

Letters from our readers

13 September 2003

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

On "Bush, 9/11 and Iraq—a policy founded on deception"

Dear Bill Vann,

Just a further note on the bourgeois reaction to Bush's speech... On the local news program, an ABC affiliate, they had a sound bite from Tom Harkin, in which he expressed support for Bush's quest for international assistance, but at the same time criticized him for going it alone, and qualified his support with the demand that the international community be given assurances that the US will not go it alone ever again. Following which, they had the reply of Rumsfeld, which consisted in him alluding to Harkin's remarks as being treasonous. Not using that word, though, rather, saying that he was essentially giving aid and comfort to the enemy. He was rather flippant, but the message was clear.

As you stated, "A government that is able to defend its policies before the people only through falsification and deception is a regime of extreme crisis." However, they seem to be intent on doing everything they can to hold onto power, including crushing any opposition, from any quarter, including their partners in crime: the Democrats.

It seems the national bourgeoisie is splitting: much as the international bourgeoisie did, over the question of war and of the neoconservative agenda in general. If this is so, will it become a violent split? From all indications—including the neo-conservatives' ascension to power, the two recent wars, and the buildup to war in Colombia, and the Philippines, the redistricting move in Texas and the recall in California, to the ongoing corporate crime spree from across the board financial fraud to the outright rape of the working class through the deteriorating economic condition. And, of course, the increasing use of repression to curb civil discontent—it would seem that a peaceful split among the ruling class is not in the offing. At least not from the neo-con side of the fence. The neo-liberals, on the other hand, have shown themselves consistently reluctant to fight on issues of principle. The current redistricting plan in Texas being the exception to the rule, although the last report I heard on that situation was that one of the Democrats returned, giving the Texan Republicans the needed quorum. Given this history of cowardice by the Democrats, even on issues of principle, it would seem that the Bushites may consolidate their power within the bourgeoisie without a serious conflict amongst themselves.

Sincerely,

HR

Las Vegas, NV

9 September 2003

Thanks for the analysis contained in the article assessing Bush's

speech. You have hit the nail on the head—the lies and the deception are so much a part of this administration's strategy—but then that has always been the policy of former administrations. The naïveté and ignorance of the average US American makes it easy for any party in power to do this. The whole system is so corrupt and enmeshed in policies which lend themselves to corruption that it may be too late for this nation to change. I am sorry if I sound against anything that is US, but recently I have found more and more people with the same attitude as mine—even in sport!

Keep up the good work and lots of luck.

OR

9 September 2003

For the sake of the future, the truth must be pursued relentlessly wherever and whatever it leads to. We have seen what happened to the former Soviet Union, which was characterized as being led by a bunch of thugs, so indeed there is a precedent.

I am in the US; truth and reason are both being trampled wantonly, it is shocking to behold. It is "back to the future," even to feudalism, which never really went away!

JB

9 September 2003

I am a relatively new subscriber to WSWWS and I want to let you and your staff know what a good job you are doing to "tell it like it is." When I compare the substance found in your articles and compare it to similar items as reported in the so-called press, a totally different story emerges. I'm a Korean War veteran and I like to think my time in the army meant something with regard to what this country stands for, etc. Although I speak for myself I suspect a number of veterans feel the same way; that is, did we risk our lives defending our country for what is going on with our current government in Washington DC? For me, the answer is a resounding no. What galls the hell out of me is that there is not one individual (and that includes the president himself) who has spent any significant time in the military. I strongly suspect neither of their children has either. To have individuals such as these make decisions on the back of our current men and women of the military is reprehensible. As the golden rule implies, "He who has the gold, rules"!

WM

9 September 2003

In your article "Blair government endorses Murdoch's anti-immigrant campaign" you rightly mention that Rupert Murdoch has taken the Blair government's side against the BBC's in the Hutton Inquiry into the suicide of Dr. David Kelly. Hardly a surprise, though. Murdoch rarely misses an opportunity to attack the BBC. They "distort competition," he froths repeatedly. Unlike

his news outlets like Sky which distort ... oh, never mind.

WS

10 September 2003

On "Bush seeks UN bailout of Iraqi occupation"

Dear Mr. Vann,

Good article, but I think the demands for an immediate end to the war have to be coupled intrinsically with a call for the impeachment and prosecution for war crimes of Mr. Bush as well as the immediate nationalization of the energy sector—without compensation.

Yours truly,

JH

Hamburg, Germany

4 September 2003

I am an avid reader of your web site. Your analysis of world events is truly spectacular and makes more sense to me than anything I've read or seen anywhere else. This must be true of others too according to the correspondence you receive, which is another thing I always read. Especially letters from Americans, as according to our media they support the war in Iraq.

Now that both Bush and Blair have been exposed as liars and warmongers where are the demonstrations? All the different groups which demonstrated against the war have gone quiet—wouldn't it be more effective for demonstrations now to stop a war which should never have been allowed in the first place, which has been based on lies and deceit from the beginning, which is killing soldiers and civilians every day, which is costing money that could be put to far better use. I could go on forever with reasons why we should not be at war.

The pretence for the war started with September 11 and as the anniversary of that terrible day draws close it is being used to re-inflate people. This should not be allowed to happen, if we must be at war it should not be a war against "terrorism" but against capitalism.

Workers of the world unite.

SH

8 September 2003

On "Meacher: terrorism a pretext for conquest—British official charges US 'stood down' on 9/11"

Great article. This is the type of exposure that shows these war criminals' true motives. Hopefully more people like Meacher will come forward to denounce Bush, Blair, Howard and their gang of thugs. For all the Bush/Blair gang claiming Meacher is the "looney left" his analysis fits the facts and is getting much press throughout the world (beside the USA). It must be terribly upsetting to the Bush/Blair gang that people are now understanding that their "war on terrorism" is a sham to allow them to pursue criminal agendas. In fact it shows that they are the actual "terrorists" and are spreading death, destruction and terror with their criminal policies. Hopefully as more people in the world become aware of this hoax they will realize that all the governments that have joined in the "war on terror" have only done so to enslave their own populations and that all governments do not represent the interests of their citizens. This could be the catalyst needed for the revolution of the common people of the world to unite and throw off the yoke of government oppression.

G

9 September 2003

On "Pittsburgh, Pa.: Workers protest layoffs and austerity budget"

Dear WWS,

Here in Buffalo, New York we are facing job cuts in the public sector, and it seems that every week we hear of another plant or business closing, or the layoff of workers. The public needs to be made more aware of the FACT that the Bush administration not only does not care about workers and jobs, but its radically pro-business agenda is having (purposefully) a negative impact on employment.

While I have heard plenty of complaints about the administration's "overtime" legislation from the perspective of the potential for lost income, what NEEDS TO BE VOICED is what this legislation shows about the president's commitment to JOBS and employment. While he says that he (President Bush) is concerned about unemployment, this proposed legislation shows that he is not. This bill will help businesses SHED workers, and makes new hiring less likely. Businesses will save money, not only by not paying overtime, but even more, by mandating overtime in lieu of hiring new workers (which will generally involve benefits, including health care) business has a financial incentive NOT TO HIRE, and even to reduce (and overwork) the current workforce. The overtime/comp-time legislation is especially wrong in times of rising unemployment. This is another example of the administration being "allowed" to mislead the people about its true objectives; to say one thing, while actions prove that the objectives are quite the opposite.

Regards,

RF

Niagara Falls, New York

4 September 2003



To contact the WWS and the
Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact