

GI SPECIAL 4E2:

The Republic In Danger: The Traitor Bush “Says He Can Ignore Any Act Of Congress That Seeks To Regulate The Military”

[It is unnecessary to instruct members of the armed forces, who have sworn an oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, where your duty lies, and to whom you bear true faith and allegiance, nor is it necessary to instruct you upon what you must now ready yourselves to do when the crisis comes. American citizens now look to you to act to defend our liberties. Do not betray us. T]

The Constitution grants Congress the power to create armies, to declare war, to make rules for captured enemies, and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

But, citing his role as commander in chief, Bush says he can ignore any act of Congress that seeks to regulate the military.

April 30, 2006 Charlie Savage, Boston Globe Staff [Excerpts]

WASHINGTON: President Bush has quietly claimed the authority to disobey more than 750 laws enacted since he took office, asserting that he has the power to set

aside any statute passed by Congress when it conflicts with his interpretation of the Constitution.

Among the laws Bush said he can ignore are military rules and regulations, affirmative-action provisions, requirements that Congress be told about immigration services problems, "whistle-blower" protections for nuclear regulatory officials, and safeguards against political interference in federally funded research.

Legal scholars say the scope and aggression of Bush's assertions that he can bypass laws represent a concerted effort to expand his power at the expense of Congress, upsetting the balance between the branches of government. The Constitution is clear in assigning to Congress the power to write the laws and to the president a duty "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." Bush, however, has repeatedly declared that he does not need to "execute" a law he believes is unconstitutional.

Many of the laws Bush said he can bypass -- including the torture ban -- involve the military.

The Constitution grants Congress the power to create armies, to declare war, to make rules for captured enemies, and "to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

But, citing his role as commander in chief, Bush says he can ignore any act of Congress that seeks to regulate the military.

On at least four occasions while Bush has been president, Congress has passed laws forbidding US troops from engaging in combat in Colombia, where the US military is advising the government in its struggle against narcotics-funded Marxist rebels.

After signing each bill, Bush declared in his signing statement that he did not have to obey any of the Colombia restrictions because he is commander in chief.

Congress has also twice passed laws forbidding the military from using intelligence that was not "lawfully collected," including any information on Americans that was gathered in violation of the Fourth Amendment's protections against unreasonable searches.

Congress first passed this provision in August 2004, when Bush's warrantless domestic spying program was still a secret, and passed it again after the program's existence was disclosed in December 2005.

On both occasions, Bush declared in signing statements that only he, as commander in chief, could decide whether such intelligence can be used by the military.

David Golove, a New York University law professor who specializes in executive-power issues, said Bush has cast a cloud over "the whole idea that there is a rule of law," because no one can be certain of which laws Bush thinks are valid and which he thinks he can ignore.

"Where you have a president who is willing to declare vast quantities of the legislation that is passed during his term unconstitutional, it implies that he also thinks a very significant amount of the other laws that were already on the books before he became president are also unconstitutional," Golove said.

Bush has also challenged statutes in which Congress gave certain executive branch officials the power to act independently of the president. The Supreme Court has repeatedly endorsed the power of Congress to make such arrangements. For example, the court has upheld laws creating special prosecutors free of Justice Department oversight and insulating the board of the Federal Trade Commission from political interference.

Nonetheless, Bush has said in his signing statements that the Constitution lets him control any executive official, no matter what a statute passed by Congress might say.

Golove said that to the extent Bush is interpreting the Constitution in defiance of the Supreme Court's precedents, he threatens to "overturn the existing structures of constitutional law."

A president who ignores the court, backed by a Congress that is unwilling to challenge him, Golove said, can make the Constitution simply "disappear."

In just five years, Bush has challenged more than 750 new laws, by far a record for any president, while becoming the first president since Thomas Jefferson to stay so long in office without issuing a veto.

"What we haven't seen until this administration is the sheer number of objections that are being raised on every bill passed through the White House," said Kelley, who has studied presidential signing statements through history. "That is what is staggering. The numbers are well out of the norm from any previous administration."

Said Golove, the New York University law professor: "Bush has essentially said that 'We're the executive branch and we're going to carry this law out as we please, and if Congress wants to impeach us, go ahead and try it.'"

Bruce Fein, a deputy attorney general in the Reagan administration, said the American system of government relies upon the leaders of each branch "to exercise some self-restraint."

But Bush has declared himself the sole judge of his own powers, he said, and then ruled for himself every time.

"This is an attempt by the president to have the final word on his own constitutional powers, which eliminates the checks and balances that keep the country a democracy," Fein said.

"There is no way for an independent judiciary to check his assertions of power, and Congress isn't doing it, either. So this is moving us toward an unlimited executive power."

**LIAR
TRAITOR
SOLDIER-KILLER
DOMESTIC ENEMY
UNFIT FOR COMMAND**



(AP Photo/Ron Edmonds)

MORE:

**“In Support Of Mutiny”
“I Hope To God That Real Flesh
And Blood American Soldiers
Will Stand Against War In Iran
Soon. It Has Come To That. I
Will Support It.”**

Congress and courts having now largely failed us, we must rely on the courage and the honor of our military. I believe they will do their duty which is to disobey all unlawful orders.

04/29/06 By Dennis Morrisseau, Information Clearing House. [Excerpt]

Dennis Morrisseau is a former Army Lieutenant and now a Republican candidate for the U.S. House from Vermont. He was court-martialled in 1968 for refusing transport to Vietnam after openly criticizing that war while a uniformed Army officer. Morrisseau prevailed in the court-martial.

Just this past week there was a flicker of information or rumor across the internet that a number of senior U.S. Military officers had threatened to resign if the Iran Operation comes on, as it now looks like it will.

In addition, it was said that DoD was treating the communication of the threat to resign as a "mutiny". (Against civilian authority was the Administration's spin.)

If, in fact, such a thing did occur, it is indeed a mutiny in my opinion. One I have been expecting for quite some time.

The Administration's planned attack on Iran following upon the Bush/ Cheney disaster in Iraq is indeed likely to stimulate a mutiny among our armed forces.

As a declared candidate for Congress here in Vermont and a former Army officer myself, with some legal training, I hereby formally state that I support the "mutineers" if they exist.

And if they are so far only rumors, only ghosts, then I hope to God that real flesh and blood American soldiers will stand against war in Iran soon. It has come to that. I will support it.

There is no legal or Constitutional authority, to date, under which this administration can proceed to an attack on Iran, much less one involving an unprovoked and unnecessary resort to nuclear weaponry.

There has been no Declaration of War.

And if this Congress, almost all of whom ought to be immediately retired, does not declare war on Iran, then no attack on that nation by American forces should be permitted.

Congress and courts having now largely failed us, we must rely on the courage and the honor of our military.

I believe they will do their duty which is to disobey all unlawful orders.

Should our military fail us now, we must act ourselves. If the good men and women who wear our uniform will not refuse unlawful duty, and those more compliant with authority will not stand down in the face of the threatened attack, then we the people must immediately take the present government down.

Our only means to do so in time, is to stop work entirely coast to coast and walk into the streets together. We cannot wait for the upcoming elections I am afraid.

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.

IRAQ WAR REPORTS

Two U.S. Patrols Attacked: Vehicle Burning Near Al Askandariya; Casualties Not Announced

May 1, 2006 By DPA

A bomber detonated an explosive-laden car near a US army patrol Monday, killing one Iraqi civilian and wounding two others in al-Askandariya, 65 kilometers south of Baghdad, eyewitnesses said.

The US vehicle was wrecked and was seen to be on fire, with the US army closing off the area, the eyewitnesses said.

A US military spokesman confirmed that a car bomb detonated near a US army patrol in al-Rahim area, but said no casualties were reported.

More Fiji Mercenaries Killed

May 1, 2006 Fiji Village

Three Fiji Citizens are confirmed to have died in war-torn Iraq yesterday in a road side bombing.

Details are still sketchy however, it has been confirmed that the three locals were employed by Armor Group as security officers and were hit by a bomb outside Baghdad City.

It is understood two men are from Lomaiviti and one is from Delaivuna in Naitasiri and the families are yet to be informed of the incident.

Officials from Armor Group are expected to comment later.

Meanwhile 4 Fiji men died after being ambushed in Baghdad last week.

Ramadi: The Occupation Besieged; Fighting To Keep Route Michigan Open



Spc. Joe Sommer, 20, of Lawrenceville, Ga., of Charlie Company of the U.S. Army's 1st Battalion, 506th Infantry Regiment, looks through binoculars at a window where he manned a machine gun guard post at of a U.S. observation post called OP Hotel in Ramadi April 29, 2006. (AP Photo/Todd Pitman)

"We watch for anything that's not normal. But nothing's normal around this place," said Spc. Joe Sommer, 20, of Lawrenceville, Ga., his belt-fed machine-gun poking out a hallway window.

May 1, 2006 TODD PITMAN, Associated Press Writer

RAMADI, Iraq

On the roof of a ruined hotel-turned-observation post nicknamed "the Ramadi Inn," two U.S. snipers listen to Johnny Cash's "Ring of Fire" on an iPod and watch a firefight through holes knocked out of a penthouse wall.

Marines at another sandbagged outpost up the road are firing grenades at insurgents, sending clouds of smoke rising above a hazy midday skyline of rusting water towers, minarets and an exquisite blue-domed mosque.

"It's a never-ending war," says one of the snipers, 22-year-old Spc. Jarrod York of Mansfield, Pa., as explosions boom in the distance.

Ramadi, populated by Sunni Arabs 70 miles west of Baghdad, is the most dangerous city in Iraq for U.S. forces. Commanders say there are more insurgent attacks here than anywhere else in the country, with militants and American troops exchanging fire several times a day - at least.

American troops seized "the Ramadi Inn," known officially as OP Hotel, in 2004 to protect a road through the heart of the city. Two years later, they are using the building and others like it to secure Route Michigan, a key supply road for U.S. forces.

This four-story structure is one of the tallest in town, offering panoramic views over an urban wasteland crawling with insurgents.

The troops say the militants are also watching them - casing their positions in vehicles, peeking around corners, looking from afar through binoculars and video cameras.

It's difficult to imagine the hotel ever had a place in Ramadi's hospitality industry. Rocket blasts have pummeled the building, a truck bomb nearly destroyed it and human hands have stripped it bare of furnishings.

The rooms on one dusty, darkened floor have been converted into sandbagged machine-gun nests manned by U.S. and Iraqi forces.

With boxes of ammunition and spent bullet casings at their feet, troops sit with binoculars 24 hours a day. They brace for attacks, watch for guerrillas and keep an eye out for battles - muzzle-flashes, explosions, plumes of smoke.

"We watch for anything that's not normal. But nothing's normal around this place," said Spc. Joe Sommer, 20, of Lawrenceville, Ga., his belt-fed machine-gun poking out a hallway window.

Past dreary halls draped with camouflage nets, soldiers sleep in cot-crammed quarters with no electricity, running water, phones or Internet.

Iraqi forces arrived a couple weeks ago and sleep on their own floor. A few promptly installed a satellite on the roof so they could watch TV in their rooms.

Every window has been sealed with leaking sandbags. Troops joke the weight of the bags may bring down the building. Scrawled on one wall: "Ramadi Inn, aka OP Sandbag."

Only a few rooms have generator-driven fluorescent lights: the command center and a kitchen stacked with military rations. A few rays of sunlight stream in during the day, but the darkness "makes you feel like you're living in a cave," said Army Lt. Nicholas Goshen, 24, of Cleveland.

Ringed by trash, blast walls and razor wire, the hotel's crumbling brown balconies and boarded windows are covered by chicken-wire fencing that hangs from the roof to help deflect shoulder-fired grenades.

Exchanges of fire have wasted most surrounding buildings and forced nearby residents to flee.

"It's sad, but this hotel is critical to keeping Route Michigan open," Goshen said, looking at vacant, bullet-sprayed shops across the street.

The snipers are stationed in a small enclosed room called the penthouse, which is on the roof.

Sgt. 1st Class Britt Ruble, platoon commander for Charlie Company of the Army's 1st Battalion, 506th Infantry Regiment, said snipers had "taken out quite a few people digging in alleys" - planting roadside bombs - in the past year.

Ruble said rocket-propelled grenades struck the hotel at least 10 times in recent months, one of which hit the wall above Spc. Richard Cruz, 27, of Los Angeles.

"It knocked him back off his gun, but he got right back up and kept shooting," Ruble said.

Soldiers said bullets flew through the windows during that gunbattle in March, ricocheting off walls. One round hit an American soldier in the ankle; a medic found the 7.62 mm slug in his boot.

After that, "we took the sandbags all the way to the ceiling, doubled 'em, made 'em so we can actually fight from 'em," Ruble said.

Black marks and chips on the walls and ceilings bear testament to such stories, but soldiers say it is quieter here now than it had been - and quieter than other Marine-manned outposts along Michigan that are attacked daily.

When not on guard duty, troops read, play hand-held video games or write letters. On Sunday, a few watched "The Greatest Wrestling Stars of the 80s" on a laptop. Hot meals arrive in plastic containers once a day. Sometimes breakfast and even ice cream are thrown in.

But luxury it is not.

On some walls the words "never forgotten" are written beside the names of fallen soldiers.

Goshen said he tries to call his girlfriend before going on a four-day stint at the hotel. This time, coming off another mission, he had no time.

"She knows I'm guarding a hotel, but she probably thinks it's a nice hotel and I live in a room. She doesn't understand," he said. "My family would probably get a little scared if they saw what this place looks like."

REALLY BAD PLACE TO BE: BRING THEM ALL HOME NOW



A team of U.S. Navy SEALs fires on insurgents from a rooftop April 21, 2006 in Ramadi. U.S. soldiers patrolling in Ramadi say that enemy contact is so regular, they can make accurate estimates of how long it will take to be shot at after the start of their patrols. Estimates range from 45 minutes for one company to just 8 minutes for another. (AP Photo/Todd Pitman)

AFGHANISTAN WAR REPORTS

Three Occupation Troops Wounded: Command Refuses To Say What Nationality

4.28.06 Los Angeles Times & May 01, 2006 By Noor Khan, Associated Press

On Monday, a suspected Taliban attacker in a car exploded a bomb near a coalition convoy in Tirin Kot, the main town in Uruzgan, said provincial police chief Rozi Khan.

One coalition soldier and one Afghan passer-by, a boy, were hurt. The attacker died.

Meanwhile, a bomb exploded near a convoy of foreign troops traveling along a highway in Maiwand district of southern Kandahar province, injuring two soldiers and destroying their vehicle, a military official said.

Maj. Quentin Innis, a Canadian military spokesman for the coalition forces in the region, said the soldiers were moved to a base in Kandahar city for treatment but their wounds were not life threatening.

The officials did not immediately disclose the nationality of the wounded soldiers in either incident, the latest in a wave of assaults blamed on the Taliban.

Taliban militants and their allies are executing people spying for U.S. forces across the border in Afghanistan. Militants in Pakistan have killed at least 53 people.

How Bad Is It?

April 28, 2006 By Sarah Chayes and Amir Soltani Sheikholeslami, Boston Globe
[Excerpt]

In Afghanistan, disgust at warlords whom the US military signed up as proxies and then ushered into positions of power has much of the exasperated population cursing the very word "democracy" and harking back nostalgically to the Taliban era as one of at least some law and order.

Now, when Taliban knock on village doors at night asking for succor, few see a reason to risk denying it.

NEED SOME TRUTH? CHECK OUT TRAVELING SOLDIER

Telling the truth - about the occupation or the criminals running the government in Washington - is the first reason for Traveling Soldier. But we want to do more than tell the truth; we want to report on the resistance - whether it's in the streets of Baghdad, New York, or inside the armed forces. Our goal is for Traveling Soldier to become the thread that ties working-class people inside the armed services together. We want this newsletter to be a weapon to help you organize resistance within the armed forces. If you like what you've read, we hope that you'll join with us in building a network of active duty organizers.

<http://www.traveling-soldier.org/> And join with Iraq War vets in the call to end the occupation and bring our troops home now! (www.ivaw.net)

TROOP NEWS

GET THE MESSAGE? QUIT FUCKING WITH IMMIGRANTS



Mexican-American Estela Mendez holds up a sign with pictures of her two nephews Sylvester and Pedro Jimenez, who are in the U.S. military in Iraq, during an immigration reform rally in Detroit, Michigan May 1, 2006. Mendez's father came to the U.S. 47 years ago as an immigrant from Mexico eventually becoming a U.S. citizen.
REUTERS/Rebecca Cook

**Leaders Visit:
Front-Line Troops Say, “Yeah,
So?”**

“For Many Of The Troops They Might Just As Well Not Have Visited At All”

April 27, 2006 By Arwa Damon

BALAD, Iraq (CNN)

As Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld made their surprise visits to Baghdad on Wednesday, many of the troops stationed north of Baghdad, in Balad and Dujail, say either they didn't know about it or didn't care.

"I'd ask him for a plane ticket home to see my wife. I have barely seen her in the last two years," said a young sergeant, who did not want to be identified. Like many of the soldiers with the 4th Infantry Division, he is on his second deployment to Iraq.

Some joked that whenever VIP's come to visit they just go to the main bases and meet the "fobbits," the nickname given to troops who do not go outside the barbed wire.

Rumsfeld and Rice were visiting to show support for Iraq's movement toward a new government.

And for many of the troops with the 3rd Battalion, 29th Field Artillery Regiment and 4th Infantry Division stationed in Balad and Dujail, they might just as well not have visited at all.

As we discussed the visit, a tip came through -- a suspected leader of a cell dedicated to making "IED's," or improvised explosive devices -- military-speak for homemade bombs - - would be at a certain location at 1400 hours.

The chase was on.

Bumping along the dusty back roads to avoid insurgents, a VIP visit was the furthest thing from these troops' minds. For them, the priority is the mission. On this day they were following a lead, chasing a vehicle trying to escape as they approached the target house, and trying to find bits of intelligence from residents unwilling to talk.

A top priority is getting themselves and their fellow soldiers home alive, and we are told that priority does not change, no matter who visits.

Denmark Intends To Cut Number Of Troops In Iraq

1 May 2006 Focus Information Agency

Copenhagen: The Danish cabinet intends to pull out some 100 soldiers from the total of 539 strong contingent deployed in Southern Iraq, the Danish press reports today, cited by AP.

According to the publications the Danish Foreign Minister Mr. Per Stig Møller intends to present on 18th May a suggestion for reducing the troops to 400 people. Denmark's contingent in Iraq was deployed in Basra under British command. The Parliament should decide whether to prolong or not their mission that ends on 30th June.

1000 West Point Cadets Demonstrate Against Stupid Drug Searches

4.28.06 Washington Post

]

At least 1,000 West Point cadets demonstrated last week against the manner in which a drug search was carried out in their barracks.

No narcotics were found, and no disciplinary charges have been brought since the incident.

“Gangs” Getting Help From Soldiers

May 1, 2006 CBS Broadcasting Inc

Graffiti painted by Chicago gangs is showing up in Iraq.

The Chicago Sun-Times reports the graffiti shows the increasing gang activity in the Army.

Chicago police have reportedly seen evidence of gangs getting help from soldiers, and the FBI visited Army bases to check into gang activity.

Government Fucks Over Military Spouses Again, As Usual

5.1.06 Houston Chronicle

A program that helps military spouses with job training, placement, tuition and child care is in jeopardy because government officials don't plant to renew its federal grant.

New York City Labor Against The War Says:

Saturday, April 29, 2006 – NYC

End the War – Bring All the Troops Home Now!

No More Blood for Empire, Oil and Profit

• Immediate withdrawal of occupation forces from Iraq, Afghanistan & the entire Middle East.

- No "timetable."
- No "advisors."
- No "redeployment."
- No air war.

• No war on Iran.

• End all aid to the Israeli apartheid state – Freedom for Palestine.

• U.S. hands off the Philippines, Colombia, Haiti, Venezuela, Cuba – and the rest of the world.

Defend Working People At Home

- No human being is "illegal" – Full amnesty for undocumented immigrants.
- End the attack on Arab/Muslim rights.
- Reconstruction and the right of return for Katrina victims.
- Decent wages and benefits for all workers.

Labor Contingent

**Assembles 10:30 a.m., on 19 St., between Broadway & Park Ave. S.
March begins at 12 Noon**



Flyer issued by:

NYC Labor Against the War (NYCLAW)

http://www.traprockpeace.org/nyclaw_blog/

nyclaw@comcast.net ▲ 917-282-0139

The Republicans couldn't have done it without the Democrats, who have fully supported war and occupation in Afghanistan and Iraq, threats to attack Syria and Iran, Israeli apartheid and ethnic cleansing, the Patriot Act, and many other Bush policies. Their real complaint is that Bush is losing the war.

The U.S. war in Iraq is built on one lie after another: "weapons of mass destruction," "stopping terrorism," "promoting democracy," and now, "preventing civil war."

In reality, it is a naked grab for oil and empire, enforced with slaughter, torture and death squads.

Such lies have been used to launch brutal U.S. wars of empire throughout U.S. history. And, as always, working people pay the terrible price.

This war has killed thousands of Iraqis and G.I.s, looted the economy and promoted ethnic division.

At home, the "War on Terror" since 9/11 has meant racist attacks on the Arab/Muslim community and immigrants, assault on civil liberties, billions of wasted dollars, massive cuts in social safety net, betrayal of Katrina refugees, and weaker labor unions.

Bipartisan Empire

None of this is an accident. It is part and parcel of Bush's shameless exploitation of 9/11 to increase U.S. domination of the Middle East and the rest of the world.

But the Republicans couldn't have done it without the Democrats, who have fully supported war and occupation in Afghanistan and Iraq, threats to attack Syria and Iran, Israeli apartheid and ethnic cleansing, the Patriot Act, and many other Bush policies.

Their real complaint is that Bush is losing the war.

Grassroots Resistance

But the U.S. empire has bred resistance across the planet.

By standing up to the most powerful military in world history, ordinary Iraqis have prevented the conquest of their country, and stopped the U.S. from invading Iran, Syria or other countries on its hit list.

The empire also faces resistance amongst poor and working people in Palestine, Afghanistan, Colombia, Haiti, the Philippines, Venezuela and many other countries.

At home, widespread antiwar sentiment is clear from the voices of military families and veterans, mass demonstrations, local resolutions, counter-recruitment, and labor bodies representing millions of workers.

A growing number of G.I.s-workers in uniform-have refused to reenlist, gone AWOL or deserted.

Meanwhile, Bush's war at home has generated opposition from Katrina refugees, NYC transit workers, and a new mass immigrant's rights movement.

Mass movements like these stopped the bloody U.S. war in Vietnam. In the same way, we can stop today's war of empire.

Who We Are

New York City Labor Against the War (NYCLAW) was founded by trade unionists immediately after 9/11 to oppose U.S. wars of empire.

Join us at NYCLAW meetings on the first Monday of each month, at 6:30 p.m.

For more information, contact nyclaw@comcast.net, or 917-282-0139.

IRAQ RESISTANCE ROUNDUP

Assorted Resistance Action

May 1 (Reuters)

Eight members of the Interior Ministry commandos were injured when a roadside bomb exploded next to their patrol in the city of Samarra, north of Baghdad, an Iraqi and U.S. co-ordination centre said.

One police officer was killed and three policemen wounded when their patrol was targeted by a car bomb near the town of Musayib 60 km (40 miles) south of Baghdad, police said.

<p>IF YOU DON'T LIKE THE RESISTANCE END THE OCCUPATION</p>

FORWARD OBSERVATIONS

“Small Mutinies Began To Break Out”

**“We Refuse To Fire On Our Arab
Brothers”**

April 26, 2006 by Nicholas von Hoffman, The New York Observer [Excerpts]

As the Algerian conflict dragged on, small mutinies began to break out in the French Army.

Mr. Morgan writes that "the men of the 401st Anti-Aircraft Regiment, who were being kept 'under the flag' an extra nine months, were sent on a training operation on the beach, where they took off their clothes and went swimming.

Pamphlets began to appear in the barracks saying: 'We who have lived under a foreign (German) occupation learned to hate the occupiers. We are not cowards or defeatists, but we refuse to fire on our Arab brothers, many of whom served in the French army in World War Two.'"

“Which Of Your Children Do You Want To Sacrifice In Payment”

Here's the essence of our energy policy. Imagine this: you pull into a gas station and tell the attendant to fill up the gas tank. It comes time to pay and the attendant asks "Which of your children do you want to sacrifice in payment." Which child must die? Ridiculous? How is that different than what we are doing in the Middle East? April 29, 2006 By Michael A. Fox, Truthout Perspective

UFPJ Judas Goats Mobilizing To Back Imperial Democrats: No Iraq Veterans Speakers Allowed 4.29: In Fact, No Speakers At All Allowed

<p>Thus, the chief demands of April 29 avoid certain contentious but all-important questions--the Bush administration's war threats against Iran, the Palestinian struggle against Israeli occupation, even immediate withdrawal from Iraq--with the intentionally vague statement "No more never-ending oil wars."</p>
--

The successes in the struggle over the past year have been at the grassroots--opposing military recruitment on campus, developing networks of antiwar veterans, supporting the GI resisters. This is where we have to start in building for the future success of the antiwar movement.

April 28, 2006 Socialist Worker, Editorial [Excerpt]

A Gallup poll last week showed George Bush's approval ratings at an all-new low of 36 percent, and support for his handling of the Iraq war is even lower. Almost two-thirds of people want U.S. troops pulled out of Iraq within the year, and three in 10 want immediate withdrawal.

Those findings are strikingly similar to a Zogby poll of U.S. soldiers stationed in Iraq, which found 29 percent in favor of immediate withdrawal and an overwhelming 72 percent in favor of a pullout within a year.

Unfortunately, this mass sentiment against the war hasn't translated into a stronger antiwar movement.

Demonstrations on the third anniversary of the war last month were smaller than the year before, despite the larger opposition.

And the April 29 demonstration in New York City this weekend--which the antiwar coalition United for Peace and Justice (UFPJ) supported in opposition to the international call for March 19 protests--has been watered down into a broad liberal mobilization, with a barely muted emphasis on electoral politics over activist organizing.

The centerpiece of the day will be a five-hour "peace and justice festival" squeezed into a small city park called Foley Square. There will be no speakers at the festival.

Some progressives say that April 29 will be a step forward for the movement because of the involvement of not only antiwar organizations like UFPJ, but also mainstream liberal groups like the National Organization for Women and Operation PUSH.

But the effect has been to highlight only the least objectionable demands on a range of issues--and exclude anything more radical.

Thus, the chief demands of April 29 avoid certain contentious but all-important questions--the Bush administration's war threats against Iran, the Palestinian struggle against Israeli occupation, even immediate withdrawal from Iraq--with the intentionally vague statement "No more never-ending oil wars."

The goal--explicitly stated by some organizers--is to make this demonstration part of a broader mobilization behind the Democrats for the midterm congressional elections in November. This is part of a strategic orientation aimed not at mobilizing the growing numbers of people against Bush's war, but at promoting the "antiwar Democrats."

But the Democrats--and not only the party's mainstream leadership, but its liberal wing--are still pushing ways to "win" the war with formulas that aren't much different from the White House line that "as Iraqis stand up, we will stand down."

Thus, the proposal from the Pentagon brass' mouthpiece Rep. John Murtha--described by the media and even peace groups like UFPJ as "antiwar"--is really aimed at salvaging, not ending, the U.S. military dominance of the Persian Gulf region, through redeploying U.S. troops out of Iraq to Kuwait, Qatar and Dubai.

The Democrats' attempts to position themselves as more competent in defending national security than the Republicans has also given a discredited and unpopular White House the political room to beat the war drums against Iran.

If the antiwar movement lines up behind the Democrats, it will undermine efforts to oppose all U.S. military interventions.

The Democrats are not an antiwar party. The antiwar movement can't hope to meet the challenges it faces if it tailors its activity and arguments to the needs of a pro-war political party.

UFPJ wants to tone down the message of the movement to match what its supposed "allies" in the Democratic Party are saying. But this is exactly the opposite of what the immense antiwar majority is looking for. The slogan "Take back Congress" doesn't inspire anyone.

The successes in the struggle over the past year have been at the grassroots--opposing military recruitment on campus, developing networks of antiwar veterans, supporting the GI resisters. This is where we have to start in building for the future success of the antiwar movement.

What do you think? Comments from service men and women, and veterans, are especially welcome. Send to thomasfbarton@earthlink.net. Name, I.D., address withheld unless publication requested. Replies confidential.

Neil Young Kicks Out the Jams! **"This Is More Than A Rock Album. It's A Call To Arms"**

From: Ron Jacobs
To: GI Special
Sent: May 01, 2006 8:33 AM

By Ron Jacobs

On April 30, 1970, Richard Nixon told the world that US forces were invading the country of Cambodia. Within twenty-four hours of his announcement, the streets of many cities and towns around the United States and elsewhere were filled with angry protests against the US action.

On May 4th National Guard troops opened fire on protesters in Kent, Ohio killing four and wounding many others. Within days, the rock band Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young released the angry single "Ohio" about the murders at Kent.

A simple guitar lick opens the tune and then Neil begin singing: "Tin soldiers and Nixon's coming/Four dead in Ohio...." The song is angry and direct. The response was similar. While most stations played the tune, there were several that refused. The single, which included the acoustic "Find The Cost of Freedom" on its B side, made it to the number 14 position on the charts.

One of the harshest reactions to the song occurred at the European studios of Armed Forces Network (AFN)--the radio network heard by US military and their dependents throughout Europe. After a night DJ played the tune, he was removed from his deejay position and the song was never heard again on AFN Europe that summer. In addition, it was impossible to find at Post Exchanges in Germany.

Anyhow, Neil Young has done it again.

A week or so ago, he went into the studio with the same sense of urgency that the producers of the "Ohio" single recall to record a new antiwar work called Living With War. The CD should be in stores by May 15, 2006. As a favor to fans and other interested folks, Young's record company released it as streaming audition on his website April 28th. The first fuzzy bass tones came out of my speakers a little after 7 AM. Then came Neil singing "Won't need no?/Won't need no stinkin' war...after the garden is gone...."

That ever-so-recognizable Silvertoney sound that Young makes with his electric guitar plays a melodic arpeggio in between the and behind the lyrics. Lyrics that appear at first to be as fuzzy in their meaning as the bass that is part of Young's signature electric sound, but turn out to be as clear as his ringing guitar licks.

If this were an a vinyl album, I would write about what appears next on the neverending groove, but I'll just call it a tune, not knowing any lyrical way to describe the series of digital commands that technology uses now to record music. The song is a simple melody that describes our lives here in the mother country (or is it the Fatherland). You know--watching the flat screen TV and just living with war everyday. The body counts and the wounded boy or girl next door--just living with war. That's the price we pay for that overpriced flat screen TV and the right to buy it at Costco.

It's not a cynical song and it isn't resigned, either. It's stating a tragic fact. Young is trying to get us all to do something to stop it.

Don't need no more lies. That's the refrain of Young's next melody. Titled "The Restless Consumer," the song opens with the observation that we can't see those flag-draped coffins. Why? Because the spin machine doesn't want us to. Like everything else in

this latest war (that's the war on terror, not just the one in Iraq), everything we hear is just another lie. Terrorists and terror alerts. WMD and democracy. Don't need no more lies. Will the restless consumer get tired of the lies and do something about it? That's what Young seems to be asking here.

"Back in the days of Shock and Awe." So begins song number four: "Shock and Awe." It's a lament for the dead. It's a lament for the nation's dead soul. It's a wailing at the wake of so many Iraqi children. The music here is defined by the trumpet that plays the melody. A melody that could be the tune of one of those rhymes children make up when they're skipping rope or playing tag.

Curtis Mayfield once titled an album of his Back In the World. The "World" is what GIs called the States when they were overseas, especially in a war zone. Neil's next song is titled "Families." Family values that ring true, like when a soldier writes that they're coming back to you. It's another part of war that only soldiers and their families know. Longing and wondering. Children unseen and growing old without their parent. Some born while the parent dies overseas in a war that has no meaning. When your family is stateside, that's where the world is.

"Do you think that you believe in yours/More than they do theirs now?" That's a lyric from the song "Flags of Freedom." Flags on Main Street and sons going off to war. The tune is borrowed from Bob Dylan's "Chimes of Freedom" but the hope implicit in Dylan's song are not here. All that's left is the cynical world that Dylan hoped to overcome. The world that we all hoped to overcome. Is there still an answer blowin' in the wind?

The next song is the single. It is the clarion bell. It is the first chime of freedom. Impeach the President. That's what Neil titles his next tune. It begins with a trumpet playing Taps. Nothing held back.

It's a call to arms from a poet to a pretender. Get the sonuvabitch out of there. Let's impeach the president...for lying us into war. Let's impeach the president...for spying on us all. Let's impeach the president for hijacking our religion....and using it to get elected.

