

# Letters from our readers

21 September 2006

*The following is a selection of recent letters sent to the World Socialist Web Site.*

On “Five years since 9/11: A political balance sheet”

The author has certainly laid the pieces of the puzzle out: the weapon, the motive—they are as plain as the nose in front of the face.

The cabal now in power, will say it over and over again to the masses, but they will never comprehend such a massive cover-up. We know now from the lips of Emperor Bush himself that Iraq had absolutely no connection to the events of that day, and for all that revelation, everything proceeds. That is the power of a diseased mind, in high places; it has no control over its madness. Remove Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, etc. and the Hydra would grow a new head or limb; like cancer it mushrooms at a rate of growth until it implodes on itself.

TG

11 September 2006

On “Who was behind the attack on the US embassy in Syria?”

Your articles about the thwarted bombing in Syria and on the atrocity on September 11, 2001, are building quite a logical and persuasive case that both events were “false flag terrorist operations.” It seems to many that the entire progress of the War on Terror has depended upon terrorist attacks in which the Anglo-American governments, or certain rogue elements within them acting at the behest of aggressive global capitalism, have played a leading and covert hand, and your articles support this thesis.

It seems to suggest that this time, because the Syrian attempt was so primitive by comparison to 9/11 itself, that the objective of this “false flag operation” might not have been to destroy the US embassy outright but rather to foil the attempt without any loss of life—as the *casus belli* for a Syrian and Iranian war would be established in either case, as your article points out.

I believe the more clearly it can be shown that the capitalist state is itself the perpetrator of the vast majority of terrorist atrocities, through aggressive militarism and covert operations, and does this in order to control the masses through fear, the less this terrible weapon of oppression will be at their disposal. In order to defeat capitalism we must first expose and defeat manufactured fear and terror.

JQ

13 September 2006

On “New York Times on 9/11 observances: propaganda in

the guise of reportage”

I’m sure this doesn’t originate with me, but “age of *error*” sounds like a more accurate buzz-phrase than “age of terror.”

BS

Springfield, Oregon, US

13 September 2006

On “A tale of two elections: the US and Ukraine in 2004”

Thank you, Mr. Damon, for the article that reveals the true nature of the events. I witnessed the turmoil later dubbed as “the Orange Revolution,” and I am confident that it really was masterminded and financed by the United States. They report Ukrainian media to have been biased and corrupt. However, the media became even *more biased* after the initial runoff results were made public. I myself witnessed a reporter reporting (excuse the pun) tens of thousands of people in the central city square. Ironically, I happened to be standing nearby in that very square where I saw two hundred people at best. The misinformation was everywhere. People believed—and many still do—that the “revolution” had something to do with the so-called “People Power,” that it was going on throughout the country—they were made to believe that. In reality, it was nothing like what was shown on TV in the West. A friend of mine from Germany said, “The Ukrainian people showed everyone how to fight for freedom, democracy...” I just said nothing. Most people were led to believe something *very* different from what actually happened. It was a great example of how public opinion manipulation technologies can be applied to topple dissenting regimes.

The *Guardian* newspaper wrote in this respect, “Everything is brandable.” The pro-American forces were given everything they needed to win. And they did win. Even though it means no future for Ukraine. With regard to the “Orange Revolution” I suggest that you have a look at this article published by the *Guardian*.

Thank you very much once again for the article.

P.S. And one more thing. The hot water supply has been shut off since March and no one seems to know when it is going to resume. Last winter the temperature in my flat was 7 degrees centigrade. I am serious.

AK

14 September 2006

On “Fred Breinersdorfer, writer of *Sophie Scholl—The Final Days*, speaks to the WSW”

Please check out my review of the Breinersdorfer/Rothmund

travesty. He continued the dishonesty so evident in his film, by demonstrating a complete lack of understanding of the historiography of the White Rose.

Contrary to what he said in his interview with Mr. Phillips, the DDR in fact honored the members of the White Rose at a time when West Germans ignored them totally. The Gestapo interrogation transcripts were viewed—and used in scholarly research—by several well-known East German writers. That West Germans refused to acknowledge the existence of the transcripts, although their existence was known (e.g., Inge Scholl had a complete set in the 1960s!) Bordering on criminal.

Now, East German researchers skewed their conclusions based on the transcripts, just as “West German” researchers did after 1989. This is primarily seen in the deification of Sophie Scholl, which should never have happened. Hans and Sophie Scholl were the weak links in the White Rose resistance, not its moral center.

Our work seeks to present who did what, and why, and when—whether they were out-and-out Communists, moderate Socialists, opportunists, democrats or republicans (both with lower case), Catholic, Lutheran, anthroposophist, atheist, or even—as in the case of Kurt Huber—pro-Nazi/anti-Hitler.

Best regards,

Ruth Hanna Sachs

Center for White Rose Studies

West Berlin, New Jersey, US

29 August 2006

*On “Confused, not thought through: V for Vendetta”*

I’ve just found your review of *V for Vendetta*. While I agree that the film is poorly thought through, I have to say that you are dead wrong about the possibilities of the comic book (“I could possibly be convinced otherwise, but basing a serious film on a graphic novel, seems to me a questionable proposition. Is that not perhaps an inherently limited medium?”)

In what sense is it inherently limited? I don’t believe you have thought through your own argument, and your use of equivocal language like ‘perhaps’ and ‘seems’ leads me to believe that you know it. It seems to me to be no more limited than film (indeed, there are many things you can do in comics that you can’t do in film.)

I suspect you have never read any of Moore’s work. You’re quite right to dismiss the film adaptations of *From Hell* and *The League of Extraordinary Gentlemen* as tripe; they are. But Moore’s *From Hell* is one of the most extraordinary works of literature you will ever read. I defy you to read it and then call comics a “limited medium.”

Moore’s *V for Vendetta* is a book that juxtaposes fascism and anarchism; not, as in the film, cartoon Nazism and weird cuddly romantic liberal democracy with bombings. He’s well aware of the undemocratic nature of V’s revolution. He’s also well aware of the ridiculous way the film tries to paint Fawkes as a “freedom fighter”—there’s no such nonsense in the

novel—and of the film’s unlikely resolution (there are no easy solutions in the book).

All the dialogue you cite was invented by the Wachowski brothers, for no reason that I can think of; the two sequences they largely left alone are the two most powerful scenes in the film. That’s why Moore has severed his ties with Hollywood and no longer accepts any income from his publishers for *V for Vendetta*. He keeps writing important pieces of literature, and Hollywood keeps turning it in to flashy pap packed with painful “improvements” of his writing. Then people come along and judge him, and indeed the medium of comics, by the standards of those terrible films. Given that, you could almost excuse ignorant comments such as yours, except that you kind of expect critics to know what they’re talking about.

EF

10 September 2006

*On “Spain: ‘Law of historical memory’ continues cover up of Franco’s crimes”*

I have just been reading George Orwell’s account in *Homage to Catalonia* of the defeat of the anti-Franco forces.

Orwell started out as a neutral in the ideological disputes on the left in Spain. He thought that the left should put aside these differences and join forces militarily. The armed attack against the POUM, a coalition of non-Stalinist Marxists, stunned him, causing him to reassess the roles of both the Socialists and the Stalinists. He subsequently came to believe that the whole programme of the Spanish Communist Party was counterrevolutionary, that their support for the discredited parties of the bourgeois democracy neutralized a great deal of potential popular support for the anti-Franco side.

It is no wonder that the Socialists and the Communist Party do not want this history examined objectively.

JC

Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

11 September 2006



To contact the WSWs and the Socialist Equality Party visit:

**[wsws.org/contact](http://wsws.org/contact)**