

2003 FEB -6 P 12: 09

February 7, 2003

CLERK
MASSACHUSETTS
Communication for City Council Meeting February 10, 2003
To: The Honorable the City Councillors
From: Elie Yarden, Cambridge Greens
Subject: The Impending Invasion of Iraq



Among public opponents of the current U.S. government's domestic and foreign policies, Senator Edward Kennedy has been the most articulate in characterizing it as Imperialist adventurism, and denying that it is intended to defend the people of the United States. As of this morning's news, after the speech to the U.N. by Secretary Powell, Kerry and Markey support the Bush agenda; Kennedy and Capuano oppose it.

Where does the City of Cambridge stand? I submit information that may help you decide.

- A. An essay, not yet published, by Eliot Weinberger, *New York: Sixteen Months After*. Mr. Weinberger is best known as the translator of the poetry of Octavio Paz, I chose this history because it is the most comprehensive, and also because the information contained is easily verifiable.
- B. The 1997 *Statement of Principles* of the "Project for the New American Century." This is the Washington 'think tank' that is most influential in directing U.S. policy. Many of the 25 original signers are members of the Bush administration today.
- C. A copy of a letter that I sent to members of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation on September 26, 2002.
- D. An article by Gary Washburn of the Chicago Tribune January 16, 2003, concerning the discussion of the City Council's Committee on Human Relations, on the Iraq War.
- E. A e-mail report of the results of the vote on the resolution, and a copy of the actual text.

Exhibit A

Date: Thu, 16 Jan 2003 21:02:32 -0500
Reply-To: dbuuck@mindspring.com
Sender: UB Poetics discussion group<POETICS@LISTSERV.BUFFALO.EDU>
From: David Buuck <dbuuck@MINDSPRING.COM>
Subject: weinberger essay

New York: Sixteen Months After

Eliot Weinberger

11 January 2003:

For years they'll be debating the future of the empty pit where the World Trade Center once stood, with fantastic or hideous proposals of gardens in the sky or indoor lakes or threatening tic-tack-toe-shaped fortresses. But at the moment, the only thing certain is the fate of the actual towers themselves. The scrap steel will be shipped from the Fresh Kills landfill in Staten Island to the Grumman shipyard in Trent Lott's fiefdom of Pascagoula, Mississippi. There, it will be melted down and turned into the "New York," an \$800 million "state of the art" amphibious assault ship. In Bush America, every ploughshare must be beaten into a sword. War and war and war. 150,000 troops are massed in the surrounds of Iraq, many of them reservists pulled from their normal lives, preparing for what the Pentagon is already declaring the "greatest precision-bombing aerial assault in history," to be followed by an invasion which the United Nations estimates will cause 500,000 casualties. There are troops or "advisers" in India, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, the Philippines, Colombia. . . and speculation that Iraq is merely a stop on the road to Iran.

Military operations in Afghanistan are continuing at a cost of a billion dollars a month — compared to the \$25 million a month the U.S. is spending there on humanitarian aid, most of it paying for the offices and maintenance of the aid workers, or vanishing into the crevices of local corruption. Helmeted and armored Special Forces troops still move like Robocop through the villages, past the hundreds of thousands of displaced peasants trying to survive the winter. This year, the Pentagon budget will increase by \$38 billion to almost \$400 billion. The increase alone is practically the entire budget of the second-biggest military spender, China. Meanwhile, millions of Americans have lost their jobs or have had their salaries greatly reduced. There are schools around the country that will be closing a month early this year because of budget cuts, further evidence of the theory that Republicans never allot any money for education in order to keep the electorate stupid so that they'll vote for Republicans.

Everything is war and war, the talk of war, while the real, declared war — "the War on Terrorism" — is a complete failure. It could not be otherwise: One cannot, by definition, wage a military (and not metaphorical) war against terrorism, for the terrorists themselves are not waging a war. Wars are fought to coerce an enemy to accept one's policies or sovereignty. Even when they involve the mass slaughter of civilians

— as has been increasingly the case since World War I — they are not terrorism. (A Palestinian suicide bombing, however repulsive, is the act of a civilian combatant in a war of independence.) Terrorism is committed by small, clandestine, independent groups — "the evil twins of NGO's" — in the attempt to persuade like-minded people to join their side, whether physically or intellectually. The massacre at the World Trade Center was, in terms of the United States, a means without an end: There were no grounds on which the U.S. could admit "defeat"; the only possible "victory" for al-Qaeda was a sympathetic response from within the Muslim world. In a revenge-seeking and deliberate confusion of host and guest, the U.S. military easily overthrew the essentially unarmed Taliban regime, leaving vast areas of the country in the hands of warlords, and partially restoring the freedoms (music and television, women without burqas and girls in school, clean-shaven men) which the Afghans had enjoyed under that oppressive Soviet occupation the U.S., through its fundamentalist surrogates, the Taliban, had fought so long. [Freedom, however, only goes so far: A few days ago, a political cartoonist was thrown in prison for mildly satirizing President Karzai.] The country is in ruins, but the pipeline from Kazakhstan has now become a reality, and its plans are drawn, the fulfillment of an old dream among the Bush crowd. As Dick Cheney said in 1998, when he was CEO of Haliburton: "I can't think of a time when we've had a region emerge as suddenly to become as strategically significant as the Caspian. It's almost as if the opportunities have arisen overnight. The good Lord didn't see fit to put oil and gas only where there are democratically elected regimes friendly to the United States. Occasionally we have to operate in places where, all things considered, one would not normally choose to go. But we go where the business is."

The War on Terrorism has been good for business, but hasn't done anything bad against the terrorists. With one possible exception (an Egyptian strategic planner), not a single important al-Qaeda member has been killed or captured. George Bush has not mentioned the name "Osama bin Laden" in six or eight months, and no wonder: He may think he's Wyatt Earp, but those evil-doing Clanton Brothers aren't playing by the rules and they never showed up at the OK Corral. So all Bush can do is just shoot at anybody who looks mean.

After all, al-Qaeda — once one strips away the propaganda — appears to be a group of, at most, a few hundred educated, middle-class fanatics, who masterminded terrorist actions, mainly in Africa, at the rate of one every eighteen months. They also ran camps in Afghanistan for thousands of young peasants attracted to local jihads, including 5,000 trained by Pakistani intelligence for incursions into Kashmir and 3,000 Uzbeks attempting to overthrow the dictatorship in Uzbekistan (which receives hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. military aid). It is these Afghan and foreign peasants, Taliban foot soldiers and jihadis, that the Bush Team has labeled "al-Qaeda terrorists" and left to rot in Guantanamo Bay (in cages, by the way, identical to the one in which Ezra Pound was placed in Pisa in 1945). Al-Qaeda, as the recent bombings in Kenya prove, continues as it did before. Forced out of Afghanistan, it is merely less visible. There is indeed a malevolent "sleeper cell" in the United States, but it is not the one in

Attorney General John Ashcroft's apocalyptic imagination. It was formed in the 1970's, in the Ford Administration, by Donald Rumsfeld, then as now Secretary of Defense, and his young disciple, Dick Cheney, whom Rumsfeld got appointed as White House Chief of Staff. During the Reagan years they attracted brilliant young ideological extremists: Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Elliott Abrams, Zalmay Khalilzad, among them. In 1992, the last year of the Bush Sr. administration, convinced, as everyone was, that Bush would be reelected, and hoping for a second-term purge of the multilateralists surrounding the President, they launched their first secret manifesto: "Defense Planning Guidance for the Fiscal Years 1994-1999," written by Wolfowitz and Khalilzad, under the direction of then Secretary of Defense Cheney.

According to their "Guidance," with the collapse of the Soviet Union, the "first objective" of the United States was now "to prevent the re-emergence [sic] of a new rival": "The U.S. must show the leadership necessary to establish and protect a new order that holds the promise of convincing potential competitors that they need not aspire to a greater role."

