

Letters on Bush's State of the Union speech

8 February 2002

We received the following letters in response to the January 31 article, "State of the Union speech: Bush declares war on the world."

Dear Editor,

Thank you for sounding the warning. There are many parallels between the Bush administration and the Nazi regime; Bush's ambitions to establish a Fourth Reich being not least amongst them. Since the theft of the 2000 election, events have proceeded at an almost bewildering pace. Democratic practices and norms lie in tatters on the ground, whilst the bourgeois media sinks further and further into its mire of complacency. History is repeating itself.

Yours,

EG

31 January 2002

Thoughts mirrored—Bush's speech is a repainting of the cold war days now substituting the "terrorists" for communists. All I can say is that it's pretty scary. I have forwarded your articles to friends and relatives and they call to tell me don't send me this stuff again, because of the word Socialist. No one I know would read your web site.

They're all clones and Americans who never emerged from the '50s. My guess is this is representative of the general public and that's the unbreakable part of the equation: America is this way because that's what Americans want—America is George Bush!

Sincerely and thanks for your good writing,

RR

1 February 2002

Hello WSWS and readers:

The American administration actually declared war on the world on September 11. That's how it sounded to me, at any rate. When the bourgeois media trumpeted the administration's vow to combat countries that "harbour terrorism", and further declared, in so many words, you're either for us or

against us, it was obvious to me that the Teflon Nation, which has the combined military might of nine of its closest competitors, was moving to consolidate its position as Cop of the World.

Since 1999, Canada has been accused in the American press as being a "haven for terrorists". What's the difference between "harbouring" and "being a haven for"? Well, in the case of Canada, it means that the US feels justified in meddling in domestic politics. Specifically, the American administration has succeeded in pressing its demands that it be allowed to "harmonize" Canadian immigration and customs policy. They have moved to militarize the border between Canada and the US, a move that is strictly for show. This border has historically been referred to as "the longest undefended border in the world".

This border is, in fact, undefendable. The US has 9,000 troops on the US-Mexico border, yet 40 persons per hour are said to cross illegally every day. The US-Canada border is easily five times that length, yet the US has sent only 900 troops. Clearly, this militarization is merely for show, to back up the demands for "harmonization" of Canadian domestic policy.

If the US can treat its erstwhile friend—a friend with no real means of self-defence—in this fashion, what does it have in mind for its enemies?

JC

2 February 2002

Hello:

Finally I read an intelligent article that sums up the bellicose speech (more Hitlerian) that Bush gave the other night. Thank you for providing some sanity in these totally insane times. Bush and company are a very scary bunch.

SC

Clearlake, California

2 February 2002

Re your editorial of 31 January, I am pleased to see

that at least someone is still speaking out and still has the courage to tell the truth. Keep up the great work! Peace.

2 February 2002



To contact the WSWs and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact