. has some supportable war goals that are worth sticking around to secure (rather than immediately and unconditionally pulling out), why call it a war "for oil", rather than for the supportable goals you think the US is fighting for in Iraq? It doesn't make any sense. Similarly, you can't hold up a sign with a picture of Casey Sheehan and the slogan "I stand with Cindy" if you don't stand with Cindy's stand on the war--bringing the troops home *now.* (Unlike certain Ann Arbor liberals, Cindy understands that making even one more mother go through what she has by sticking around so much as another month is unacceptable.) Still, there are definitely problems there that create an opening for more consistent opponents of the war.

Anyway, it was a pretty good march through downtown Ann Arbor, ending with a silent trek through a campus path with 1,000 crosses and other symbols to commemorate the working-class kids in uniform that have already been

sacrificed at the altar of Haliburton (there wouldn't be room for the more accurate 2,000) and a concert and rally at the end. I was disappointed to see the main MPW speaker going on about a petition to get Congressmen to support the "Out of Iraq" resolution, which calls for BEGINNING to pull out troops in late 2006. Not finishing in late 2006, which would be ridiculous enough, considering that it took them all of three weeks to drive into Baghdad under the enemy fire of a still somewhat intact Iraqi army. It certainly shouldn't take much longer than that to pull them out (under the cease-fire with the insurgents that could easily be brokered for a pullout). Anyway, how many more Gold Star Moms for Peace would you accumulate in an another entire year of bombings, raids, patrols and sweeps in Iraq?

No, this is a resolution to pull the troops out *starting* in more than a year from now. Contrast to the opinion polls that have been showing for a while now that most Americans want to start pulling out at least some troops *now,* with a significant segment wanting to pull them all out now--and, if asked how to pay for rebuilding New Orleans, the majority will say "by bringing the troops home from Iraq." (I was happy to see a great many signs and banners making the Iraq-New Orleans connection very stark.) Pathetic. What's even more pathetic (I left before Dingell got there) was that another speaker said that "Dingell is basically on our side, but he needs to be prodded to do more," whereas according to the Ann Arbor News report he said point blank when he spoke that he would not even support the resolution to START pulling out in October 2006, since (although he voted against the

initial invasion), it's important to stick around for as long as it takes to "defeat" the insurgency and guarantee "stability"- -i.e. to force the natives to accept the puppet government we imposed on them, complete with permanent US bases, privatization of the country's national resources and all the rest. This is the guy whose "basically" on their side? How?

Even if putting pressure on elected Democrats was a good strategy (it isn't), this kind of shit would still be self-defeating. If the movement is willing to water down its position beyond recognition to be respectable to the politicians, what possible incentive do the politicians have to even meet you half-way to save face? That is to say, if they water down their program to being within an inch of what you already stand for, you don't sound unreasonable refusing to budge that extra inch, because you're already saying something pretty similar.

Now, a sit-in at Congressman Dingell's office to demand that he switch his position might do some good, but orienting everything around a meeting to beg him politely?

Liberation or world domination? A new precedent for American imperialism By: Matt Erard (Chair, Socialist Party of Michigan)

When George W. Bush officially declared the "war on terror" in 2001, the term and initial concept were nothing new in Washington. The war was first declared by Ronald Reagan in 1981 when he affirmed that a war on terrorism would be the core of U.S. foreign policy. The applications of both Reagan's and Bush's declarations of a war on terror shared the similar contradictions of

Anyway, despite the abysmal politics of the organizers, the depth and breadth of participation by people from all around the community, the diversity of groups and individuals, and the fact that (as far as I could tell) most people there supported the "out now" wing of the anti-war movement were all definitely encouraging signs that the anti-war movement really has started to turn a corner and return to something of the energy and scale it had back in 2003.



That makes it all the more important that the people who squandered the movement last time around by folding it up to focus everything on electing the enthusiastically pro-war Kerry and who (as proved by the spineless slogans and meetings with Dingell) have learned nothing from the experience, not be allowed to set the tone for round two

vastly surpassing any other country in the world in the direction and funding of terrorism abroad and using the word "terrorist" to label nearly all political enemies, including many of the most helpless victims of U.S. sponsored aggression. Incidentally, it was in the midst of Reagan's first war on terrorism when the U.S. became the first and only country in the world to be found guilty

by the World Court of international terrorism.

The conceptual foundation of Reagan's declaration of a war on terrorism was to camouflage the terrorism conducted by the United States and ensure that it received sufficient congressional funding. George Bush Sr. and Bill Clinton also used the term publicly to mask the motives of U.S. sponsored aggression. Modeled on the success of this subterfuge for the last three presidential administrations, the Bush regime initially used the war on terror concept for identical reasons. The difference however, is that the ambitions of the Bush regime are far more vast.

While Regan's war on terror relied primarily on the curtain of covert operatives and financing the terrorism of despotic puppet governments, the Bush regime has been able to use the September 11th 2001 attacks to build popular support for direct military combat in its continued and increasingly central imperialist objectives. With Bush's greater capability to use overt in addition to covert operations, the scope of U.S. power and potential control is significantly escalated.

The most distinctive aspect of Bush's war on terror has been its gradualism. Before invading Iraq, which had been a central objective of the Bush regime long before it came to power, Bush

immediately used the September 11th attacks to invade Afghanistan since it had the most credulity due to its alleged harboring of Osama bin Laden.

While using Afghanistan as its first precursor the Bush regime immediately began to blow the fog of fear and victory toward its next step on its agenda. With tremendous public support resulting from the Bush regime's endless jingoism, apocalyptic warnings, and rapid overthrow of the Afghan Taliban, the Bush regime succeeded in winning sufficient domestic support to invade Iraq. With the Bush regime's insistence on Iraq's possession of stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction as well as its connections with Al Qaeda and involvement in the World Trade Center attacks, it wasn't hard for many of those who believed in the war on terror concept in the first place to believe that invading Iraq was the truly the next step to ensure the safety of Americans.

The point at which the discovery that Iraq's WMD and ties to Al Qaeda were non-existent marked the end of the war on terror carried over from the Reagan administration and the beginning of a new calculated precedent for U.S. foreign policy.

The consistent admonition of the Bush regime by liberal capitalist intellectuals for its foolish, but honest mistake suffocates under any level of scrutiny. It



was well known before the invasion to nearly everyone with any knowledge of Iraq's military capabilities, UNSCOM reports, and irreconcilable interests with bin Laden that Iraq had no weapons of mass destruction or any connections whatsoever with militant Islamists. It would not have been even remotely possible that the Bush regime was unaware of the inaccuracies in its pre-war statements about Iraq.



As Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz bluntly stated in an interview in *Vanity Fair* magazine after the WMD had proven non-existent ““For bureaucratic reasons, we settled on one issue, weapons of mass destruction, because it was the one reason everyone could agree on.”

Many who were familiar with Iraq's weapon capabilities before the invasion assumed that the Bush regime would likely plant weapons of mass destruction in Iraq after Saddam Hussein was deposed since they were so vital for justifying the war. Such an action of mass deception would not be beyond the Bush regime, judging from its past record, and could have been conducted with little difficulty or risk. Planting weapons, however, would have confined the Bush regime's global war to the ruse of combating potential military and terrorist threats and limited the new precedent for which it planned to set.

The invasion of Iraq, according to the Bush regime, after its initial justifications proved false, was truly about liberating the Iraqis from tyrannical rule and establishing freedom and democracy. Any mention of weapons of mass destruction disappeared from Bush's speeches as though such a claim had never been made at all. The new precedent set by the Bush regime for waging wars of aggression transformed from the already clearly absurd notion of protecting American security preemptively to liberating the rest of the world's population from “tyrannical rule”.

The aggressive liberation precedent first became formalized in Bush's second Inaugural address on January 20th in which he indirectly declared war on the rest of the world. Marking the transition from the security standard to the liberation standard, Bush stated “We have seen our vulnerability - and we have seen its deepest source. For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny - prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder - violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a mortal threat.”

Most notable about Bush's inauguration speech was the absence of any reference to terrorism, terror, or the supposed war that the U.S. was waging against it, despite the fact that the war on terror had been the stated foundation of U.S. foreign policy during Bush's first term.

The revelations after the invasion of Iraq had largely destroyed the credibility the U.S. would need to continue its

imperialist wars on merely a preemptively defensive basis. This apparent setback, however, was no mistake. The only conclusion that can be rationally drawn is that the Bush regime had calculated the eventual disclosure of Iraq's inability to actually threaten the United States in order to premier its new precedent of launching aggressive wars for "liberation".

The mendacious propaganda about Iraq's weapons and the security threat it posed was useful only for building up to this point. Through appeals to patriotism and "supporting our troops" in a just cause, the support for aggressive war on the basis of security is easily transferable for many to support for aggressive war on this even looser and broader concoction. Although the Bush regime has taken the expected loss of support among some of its prior war supporters since its first justifications for the invasion of Iraq were exposed, if invasions on this new basis can achieve even the status of being controversial, then the forces of U.S. imperialism can claim victory and likely continue in their pursuits.

The precedent of aggressive "liberation" is particularly significant as a new development in U.S. foreign policy because it broadens the scope of targets for U.S. imperialism. If this precedent proves successful it will no longer require U.S. officials to sell the belief to the public that its targets for direct military aggression pose an immediate threat to the United States. Instead it merely requires officials to sell the belief that its targets are hostile to "freedom" or that their hostility to freedom will likely one day lead them to threaten U.S. security. Political targets such as Cuba

or Venezuela, which the U.S. would have had to rely on middlemen and covert operations to overthrow in the past, may now become targets of full scale war.

Even the term "war on terror" has started to fade from the propaganda of the Bush regime since July when Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and other regime officials began referring instead to "the global struggle against violent extremism." General Richard Meyers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that "the threat instead should be defined as violent extremism, with the recognition that terror is the method they use."



As if the term "terror" were not vague enough, the relativity of the word "extremism" makes it applicable in the right context to nearly everyone. With the ease that the U.S. has had throughout the past two decades in labeling its political enemies as terrorists as it wages assaults against them, its success in such a pursuit can only be enhanced if it achieves credibility in openly attacking its political enemies simply for being "extremists." It is probably no coincidence that the term "extremist" has been used primarily by members of

the powerful elite in the past to refer to members of the revolutionary left.

The term “violent” is equally vague and broad, with a dictionary definition that restricts its use only to that showing great force and intensity. The term “violent” in the right context can at least be applied to any government if not also at least some elements of almost every political grouping. The use of the word “struggle” is equally manipulative since it will likely be used to perpetuate the notion that the U.S. is the underdog in its antagonisms.

The strategy of gradualism by the Bush regime in establishing new precedents for foreign policy has been paralleled by its strategy of continuously testing the waters in its domestic crackdown on civil liberties and human rights. Beginning with the passage of the USA PATRIOT ACT and the removal of post-COINTELPRO restrictions placed on the activities of the FBI, the Bush regime has been in the process of regularly unfolding evermore repressive measures to crackdown on dissent and strip Americans of their most fundamental rights.

Feeding off the wave of the government and media promoted racism that swept the nation after the 2001 terrorist attacks; the Bush regime initially targeted

primarily Arab and Islamic Americans to test the limits on public tolerance of its domestic oppression. With the success of the Bush regime’s crackdown on the civil liberties of Muslim and Arab Americans, it has now begun to increasingly target political dissidents and is still in the process of drafting far more repressive legislation.

It is very likely that a combination of the unanticipated persistence of Iraqi resistance and the international anti-war movement has been responsible for stalling the U.S. from engaging in any more direct wars since the invasion of Iraq thus far. Although only the abolition of the profit system can bring an end to escalating imperialism and the economic crisis which fuels it, an international anti-war movement that is independent from the parties of capital is the only force that can limit and stall imperialist attacks within the existing system. The United States anti-war movement is slowly recovering after suffering a significant setback when large sections of it became co-opted by the Democratic Party in the 2004 elections. The growth of the anti-war movement in both size and political consciousness is paramount at the current juncture.





Quote of the Year:

“There, I used the ‘I’ word, imperialism, and now I’m going to use another ‘I’ word, impeachment, because we cannot have these people pardoned. They need to be tried on war crimes and go to jail.”

--Cindy Sheehan, reflecting on the ‘noble cause’ her son Casey was sent off to die for. Here at “The Michigan Socialist,” we concur with both of her “I” words and we would suggest an “R” word as well.

For more information, check us out at

<http://www.spmichigan.org>

Socialist Party of Michigan : P.O. Box 3285, Kalamazoo, MI 49003-3285 • Email: spmi@spmichigan.org • Phone: (269) 598-0534