We must "discourage" the "advanced industrial nations" from "challenging our leadership."

"We must maintain the mechanisms for deterring potential competitors from even aspiring to a larger regional or global role."

"We will retain the pre-eminent responsibility for addressing. . . those wrongs which threaten our interests. . . Various types of U.S. interests may be involved in such instances: access to vital raw materials, primarily Persian Gulf oil; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles, threats to U.S. citizens from terrorism. . ."

The report, which never mentioned any allies in these global efforts, was an embarrassment to Bush Sr. and his consensus-building advisers, and was quickly suppressed after it was leaked to the New York Times. Then Bush was defeated by Clinton, and the cell went underground in the boardrooms of corporations and right-wing foundations and think tanks.

In 1997, "appalled by the incoherent policies of the Clinton administration," they formed a group called the Project for the New American Century (PNAC), "to make the case and rally support for American global leadership" and to restore "military strength and moral clarity." Their founding statement was signed by, among others, Rumsfeld, Cheney, Wolfowitz, Khalilzad, Lewis Libby, and Jeb Bush (at the time the Heir Apparent), along with such imams of conservatism as Francis Fukuyama, William Bennett, and Norman Podhoretz.

In September 2000 — when the election of Gore seemed a certainty — PNAC produced what was to become the Hammurabic Code of the Bush Jr. Administration: *_Rebuilding America's Defences: Strategies, Forces And Resources For A New Century_*. The document, which is endless, speaks openly of a "Pax Americana": expanding current U.S. military bases abroad, and building new ones in the Middle East, Southeast Europe,

Latin America, and Southeast Asia. It is contemptuous of the United Nations. It recommends "pre-emptive strikes" and particularly mentions Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. It suggests that to fight these countries we need small nuclear warheads to target "very deep, underground bunkers." (Such weapons, called Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrators, are now being developed.) It speaks of fighting and "decisively winning simultaneous major theater wars." (Thus Rumsfeld's current obsession with taking on Iraq and North Korea at the same time.) It is the origin of that bizarre, Teutonic phrase, "homeland security." It advocates, as has now been done, pulling out of the Anti-Ballistic Missile and all other international defense treaties—in the Pax Americana we won't need them. It recommends increasing defense spending to 3.8% of the Gross Domestic Product (the amount of the 2003 budget, almost to the penny). It talks not only of controlling outer space with Star Wars weaponry, but also of controlling cyberspace, fighting "enemies" (foreign or domestic?) on the Internet. One of its many charts reads:

	Cold War	21st Century
Security System:	Unipolar	Bipolar
Strategic Goal	Contain Soviet Union	Preserve Pax Americana
Main Military Mission(s)	Deter Soviet Expansion	Secure and expand zones of democratic peace deter rise of new great-power competitors; defend key regions; exploit transformation of war
Main Military	Potential global theater wars spread across globe	Potential war Threat(s) across many theaters
Focus of Strategic Competition	Europe	East Asia

The U.S., in short, is "the essential defender of today's global security order." Allies are unnecessary; world opinion is irrelevant; potential competitors must be crushed early. And, in the eeriest moment in the report, it imagines "some catastrophic

event," a "new Pearl Harbor," that will be the catalyst for the U.S. to decisively launch its new Pax. (Small wonder that, on September 12, 2001, Donald Rumsfeld insisted we immediately invade Iraq and, shortly after, Condoleezza Rice convened senior members of the National Security Council to ask them to "think about "How do you capitalize on these opportunities?"")

The Sleeper Cell has awoken. After successfully engineering a judicial coup d'etat to install their genial figurehead as President, they now control the U.S. government. Led by Cheney and Rumsfeld, Wolfowitz is Deputy Defense Secretary, Khalilzad is Ambassador to Afghanistan, Libby is Cheney's chief of staff, Abrams (after having been disgraced in the Iran-contra scandal, and after years campaigning for a law to require the posting of the Ten Commandments in every government building) is now chief White House adviser on the Middle East. A half-dozen others from PNAC hold important posts in the Defense and State departments. Their goal has been cheerfully described by Condoleezza Rice (who believes that Bush is "someone of tremendous intellect"): "American foreign policy in a Republican administration should refocus the United States on the national interest. There is nothing wrong with doing something that benefits all humanity, but that is, in a sense, a second-order effect." Richard Perle, chairman of the Defense Policy Board, is more honest: "This is total war. .. If we just let our vision of the world go forth, and we embrace it entirely and we don't try to piece together clever diplomacy, but just wage a total war, our children will sing great songs about us years from now."

In ways that Ronald Reagan would envy, the Sleeper Cell is masterful at manipulating the new forms of mass media, particularly the hyperbolic television news and radio talk shows. It officially began the rhetorical invasion of Iraq precisely on September 1 (in the words of Andrew Card, White House chief of staff, "You don't launch a new product in August") and was relentless in creating frightening stories until the November elections. Endless reports of atrocities committed by Saddam Hussein (some of them, of course, true) were combined with assertions that, as Rumsfeld put it, there is "bulletproof evidence" linking Saddam and al-Qaeda (none of which has ever been produced), which in turn were combined with frequent warnings from Ashcroft and the FBI and the CIA of new "spectacular attacks" from al-Qaeda "that meet several criteria: high symbolic value, mass casualties, severe damage to the American economy and maximum psychological trauma."

It is dizzying trying to keep up with the news, to remember what happened the day before — which is precisely their intention — but let two examples suffice: In December, a few days after Iraq turned over a 12,000-page list of their weapons to the U.N — an act first demanded by the White House, and then ridiculed when Iraq complied — the media were suddenly flooded with a story that Iraq had given al-Qaeda the nerve gas VX, an odorless, colorless oil that causes death in minutes. This story, needless to say, fit all the criteria for sensational news: Iraq/al-Qaeda connection, gruesome death, and terrorist threat. A few days later, those omnipresent and anonymous "senior officials" were telling CNN that there was "absolutely no intelligence" on this matter,

"zero confirmation of evidence." Obviously the story had originally come from the government, and it followed the classic pattern of what was, during the Vietnam War, called "disinformation": leak false information, wait until it has its effect, and then deny it, knowing that assertions remain in the collective memory longer than their negations.

Far more serious is the current frenzy over the possibility that Iraq will somehow release smallpox, either among American troops in the projected war, or in the U.S. itself through its imagined terrorist surrogates. This has led to the mass-production of smallpox vaccines — to the delight of the drug company executives in the Bush inner circle — ambitious plans to vaccinate the entire country and the predictable "lifeboat" debates on television of who should be vaccinated first.

The smallpox panic largely comes from the assertions of Judith Miller, a New York Times reporter, that unnamed "intelligence sources" are "investigating" whether a scientist named Nelja Maltseva from the Russian Institute of Viral Preparations visited Baghdad in 1990 and sold Iraq a vial of a smallpox strain that caused an epidemic in Kazakhstan in 1972.

Dr. Maltseva died two years ago. Both her daughter and a laboratory assistant claim that she only visited Iraq once, in 1971, as part of a global smallpox eradication effort, and that her last trip abroad was to Finland in 1982. Furthermore, the Russians have always claimed that the Kazakhstan epidemic never happened, but was merely Cold War propaganda.

Edward Said attacked Miller years ago for her "thesis about the militant, hateful quality of the Arab world." Among her many books, she is the co-author of *_Saddam Hussein and the Crisis in the Gulf_* with Laurie Mylroie, who is the author of *_Saddam Hussein's Unfinished War Against America_*, which expounds the theory that Saddam personally orchestrated the 1993 World Trade Center bombing-- a theory that only Richard Perle seems to believe ("splendid and convincing"). Like almost everyone on the White House Team, Miller is associated with two right-wing think tanks, the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (the latest issue of its magazine features Oriana Fallaci on the "moral superiority of Western culture") and the Middle East Forum, which has been posting the names of university professors critical of Bush on its website. The Forum is run by Daniel Pipes, who is famous for his comment about the "massive immigration of brown-skinned peoples cooking strange foods and not exactly maintaining Germanic standards of hygiene".

The general hysteria about smallpox, in other words, and the very real possibility of mass vaccinations with its statistically inevitable corresponding deaths, is entirely the result of unsubstantiated rumors published by someone with a clear agenda.

Meanwhile, over at the Pentagon, Rumsfeld has created 2POG, the \$7 billion Proactive Pre-emptive Operations Group, whose "super-intelligence support activity" will combine "CIA and military covert action, information warfare, and deception."

Along with the usual boys'-magazine fantasies of high-tech espionage (including something about "tagging" the clothes of terrorists with DNA samples that can be perceived by laser beams from satellites) the "proactive" component consists of "duping al-Qaeda into undertaking operations it is not prepared for and thereby exposing its personnel." That is, encouraging terrorist acts that will provoke an American response. If this seems unimaginable, or paranoid, it is worth remembering Operation Northwoods, which the Pentagon proposed to Kennedy a few months before he was assassinated. The idea then was a project of bombings, hijackings and plane crashes that would kill American citizens and lead to popular sentiment for an invasion of Cuba. (Kennedy—even James Bond-addicted Kennedy—rejected that one.)

Around another bend of the Pentagon, the Defense Research Projects Agency has created the Information Awareness Office, whose mission is "Total Information Awareness" (TIA). The Office is run by former Admiral John Poindexter, who in 1990 was convicted of five felony counts for lying to Congress about the Iran-contra affair. TIA, according to Poindexter, will create "ultra-large-scale, semantically rich, easily implementable database technologies" that will allow the Pentagon to access "world-wide, distributed, legacy databases as if they were one centralized database." Which means: every possible computerized record in the U.S., on which an individual's name appears, will be copied and collated by the Pentagon: credit card purchases, library books, police records, automatic toll-collectors on bridges, university course enlistments, membership lists, and on and on—as well as all e-mails and logs of Internet surfing. They have received \$200 million for a pilot program. Over the door of Poindexter's office is the motto "Scientia Est Potentia," Knowledge Is Power. (George Bush presumably being the exception that proves the rule.)

The Sleeper Cell has awoken, and there is nothing to stop them. The Democratic Party, afraid of being branded "unpatriotic" by the Republicans, has gone into hibernation. The tattered remains of the Left is—as the Left always is—more preoccupied with fighting among themselves. With a few individual exceptions, there is almost no opposition in the major media. (Powerful anti-Bush articles by, among others, Gore Vidal, Harold Pinter, and John Berger, are published in England, but not here.) The only forum for criticism is the Internet, which, though still uncontrolled, remains the one point in the PNAC program that has yet to be (openly) addressed by the Bush Team. As we enter Bush II Anno III, anger has turned into a kind of sullen resignation.

Perhaps the problem is that there are no words to describe this Administration. All the pejoratives, however accurate, that might be applied—"warmongers" and "imperialists," "corrupt" and "bloodthirsty," "fanatical" and "criminal"—have been drained of their meaning by decades of propaganda. They are as banal as the rhetoric of the think tanks. Small wonder that American writers have generally been either silent or bathetic ("9/11 reminded me of the day my father died") on all that has happened in the last two years. We no longer have the words to even think about what is happening, about violence that is not "just like a movie," about people

like Cheney and Rumsfeld and Perle and Wolfowitz and Rice and Ashcroft and Bush, who are not Pol Pot or Stalin or Hitler, who are lesser forms of evil, but evil nonetheless. To begin to talk about them is to relive the old nightmare of the scream with no sound.

Eliot Weinberger <unreal@worldnet.att.net>

The "New York. . . After" articles are written for publications abroad. In English, they circulate via e-mail and may be reproduced freely.

These articles will be published for the first time in the U.S. as a book, *_9/12_*, available in March from the Prickly Paradigm Press, distributed by the University of Chicago Press. Pre-orders from Chicago at: <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/hfs.cgi/00/15795.ctl> or from Amazon at:

http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail//0971757593/qid=1042414800/sr=1-24/ref=sr_1_24/103-7591973-2011801?v=glance&s=books

©2002 University at Buffalo Computing and Information Technology

Exhibit
B

Project for the New American Century

Statement of Principles

June 3, 1997

American foreign and defense policy is adrift. Conservatives have criticized the incoherent policies of the Clinton Administration. They have also resisted isolationist impulses from within their own ranks. But conservatives have not confidently advanced a strategic vision of America's role in the world. They have not set forth guiding principles for American foreign policy. They have allowed differences over tactics to obscure potential agreement on strategic objectives. And they have not fought for a defense budget that would maintain American security and advance American interests in the new century.

We aim to change this. We aim to make the case and rally support for American global leadership.

As the 20th century draws to a close, the United States stands as the world's preeminent power. Having led the West to victory in the Cold War, America faces an opportunity and a challenge: Does the United States have the vision to build upon the achievements of past decades? Does the United States have the resolve to shape a new century favorable to American principles and interests?

We are in danger of squandering the opportunity and failing the challenge. We are living off the capital — both the military investments and the foreign policy achievements — built up by past administrations. Cuts in foreign affairs and defense spending, inattention to the tools of statecraft, and inconstant leadership are making it increasingly difficult to sustain American influence around the world. And the promise of short-term commercial benefits threatens to override strategic considerations. As a consequence, we are jeopardizing the nation's ability to meet present threats and to deal with potentially greater challenges that lie ahead.

We seem to have forgotten the essential elements of the Reagan Administration's success: a military that is strong and ready to meet both present and future challenges; a foreign policy that boldly and purposefully promotes American principles abroad; and national leadership that accepts the United States' global responsibilities.

Of course, the United States must be prudent in how it exercises its power. But we cannot safely avoid the responsibilities of global leadership or the costs that are associated with its exercise. America has a vital role in maintaining peace and security in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. If we shirk our responsibilities, we invite challenges to our fundamental interests. The history of the 20th century should have taught us that it is important to shape circumstances before crises emerge, and to meet threats before they become dire. The history of this century should have taught us to embrace the cause of American leadership.

Our aim is to remind Americans of these lessons and to draw their consequences for today. Here are four consequences:

- we need to increase defense spending significantly if we are to carry out our global responsibilities today and modernize our armed forces for the future;
- we need to strengthen our ties to democratic allies and to challenge regimes hostile to our interests and values;
- we need to promote the cause of political and economic freedom abroad;
- we need to accept responsibility for America's unique role in preserving and extending an international order friendly to our security, our prosperity, and our principles.

Such a Reaganite policy of military strength and moral clarity may not be fashionable today. But it is necessary if the United States is to build on the successes of this past century and to ensure our security and our greatness in the next.

Elliott Abrams Gary Bauer William J. Bennett Jeb Bush

Dick Cheney Eliot A. Cohen Midge Decter Paula Dobriansky Steve Forbes

Aaron Friedberg Francis Fukuyama Frank Gaffney Fred C. Ikle

Donald Kagan Zalmay Khalilzad I. Lewis Libby Norman Podhoretz

Dan Quayle Peter W. Rodman Stephen P. Rosen Henry S. Rowen

Donald Rumsfeld Vin Weber George Weigel Paul Wolfowitz

Exhibit C
COPY

September 26, 2002

To the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation:

Reports in the press, as well the position statements of prominent members of the Bush Administration to be found on the Project for a New American Century web site, convince us that the actions of that administration are undermining all hopes for future world peace

Rather than allow the military strength of the United States to *support* the peace efforts of the United Nations, the Bush Administration has:

- rejected or failed to ratify the international treaties designed to prevent war, protect all peoples from the actions of unjust governments, and bring criminal leaders like Saddam Hussein before the World Court;

- violated its own commitments to free trade by selective protectionism;

- acted to weaken peaceful regional alliances such as the European Union, which are not under U. S. control;

- asserted that it will act to prevent any state or alliance of states from threatening, through free competition, its economic superiority;

- declared that it will take any military action it deems necessary to maintain supremacy in all areas of interest; and

seeks to justify its policies by asserting the cultural and political superiority of the values of American society.

We believe the Pax Americana idea to be a souped-up version of late 19th and early 20th century Imperialism — the “White Man’s Burden.” Were the United States to succeed in forcing its practices of unbridled exploitation of the world’s resources, and compelling other peoples to use their resources in ways dictated by laws made for the benefit of the U. S., the famous words: “You make a desert, and you call it ‘Peace’” will apply to us.

We believe that most Americans do not seek world domination. Thus we ask that the the Massachusetts congressional delegation, all members of the Democratic Party, expose the Bush party agenda for world dominion and the suppression of dissent within our country. Let us not thwart the desire of other nations to find ways of prospering with greater social equality and less damage to the earth than is our way. Put a stop to Unilateralism, doctrines of American Exceptionalism, and other expressions of Manifest Destiny. These can only lead to devastating wars and destructive hatreds. The rhetoric of the bully has no place in international affairs. Despite terrorist attacks, despite the continuing failures of our government to protect the lives and the welfare of the American people, we remain strong. Let us learn to walk more carefully.

We expect the Democratic Party to offer us an alternative to Bush’s imperialism in the coming election. Any compromise with, any appeasement of, imperialist agendas will only add to the harm. The ideology of the Bush Party leaves no space for a bipartisan foreign policy.

Elie Yarden



Exhibit D

**Aldermen urge U.S. to go slow on Iraq
Council panel backs proposal**

By Gary Washburn
Tribune staff reporter
Published January 16, 2003

A Chicago City Council committee on Wednesday hosted what turned out to be a forum against President Bush's policy on Iraq, ultimately voting to approve a resolution opposing a pre-emptive attack "unless it is demonstrated that Iraq poses a real and imminent threat" to U.S. security.

More than a dozen speakers, including religious, government and labor leaders, voiced support for the measure; no one opposed it. After about two hours of the council's testimony, members of the Committee on Human Relations overwhelmingly gave its approval. Ald. James Balcer (11th) was the only "no" vote, though he said he supported "95 percent of this resolution [and] what I heard here was very, very compelling."

The measure now goes to the full City Council, where Ald. Joe Moore (49th), one of its sponsors, said that 29 of the city's 50 aldermen either have signed on or have indicated their support.

Though some might question the importance of the council's position on a matter of international scope, Moore contended that it would have "tremendous impact."

"It will mean that Chicago is the largest city yet to weigh in on this," he said. "It will have a cumulative effect because, as more and more cities, towns and villages pass these resolutions, it is indicative of what people at the grass roots are thinking."

"People might ask why the City Council would get involved in international questions," said U.S. Rep. Danny Davis (D-Ill.), one of the speakers. "The people are the decision makers," he said. "People determine what ought to be the direction, and when members of Congress hear . . . that is where we get our marching orders."

A war on Iraq would divert resources from the war on terrorism and "make us even more a pariah in the Muslim world than we are today," asserted John Roberts, a DePaul University law professor. "How can we tell Indians and Pakistanis not to attack one another when we attack a sovereign nation?"

Other speakers asserted that the cost in human life and money would be onerous.

A war "would raid the Social Security trust fund and cut funding to states and cities already facing budget deficits," asserted Mark Postilion, recording secretary for Local 705 of the Teamsters Union.

Balcer, a decorated Vietnam War veteran and former city liaison to veterans, said he agreed with supporters of the resolution that diplomatic efforts should be exhausted before the U.S. goes to war. His only objection was the measure's suggestion that Iraq does not already pose an imminent threat to U.S. security.

Exhibit E

Subject: Fwd: Copy of Chicago City Council Anti-War Resolution
Message-ID: <4.3.0.20030117171145.00a66f00@mail.fmnh.org>

Chicago Passes Anti-War Resolution

46-1 Vote Follows Extensive and Personal Debate (Chicago, Jan. 16, 2003)

After one of the most mesmerizing, impassioned and personal debates ever to occur in Chicago's City Council Chamber, Chicago has become the largest and most prominent city in the nation to formally oppose a unilateral pre-emptive strike on Iraq.

One by one, black and white, Latino and Jewish, men and women, the Aldermen stood to draw attention to their own particular concerns with the current path of the Bush Administration. Many pointed out that the real dangers this nation faces today are the rising rates of unemployment and economic stagnation. Others were concerned about the double standard the administration is showing with respect to North Korea. And some drew attention to the prospect of young sons and daughters coming home in body bags from an ill-conceived war.

The Committee of Human Relations of the Chicago City Council sent the "Resolution Opposing Pre-emptive U.S. Military Strikes on Iraq" to the full council today after a vote yesterday

"It is our sons and daughters who will be recruited-- perhaps even conscripted--to fight in this war," said Ald. Joseph Moore (49th), chief sponsor of the resolution. Ald. Leslie Hairston (5th) was concerned that the "cost of the war will dry up federal funding for domestic programs for a war that has yet to be justified."

Judith Kossy of Chicagoans Against the War on Iraq said she and her organization were deeply moved by the leadership of Ald. Joe Moore, Ald. Helen Shiller, Ald. Ricardo Munoz, Ald. Leslie Hairston and by the action taken today the City Council. "Two out of three people in the nation oppose a unilateral war. It's important for local leaders to articulate their constituent's feelings to President Bush and to the world," Kossy said.

The full resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING A PRE- EMPTIVE U.S. MILITARY ATTACK ON IRAQ

WHEREAS, the issues between Iraq and the world community have not proven to be irresolvable by traditional diplomatic efforts; and

WHEREAS, while Saddam Hussein is a tyrant who should be removed from power, both for the good of the Iraqi people and for the security of Iraq's neighboring countries, it is not at all clear that a unilateral U.S. military action would result in the installation of a free and democratic Iraqi government; and

WHEREAS, U.S. military actions would risk the deaths of thousands of Iraqi civilians without guaranteeing the safety and security of U.S. citizens; and

WHEREAS, a pre-emptive and unilateral U.S. military attack would violate international law and our commitments under the U.N. Charter and further isolate the U.S. from the rest of the world; and

WHEREAS, the Congressional Budget Office estimates a military action against Iraq will cost our nation between \$9 and \$13 billion a month, likely resulting in further cuts in federally funded projects and programs that benefit our city and its residents; and

WHEREAS, a U.S.-led war in Iraq would compromise our current action in Afghanistan, and require years of nation-building activities in Iraq; and

WHEREAS, the Bush administration has failed to articulate a clear strategic objective or outcome of a military attack against Iraq, and such an attack fails to enjoy the support of many of our important allies; and

WHEREAS, we give our unconditional support to U.S. military personnel serving at home and abroad in their tireless battle against global terrorism, and should our military forces be sent to Iraq, we give our unyielding support to our young men and women serving in our nation's military, even if we oppose the policy that sent them there;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the members of the City Council of the City of Chicago, oppose a pre-emptive U.S. military attack on Iraq unless it is demonstrated that Iraq poses a real and imminent threat to the security and safety of the United States; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we support a return of U.N. weapons inspectors to Iraq, enhanced by sufficient police support to guarantee unfettered access to all targeted sites; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that we urge the U.S. to work through the U.N. Security Council and reaffirm our nation's commitment to the rule of law in all international relationships; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Illinois congressional delegation and the President of the United States.

S-46

Consent Communication #3

A communication was received from Elie Yarden, regarding the impending invasion of Iraq.

In City Council February 10, 2003

PLACED ON FILE.