

Letters from our readers

16 July 2003

Below we post a selection of recent letters to the World Socialist Web Site.

On "Study on Iraq coverage shows BBC was most pro-war of British networks"

I just read your article entitled "BBC was most pro-war of British networks" and must wholeheartedly agree with what was said. I'd like to send you an email that I sent to the BBC which, as expected, wasn't put on the web site:

"Yet again, a whitewash—what a surprise. Yet again, the government has got away scott free with lying and, oh I nearly forgot, the murder of thousands of innocent civilians (they don't matter much, do they—what were they called, 'collateral damage'—that's it). However, something is different this time, something that will come back to haunt these people for a long time yet—the majority of people no longer believe a word they say. The MP's might be playing ball and the BBC might be playing opposition, but people with any intelligence no longer believe their lies.

"As we all know, if it was about weapons of mass destruction the UN would have been allowed to continue its work. After all, they were succeeding in removing all such weapons, if indeed there were any, from Iraq. The lack of retaliation in the war proved that there were none. We all know (some of us right from the start) that there was a timetable that would be adhered to at all costs, UN approval or not. We all know that the dossiers were spiced up to give some kind of justification to their plans—it's blatantly so, no matter what the conclusion of the MPs in this inquiry.

"The BBC should not apologise. To do so would actually be laughable. Get this—the government lies to bring a sceptical parliament and public behind them in an unnecessary war. Millions of people protest against the war yet the government continues its relentless pursuit of evidence at all costs to bring some kind of legality to their campaign. Enough people saw through their lies and made it obvious by protesting, by writing to their MPs, by appearing on television programmes to state the case against war. The government did not relent, but instead continued the push to war and finally started it. Now they have got their victory and have still found no WMDs. The BBC accuses the government of 'sexing up' a dossier and the government wants an apology. Now what could be more ridiculous than that!?!?! I could accuse these people of a lot more than 'sexing up' a dossier and I will right here:

"They have lied, connived, exaggerated, manipulated, cheated and conned their way to a campaign that has cost the lives of thousands of innocent Iraqi people and will continue to take lives for decades to come with the disgusting weapons that have been used in such massive quantities (cluster bombs, DU [depleted

uranium] weapons, unexploded ordnance, etc, etc.).

"The evidence is clear, no matter what the BBC is forced to do or say. Does the government think people so stupid as to believe that by making the BBC apologise for their statement that people will then start believing what they say—that's just so stupid, once again, it's laughable.

"Oh, and just in case this message gives the impression that I think the BBC is the impartial, government watchdog that this saga makes out, it should be pointed out that these questions should have been asked before this war started. In asking them now, it's all just a silly smokescreen to distract us from the fact that the government has murdered innocent people in a preemptive action against a strategically important nation that posed no immediate threat to either us or its neighbours. The BBC was complicit in this war—where were you when the protests were gaining momentum and thousands were turning out on an almost weekly basis? Why did you not send reporters to get an idea of the scale of the protests until the final one (by which time it was too late)? Where were you when the facts about the dossier were known before the war? Why did you not investigate all points of the dossiers as soon as they were released? The BBC did nothing to prevent the war; in accusing the government of lying now, it's too little, too late and is irrelevant, as we can all now see.

"I am looking forward to the day that George Bush is impeached for the lies he used to bring about this war because, in providing him with the bulk of his evidence, Tony Blair and his lying cronies will quickly follow. What a great day that will be...

"I have to add the point that if this gets published, I shall eat my hat!! I have written to you before (before the war started) and not been published, so I'm used to it now. Go on, prove me wrong!!"

Keep up the good reporting!

Regards,

MM

10 July 2003

On "Parliamentary whitewash of Blair's lies on Iraq falls flat"

I watched some of the statements on BBC World News. Tony Blair bore an expression not unlike that of a rabbit in the headlights, insisting upon his belief in the existence of WMD in Iraq and that they would eventually be found. I imagine that in the back of his mind he was suddenly realizing that he owed his present situation to Bush and that he was rapidly becoming unfond of his US pal.

In the end, the report on the security services presented a lovely example of "praising with faint damns."

CZ

San Francisco

9 July

On "Britain: Blair government blames BBC for crisis over Iraqi war lies"

Blair and Bush can blame any one they like—but it comes down to both of them. I'm not sure why the press is hands off on this—If it had been President Clinton the Articles of Impeachment would have already been filed.

As an American I can't for the life of me see how some people claim Bush is a truthful person—he is not; he misled the world—and Blair was right behind him. The US has itself in such a mess at this point with Iraq it's embarrassing. I believe we should impeach Bush. How can we not? It's wrong to show the world that some of our laws don't matter—our president does not stand above our law. It is time to draft the impeachment and those who oppose this let them explain why Bush deserves more leniency than was given to Clinton.

VJ

Gainesville, Florida

2 July 2003

On "Bush administration divided over intervention in Liberia"

Usually I know what position is being taken by your authors on an issue. I am also nearly always in agreement. But certainly you can't really be viewing a humanitarian intervention in Liberia, which is requested by all sides, as imperialism. If you are, I would be very curious to know the rationale.

CK

This is an excellent article, the most complete treatment of the subject that I've seen. I'm particularly interested in Liberia because one of my former employees was a Peace Corps volunteer there.

HJ

7 July 2003

On "Bush accuses Europe of starving Africa"

Excellent article. It nicely explained the controversy over GM foods, something I did not fully grasp before. Thanks for pulling this together.

DG

Arizona

2 July 2003

On "US convenes Iraqi council with aim of grabbing oil"

What's really sad is, all this happens long after the "embedded" cameras are gone, and people around the world resort back to their daily lives. Who takes the time to read such well-written, truth revealing articles such the topic of this email found on the WWSW site?

I think it was the Syrian ambassador to the UN who put it well, "...what are we really talking about here; a bunch of robbers? Do you really expect the world to believe given the present US military build-up that the troops are going to return to their barracks empty handed?..."

Alas, behold the truth revealed; let the robbery begin.

Damn shame.

JM

13 July 2003

Your 7 July article titled "40 Millionaires in US Senate" wonderfully illustrates the fact that the US Government consists of some of the wealthiest, greediest, and self-indulged people in this

country. It also shows that simply blaming Bush for all things bad is absurd. These political, international and economic policies that dump huge sums of money into the pockets of a very few individuals are driven forward by the Bush administration, the Senate and the House of Representatives. This government has set itself up to tend to its own selfish needs, at the expense of the majority.

Your article spiked my curiosity to look into what the actual reported incomes are for each one of the United States. After exploring the US Department of Commerce's Bureau of Economic Analysis web site [<http://www.bea.gov/bea/regional/spi/>] I found 2002 statistics for per capita personal income. This provides yet another level of evidence of just how far these "leaders" are from the people they claim to represent.

Here are the lowest five:

Mississippi = \$22,372

Arkansas = \$23,512

West Virginia = \$23,688

New Mexico = \$23,941

Utah = \$24,306

The top ten in the United States are:

Colorado = \$33,276

Illinois = \$33,404

Minnesota = \$34,071

New Hampshire = \$34,334

New York = \$36,043

Maryland = \$36,298

Massachusetts = \$39,244

New Jersey = \$39,453

District of Columbia = \$42,120

Connecticut = \$42,706

These numbers induce shock on their own, without comparison to the senators' salaries. However, it is crucial to see the contradiction between the majority of the US population and the representatives. These politicians are about big business and fattening their personal bank accounts.

In addition, these statistics add the other elements of social deterioration (i.e., increased unemployment, decreased health services, declining education standards) we hear about each and every day.

Thank you,

CL

11 July 2003



To contact the WWSW and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wwsw.org/contact