

GI SPECIAL 3D32:

**THIS IS HOW BUSH BRINGS THE TROOP HOME:
BRING THEM ALL HOME NOW!**



A photo of U.S. Army Sgt. 1st Class Ramon Acevedo Aponte during a wake in Penuelas, Puerto Rico, Nov. 7, 2005. Acevedo Aponte, age 51, was killed when a bomb exploded near his humvee in Rustamiyah. (AP Photo/Brennan Linsley)

Resistance Attacks In Ramadi: Captain Jeffrey Pool Caught Telling Unbelievably Stupid Lies

Dec. 1, 2005 (AP) & BBC

Insurgents attacked US bases and government offices in Ramadi, in central Iraq, and then dispersed throughout the city, reports say.

Heavily-armed insurgents fired mortars and rockets at the buildings and then occupied several main streets, residents told news agencies.

The attacks in Ramadi occurred as local tribal leaders and U.S. military officials were to hold their second meeting in a week at the governor's office in the city center.

Police Lt. Mohammed al-Obaidi said at least four mortar rounds fell near the U.S. base on the eastern edge of the city, but that there were no reports of casualties.

An AP Television News video showed the insurgents walking down a shuttered market street and a residential neighborhood, *as well as firing four mortar rounds.*

US Marines spokesman Captain Jeffrey Pool told the AFP news agency the militants had simply fired a rocket propelled grenade at a joint US-Iraqi observation post at 0930 (0630 GMT).

Captain Pool accused the militants of exaggerating the scale of the attack.

"This is clearly a sign of how desperate insurgents have become," he said. [This pathetic bullshit is a sign of how desperate Captain Jeffrey Pool and the other lying brass have become. What's so hard to believe is that he thinks he can get away with it.]

Residents told the Reuters news agency earlier that hundreds of heavily armed men in masks had for a time patrolled the main streets of the city and set up checkpoints.

Residents said there was no noticeable presence of US or Iraqi forces in the city after the attacks. [Surely they overlooked Captain Jeffrey Pool, observing so carefully what was going on, so he could report it later. Or was he off someplace else, indulging his fantasy life in perfect safety? But what did he have to fear, if there were no "insurgents" around, and it was all just a big "exaggeration"?)

The attack came as 2000 US Marines and 500 Iraqi soldiers launched an offensive against insurgents in Hit, east of the River Euphrates, not far from Ramadi. [Far enough, it would seem. So the resistance hits Ramadi. Whack-a-mole goes on.]

IRAQ WAR REPORTS

II MEF MARINE DIES FROM FALLUJAH SMALL-ARMS FIRE

December 1, 2005 HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND NEWS
RELEASE Number: 05-12-02C

CAMP FALLUJAH, Iraq – A Marine assigned to Regimental Combat Team 8, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward), died of wounds received from small arms fire while conducting combat operations against the enemy in Fallujah, Nov. 30.

ANOTHER MARINE KILLED IN ACTION IN FALLUJAH

December 1, 2005 HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND NEWS
RELEASE Number: 05-12-04C

CAMP FALLUJAH, Iraq – A Marine assigned to Regimental Combat Team 8, 2nd Marine Division, II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward), was killed in action by small arms fire while conducting combat operations against the enemy in Fallujah, Nov. 30.

TAJI BASED TASK FORCE BAGHDAD SOLDIER DIES FROM GUNSHOT WOUND

December 1, 2005 HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND NEWS
RELEASE Number: 05-12-01C & AFP

BAGHDAD, Iraq — A Task Force Baghdad Soldier based in the Taji military base died as a result of a gunshot wound north of Baghdad Nov. 30. He died in the medical treatment facility. The military would not elaborate on the nature of the incident.

II MEF MARINE DIES IN AL TAQADDUM VEHICLE ACCIDENT

December 1, 2005 HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND NEWS
RELEASE Number: 05-12-03C

CAMP FALLUJAH, Iraq – A Marine assigned to the 2nd Marine Aircraft Wing, II Marine Expeditionary Force (Forward), died in a non-hostile vehicle accident near Al Taqaddum, Iraq Nov. 30.

REALLY BAD PLACE TO BE: BRING THEM ALL HOME NOW.



U.S. soldiers walk near the site of a car bomb attack in Kadim district, northwest Baghdad, October 31, 2005. (Ceerwan Aziz/Reuters)

TROOP NEWS

Pennsylvania Guard “Stretched So Thin” That It Won't Be Able To Send Fully Equipped Units To Iraq Next Year

Dec. 01, 2005 Associated Press

LATROBE, Pa. - Most U.S. troops will leave Iraq within a year because the Army is "broken, worn out" and "living hand to mouth," Rep. John Murtha told a civic group.

Murtha, a decorated Vietnam war veteran, said the Pennsylvania National Guard is "stretched so thin" that it won't be able to send fully equipped units to Iraq next year.

Murtha predicted it will cost \$50 billion to upgrade military equipment nationwide, but says the federal government is already reducing future purchases to save money.

Lt. Col. Chris Cleaver, spokesman for the Pennsylvania National Guard at Fort Indiantown Gap, said "there are some deployment concerns."

Cleaver said some guard units had to leave equipment in Iraq when they returned to the United States, which could cause training problems here.

But Cleaver also said most of the 2,100 Guard troops now deployed with the 2nd Brigade Combat Team can't be sent back to Iraq for a second tour of duty anyway, because of regulations that limit redeployment.

IRAQ RESISTANCE ROUNDUP

ASSORTED RESISTANCE ACTION:



An Iraqi policeman views a burnt vehicle following an attack on an advisor to the interior minister in Baghdad December 1, 2005. (Thaier Al-Sudani/Reuters)

Dec. 1, 2005 (AP) & Aljazeera & (Reuters)

Resistance fighters attacked the six-vehicle convoy of a Saad al-Obeidi, an adviser to Iraq's defense minister, seriously wounding him along with two of his bodyguards in the Yarmouk neighborhood of Baghdad, police said.

BASRA - An Iraqi translator who had worked with British forces was assassinated on Wednesday in the southern city of Basra, police said.

**IF YOU DON'T LIKE THE RESISTANCE
END THE OCCUPATION**

**GET THE MESSAGE?
UNWANTED:
NO HONORABLE MISSION:
REMEMBER THE OCCUATION POLL?
*42% OF IRAQIS FAVOR KILLING U.S.
TROOPS***



An US soldier from 1st Battalion, 184th Infantry Regiment in the Sunni Al-Dura neighborhood, southwest of Baghdad.

Rebels attacked a US-Iraqi base in the restive western city of Ramadi, hours after the US president outlined his strategy for winning the war in Iraq. (AFP/Mauricio Lima)

FORWARD OBSERVATIONS

**A History Of U.S. Armed Forces
Rebellions:
Conclusion**

As generals and war planners arrogantly declare the inevitability of U.S. empire and the common cause of military might, and likewise as the Bush Doctrine today boldly declares a permanent war against terrorism, waged for peace, Vietnam may prove an invaluable lesson to remember.

While war-planning is made in the air-conditioned rooms and safe havens far away from combat action, wars are fought on the ground by working-class troops who may not only serve, but may also be the soldiers who rebel.

By Martin Smith (Sgt. USMC; out of service)

Writing this was about healing a really dark chapter in my life, my experience in the marine corps. The words I wrote came out of an inner pain and experience that needed to heal.

But most of all, I hope that my words in some way bring an end to this god damn war and that no one else will have to come back in a body bag.

This isn't about me, it's all about bringing the troops home now,

Martin Smith

Conclusion:

We went to the New York World's Fair, saw what the past had been like, according to the Ford Motor Car Company and Walt Disney, saw what the future would be like, according to General Motors. And I asked myself about the present: how wide it was, how deep it was, how much was mine to keep.

Kurt Vonnegut's Slaughterhouse-Five or The Children's Crusade

If we do not speak of it, others will surely rewrite the script. Each of the body bags, all of the mass graves will be reopened and their contents abracadabraed into a noble cause.

George Swiers, Vietnam veteran

Race and class were at the heart of the soldiers' rebellion in Vietnam.

Soldiers' work within a squad informed their means of resistance from individual troops into collective action based on bonds of intimacy. Grunts went on "search and destroy" missions that shaped their consciousness into contradictory responses that contained both the brutality of war but also the possibility of transformation.

The same troops who committed war atrocities sometimes emerged as fighters for “peace from below.” Soldiers moved from loyal “insiders” to rebellious “outsiders” who challenged the most sacred of military institutions—the obedience to orders.

Individual combat refusals mushroomed to involve mutinies by whole companies.

When troops returned to base camp from their labor in the field, different opportunities and conditions produced resistance.

A class war within the military pitted soldiers against their officers and non-commissioned officers, and race divided blacks against whites, mirroring the racial tensions that erupted in the United States. In response to the soldiers’ rebellion in Vietnam, the military initiated reforms that included the liberalization of command policy, the end of the draft, and even the termination of the ground war.

The soldiers’ rebellion in Vietnam as a labor study, intersecting race, class, and resistance, challenges the boundaries of the Vietnam anti-war movement and expands the framework of working-class history. Yet today, the memory of Vietnam War protest is contested terrain. The main actors have been recast as white middle-class campus radicals who went too far, if not busy spitting on returning troops then plotting terrorist attacks on government targets along with the Weather Underground.

Pro-war villains of the past, such as Robert McNamara, have reemerged as anti-war heroes of today, and anti-war heroes of the past, such as John Kerry, have elected to redefine their image from war dissenter into terrorist fighter. Moreover, the “leadership, courage, and sacrifice” that earned Kerry the Silver Star, Bronze Star, and three Purple Hearts, promoted on the Kerry website, contradicts the presidential hopeful’s own personal history of opposing the war.

In fact, over thirty years ago on April 23, 1971, John Kerry and his medals defined heroism on different terms. As a member of Vietnam Veterans against the War, Kerry along with hundreds of other veterans, pitched his ribbons over a wire fence at the Capitol steps. According to Kerry, “I did what I thought was right, and I’m very proud of what I did—I threw back my ribbons.” The Kerry of 1971, proud to discard his medals, and the Kerry of 2004, proud to retain his medals, is a twist of historic irony.

Attempts to obscure the historical memory of the Vietnam Anti-War Movement are rooted in the desire to turn the “bad war” into a “noble cause,” as President Reagan declared. By repackaging the history of protest as a privileged white middle-class minority of the population, the effect is that the wide range of dissenting voices are silenced, if not forgotten: voices that challenge the dominant ideas about whom, which ethnicity, and what class actually opposed the war.

Yet sometimes events of the present can unearth and cast open moments of the past that are locked away and sealed in the dark closets of forgotten bones and skeletons. Fragmented memories of dissent come to life when a present war in another country produces similar grounds of contestation, new battles being waged and another war within.

On October 15, 2004 the Jackson, Mississippi's Clarion-Ledger, published "Platoon defies orders in Iraq" on its front page.

According to the article, seventeen members from the 343rd Quartermaster Company, an Army reserve unit from Rock Hill, South Carolina, refused a "suicide mission" in Iraq, because they considered their vehicles unsafe. Of note, the unit contains three women and fourteen men, in what may be the first defiance in combat by men and women together.

Amber McClenny, one of the unit members, left the following message on her mother's voicemail back in the states and claimed she was under arrest, "They are holding us against our will...We are now prisoners." The wife of sergeant Michael Butler, member of the 343rd as well, told the reporter, "When my husband refuses to follow an order it has to be something major."

In interviews that appeared on CNN after the story broke, family members and their voices, largely African American, reveal how the war in Iraq, with its all-volunteer force, is still dependent on working-class people to fill its ranks. It also exposes that the obedience to any and all orders from soldiers is not a guaranteed conclusion. Soldiers have agency and are rediscovering the same collective tools of resistance that erupted in Vietnam.

Similarly, underground newspapers that flourished in Vietnam are returning--but this time in a new form, via the Internet. Thomas Barton, who contributed to and distributed Vietnam GI in the sixties, is now producing GI Special (<http://www.militaryproject.org>).

GI Special is an Internet news source that includes a collection of articles from other media that are specific to the concerns of troops in Iraq and their families.

Traveling Soldier (traveling-soldier.org) is another modern "underground" newspaper produced by Vietnamese American activist Pham Binh that is also available on the web. In a phone interview with Pham Binh on November 29, 2004, he said that reading Marilyn B. Young's *The Vietnam Wars* radicalized him and that as a result, he is committed to changing U.S. foreign policy and fighting against the current war in Iraq.

Binh believes building civilian anti-war projects with soldiers is a critical step in stopping the war. Utilizing a similar format to Vietnam GI by publishing actual letters by troops stationed overseas, GI Special and Traveling Soldier are building a new base of anti-military and anti-war soldier readers.

These new publications have subscriptions by troops stationed in Iraq, Germany, and Okinawa, Thomas Barton claims. In fact in the October-November 2004 edition of Traveling Soldier, one soldier from Baquba, Iraq writes of a secret organization of troops calling themselves, "FTA," connecting past troop resistance to that occurring in Iraq. The soldier, pen-named hEkLe, from Baquba explains:

"This is an almost underground cult within the ranks. The members of this secret organization refer to each other as Joe's. Soldiers will know who is FTA just by looking at him. He will immediately understand that 'Joe' hates being oppressed

by his superiors, disagrees with the army's stupid rules, and resents the army for taking him to crazy 3rd world countries, only to try to kill him.

"The actual graffiti 'FTA' can be found in almost every portable toilet or restroom...The whole façade of 'one big happy army' disappears right in front of their eyes, and their petty little fantasy world of structure and order come crashing down around their ankles."

Other anti-military graffiti that can be found in the latrine in Iraq according to this soldier include: "One weekend a month?! BULLSHIT!!" "Thank God I got out of the army...SEVEN MONTHS AGO!!" and "THE U.S. ARMY IS RAN BY NAZI SWINE!!" Such resistance, hidden from the mainstream press, provides a different image of the soldiers' world in Iraq, recalling a similar era of protest by troops in Vietnam.

In the December 5, 2004 edition of GI Special, Heretic, the pen name of a troop also stationed in Iraq, voices how the military is still divided between "us versus them." The soldier explains:

"There will be a division between lifers and the heads again. It has already started with the stop-lossed soldier obviously not wanting to be in service any longer. Many of them get court marshaled or chaptered out with dishonorables saving the military from paying already deserved Collage loans GI Bill and other veterans benefits.

"As war here in the middle-east gets more violent the soldiers will become less afraid of punishment. Prison will become a more sane option than trying to take Fallujah for the fourth time..."

"We fight for lies, are alienated by our chain of command and are only trying to ride out the clock until we can finish our contracts without losing what we have worked for or seeing the inside of a prison cell.

"The Armed Forces will never have a loyal troop base until its goals change. If there was something worth fighting for, something the common man can gain, rather than just being underpaid mercenaries for some elitist, then the soldiers would have more encouragement to join in work hard.

"I myself find it difficult to have discipline in an Army full of ass-kissing lying hypocrites who enforce a wicked US policy with a violent war I disagree with.

"I serve in shame,

"The Heretic, Iraq"

HekLe and the Heretic represent the growing dissent in the military that has been a part of all U.S. wars but that occurred in Vietnam on a scale never previously encountered.

The war in Iraq contains the similar contradictions of class inequality and official justifications for war that do not match the troops' own experience on the ground.

In conclusion, the working class war in Vietnam was a working class revolt that pitted soldiers against lifers, brought the intersection of race and class to the fore, and developed news forms of resistance.

Labor historiography, in general, has forgotten an important episode, that of soldiers who resisted during the Vietnam War and in previous wars—and those troops, like the 343rd, serving in Iraq today.

In The Many-Headed Hydra, Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker describe the mythic creature that grew two new heads in place of the one that Hercules chopped off, as a metaphor for the rebellion by a global proletariat.

In this light, the soldiers' rebellion in Vietnam was indeed one of the ferocious heads of this mighty creature. By contributing to underground newspapers, pirate radiobroadcasts, the refusal of orders, prison rebellions, fraggings, and mutinies, soldiers invented new tactics of resistance that turned the "working-class war" into a working-class revolt.

Further research on the soldiers' rebellion in Vietnam may shed light on pertinent questions for today. The examination of how troops of color and whites forged alliances and unity in combat may shed new light on the intersection of race and class.

Further scholarship may reveal the potential for class unity to break down the barriers of race.

The study of gender, masculine identity, and how troops broke down these constructions to form new bonds of camaraderie deserves greater attention. In the McCormick Commission report on the conditions of the military stockades, published in 1970, I discovered that "sexual deviants," the cruel label given to homosexual troops, occupied all such military prisons.

More study on how sexual identity intersected class during the war deserves further attention, especially given the recent debate around the "don't ask, don't tell" policy and whether homosexuals should be allowed to serve in the military. Furthermore, recent debate on the reinstatement of the selective service to end the so-called economic draft of the volunteer force needs further historical context as well. In Vietnam, the draft was not a fair and equal playing ground, nor will it likely reveal itself to be free of class bias in the future.

Norman Mailer's novel, The Naked and the Dead, written in 1948, is relevant to the soldiers' rebellion in Vietnam and for members of today's military to consider.

The work is centered on a suicide mission by a reconnaissance patrol that must assess the Japanese rear guard on the fictional island of Anopopei during World War II.

If the soldiers survive and return without trouble, General Cummings plans to send out a company for a surprise attack, a daring tactical offensive that would likely lead to his promotion. The character of General Cummings, with his silk monogrammed handkerchiefs, represents the emerging military industrial complex.

In a series of dialogues between General Cummings and Lieutenant Hearn, the liberal junior officer, Mailer reveals the ruling ideology that infests the war planners and the class disparity at the heart of the military.

The general divides the unit's meat rations so that half go to the 180 enlisted men and the other half to the thirty-eight officers. Cummings explains his grand purpose to Hearn: "Break them down. Every time an enlisted man sees an officer get an extra privilege, it breaks him down a little more...they also fear us more...Every time there's what you call an Army injustice, the enlisted man involved is confirmed a little more in the idea of his own inferiority."

Mailer lays bare the naked realities of class between the officers and the enlisted men, challenging the notion that the military is united for a common cause. In the work, General Cummings explains to Lieutenant Hearn what "the good war" was really about:

"For the past century the entire historical process has been working toward greater and greater consolidation of power...Your men of power in America...are becoming conscious of their real aims for the first time in our history. Watch. After the war our foreign policy is going to be far more naked, far less hypocritical than it has ever been. We're no longer going to cover our eyes with our left hand while our right is extending an imperialist paw."

General Cummings and policy makers like him are a product of a system that will continue to create atrocities and war crimes, as during the Vietnam War at My Lai and as revealed by the prison abuse scandals at Abu Gharib in Iraq.

As generals and war planners arrogantly declare the inevitability of U.S. empire and the common cause of military might, and likewise as the Bush Doctrine today boldly declares a permanent war against terrorism, waged for peace, Vietnam may prove an invaluable lesson to remember.

While war-planning is made in the air-conditioned rooms and safe havens far away from combat action, wars are fought on the ground by working-class troops who may not only serve, but may also be the soldiers who rebel.

One day while I was in a bunker in Vietnam, a sniper round went over my head. The person who fired that weapon was not a terrorist, a rebel, an extremist, or a so-called insurgent. The Vietnamese individual who tried to kill me was a citizen of Vietnam, who did not want me in his country. This truth escapes millions.

**Mike Hastie
U.S. Army Medic
Vietnam 1970-71
December 13, 2004**

Do you have a friend or relative in the service? Forward this E-MAIL along, or send us the address if you wish and we'll send it regularly. Whether in Iraq or stuck on a base in the USA, this is extra important for your service friend, too often cut off from access to encouraging news of growing resistance to the war, at home and inside the armed services. Send requests to address up top.

Hard Rain: Towards a Greater Air War On Iraq?

From: Ron Jacobs
To: GI Special
Sent: December 01, 2005 8:13 AM

By Ron Jacobs

Recently, news reports in US and European newspapers have suggested that Washington and London are considering a major reduction in their forces in Iraq. These reports usually fail to mention that those same forces were increased only last summer and that the rumored reduction is really not as large as advertised when looking at the actual numbers in country.

Also, with few exceptions, most of these reports don't bother to state that if the troops are pulled back from the front and brought home, the Pentagon plans to replace their combat capability with air power.

For those who were around during the US war in Vietnam, this plan is an eery echo of the last few years of that war. Back then, this strategy was part of the Nixon administration's plan for "peace with honor." It was a plan known as Vietnamization and worked like this: South Vietnamese troops (ARVN) worked with diminished US forces on the ground, attacking guerrilla forces and their supporters after calling in air strikes conducted by US Air Force (USAF) planes.

In addition, there would be occasional bombing campaigns that targeted entire areas of the Vietnamese countryside and lasted for days or even weeks, destroying whole villages and parts of cities and killing civilians by the hundreds.

Perhaps the best known of these massive bombing campaigns took place during the month of December in 1972 and were known as the Christmas bombings. This storm of death was the biggest campaign of its kind and destroyed portions of Hanoi and many other northern Vietnamese cities. More than 1600 Vietnamese died in that eleven day period.

At this point, it seems that the US is using its air power in Iraq (and Afghanistan) for what they call close-support operations. Usually this means that the air attacks are on a relatively small scale and that bombs and rockets are targeted at individual buildings and city blocks.

Still, the number of air support missions is not small. In fact, according to a November 28, 2005 press release from the U.S. Central Command Air Forces, "Coalition aircraft flew 46 close-air support missions Nov. 27 for Operation Iraqi Freedom. They (the missions) supported coalition troops, infrastructure protection, reconstruction activities, and operations to deter and disrupt terrorist activities. Coalition aircraft also supported Iraqi and coalition ground forces operations to create a secure environment for upcoming December parliamentary elections."

These 46 missions were followed by 42 more on November 28th.

That's 88 acknowledged air support missions in two days. (In addition, 18 more close support missions were reported in Afghanistan for the 28th of November).

Multiply that by seven days in a week and it becomes 308 flight combat permissions in Iraq alone.

Given the nature of the weaponry, even so-called close air support means that there will be civilian deaths. It's pretty much impossible to kill only one or two people with a quarter-ton bomb or even a 50 pound rocket.

The collateral effects of the use of such rockets by Israel on cars motored by Palestinian resistance members proves this point quite graphically.

The old film of Vietnamese farmers raked by gunfire from US attack copters and rockets from low-flying US jets underline the likelihood of increased civilian dead, as well.

So, why then are the Pentagon and White House considering this change in strategy?

Plain and simple, it's about US domestic politics.

Back in 1969, when Nixon was elected to his first term, he promised to bring peace with honor and end the war in Vietnam. Instead, he expanded the war and it became even bloodier.

At the same time, however, he did begin to remove US troops from ground battle.

Since the ARVN was not trusted by US commanders to carry out the war on its own, the Pentagon used the remaining several thousand US ground forces to lead search-and-destroy missions with the assistance of USAF weaponry and the ARVN.

Although this strategy made the war planners in Washington look good to the war-weary US public while it continued the killing of Vietnamese, it did not sit so well with the Saigon government. They knew it would not keep them in power.

Like Robert H. Johnson, a member of the Policy Planning Council in the US State Department from 1962-67, wrote in the establishment journal Foreign Affairs in 1970: "It is evident from (South Vietnamese) President Thieu's cautious views as to the appropriate timing of U.S. withdrawals, as well as from the continuing flow of news reports on the views of American officers in South Vietnam, that many in Vietnam -- aware of the persistent, long-standing weaknesses of the ARVN's military efforts --(were) rather less sanguine than U.S. policy-makers about the prospects for a reasonably early U.S. pullout." (July 1970)

despite this, there was still some talk from the warmakers' circles in July 1970 that the US could achieve its goals in Vietnam through military action from the air, even as it was removing its ground troops from Cambodia after the violent and widespread opposition to the April 30, 1970 invasion of that country.

To illustrate this, even though US troops were for the most part removed from Cambodia, the bombing of that country continued unabated until the US-installed government fell to the Khmer Rouge in spring 1975.

Back to Iraq.

There is still a committed belief in the Bush White House and much of Congress that the US can achieve its goals militarily in that country. This is apparent in the words of the White House and in the supposedly more moderate words of Democrats like Joseph Biden (Del.).

The White House and the vast majority of Congress do not differ on the war, only on how it is being conducted. One can bet their holiday dinner that the majority of Congress would love to see US air power doing most of the killing and destruction in Iraq.

This shift in strategy combined with a redeployment of US ground forces to Kuwait and well-fortified defensive positions in Iraq would probably decrease the number of US casualties and (they hope) ensure the re-election of most of those congressmen and women who will hear the wrath of their constituents when they go home for the winter holidays in a few weeks.

According to a Seymour Hersh piece in the New Yorker on November 28, 2005, some USAF commanders are concerned about switching to the greater use of air power in Iraq. The two primary reasons they mention are the increased danger of civilian casualties and the possibility of Iraqi commanders calling in the strikes.

The former concern, while noble, is increasingly pointless, given the nature of the war on the ground, where the occupying forces tend to shoot first and determine the nature of their victims later.

Unsaid in these officers' concern is the historical fact that air power doesn't work against a guerrilla insurgency.

If it did, then wouldn't Ho Chi Minh City still be named Saigon?

Would the FARC guerrilla forces in Colombia still control a substantial portion of the Colombian countryside?

It seems that air power does not win wars--it only destroys the earth and makes a lot of money for the weapons industry.

That, and increases the hatred of the population that the aircraft and their pilots are bombing

Perhaps if an aggressor is willing to carry such a policy to its logical conclusion--total devastation--than that aggressor can probably win its war, albeit there will be little left to win (except for that oil in the case of Iraq).

Is this what George Bush means when he insists on nothing short of victory?

If not, than it seems that the only reason for a strategy that replaces ground combat with death from the air is some kind of chauvinistic revenge.

What do you think? Comments from service men and women, and veterans, are especially welcome. Send to contact@militaryproject.org. Name, I.D., withheld on request. Replies confidential.

IRAQ: “The Most Foolish War Since Emperor Augustus In 9 BC Sent His Legions In To Germany And Lost Them”

12.1.05 Ray McGovern, Truthout Perspective [Excerpts]

I found it embarrassing to listen to President Bush stretch for evidence of "real progress" in readying Iraqi army and security forces to "stand up (so that we) can stand down."

Did you know that, because of our help, the Iraqis now have their own supply depot north of Baghdad; simulation models for roadblocks; a bomb disposal school; a training program for squad leaders?

Bush even quoted a US soldier saying, "We have turned the corner." For veteran observers of the Vietnam, this brings on a very troubling flashback.

A pity that those running the war in Iraq found ways to sit out Vietnam.

For there, too, was a guerrilla war in which it was very difficult to estimate the number of "insurgents," without including thousands and thousands of the populace supporting the resistance, with many of them acting as night-time guerrillas.

The lesson is that an army trained and supplied by foreign occupiers can almost always eventually be outmatched and out-waited in a guerrilla war, no matter how many billions are pumped into things like simulation models for roadblocks.

Don't take my word for it. Professor Martin van Creveld of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, the only non-American military historian on the US Army's list of required reading for officers, recently criticized President Bush for "launching the most foolish war since Emperor Augustus in 9 BC sent his legions in to Germany and lost them."

Hampton University: A Corporate Plantation Run By Scum Who Hate Our Freedom: Ignorant Bush-Buddy Trash Charge Students With “Cajoling” And/Or “Proselytizing”

We will not forget about our people. We will not be intimidated. Fight not for us, but with us because the actions of the Hampton Administration and the increasingly frequent campus repression happening nationally ultimately threaten us all.

November 25th, 2005 By John Robinson and Brandon King, Traprockpeace.org/

John Robinson is an organizer at Hampton University. He is one of the students charged in violation of the Hampton University Student Code of Conduct. He is a senior sociology major from Washington D.C.

Brandon King is also both an organizer at Hampton U and one of the students charged in violation of the Hampton University Student Code of Conduct. He is a senior sociology major and a native of Chesapeake VA.

On Wednesday November 2, 2005 at Hampton University, the progressive campus group affiliated with Amnesty International, United Students Against Sweatshops, and Campus Anti-War Network held a student walk-out on the issues of New Orleans urban renewal, AIDS crisis, homophobia, the prison industrial complex, the war in Iraq, and the crisis in Sudan.

The organizers for the group had been planning the action for sometime, and promoted it with radio announcements, posters around the campus, and handing out fliers at campus group meetings. The planned activities included speeches, chants, poetry, and musical performances.

Earlier that day an international student was subjected to intense interrogation by the Dean of Women and was told by the Hampton University police that she would be shadowed by a cop.

At twelve noon Brandon King began to speak to about 75-100 students in the Student Center about our plans for the day. We handed out information on the Iraq war and the Katrina disaster.

Then armed HU police abruptly shut down our activities.

The HU police booked several people just because they were wearing stickers and other paraphernalia that advertised our events. They booked people who weren't even wearing paraphernalia because they looked suspicious.

The police used hand-held camcorders to record the faces of the activists without our permission. They attempted to intimidate the student onlookers by their random targeting. Three of us were singled out as leaders by the Dean of Men and HU police, who temporarily confiscated our students ID cards.

The next day, one leader of our group, Brandon King, was told by a Hampton University Lieutenant Detective that, despite the fact that he was a "hometown athlete," he would be expelled if he did not cooperate and give up the names of other group members.

Now Brandon, three sophomore activists, a junior activist, a non-affiliated supporter and myself have all been summoned to an administrative hearing for violating the code of student conduct by "actions to cajole or proselytize students", "distributing and/or posting unauthorized information", and "violating the administrative guidelines for student demonstrations".

The students were given notice at 5:00 p.m. Friday, November 18 to appear at an administrative hearing at 10:00 a.m. Monday, November 21. This short notice obviously made it virtually impossible for the students to organize support from lawyers, parents,

witnesses, other students, and sympathetic organizations both on campus and in the wider community. Nevertheless, the administration received many calls and e-mails and agreed on Monday morning to postpone the hearings indefinitely. Upon returning to school from Thanksgiving break on Monday November 28, the students learned that the hearings had been rescheduled for Friday, December 2.

Shortly before the break, students met with local reporters in a nearby shopping center owned by the administration.

As the students described to the reporters the repressive conditions they face at Hampton University, a Hampton University cop sent by the Dean of Students confirmed the students' allegations.

He pulled his squad car to within inches of the camera man and cut short the interview by stepping in between the camera man and the student interviewee.

After the reporters put their camera away inside their car, the police still demanded that they leave the property. The video footage of these events was shown on the nightly news. The story also appeared the next day as the cover story in the local newspaper, The Daily Press.

The Dean of Students, in turn, wrote a letter to the editor of the Daily Press responding that the school encourages peaceful protest, and the kids who face discipline refused to use the legitimate routes. This letter was mass copied and two copies were placed on every dorm door on campus.

Repressive Rules, Selective Enforcement

It is clear that the school seeks to quell all social activism by maintaining repressive rules and selectively enforcing them against any progressive student activism.

“Actions to cajole and/or proselytize students” constitute an offense that is so vague and broad that virtually every student, teacher, and administrator is guilty of it every day.

To “cajole” is defined as trying to influence or manipulate others through insincere arguments, which is something Hampton administrators routinely do to students. Every recognized student club on campus to some extent attempts to “proselytize,” that is, to persuade students to adopt a specific orientation or actions. This rule is vague so that it can be selectively enforced in the interests of the administration.

Moreover, the school's concern about the actions of our group speaks to a much deeper issue. The administration itself has long been guilty of attempts at cajoling and proselytizing black students with its strict assimilationist program.

The most profound contradiction in Hampton's program is that it aims to make its black students ignorant of the racism which pervades our society, while fostering an elitist and individualist culture that works to the detriment of the Black community.

The accused students merely attempted to challenge the corporate bourgeois indoctrination prevalent at Hampton and to promote ideas more attuned to the interest of the community and humanity in general. It is only in the sickest sense that the promotion of human rights-related issues can be seen as an attempt to convert the students from one persuasion to another. The school makes no attempt to educate its black students on any of the issues, and seems to prefer cultivating political docility and sub ordinance instead.

The students also face charges of violating the guidelines set forth by the Administration on student demonstrations. It has been our experience that the provisions which control student demonstrations as delineated in the Student Handbook effectively prevent any expression of dissent, and therefore any semblance of democracy.

This is because any demonstration, march, vigil, or rally on campus must be called by an officially recognized student group and approved in advance by the Chief of Police and Director of Student Activities. Any student group that might call for such actions never gets recognized by the Administration in the first place.

Hampton University's administration has shown time and time again that it will not recognize, nor give any legitimacy to our organizations and our causes. We have repeatedly been denied access even to the Administration's own procedures through which groups are evaluated and then either recognized or denied recognition. Our applications have never been afforded the hearings and votes to which we are supposed to be entitled. The Administration, whenever it feels like, simply announces that "there is a moratorium" on new student organizations."

In refusing to acknowledge and recognize the groups that they suspect to be prone to protest and activism, the administration of Hampton, in effect, bans activism on campus.

This is what has long been enforced at Hampton University. The violations outlined in the hearings summons were only technicalities, created by the arbitrary and repressive policies of the administration itself, which seek to deny any free and independent social and political expression by Hampton University students.

And now the administration has informed the accused students that they can be expelled for their offenses. More and more students at HU believe, however, that their school's disdain for democratic principles is unacceptable and must, at all costs, be resisted.

The administration was very clear in its opposition to our agenda from the very beginning. When we put up the posters and fliers across campus at night, they organized police teams during the day to march through the campus and snatch down every paper. But the corporate elitist ethos cultivated by Hampton still had to be counteracted, so we put up more and more. The administrative response was always swift but never swift enough, each time more overtly repressive than before.

Meanwhile, students and other groups, whether officially recognized or not, routinely pass out unauthorized fliers and put up unauthorized advertisements on campus daily.

The advertisements are usually promoting parties, bars and other venues for alcoholic consumption. The administration rarely interferes with this activity and never punishes those who engage in it.

But the activists at Hampton put up posters about a social justice-oriented student walk-out, and passed out information on the brutal, highly unpopular War in Iraq, and they alone are threatened with the penalties outlined in the student handbook. This selective enforcement of the rules reveals the true nature of the Hampton administration.

The Hampton Model as Apparatus of Exploitation

Some of the Hampton police who harassed us said that they just “had to do their job.”

Just for clarification, their bosses are the University President Dr. William R. Harvey, who is a Bush appointee to the Federal National Mortgage Association, and a Board of Trustees bounteous with Bush-Cheney campaign beneficiaries.

A close friend of President Harvey especially relevant to this discussion is the commencement speaker he selected this past spring, Alphonso Jackson, Bush’s Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Jackson has made a priority of cutting back access by poor black people to subsidized Section 8 housing.

Shortly after hurricane Katrina, Jackson told the Houston Chronicle that most of the black population of New Orleans should not be allowed to return, and that New Orleans in the future will be a predominantly white city.

The University president has often shown this same contempt for the Black community. A recent example is when he was asked by a few members of our group at a Town Hall Meeting, the reason why the school did not have an aids awareness group. President Harvey responded that we probably did not need one because everyone knows about Aids.

The girls did not accept that answer because they knew that AIDS disproportionately affected Blacks, and the Hampton Roads area was in the Top ten AIDS infected areas therefore they started a campus AIDs group the next week.

Students at Hampton University have become accustomed to, although not content with, the school’s restraint of free thought and expression.

The issue has arisen publicly before with the Hampton school of journalism. In 2003, a student writer for the supposedly “student-run” campus newspaper, “The Hampton Script”, wrote an article about the school cafeteria and its 100+ health code violations.

The administration wasn't particularly enthused about how the information would affect the school's image so they seized all copies and destroyed them. They also basically purged the staff, attempted to expel the student writer, and created a task force to supervise the creative process of the newspaper.

This task force, chaired by the University's Dean of Students who has no journalistic credentials, made several "recommendations" to the newspaper staff.

One worth mentioning here states that "Oversight and guidance from a faculty advisor (or advisors) with adequate journalistic knowledge and an appreciation and commitment to the Hampton Model are necessary." This model was used in the academic programs of other HBCUs. And while the faces and tactics have changed, the underlying principle is nonetheless the same.

Hampton History

When providing an even closer look at the educational environment of historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), one will gain a clearer understanding of its purpose in society and also its setting for which student resistance to its educational model originated. William Watkins explained how with the creation of HBCU's more specifically, Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute (now Hampton University) "played no small role in creating a comprador class for the twentieth century.

Black compradors have anchored the Black South. They have been pious, conservative, obedient, and loyal to the sociopolitical order. They have supported gradualism, incrementalism, and non-violence over revolution. They have provided a sometimes prosperous middle class without which the capitalist economy could not have stabilized. They have acted as a buffer in the South, providing business services, education, religion, fraternal orders, and hope to a people battered by slavery, sharecropping, violence and four centuries of oppression."

An avid proponent of this as an educational model that creates these pseudo-progressive results was the founder of Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, General Samuel Chapman Armstrong.

Armstrong's true feelings of blacks should not go unmentioned due to how these beliefs guided him in administering education to blacks. Armstrong felt the black "does not see 'the point' of life clearly; he lacks foresight, judgment, and hard sense. His main trouble is not ignorance, but deficiency of character; his grievances occupy him more than his deepest needs. There is no lack of those who have mental capacity. The question with him is not one of brains, but of right instincts, of morals and of hard work."

Armstrong placed blacks in the category of "savage races" that were "mentally sluggish" and "indolent." Character training was/is the only way blacks could be salvaged. This is why Hampton University's educational model is so significant. It is not just schooling, but also it was/is, as Watkins puts it, "saving a race from itself."

The most prominent black advocate for this model was Armstrong's neophyte Booker T. Washington. Because blacks faced oppression and political repression on a daily basis, W.E.B. Du Bois felt this reality should not go ignored. He pleaded with Washington to address these realities by stating "It is wrong to encourage a man or a people in evil doing; it is wrong to aid and abet a national crime simply because it is unpopular not to do so.

"We have no right to sit silently by while the inevitable seeds are sown for a harvest of disaster to our children, black and white." In saying this, Du Bois draws the line between himself and supporters of Armstrong and Washington's form of education and indoctrination.

When black students rebel against the existing social order, they are looked at as deviant because they buck an educational model that truly does not function in their favor.

Student Resistance Through the Years

At Hampton University in 2005, this student resistance has been more intense perhaps than ever before. In the wake of such social atrocities as the Katrina disaster, black students have achieved a much higher degree of political consciousness than in previous years. The student activist group at Hampton, whose members are now being threatened with expulsion, has worked tirelessly for years promoting consciousness on social issues and providing ways for students to become involved.

In the Fall of 2002, students attempted to get Dr. Taye Wolde-Semayat, a former political prisoner in Ethiopia and President of the Ethiopian Teachers Union, to speak on campus. He had been released following a five-year campaign by Amnesty International, the National Union of Teachers, and teachers' unions around the world. Hampton University refused to allow him to speak on campus.

The Vice President of Student Affairs, Dr. Bennie McMorris, signed a form which would allow for Dr. Taye to speak on campus but later rescinded his signature and refused to allow the event to take place on campus. The students got a local church as a venue for Dr. Taye to speak. These students also organized massive carpooling for students to attend the event. Over 200 people, including community and church members, students, and faculty attended the event which was held two miles away from the campus.

After this event, our organization continued to fight to be a recognized organization on campus. We were met with an administration that repudiated the idea of recognizing an organization that sees as its mission advocating, promoting, and mobilizing people to fight for human rights.

Each year we applied for recognition and have been consistently denied access to the democratic process to which we are entitled. Not only has our organization been denied recognition, but other socially conscious and politically aware groups have also been denied. To date, there are no progressive groups on the campus of Hampton University.

Securing the Future

That has not stopped us from organizing. We've managed to have our meetings in random classrooms on campus through developing really good relationships with campus workers. Many students see the need to address social justice issues through activism and education. Even though the University does not provide an environment conducive to activism or allocate any resources to our group, we've managed not only to function, but to grow. Our membership has increased exponentially and the members are more passionate than ever. The administration is now attempting to stifle this growth by singling out the next generation of activists and trying to scare them into committing themselves to the Hampton Model.

When the HU police and administration stopped our gathering, some of the members of our group felt demoralized.

We thought that the intimidation of students by the Campus police and Administration meant that we had failed.

But seeing how energized the campus became after the incident helped us change the way we saw the situation.

Although the police prevented us from making the point that we intended to make, the students ultimately were made conscious in a much deeper way that could not have been achieved through our speeches and poetry.

The students saw what their school's administration was really for by seeing what it was against.

Students saw first hand what happens when students stand up for human rights and social justice.

So many students openly express their anger with the way Hampton handled the situation. Students have been very supportive and sympathetic with what we are doing at Hampton. Students who wouldn't have normally been involved are now compelled to be active after watching their school reveal its "true colors".