This is the song that got the attention of FoxNews--who now control the Information Bureau of the great leader. The Italians strung up Mussolini and then told each other, kick him until you're sure he's dead. No one's calling for that, but there's plenty calling for impeachment. It's time to bring him down. And make sure we take Cheney with him. Otherwise it's no victory.

Then what? What if we did get rid of Bush and Cheney? Who rules?

Neil knew better than to leave us hanging. "Lookin' For a Leader" is the next song. He runs through a litany of names and rejects them all. Maybe Obama--no I guess not. Maybe Colin Powell, he could make up for the lies he told? The ones that helped bring us to where we are. Never mind.

This is the weakest song on the album politically, but only because Young names some names. He's right about the need for a new direction, but the names he lists are not the ones to look at.

He's right when he says that person is walking among us. He's right when he says that leader needs the great spirit on their side. We have sunk into the darkness that Hunter S. Thompson described so well when he was alive. The abyss of fear and loathing. Of corruption and death. Where good is evil and evil is placed on the altar in the temple of the powerful.

This past December a very good friend of mine died in a tragic fire. He was fifty-three. We had just got back together after a decade or so of being in touch only rarely and then via the phone and US mail.

My buddy was a Navy vet from the Vietnam period. He joined the Navy out of high school so that he wouldn't get drafted into the Army (his lottery number was sure to get called that year and the war was raging). He spent a year and a half off the coast of southern Vietnam. While on the USS JFK carrier, he contracted Hepatitis C from some chemicals he worked with. At least that's what the VA doctors told him.

The Hep C was only exacerbated by the lifestyle he temporarily assumed when he came back. A lifestyle that many vets undertook for some period of their return--if only to forget what they saw and did. When I saw him a few weeks before he died, we talked about music, books, old friends, and the world in general. Our plan was to go to some shows this summer. Then the fire struck.

I only tell you this because the second-to-last song on Living With War is about a friend of Neil's who died in Vietnam. It's this man and all the other vets of US wars of Empire that are the muse for this album. Their deaths are the inspiration for Neil's angry music and pointed lyrics. Men and women who underneath it all were believers in the ideals for which they were told they were fighting. Ideals that look like nothing but frickin' lies. Many of those men didn't physically die in Vietnam, but they died there just the same.

Can we get those ideals back?

Neil, the eternal optimist believes we can. That's why he ends the album with "America the Beautiful." He is much more of a believer than me, but more likely closer to the majority of the residents of this country.

The music on this album is classic Neil Young. Electric but not flashy. Driving rock that makes you sing. If I drove a car, this is the kind of music I would want in my player as I drove on the Interstate across the land.

Short songs that you know will be extended and tear up the aisles when they're performed live this summer when Neil goes on tour when Crosby, Stills, Nash & Young reform for their Freedom of Speech in 2006 tour.

This is more than a rock album. It's a call to arms.

Listen!

I wonder if AFN will play it. Or Clear Channel.

OCCUPATION REPORT

“Rice’s Trip Is Just Another Desperate Move By The Americans” “But They Have Lost Their Influence”

April 27 by Louise Roug and Paul Richter, AFP [Excerpt]

Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld paid a surprise visit to Baghdad on Wednesday to express support for Iraq’s new leaders, but drew criticism from Iraqi politicians who said they feared the unannounced visit might do more harm than good.

"We didn't invite them," said Kamal Saadi, a Shiite legislator close to the new prime minister-designate, Nouri Maliki.

Saadi said Iraqi leaders had not been given advance notice of the visit, which came just days after Iraqi politicians broke through a months-long impasse on the selection of a prime minister.

"Maybe Rumsfeld's visit can be justified" because of American troop presence, "but I can't see a clear reason behind Rice's visit," Saadi said. "The crisis is over and negotiations are taking place."

"Enough is enough," said Sheik Mahmoud Sudani, a politician affiliated with radical Shiite cleric Muqtada Sadr.

"Rice's trip to Iraq at this critical time is just another desperate move by the Americans to try to impose themselves on our new government. But they have lost their influence."

**OCCUPATION ISN'T LIBERATION
BRING ALL THE TROOPS HOME NOW!**

DANGER: POLITICIANS AT WORK

Republican Senators Support Rumsfeld Like A Rope Supports A Hanging Man

But in the aftermath of calls by several retired generals for Rumsfeld's ouster, those GOP lawmakers remain uncomfortable with him. Given the chance, they offer no words of support.

April 27, 2006 By Liz Sidoti, Associated Press

Senate Republican critics of Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld are deferring to President Bush's support for the Pentagon chief, mindful that his fate is out of their hands.

But in the aftermath of calls by several retired generals for Rumsfeld's ouster, those GOP lawmakers remain uncomfortable with him. Given the chance, they offer no words of support.

"He still is in the confidence of the president. The president reiterated that the other day, so I'll continue to try to work with him," Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., said Wednesday.

"There really is only one person he needs to please, and that's the president," added Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine. "The president's made clear that the secretary is his choice and that really ends it."

"Is he still here?" joked Sen. Trent Lott, R-Miss.

Yes. Should he not be?

"That's up to him and the president. I don't see that his performance has changed," said Lott, who has said he's "not a fan" of Rumsfeld.

Hardly glowing endorsements.

Striking a careful balance, [Sen. John Warner, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee] issued a statement this week calling the debate among retired generals about Rumsfeld "an important exercise of the right to freedom of speech."

But Warner noted that Bush has decided to retain Rumsfeld in his Cabinet and said: "I support the president's right to make this decision."

Notably missing was praise for Rumsfeld. There wasn't even lukewarm support.

CLASS WAR REPORTS

Bolivian Army Takes Control Of Bolivian Gas Fields

1 May 2006 By Carlos Alberto Quiroga, (Reuters)

LA PAZ, Bolivia

Bolivian President Evo Morales ordered the military to occupy the country's natural gas fields on Monday after nationalizing the energy sector and threatening to expel foreign companies if they do not sign new contracts within six months.

