Millions of workers in America and around the world were horrified by the torture and abuse of Iraqi prisoners by American soldiers at the Abu Ghraib prison. For some, these outrages committed by American soldiers challenged their ideas about what America is supposed to stand for; for others, these horrendous acts only confirmed their worst fears about what America was capable of.

Ruling-class elements, politicians and other supporters of capitalism and class rule also expressed indignation over the conduct of the soldiers involved. But theirs were the voices of hypocrisy.

The initial reaction of the Bush administration to these blatant acts of brutality was to blame them on rogue elements in the military while asserting that torture “was the wrongdoing of a few,” words that didn’t wash. A 6,000-page report authored by Maj. Gen. Antonio Taguba outlining torture and abuses in Iraqi prisons run by the U.S. Army was issued to Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld months ago, absolutely confirming what administration sources denied.

The CIA and other agents who actually interrogated prisoners may have committed unspeakable acts. They were undocumented and conducted in secrecy. Recent reports record 33 deaths in detention in Iraq and Afghanistan. Most, allegedly, were related to “heart problems,” but nine were due to homicide, of which six were due to “blunt force injuries” and one to multiple gunshot wounds.

All of this flies in the face of the statement President Bush made last year on behalf of United Nations International Day in Support of Victims of Torture that the U.S. is “committed to the worldwide elimination of torture and we are leading this fight by example,” challenging all other nations “in prohibiting, investigating, and prosecuting all acts of torture and in undertaking to prevent cruel and unusual punishment.”

In fact, the Bush administration has deliberately made a policy of rejecting the Geneva Conventions on treatment of prisoners. His general counsel for the Department of Defense, William J. Haynes, signed off on the legality of withholding Geneva Convention protections for detainees at the U.S. prison facility at Guantanamo Bay.

For those who had worked at least a month at one of IBM’s chip manufacturing plants, results were dramatically higher: Men were 62 percent to 79 percent more likely to have died from kidney, skin or brain cancer, and female workers were 112 percent more likely to have died from kidney cancer.

IBM attorney Robert Weber called the paper “unreliable” and “irrelevant” and “inconsistent with the law.”

IBM’s employee mortality data as an expert witness for the plaintiffs in the trial. He and coauthor Rebecca Johnson analyzed mortality data from 33,370 former IBM employees and work- place histories for more than 18,000 deceased workers for the years 1969 to 2001.

According to their analysis, the IBM workers suffered cancer rates higher than the general population. Their study showed that the 7,697 male workers “who had died of cancer were between 23 percent and 62 percent more likely to have died from cancers of the kidney, brain, blood and skin.” (Science, May 14) The 1,667 IBM women “were 20 percent more likely to have died from kidney cancer.”

“We have no territorial ambitions, we don’t seek to acquire foreign countries. We don’t strive to acquire foreign countries. But beyond that, would you, as an academic, accept the comparison?”

“At the time, almost everyone was ready to find a comparison in history for America’s position in the world now, had rise up the Roman Empire, as in comparison. There’s an obvious difference: America doesn’t have an empire,” he said in November 2002.

Condoleezza Rice made a similar assertion in the following exchange from an interview with ZDF German television in July 2003.

“We have no territorial ambitions, we don’t seek to acquire foreign countries. But beyond that, would you, as an academic, accept the comparison?”

“DR. RICE: I wouldn’t accept the comparison, to the Roman Empire, of course, because the United States has no imperial ambitions.” (Emphasis added)

Dr. Rice clearly sidestepped the distinction her interviewer tried to draw between territorial expansion and economic imperialism. She knows, or should know, that American capitalism has a long history of imperialist intervention in Latin America, for example, and that the extension of its empire in that part of the world rarely involved permanent military occupation or territorial annexation.

As noted in an article marking the 50th anniversary of the U.S.-inspired invasion of
Textbooks and ‘Politically Correct’ History

By B.G.

ike any other capitalist enterprise, book companies are in business to make money, and unless their income exceeds their outgo, business is a very tenuous one. It used to be the practice for publishers of American history texts to publish one version for schools in the North and another version for schools in the South, manipulating such things as historical accuracy and the Civil War to suit the preferences of publishers and serve the purposes of either northern or white-dominated southern school boards. Now there is a tendency among schoolbook publishers to accommodate every prejudice between one set of covers by producing history texts that will be acceptable in all parts of the country. This is ad- mittedly a daunting task, the publishing indus- try’s equivalent of being all things to all people. Class-conscious workers and Socialists may find it difficult to empathize with the industry’s marketing problems, if only because the key to understanding the history of this or any other country is that the class struggle is not even a consideration. Nonetheless, it is interesting to watch how publishers perform their dance.

To keep a market and make a profit, one text- book company eliminated mention of widespread participation by African Americans became the norm because Texas was and remains the second largest buyer of textbooks in the nation after the South. Such a policy was and is continued because certain Texans having a voice in deciding what to present in school history textbooks. Texas is the state where one will find it difficult to empathize with the industry’s marketing problems, if only because the key to understanding the history of this or any other country is that the class struggle is not even a consideration. Nonetheless, it is interesting to watch how publishers perform their dance.
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Attorney General Ashcroft’s arrogant assertion, without having to prove just cause, unprecedented powers to obtain records from the media distracted us with reports of Saddam Bush quietly signed into law last December while 2004, a chunk of Patriot Act II that President The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year are now working their way through Congress. Patriot Act II, a kind of Patriot Act on steroids—Enhancement Act—sometimes referred to as draconian measures like the Domestic Security more rapidly establish a totalitarian state. More well as judicial decisions that back them up, the president, the attorney general and others, as such, con-siders any opposition to his policies to be no less “treasonous” than an act of treason.”

Your tactics only aid terrorists, for they erode our constitutional qualification for treason—when he said, “To those who scare peace-loving people with phantoms of lost liberty, my message is this: Your tactics only aid terrorists, for they erode our national unity and diminish our resolve.” An unnamed White House spokesperson quoted in an article on the Web site capitolhillblue.com put it even more directly last year before the attack on Iraq. “The president,” the source said, “con-siders this nation to be at war, and, as such, con-siders any opposition to his policies to be no less than an act of treason.”

Thanks to the Patriot Act, the Homeland Security Directive and other repressive orders by the president, the general attorney and others, as well as judicial decisions that back them up, the U.S. government has many more tools in place to more rapidly establish a totalitarian state. More draconian measures like the Domestic Security Enhancement Act—sometimes referred to as Patriot Act II, a kind of Patriot Act on steroids—are now working their way through Congress.

The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004, a chunk of Patriot Act II that President Bush quietly signed into law last December while the media distracted us with reports of Saddam Hussein’s capture, grants the FBI new and unprecedented powers to obtain records from financial institutions without a court order and without having to prove just cause. This wave of repressive measures, contrary to Attorney General Ashcroft’s arrogant assertion, has already produced far more than “phantoms” of lost liberty. According to an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) document, “8,000 Arab and South Asian immigrants have been interrogated because of their religion or ethnic background rather than any credible evidence against them.”

“Thousands of men, mostly of Arab and South Asian origin,” the document continues, “have been held in secretive federal custody for weeks and months, sometimes without any charges being filed against them. The government has refused to publish their names and whereabouts, even when ordered to do so by the courts.”

“The press and the public have been barred from immuring case files of the hearings held from September 11 and the courts are ordered to keep secret even the hearings are taking place.”

Further, the ACLU document notes, “President Bush has ordered military commissions to be set up to try suspected terrorists who are not citizens. They can convict based on hearsay and secret evidence by only two-thirds vote.” And, it adds, “American citizens suspected of terrorism are being held indefinitely in military custody without being charged and with-out a trial.”

By mid-2003, the Justice Department’s own investigation of civil rights and civil liberties abuses, including charges that some immigrants in federal detention centers had been beaten. Earlier this year, (Continued on page 8)
Degrading the Oceans

Life on Earth began in the primaeval oceans. Land-dwelling species emerged later. With continental drift and the breakup of the supercontinent Pangaea, oceans receded and developed different ecosystems.

With their myths of ocean and sea gods, ancient peoples recognized the importance of oceans, although with prescientific understanding. Even today surprising little is known about the oceans.

Nonetheless, alarms have been sounded recently about the degradation of the oceans. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy has drafted a 450-page report. According to the Los Angeles Times, problems include: "seafood contaminated with hormones and chemicals such as mercury and dioxins; urban runoff laden with oil, trash and human waste; farm runoff that causes blooms of algae that suffocate all life and create oceanic 'dead zones'; sea temperatures that are killing coral reefs and spreading water-borne viruses."

Perhaps redundantly the Times continued, "the report lays blame on a variety of human activities." Translated from the "objectivity" of the bourgeois media, that means that in a few centuries profit-driven capitalism has jeopardized oceans of evolution.

James W. Watkins, a retired Navy admiral, who headed the commission said: "Everyone agrees the oceans are in trouble. We know if we don't get moving now, in 10 years we may not be able to recover."

The recommendations of the commission, which included oil, shipping and finance capitalists, government bureaucrats and scientists, are similar to those of the Pew Ocean Commission, whose members were more tilted toward environmentalists.

However, the seriousness does not mean that everything meaningful will be done. First of all, the U.S. commission believes its 200 some recommendations could be put into effect for $3 billion. That sum is unimaginaly for any working person, but a drop in the bucket compared to the $166 billion for the contentious occupation of Iraq. Capitalism has its priorities, after all.

"What's alarming," said De Leon: "Everyone agrees the oceans are in trouble. We know if we don't get moving now, in 10 years we may not be able to recover."

The Times reported that the commission recommended that President Bush "set up a National Ocean Council, appoint a White House assistant to lead it, and bring order to the chaos of 20 federal agencies that implement America's [international] laws." The Times added: "George Bush who denies that burning fossil fuels has anything to do with global warming!"

De Leon charged: "The report blames Bush's MO. But Bush is not the problem. Capitalism is the mess. The oceans are in is the result of profit-driven capitalism and its social economic planning.

That some minions of capitalism are alarmed about what their system has done and is doing underscores the seriousness of the problem. But to expect real restoration of the oceans is unrealistic. De Leon observed that the capitalist rulers not only in the shop but also in the "legislatures and capitolts of the nation" know that these problems and accomplish political results. He gets the laws passed that will protect his economic class interests, and he pulls the wires when those interests are in danger..."

When capitalist interests clash, the most powerful will prevail. While the environmentalists are sound, the fishing of a depleted fish population will not undo environmental damage. If that does not happen, the weak federal law that protects marine mammals from various activities like mapping sea floors with sonar will not protect sea creatures; and every fisherman, fish buyer, and fish consumer will know the source of the problem, and everyone knew that more such disasters would follow regardless of what the commission found and recommended, and regardless of what new laws the ruling class might enact to "regulate" itself. De Leon added: "There is but one commission that can 'investigate'; but one grand jury that can 'indict'; but one trial jury that can convict in the premises—[that commission is the socialist movement, that grand jury the socialist organization, that trial jury the industrial unionize organized labor of the land, marshalled on the political and economic front.]

"That commission need not wait to be appointed—social evolution has appointed it; that grand jury need not wait to be paneled—science has paneled it. The grand jury has discovered the facts, drawn up the indictment, and named the culprit—capitalism. As 'to the trial jury, it still lags behind, though assuredly drawing together."

Investigate?—Bosh! The hour calls for conviction and sentence."

Unfortunately, the working-class "jury" is still out on capitalism. If that does not happen, the form of government reflects the material conditions that the respective government is intended to safeguard. As the political movement of labor is bound to be a reflex of the trades union organization which constitutes its base, so, like a system of political choice, government cannot be a system of the development of which they are the flower. This principle explains the system of "checks and balances" upon which the Constitution of the States was constructed. Capitalism, then in its infancy, neither needed nor wanted a centralized administration. What is the function of government? De Leon continued: "In a democracy it is the defence of the "public interest," found in politics its equivalent in "checks and balances." Accordingly, no branch of the government, the executive least of all, was entrusted with controlling power. All the three branches—executive, legislative and judicial— were coordinate. They mutually checked one another, just as in old Rome the two Consuls were elected to do. But the times have changed; that is to say, the material interests that government is born of have since assumed a developed body. How far the development has gone may be measured by the practical change that the Constitution has undergone, or to be more accurate, is rapidly undergoing.

Within the last four years the executive, under President [Theodore] Roosevelt, has, in the words of intrusted instances, "done the old lipstick-on-the-pig routine," according to the Times. The Times added: "Thus the Spooner Act on Nicaragua; it assumed legislative function in the matter of Pension Order No. 78; it struck out, by the function of "constructive recess," the function vested in the Senate to confirm appointments; it seized and exercised, in the matter of Panama, the House's exclusive privileges to declare war; it put, in the matter of the Indian School Fund, a rider on the act of Congress which prohibited appropriations for sectarian purposes; and to the act into effect, finally, the opposition to both, it, in the matter of Puerto Plata, San Domingo, the prerogative of the Senate as a coordinate treaty-making power. The transition is rapid; and trusted capitalist is compelling submission on the part of the Senate and the House. From being a power, checked by any motion, the executive is becoming, if it has not yet become, the sole governmental power in the land. Concentrated capital at the trust stage of today, needs and wants a 'checked and balanced' executive as little as Imperial Rome, having grown giddy with conquest, needed or wanted two mutually check each other. These controls were targeted out as a matter of form, of custom and to save appearances—the same as with us, the Senate and House will soon continue to meet wholly as a matter of form, of custom and for the sake of saving appearances. In Imperial Rome, the emperor's will (Continued on page 10)
Victor Reuther

A man of proven personal courage who understood the class struggle, but who ultimately rejected socialism and accepted capitalism

When Victor Reuther died on June 3, at age 92, John Sweeney, president of the AFL-CIO, eulogized him as “one of the most important and inspirational figures in the developmental years of the labor movement....” Reuther, he said, “ranks among our movement’s heroes.”

Sweeney also alluded to the sit-down strikes of 1936–1937 to embellish his tribute to the last of the three Reuther brothers. The sit-down strikes caused General Motors, and eventually the entire auto industry, to accept the United Auto Workers Union as the exclusive bargaining agent for autoworkers. “Together with his brothers, Walter and Roy, [Victor] built the UAW into a powerful force for social good,” Sweeney said.

Ron Gettelfinger, president of the UAW, was no less effusive. “The entire UAW community is saddened by the loss of Victor Reuther, a pioneer of our union whose passion for social justice and talent as an orator energized and mobilized early sit-down strikers,” he said.

Conspicuous by their absence, however, were tributes from such ruling-class sources as the former U.S. president’s fatal plane crash, “the United Auto Workers president was a symbol of enlightened unionism and social activism that’s not easily replaced.”

The stakes were high and the companies did not need the passing of Walter Reuther to recognize their class struggle. But who ultimately understood the class struggle, but who nonetheless led the workers to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic.

In marking the passing of former president Ronald Reagan; or it was the fact that the UAW-CIO had paid to the UAW-CIO the “courage” to outlaw the sit-down strikes, and perhaps until the end of the life of the sit-down strikes; and both survived attempts to outlaw the sit-down strikes. A “courageous” by the UAW-CIO to outlaw the sit-down strikes; and both survived attempts to outlaw the sit-down strikes.

The reason for the Sweeney and Gettelfinger adulation was nothing like similar to say about Victor Reuther, at least nothing that was appropriate for posting on the White House Web site.

The New York Times and the Wall Street Journal did take notice of Victor Reuther’s passing, as did the Detroit Free Press, the Los Angeles Times and many other news outlets. Most confined themselves to obituaries that highlighted Reuther’s role. His was not one of those approaches the tribute the Wall Street Journal had paid to brother Walter.

“At a time when many liberals were disenchanted with the labor movement,” the Journal lamented, “Reuther, the UAW president was a symbol of enlightened unionism and social activism that’s not easily replaced.”

The answer, of course, is that the battle did not take place inside the plant where the sit-down strike was on, but outside—and that’s where the Reuther brothers were. The “Battle of the Overpass,” as the Detroit News called it, and when the Reuther brothers subsequently received a severe beating at the hands of company stooges and scabs, but that had nothing to do with organizing or leading the sit-down at GM Fisher. Hence, the tributes paid to Victor Reuther by the UAW-CIO opposed the sit-downs because they alienated the companies and complicated rather than helped UAW-CIO efforts to lead GM to the bargaining table. Homer Martin, UAW president at the time, made this clear in January 1937 when the “Battle of the Overpass” occurred, when he said: “We have nothing given anybody orders to sit down.”

Truth is that Victor Reuther and his brothers were UAW organizers sent in to take charge of the strike by leading workers into channels that the UAW-CIO leadership regarded as more constructive. The Reuther brothers failed at that. What brought the automakers to heel was the knowledge that the UAW-CIO was allowing the workers to send the National Guard into the plants. A major bloodbath seemed to be in the offing, but the possible consequences such a massacre would have for the auto capitalists and their precious system posed a risk that was too big to take.

The sit-down strikes were “successful” in two important respects. They forced the auto industry to accept the UAW as the exclusive bargaining agent for auto industry workers, which was the end all and be all of what the UAW and the CIO were after. That, in turn, gave the U.S. Supreme Court the “courage” to outlaw the sit-down strikes; and perhaps until the end of the life of the sit-down strikes. A “courageous” by the UAW-CIO to outlaw the sit-down strikes; and perhaps until the end of the life of the sit-down strikes.

The UAW-CIO “leadership” quietly accepted the sit-down strikes. The Reuther brothers went on to lead the UAW down the path, to capitalists, acceptable path of “collective bargaining.” Hence, the capitalists accolades for Walter Reuther 34 years ago. Hence, the tributes paid to Victor Reuther by John Sweeney and Ron Gettelfinger. Hence, the deplorable condition the labor movement finds itself in today and why it must be rebuilt, from the ground up.

Reuther and his brothers were men of unquestionable personal courage. Victor and Walter Reuther in particular suffered greatly from the brutal beatings they received during the sit-down strikes, and both survived attempts at assassination. They were sincere and honest men at the time of the sit-down strikes, and both were “social democrats” who understood the class struggle, but who nonetheless led the workers to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic. No one “organized” them and no one “led” them to adopt what, to them, was a new tactic.

We may readily concede that the three brothers were sincere and honest men at the time of the sit-down strikes, and perhaps until the end of their lives. They understood from first-hand experience just how brutal the fact of the class struggle, but who nonetheless rejected the revolutionary objectives of the socialist movement. These facts, and it takes nothing away from their reputations as courageous men to recognize that, in the end, they accepted capitalism and rejected the underlying logic of a genuine labor movement.

Reuther subsequently received a severe beating at the hands of company stooges and scabs, but that had nothing to do with organizing or leading the sit-down at GM Fisher. Hence, the tributes paid to Victor Reuther by the UAW-CIO opposed the sit-downs because they alienated the companies and complicated rather than helped UAW-CIO efforts to lead GM to the bargaining table. Homer Martin, UAW president at the time, made this clear in January 1937 when the “Battle of the Overpass” occurred, when he said: “We have nothing given anybody orders to sit down.”
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Fascist blackshirts murdered the Socialist leader 75 years ago to cover up Italy’s own ‘Teapot Dome’ Scandal

Olive M. Johnson was editor in chief of The People from 1918 until 1938. The People was a weekly publication back then, but the party was poor—poorer even than now—and its poverty allowed for only one editorial assistant to help the woman in charge.

Johnson had contributed many articles to The People before the National Executive Committee asked her to accept the editor’s post, but she had no formal training as an editor or as a writer and she was understandably reluctant to take on the task. To make matters worse, she suffered from tuberculosis, an ailment that would plague her until the end of her life.

Johnson was, however, a remarkable woman of considerable intellectual and moral strength, and despite the ailment that tormented her body and occasionally interfered with her work, she persevered for 20 years. She earned and she deserves the same notice of accomplishment on behalf of the socialist movement as some of her better-known European counterparts, such as Eleanor Marx-Aveling, Clara Zetkin, Alexandra Kollantai and Rosa Luxemburg. Indeed, it would be difficult to single out another American woman who contributed as much to the socialist cause.

Johnson died 50 years ago, on June 16, 1924, at age 82. Her life and her accomplishments deserve more than a passing mention in The People, of course, and we hope to pay a more fitting tribute in our next issue. Here, however, it is an earlier death—the assassination 75 years ago of the Italian Socialist Giacomo Matteotti, and Johnson’s editorial treatment of it—to which we must turn to call attention.

In 1922, Italy was in ferment. Factory occupations and other events made it appear that the country was on the verge of a socialist revolution. With that to prompt him, King Victor Emmanuel III invited the former “Socialist,” Benito Mussolini, to form a new government and restore the law. But on existing state power, Mussolini already had led his black-shirted Fascists in a triumphant March on Rome. He could not resist the aura of “legitimacy” that Victor Emmanuel’s overture held out to him, however, and he unashamedly accepted the king’s offer. Nonetheless, Il Duce’s ability to seal his grip on state power was still uncertain by 1924. Conditions during those early years forced Mussolini to retain certain democratic forms. Italy’s Socialists, Communists and bourgeois democrats continued to occupy many seats in the national parliament, where they resisted fascist encroachments and, much to the chagrin of Mussolini’s expectant followers, were free to speak out in opposition to the Fascists. Heinspired the Fascists to commit corruption despite intimidation and threats. Matteotti was leader of the Italian Socialists.

He was also a millionaire, and he may naively have believed that his status guaranteed him immunity from assassination. On June 10, 1924, he delivered a speech in parliament in which he promised to return the next day with proof of corruption at the highest levels of Mussolini’s government. He was murdered that night. It took police two months to discover his body in a shallow grave near Rome, but few ever doubted that Fascist thugs had murdered him. Johnson summed up what many believed Matteotti had uncovered in a news brief printed in the Weekly People of July 12, 1924:

“More and more information is leaking out as to the reasons that caused the Matteotti assassinations. Following that of black-shirted Teapot Dome affair, Matteotti was ready to charge that Sen. [Maria] Corbino [Baur], minister of national economy (apparently the Italian equivalent of secretary of the interior) had instigated our own [Secretary of the Interior Albert B.] Fall by handing over to the Sinclair Oil concern over 400 square miles of oil lands in Emilia and Sicily without any guaranties. Whether Corbino got a black satchel full of cash for the favor the report does not say, but it may be inferred that there must have been something in it for Corbino and his fascist gang because Sinclair is no piker, but always willing to act up to the principle that one good turn deserves another.”

The assassination of Matteotti and Italy’s version of the Teapot Dome scandal threatened to topple Mussolini from power, but his opponents in parliament made the fatal mistake of resigning their seats in the belief that new elections would result in a resounding defeat for the Fascists that would send them packing. At that point, however, the blackshirts confronted Mussolini and demanded that he either put an end to the democratic charade and prove himself the Il Duce they wanted by declaring himself dictator or they would find someone else who would live up to their expectations. He did not disappoint them.

It was against this background, while events were still unfolding in Italy, that Johnson wrote her editorial “Government by Assassination.” She could not project herself forward to our time, when the leaders of such “democratic” states as Israel and the United States would publicly imply, condone or declare abduction and assassination to be acceptable government policies, so she looked back into history for comparable examples. She knew what crimes capitalism was capable of committing. The massacre of millions of workers in one world war was still fresh in the minds of everyone, but the second great massacre of the 20th century was still years off. Matteotti was among the first of capitalist fascism’s “disappeared.” Capitalism has many political guises, however, and if the pury oil deposits of an Italy were motive enough for murder in 1924, imagine the strain Iraq’s massive oil reserves would put on the “Christian” consciences of our capitalist ruling class in 2004.

Government by Assassination

By Olive M. Johnson
(Weekly People, July 5, 1924)

In the good old times murder seems to have been a necessary auxiliary to “good” and stable government. The king, the caesar, tribune or dictator, whatever the good tone of the moment required that “his majesty” should call himself, if he was a man of “strength” and “character” and expected to rule long enough to be remembered at all in the pages of history, whether he ascended the throne “legitimately”—someone having accidentally forgotten to kill him off—or “illegitimately” by usurpation and murder, immediately started killing off in his own favorite manner any claimants and rivals that dared to be alive at the moment, and after that he upheld his now “legitimately” established rights by applying the same deadly method to any grumbler against his good and benevolent rule that dared to raise his head, i.e., if the grumbler was of high standing, noble and important enough to be worthy of so honorable a death. If he wasn’t he was simply mass-sacriled along with a few hundred or a few thousands of his fellows.

This method of establishing legitimacy, and of making and perpetuating good government has gone slightly out of fashion, since, with the advent of the printing press, mankind took the wicked notion of writing contemporary history, not always flattering to the majority of one man who by “consent” or tradition held the title of “head of government.” The last enthusiastic advocate of the methods here described, in Western civilization and in a country important enough to loan big in history, was “Bigno,” King Hall of the gladiator “El Cid” in Spain. Elizabeth, the worthy daughter of “Hal,” practiced it to be sure, but not with approved spirit and bravado.

Mussolini, in our time, has been trying to be something better than a dictator, before the National Executive Committee of the Socialists, trade unionists and the like, most-effective by castor oil and the mailed fist, was not to be his instrument of government if a good occasion should present itself. Having subdued the recalcitrant mobs, Socialists, trade unionists and the like, most-effective by castor oil and the mailed fist, it was not to be expected, therefore, that Mussolini would ever be the kind of a Nero should sit pretty and take sauce from the presence of his own size. The firm government” assassins had for long been ready with suicide bombs and obstacles to reviving first-century good government tactics in the 20th century. Some of these obstacles are newspapers, who are hungry for sensation even to the damage of stable government, the telegraph, wiretapping, and relations tainted by modern “Christian” hypocrisy; and to a certain extent, also a riotous notion of “democracy” which has gotten abroad in many lands, thanks to the newspapers and all other modern superficies. The assassination of Deputy Matteotti has produced a repercussion throughout Italy and the world that is making the good government of the black-shirted dictator rock to its foundations.

To become the “noblest Roman of the all,” Mussolini has evidently been born some 19 centuries too late.
Fifty years ago, the United States instigated an invasion of the tiny Central American republic of Guatemala. The politicians who occupied Washington in 1954 still had not developed the same open con-
tempt for common decency as the one that occupies it today. They lacked the audacity not to take public responsibility for their actions. They were still at the sneaky-thief stage of hiring other people to do their dirty work. Two later examples of this moral turpitude were the Iranian coup in 1953 (for which the CIA, in cooperation with President Mohammad Reza Pahlavi of Iran, leveraged the threat of invasion and the open secret that was freely discussed in the press) and the invasion of Guatemala in 1954.

Why Intervention?

The question is not “Is America intervening?” but “Why is America intervening?” The Post says it is to “counter” the “interven-
tion” of Soviet Russia. It deduces such Russian “intervention” from the fact that the Communist Party of Guatemala supports the Arbenz regime, which no good talking to Foster Dulles. But Allen Allen against the Communists in, say, Guatemala, it is

Press Tries to Hide the Truth

Hand of United States Is

Of or for the People

A U.S.-backed ‘revolution’ toppled its democratically
elected government 50 years ago and ushered in decades of dictatorship and violence

G

time-tenants of what appears in the capitalist press on the war in Guatemala is lies and more lies. The press has always been prepared to sell the people a bill of goods. Fifty years ago, the press treated the invasion of the tiny Central American republic as if it were an uprising inspired by popular resentment against the government of President Jacobo Arbenz, who, although not communist, is Communist-supported. But all the world knows that the self-styled “Army of Liberation” of Col. Carlos P. Castillo Armas invaded

Guatemala. The politicians who occupied Washing-

ton for many years past have been shocking the

world with promises of “good intentions,” “open se-
trend,” “open secret,” “open hypocrisy,” “open
cowards,” “open lies,” “open...to the press. The

American Central Intelligence Agency. On

attitudes.” The press has run counter to the interests of the United Fruit Co. Bananas, not communism, caused the United States to seek “regime change” in Guatemala 50 years ago.

More stains than stars have come to adorn our country’s flag since private interests have replaced the common wel-

fare as the guiding principle of the country. The lead-
ing article from the Weekly People of July 3, 1954, helps us to remember how and why one of those stains, now too many to count, came to be.

It is significant that, except in those Latin American states whose dictators are virtual pup-

pets of the United States, as Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic, there are few Latin

American states whose dictators are virtual pup-

pets of the United States. The enterprise of this company in exploit-

ning the main customer for the country’s chief exports, which are usually raw materials. Such a country is highly vulnerable to economic coercion. It may have nominal “sovereignty” and “national independence,” but a mere fluctuation in the price of its products in the American market can create a national crisis.

The imperial and colonialism of the United States do not require political subor-

dination. They are more subtle. They control a country by economic means—that is, by becoming the main customer for the country’s chief exports, which are usually raw materials. Such a country is highly vulnerable to economic coercion. It may have nominal “sovereignty” and “national independence,” but a mere fluctuation in the price of its products in the American market can create a national crisis.

Why Intervention?

The question is not “Is America intervening?” but “Why is America intervening?” The Post says it is to “counter” the “interven-
tion” of Soviet Russia. It deduces such Russian “intervention” from the fact that the Communist Party of Guatemala supports the Arbenz regime.

Colonialism—American Style

Apologists for American capitalism boast that the United States rejects imperialism and colonialism. The fact is that the United States rejects the kind of imperialism and colonialism that subordinates other coun-

tries to the political rule of Washington. The latest example of this is the old-fashioned imperialism and colo-

tialism that enabled three or four European powers to control vast areas of the world for more than a century, and that is rapidly dying today.

The imperial and colonialism of the United States do not require political subor-

dination. They are more subtle. They control a country by economic means—that is, by becoming the main customer for the country’s chief exports, which are usually raw materials. Such a country is highly vulnerable to economic coercion. It may have nominal “sovereignty” and “national independence,” but a mere fluctuation in the price of its products in the American market can create a national crisis.

There is little doubt that the present American-blessed—if not American-instigated—aggression

is the consequence of a series of developments that grew out of an American government’s decision to escape from this pattern of economic colonialism. Its struggles to curry United Fruit, not the fact of Communists in the Arbenz regime, are what aroused Washington to the “Communist” menace. Powerful allies of United Fruit in the Eisenhower administration did the rest. The legitimate govern-

ment of Guatemala was denied the right of buying arms in the United States to protect itself from foes plotting against it, and when it tried to obtain these arms from behind the Iron Curtain the most sinister inferences were drawn. The Arbenz govern-

ment was preparing to defend itself, and this seems to have set Washington’s powers, which doubtless hoped that, like other anti-impe-

cialist Latin American governments, this one might be overthrown by a cheaply purchased coup.

It is not a communist threat, even though some Communists are involved, but capital-

ist greed that is responsible for the bloodshed in Guatemala.

How Washington Learned of the Invasion

There is little doubt that the present American-blessed—if not American-instigated—aggression

is the consequence of a series of developments that grew out of an American government’s decision to escape from this pattern of economic colonialism. Its struggles to curry United Fruit, not the fact of Communists in the Arbenz regime, are what aroused Washington to the “Communist” menace. Powerful allies of United Fruit in the Eisenhower administration did the rest. The legitimate govern-

ment of Guatemala was denied the right of buying arms in the United States to protect itself from foes plotting against it, and when it tried to obtain these arms from behind the Iron Curtain the most sinister inferences were drawn. The Arbenz govern-

ment was preparing to defend itself, and this seems to have set Washington’s powers, which doubtless hoped that, like other anti-impe-

cialist Latin American governments, this one might be overthrown by a cheaply purchased coup.

It is not a communist threat, even though some Communists are involved, but capital-

ist greed that is responsible for the bloodshed in Guatemala.
...Threat to Liberty

(Continued from page 3)

the inspector general’s office issued another semianual report that documented more than 1,000 complaints of civil rights and civil liberties abuses received by the department over a six-month period. While the report contended that no Justice Department employees engaged in misconduct, it conventionally failed to address the question of abuses by other arms of federal, state or local government.

Moreover, while the Patriot Act and the rest of this wave of repressive measures have been billed as weapons against terrorism, the Justice Department has already used their provisions in other cases, not involving terrorism. "Corallo, a Justice Department spokesman, made it clear that the department plans to continue to use the new tools against U.S. citizens as well as immigrants and foreign citizens. "If a tool that is legal and constitutionally valid is good enough to use against organized crime or drug dealers, it ought to be good enough to be used against terrorism. Conversely, if it’s good enough to be used against terrorists, then it ought to be used against other kinds of criminals."

It is not yet true that the United States is in the grip of fascism. What is true is that the ruling capitalist class and its political representatives have in the past five years won themselves a new array of potently unconstitutional weapons with which to protect their interests wherever they choose to do so. While it may be that the country is slipping into a sort of new Dark Ages with respect to human rights and liberties, there is still time to fashion a real response capable of halting the country’s slide toward totalitarianism, rooting out its cause, and establishing permanent protections against the possibility of fascism ever again rearing its ugly head.

Benjamin Franklin admonished in 1755, "Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." No freedom-loving American worker should be willing to bargain away our rights and liberties in exchange for capitalist-class rule again.

The task before us is not a small one. The threat of fascism or some other form of totalitarianism cannot be ended by tossing the Bush administration out of office. It cannot be voted out of existence. It must be uprooted and deprived of the soil in which it thrives—the conditions of privation and constricted economic opportunity wrought by capitalism and capitalistic-class rule.

The capitalist system is inherently nationalistic, imperialistic and militaristic. Its ruling class has material incentives to divide workers by race, ethnicity and religion. All it takes is severe economic hardship, social strife, or both—conditions that are inevitable under capitalism—to bring these ingredients together and foster the growth of fascism or some like-minded right-wing movement. The attendant longing for “order,” and the capitalists’ need to preserve their rule, can then bring it to power. The German Weimar Republic actually voted to give Hitler the dictatorial powers he sought. A future Patriot Act could amount to the same thing here in the United States, should the U.S. ruling class feel threatened enough—or should no opposition arise to the kind of “creeping fascism” that presently confronts us.

Society has reached a point where capitalism is increasingly incompatible with freedom and democracy. To save capitalism, freedom and democracy must eventually be destroyed. To save freedom and democracy, capitalism must be destroyed.

Suddenly put, to reverse the trend toward repression, to defend our rights from attack and to make democracy a reality in every sphere of life, the working class must organize to end capitalistic control over the means of life and with it the political supremacy of the capitalist class.

The only cure for the fascist threat inherent in capitalist-class rule is the forging of a class-conscious workers’ movement for socialism that successfuley establishes a socialist economic democracy—a rational social system that can provide genuine economic opportunity for all and production for human needs and wants rather than for the profit of the minority capitalist class.

Every class-conscious worker who can see what is at stake had best heed the alarm, rouse themselves and join the struggle to educate and organize our class for socialism—while there is still time to do so.

...Iraq ‘Sovereignty’

Guatemala elsewhere in this issue: "The imperialism and colonialism of the United States do not require political subjugation. They are more subtle. They control a country by economic means—chiefly by becom- ing the main customer for the country’s chief exports, which are usually raw materials. Such a country is highly vulnerable to economic coer- cion. It may have nominal ‘sovereignty’ and ‘national independence,’ but a mere fluctuation in the price of its products in the American market can create a national crisis.”

President Bush and Dr. Rice notwithstanding, American capitalism’s imperialistic objec- tives in Iraq are transparently obvious. Any lingering doubt on that score surely evaporated when the Bush administration’s handpicked coalition in recent months, it’s his ties to Langley that seem to have registered with the Bush administration. (June 1)".

None of this prevented former Clinton from echoing the current administration’s claims about the United States having no imperialist ambitions in Iraq during his interview with Time. According to CNN.com, Clinton said: “I have repeatedly defended President Bush against the left on Iraq, even though I think he should have waited until the U.N. inspections were over.”

“Clinton,” CNN added, “said he did not believe that Bush went to war in Iraq over oil or for imperialist reasons but out of a genuine belief that large quantities of weapons of mass destruction remained unaccounted for.”

Clinton’s remarks make it clear that workers who oppose war and U.S. intervention abroad will find no sanctuary in the Democratic Party to stop capitalist imperialism. They will have to look to themselves.

...IBM Study

(Continued from page 1)

was lost. And there are still about 200 lawsuits against IBM that could be affected by the study if it were published.

Joseph LaDou, guest editor of Medical Care in America, the journal that has accepted Clapp’s study for publication, had a different view. LaDou, director of the University of California-San Francisco’s International Center for Occupational Medicine, noted that four peer reviewers had read and approved the study for publication before it had to be with- drawn. LaDou commented, “I wanted this in the journal because it’s the most definitive conclusion so far” until now in the computer manufacturer industry, noting that IBM’s action was a “serious disappointment to our scientific and academic freedom.”

But this is not about academic freedom. It is about corporate control and, above all, profit. Capitalist enterprises own not only the tools of production that workers must hire themselves to in order to make a living. They also own the product of the workers’ labor and the informa- tion that is involved in production and that affects the safety of the lives of those workers. If the truth had come out connecting cancer to workers’ exposure to chemicals, IBM might have had to pay for the damages its toxic work environment had caused and institute new procedures and modify its production facil- ities, all of which would have affected profits.

Workers will have a safe environment only when they own the factories and are democra-tically in a socialist society. Then they will get the full fruits of their labor without being subjected to hazards they cannot control or even know about.

Democracy: Past, Present and Future

By Arnold Petersen

This pamphlet shows what democracy meant to slaves-overseers in ancient Athens, what it means to America’s capitalist class and what it will mean to the emancipated workers under capitalist control. 80 pages—$1.50 postpaid
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...Torture  
(Continued from page 4)

To further evade the Geneva Convention prohibitions against torture the administration has also taken to “outsourcing” torture. So-called high-value-suspects are being sent to client countries that practice extreme torture techniques, such as removal of fingernails and dunking victims in tanks of water. Participants are reportedly Egypt, Zimbabwe, Morocco, Jordan and even Syria, the latter having been cited as the worldwide sponsor of terrorism by the United States. Astounding? Not at all.

The base hypocrisy of the Bush administration rests upon a long tradition of past administrations, both Democratic and Republican. They have been unified by capitalism’s imperialist drive and incessant search for markets and sources of raw materials that mandate torture as an instrument of military control.

Indeed, as the mantra of imperialist world domination has successively fallen from France and Britain to the United States so have the brutality and uprisings among the peoples of the Middle East during Anglo-French colonial domination following the arbitrary geographical divisions of the Ottoman Empire. The new front against American capitalism is a latter-day extension of those rebellions.

Consonant with American capitalism’s domestic utility in the modernization of unbridled despotism, the American military has trained over 60,000 military goons, dictators and Britain to the United States so have the brutal tactics that accompany military control and domination. The ferment, constant rebellions and uprisings among the peoples of the Middle East during Anglo-French colonial domination following the arbitrary geographical divisions of the Ottoman Empire and the new front against American capitalism is a latter-day extension of those rebellions.

The American working class will pay the price as always. Our sons, fathers, wives and daughters have been plunged into a seething ferment that fosters ruthless and barbarous conduct toward a distant and impoverished people in the interests of capitalism. In the cause of capitalist wars, our youth are being trained not only as killers but now torturers as well. If the working class does not act to end capitalist citizenship will destroy us, both physically and morally.

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Labor Party of America unequivocally condemns the use of torture. Its use by the ruling class of U.S. capitalism in its imperialist anxieties in Afghanistan and Iraq is only the latest indication that the choice faced by the working people of the world—capitalism or socialism—is really a choice between barbarism and civilization.
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He’s No Lincoln

The California Legislature is considering a measure to increase the state’s minimum wage. Speaking in opposition, Assembly member Tony Strickland said: “Not every job in California is supposed to be able to provide for a family of four.”

Was he right or was he wrong? Let’s see.

The minimum wage in California is $6.75 an hour. Wash clothes, sweep floors, wait on tables—it’s $6.75 an hour. That’s useful work, we’d say. California Assembly members don’t get the minimum wage. Last we heard, a run-of-the-mill member pulled in $99,000 a year and, according to the folks at the Capitol, “those lawmakers who own leadership positions can make up to $133,850.”

That breaks down to about $48.00 an hour on the low side and about $55.00 on the high side for a 40-hour week, 52 weeks a year. But the Assembly doesn’t meet eight hours a day, five days a week, 50 or 52 weeks a year. From 1991 to 2000, it met on 1,628 days. That breaks down to 163 days a year and a three-day “workweek.” It breaks down to a $607.36 “workday,” or $75.92 an hour.

Is Mr. Strickland’s $76 opinion worth more than the labor of the $6.75 hour the worker? Abraham Lincoln said:

“An honest laborer digs coal at about 70 cents a day, while the president digs abstractions at about $70 a day. The coal is clearly worth more than the abstractions, and yet what a monstrous inequality in the prices!” So you see, Mr. Strickland was right after all. He just picked the wrong job.

Better Medical Care

It’s no secret that rich capitalists receive better medical care than workers, of whom an increasing number lack any health care coverage. Community Medical Centers in Fresno, Calif., has made this class bias its publicly proclaimed policy with its “Friends of CMC Program.”

While CMC is trying to keep some details secret, “friends” appear to be those who donate at least $10,000. In return, everyone will receive the same medical treatment. But “friends” will have preference for private rooms and a 24-hour hotline for questions about hospital stays. Some other San Joaquin Valley hospitals send their donors get-well cards and flowers.

Is care really equal? “I’m sure the medical treatment is relatively [our emphasis] similar, but there is a difference being in a private room compared to a ward,” said Donny Wang, “a doctor can affect your ability to sleep,” said Kathleen O’Connor, owner of a health care marketing and strategy company. “Health care isn’t just about medical procedures; there is more around it that helps a patient heal and get well.” She continued, “Major donors get better attention.”

Don’t Forget Muniions Makers

War is good for business, not just for control of foreign resources, markets, exploitable labor and strategic territory to protect those interests. It’s also good for capitalists who produce weapons. The Associated Press reports: “American soldiers are firing so much ammunition that the military’s largest supplier of bullets can’t keep up. Tanks that log 800 miles a year in peacetime [relate, of course] are grinding through that many in a month in the war on terror.”

The AP was short on details about the bottom line. But with increased hiring, production lines running around the clock and small-caliber bullet usage more than doubling since 2001, business and profits are booming.

—N. Malleus
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Two Views on ‘Economic Freedom’

(Royal Weekly People, July 17, 1954)

The New York Times, in a editorial July 2, on the decision of the New York Times’ management to close its Yonkers plant permanently, thus leaving some 2,200 workers economically stranded, has given us what amounts to a definition of “economic freedom.” The platitudinizing mouthpiece said:

“We Americans deeply prize our economic freedom. Just as we allow a new company to enter any lawful business anywhere, without the by-your-leave of any government agency, so also we do not put restraints on an old company from withdrawing from a business when it ceases to make a profit.”

This concept of “economic freedom” is peculiarly a capitalist concept. It reminds us of the southern slaveowners’ definition of “liberty” to which Abraham Lincoln referred in his Baltimore speech, April 18, 1864. Said he:

“The world has never had a good definition of the word ‘liberty,’ and the American people, just now, are much in need of one. We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not mean the same thing. ‘Liberty’ means different things to different people, called by two different and incompatible names—‘liberty’ and ‘tyranny.’ ”

What Lincoln says here of “liberty” may also be said of “economic freedom.” “Economic freedom,” as conceived by The New York Times’ management, plainly, the freedom of capitalists to exploit wage labor. It is concerned exclusively with the “freedom” of capital. But to those who define “economic freedom” another way—as, say, the right of workers to appropriate the full social value of their product, and to have collective control of their tools—the Times’ “economic freedom” is despotism.

In the enlightened future, when man lives under a system in which the means of social production are owned socially and managed democratically, and production is carried on for the benefit of all in accord with the will of the community, few, if any, will have more confusion over the despotism of capitalism than over the despotism of chattel slavery.

John F. Taylor
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Death of a Salesman

By Ken Boettcher

The death of former President Ronald Reagan provided a prime opportunity for the capitalist-owned media to again polish the propaganda skills they so skillfully used during his two terms in office to create and boost support among the working-class majority for Reagan—a debased and craven salesman for the material interests of the tiny minority capitalist class.

The media circus surrounding his death and funeral could not surprise those familiar with the relationship Reagan enjoyed with the capitalist media during his lifetime. It was precisely the fawning attitude of the capitalist media that produced Reagan's moniker—the “Teflon President.” No scandal seemed to touch him—not surprising since the capitalist media was unwilling to dig too deep while the man was serving capitalist-class interests so well.

There were plenty of actions and policies during Reagan's two administrations that should have attracted the attention and criticism of any morally responsible media. They all received some attention, to be sure, but generally as “controversial,” or as “incidental” in a larger picture.

- He extended military and financial support for dictators and death squads in El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala.
- He supported the apartheid regime of South Africa.
- He backed the tiny minority capitalist class.
- He supported the capitalist reaction.
- He refused political asylum to thousands of Haitian refugees fleeing Duvalier's repression.
- He extended military aid for the brutal Haitian thug Papa Doc Duvalier, and refused to touch him—not surprising since the capitalist media upon Reagan’s death. Apparently “fawning attitude of the capitalist media upon Reagan's death. Apparently capitalism's defenders in the media believe by not mentioning them they might successfully throw up defenses against their results. And—it should be added—whatever ended the “Evil Empire,” it failed to touch the other ugly head of “communist” totalitarianism, China.

Few of these transgressions against human-decency got to the capitalist media upon Reagan's death. Apparently capitalism’s defenders in the media believe by not mentioning them they might successfully bury the transgressions themselves along with the physically and spiritually diseased body of their dead hero. The record shows who Ronald Reagan really was. History will judge him as an enemy of the working class, a true salesman for capitalist interests and a vicious servant of capitalist reaction.

Righteous for a Buck

By Paul D. Lawrence

Sometimes capitalists do the right thing, or seem to, although the pursuit of profit still motivates them.

Consider two recent examples. About 225 power utilities, out of some 2,000 nationwide, have tree-planting programs. They often give away trees to homeowners and renters who promise to plant and maintain them. Second, a company in Hanford, Calif., is recycling garbage bags, plastic food take-out containers and packaging “peanuts.” These plastics were not easily recyclable before. The result is a low-sulfur diesel oil, which is less polluting than regular diesel fuel.

Noting these facts, however, is not to praise capitalism. The profit motive usually causes social problems rather than lessening them. The profit motive is at work in both cases.

For utilities, trees mean shade, which in warmer climates such as California’s San Joaquin Valley results in lower temperatures and less demand for power. Selling less of their commodities is not paradoxical. The rate of profit depends on the amount of capital invested, not the volume of sales. Reducing, at least some—what the demand for power reduces the need for new power-generating plants, which are extremely costly. We can leave the exact calculation of profit, etc., to the utility capitalists. But if they are giving away trees, they at least believe more profits will be generated.

In addition, trees reduce pollution and carbon dioxide, one of the gases responsible for global warming. Generating power is notorious for producing pollution and carbon dioxide. Planting trees could help utilities to escape controlling pollution. Sometimes the Environmental Protection Agency and other regulators do enforce measures against pollution, although often as the result of lawsuits by environmentalists.

Plastic Energy-Hanford obviously is seeking profits. It is the first company in the nation to engage in this sort of recycling. The California Integrated Waste Management Board made a $2 million loan to the company. Recycling will divert trash from landfills. The company, of course, expects to profit by selling the low-sulfur diesel oil.

The Fresno Bee reports that employees of the Kings Waste & Recycling Authority will pick through trash by hand to recover recyclable materials. The company apparently gets the waste free. If capitalists can sometimes do the right thing for the sake of profit, imagine what would be possible under socialism. Let's narrow the focus here simply to pollution. The useful producers in a socialist society will have every incentive to reduce pollution to the barest minimum technically possible. Their health is what pollution damages; their environment is what landfills tear up to dispose of waste, etc. After thus reducing pollution to the minimum, socialist society will have every incentive to reduce the impact of that remaining minimum.

Tree planting and recycling of plastics for low-sulfur diesel fuel are only some examples of what a socialist society will do routinely—and for the benefit of all its members.

The Socialist Labor Party is not utopian. It does not presume to draft detailed plans of what socialist society will do. The decisions will be of a socialist society in which all productive property is collectively owned and democratical- ly controlled and operated by the useful producers. The examples cited here simply give the barest hint of what socialism will be able to do.