The administration was so arbitrary and ruthless that it threatened an unaffiliated supporter with expulsion. It seems that even moral support for activism is a grave violation to Hampton's administration.

These recent events have exposed the true nature of Hampton University, its educational model, how it fits into the rest of society, and above all else, why it should be resisted.

As students face administrative hearing that promise to be as grossly undemocratic as the proceedings thus far, it is imperative that we send a message to Hampton officials that they cannot get away with this.

We have gotten much support from students on campus, as well as individual and groups outside the school who share our passion and recognize the interconnectedness of our plights.

However we still need a lot more.

By singling out the younger activists, the school figures it can “nip activism in the bud” and it is thus our duty to make it clear that they can do no such thing. It is vital that African Americans are able to express their concern about the issues that so uniquely and disproportionately affect our community.

This remains true despite the large sums of money the university receives from the military and other places for maintaining a docile student body.

We aim to act not defensively, but counter-offensively in our resistance. It is not enough to just ask the administration to leave us alone in this one instance.

We intend to illuminate problems that have perennially plagued the campus of Hampton and we therefore DEMAND that Hampton University drop all charges against the five students and change its general policy toward social justice-oriented groups on campus.

We will not accept this denial of democratic procedure, nor the school’s betrayal of the black community.

We are black students and we will no longer be cajoled by the flattery of a dishonest administration nor proselytized to the ways of the corporate elite.

We will not forget about our people. We will not be intimidated. Fight not for us, but with us because the actions of the Hampton Administration and the increasingly frequent campus repression happening nationally ultimately threaten us all.

For updates on the situation unfolding at Hampton University go to
www.campusantiwar.net ,
http://www.traprockpeace.org/hampton_university_students ,
<http://www.unionvoice.org/campaign/hampton/bbk66srv7wtwik>

And for support please send email to hamptonsolidarity@yahoo.com

OCCUPATION REPORT

***SO MUCH FOR THAT
“SOVEREIGNTY” BULLSHIT:***

IDIOT RUMSFELD HAPPILY BABBLES ABOUT HOW U.S. OCCUPATION CONTROLS THE IRAQI POLICE FORCE!

November 29, 2005 U.S. Department of Defense News Transcript

Presenter: Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Peter Pace
SEC. RUMSFELD: Charlie?

Q Mr. Secretary, whenever you talk about security forces you focus primarily on the military. But what about the police? Reports that militia have either infiltrated or actually taken control of some police forces are really not a hypothetical, after all, the British had to shoot their way into Basra to retrieve a couple of their own soldiers. So what specifically is the U.S. military doing to help the Iraqis gain control of these militias within police forces and improve what has been described pretty much as an uneven performance by Iraqi police?

SEC. RUMSFELD: *I forget when the Department of Defense assumed responsibility for the police.*

GEN. PACE: About six months ago or so.

SEC. RUMSFELD: Maybe six months ago?

So the data we have on it is nowhere near as good as the data we have on the Ministry of Defense forces.

The Ministry of Interior forces, which the police are under, have been reporting up through the Department of State previously.

<p>OCCUPATION ISN'T LIBERATION BRING ALL THE TROOPS HOME <u>NOW!</u></p>

More Occupation Propaganda Deceit Exposed

Dec 1 (Reuters)

The White House expressed concern on Thursday at reports that the U.S. military has secretly paid Iraqi newspapers to run dozens of pro-American articles written by a special military task force.

The newspaper also reported that the "Information Operations Task Force" in Baghdad has bought an Iraqi newspaper and taken control of a radio station, and was using them to disseminate pro-American views as well.

DANGER: POLITICIANS AT WORK

Rumsfeld Says Iraq Death Squad Torture “Hypothetical”

November 29, 2005 U.S. Department of Defense News Transcript

Presenter: Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Peter Pace SEC. RUMSFELD: Charlie?

Q Mr. Secretary, are you concerned over -- and in fact, is the United States looking into growing reports of uniformed death squads in Iraq perhaps assassinating and torturing hundreds of Sunnis? And if that's true, what would that say about stability in Iraq?

SEC. RUMSFELD: I'm not going to comment on hypothetical questions. I've not seen reports that hundreds are being killed by roving death squads at all.

We know for a fact that it's a violent country. We know for a fact that there have been various militias. We know that there have been some militias that have been Iran-oriented. We also know there's been some militias in the north that have been very helpful. The Peshmerga have been very constructive in what they've done.

But I'm not going to get into speculation like that.

Q But, sir, that's not a hypothetical, I don't believe. The Sunnis themselves are charging that hundreds have been assassinated, people shot in the head, found in alleys.

SEC. RUMSFELD: What you're talking about are unverified -- to my knowledge, at least -- unverified comments. I just don't have any data from the field that I could comment on in a specific way.

Do you, General?

GEN. PACE: *No, I do not, sir, although I do know that the Iraqi government has said that they were going to investigate those kinds of allegations.*

LATER:

Q And General Pace, what guidance do you have for your military commanders over there as to what to do if -- like when General Horst found this Interior Ministry jail?

GEN. PACE: It is absolutely the responsibility of every U.S. service member, if they see inhumane treatment being conducted, to intervene to stop it. As an example of how to do it if you don't see it happening but you're told about it is exactly what happened a couple weeks ago.

**TRAITOR
STUPID LIAR
DOMESTIC ENEMY
UNFIT FOR COMMAND**



GI Special distributes and posts to our website copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in an effort to advance understanding of the invasion and occupation of Iraq. We believe this constitutes a "fair use" of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law since it is being distributed **without charge or profit** for educational purposes to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for educational purposes, in accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107. **GI Special has no affiliation whatsoever with the originator of these articles nor is GI Special endorsed or sponsored by the originators. This attributed work is provided a non-profit basis to facilitate understanding, research, education, and the advancement of human rights and social justice** Go to: www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml for more information. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.

If printed out, this newsletter is your personal property and cannot legally be confiscated from you. "Possession of unauthorized material may not be prohibited." DoD Directive 1325.6 Section 3.5.1.2.