Impoverished Bolivia has the second-largest natural gas reserves in South America after Venezuela, and the question of how the country should manage these riches has been at the heart of several popular revolts since 2003.

Morales became president in January on vows to exert more state control over the country's natural resources, reflecting a growing backlash against free markets and foreign investment in Latin America. Radical leftists recently complained that he had made little progress on this front.

The president chose Labor Day, May 1, to announce the sector's nationalization, which stipulates companies will have to leave the country unless they sign contracts recognizing the new state control of the fields.

"We want to ask (the Armed Forces) that starting now, they occupy all the energy fields in Bolivia along with battalions of engineers," Morales said.

Bolivian Vice President Alvaro Garcia said officials from state energy company YPFB and the military began taking control of dozens of energy installations -- including gas fields, pipelines and refineries -- after Morales signed the document.

At a Labor Day celebration in La Paz's main plaza attended by a large crowd, Garcia said the government's energy-related revenue will jump to \$780 million next year, expanding nearly sixfold from 2002.

Morales had promised to nationalize the gas sector even during his campaign but repeatedly said he would not expropriate foreign companies' assets.

South America's poorest nation, Bolivia has natural gas reserves of some 48.7 trillion cubic feet.

“Democrats Have Not Successfully Derailed The Militant Wing Of The Immigrant Rights Movement”

In contrast to the moribund antiwar movement, however, Democrats have not successfully derailed the militant wing of the immigrant rights movement -- and plans for a May 1 boycott continue in major U.S. cities.

April 28, 2006 by Sharon Smith, Socialist Worker [Excerpt]

For the first time in six decades, International Workers Day will be celebrated on US soil with mass working-class demonstrations on May 1. May Day, celebrated the world over, commemorates the seismic upheaval inside the U.S. that launched the struggle for the eight-hour workday in 1886, a time when native-born workers had few rights and immigrants had still fewer, yet both united in a class-wide battle.

The decision to organize a national day of protest for immigrant rights on May 1 this year is a conscious nod toward the traditions embodied by this working-class holiday, in which immigrants have played such a vital role historically.

May 1, 2006, holds the potential to begin to revive that tradition, from America's grassroots. The movement's most powerful slogan, "a day without immigrants," is based upon a strategy of social struggle tied explicitly to the power of workers to withhold their labor -- which successfully built the U.S. union movement in the first few decades of the 20th century.

For the labor movement, the lessons of this new struggle, with traditions rooted in its own history, could finally begin to reverse decades of retreat and setback.

To be sure, there is a debate over strategy underway inside the immigrant rights movement. Last week, Time magazine featured an article, "The Immigrants' Dilemma: To Boycott or Not to Boycott? A split is growing over how militant the upcoming 'Day Without Immigrants' should be."

Since hundreds of thousands turned out to protest in more than 100 cities on April 10, spurring several days of student walkouts from Dallas to Los Angeles, congressional Democrats and their movement minions have done their best to rein in workplace and school walkouts on May 1.

Democrats have warned supporters that walkouts could create a "backlash," while dangling the promise of "comprehensive immigration reform" -- a misleading term denoting "legalization" rather than "amnesty."

Thus far, Democratic-sponsored proposals for legalization exclude the vast majority of immigrants from the path to citizenship, instead promoting guest-worker programs that offer immigrant workers no right to workplace representation, to the delight of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Moreover, Democrats are carefully playing to both sides in the national immigration debate, as Sen. Hillary Clinton demonstrated in a recent New York Daily News interview, in which reporters described her “embracing both conservative and liberal goals.”

In the interview, Clinton argued that U.S. borders should be secured with a wall or “smart fence” before legalization begins.

In contrast to the moribund antiwar movement, however, Democrats have not successfully derailed the militant wing of the immigrant rights movement -- and plans for a May 1 boycott continue in major U.S. cities.

The difference has been the strength of the immigrant rights movement inside the working class and the growth of a committed left wing willing to challenge the dominance of strategies that rely on congressional Democrats.

MORE:

“I Will Not Bathe My Hands In The Blood Of The People Of Mexico”

April 28, 2006 By Paul D’Amato, Socialist Worker [Excerpts]

“WE DIDN’T cross the border, the border crossed us.” This slogan of the immigrant rights movement expresses an historical fact--that much of the Western U.S. was once part of Mexico.

The U.S. seized half of Mexico--including Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California--in the Mexican-American war of 1846-48. The war cost almost 14,000 U.S. and twice as many Mexican lives.

Newly elected president James Polk had war on his mind. Knowing from experience that Mexico would refuse to sell any of its provinces, he sought to provoke Mexico into war. The plan found its greatest support among Southern slave owners, who hoped through conquest to expand the number of slave states.

Critics of the invasion, like congressman Joshua R. Giddings, rightly called it “a war against an unoffending people...for the purpose of conquest; with a design of extending slavery...I will not bathe my hands in the blood of the people of Mexico.”

Ulysses S. Grant, who fought in the war, called it “one of the most unjust ever waged on a weaker country by a stronger.”

GI Special Looks Even Better Printed Out

The following have posted issues; there may be others:

<http://www.williambowles.info/gispecial/2006/index.html>;

http://robinlea.com/GI_Special/; <http://imagineaworldof.blogspot.com/>; <http://qi-special.iraq-news.de>;

http://www.traprockpeace.org/qi_special/;

<http://www.uruknet.info/?p=-6&l=e>; <http://www.albasrah.net/magalat/english/qi-special.htm>

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.