

Letters from our readers

7 July 2007

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

On “Fourteen US troops killed in two days of Iraq fighting”

Why? Why? Why are the American citizens standing for this? Why in God’s name are we allowing this to happen? Let’s unite with one voice and put an end to this nonsense. One of these deaths hit close to home. One of these soldiers was in the same unit as my husband. Let’s not let one more soldier perish in this *illegal* war! Bush lied to start this war. Americans should all be furious! Get a backbone and do something about it! Bring our troops home now. Demand it and demand it now. Bring my children’s father home now; save his life, I’m begging you. Save all the other mommies and daddies over there. I’m pleading for their lives now.

Dena Ciferri

Military Families Speak Out, board of directors

Fort Bliss, Texas, USA

23 June 2007

On “US military officials knew about contaminated water on Marine base”

I read your article about water contamination at Camp Lejeune, and I just wanted to say, “Thank you”! My son died in August 2005 at 20 years of age of a rare type of Hodgkin’s Lymphoma. He was born at Camp Lejeune. He too was born at only four pounds and had many health problems as a baby. It is heart wrenching to hear the stories of all of us who have suffered through this, and I hope the government does the right thing. My family is not involved in the claims against the government only because my son did not wish to be involved. He didn’t want to go through the stress of something like that on top of the fight of cancer. He fought for two years. Anyway, I just wanted to tell you that it helps to see people have not forgotten after so many years. Please do not give up on this. Thank you again.

SM

Tarzana, California, USA

30 June 2007

On “Antiwar coalition attempts to prop up Democratic party: United for Peace and Justice holds conference in Chicago”

The problem with supporting the Democratic Party is that it has alienated its traditional base, turning its back on the poor/working class, destroying the “social safety net,” making labor unions nearly obsolete—in short, enacting a full range of solidly right-wing policies at the expense of the majority of Americans. For all practical purposes, the two major parties merged during the Clinton administration, which took an ax to the New Deal policies that so powerfully reduced poverty while creating a solid middle class. Predictably, the result is the extraordinary economic disparities we have today.

The Democratic Party leadership has as much interest in ending this war as they do in ending poverty. We might get some “lip service” in anticipation of the upcoming elections, but nothing more. Those “staunch opponents” of the Republican war nevertheless vote to keep funding it. Efforts by an antiwar organization to “prop up the Democratic Party” is likely to attract a handful of cocktail liberals, but will only (continue to) alienate the masses (the poor/working class).

DHF

Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, USA

28 June 2007

I attended the UFPJ National Convention this past weekend, and agreed with everything you wrote in your review of the events and positions that UFPJ promoted, except there was nothing noting the strong momentum amongst member groups to take up impeachment. As a matter of fact, a proposal was submitted by World Can’t Wait, Not In Our Name, Granny Peace Brigade, CodePink and Ret. Lt. Col. Ann Wright asking UFPJ leadership and the general members to include impeachment in the strategic framework for the upcoming year. A strong argument was made for it, and when a vote was taken, the proposal lost, but not by a wide margin. In fact, I co-authored that petition, and there was a generous amount of time debating the relevance of impeachment and how

UFPJ should include this topic in every mobilization, and statement made on their web site. If you want to let your readers know that UFPJ is part of the Democratic Party, just mention the total hostile rejection of the impeachment issue by its leadership. If looks could kill, I would have been dead. In fact, at the end of the day on Saturday, when a vote to accept the proposal was taken, four of us who were delegates voted against adopting the framework for the upcoming year. That also wasn't noted in your article. This dissent amongst the member groups should be mentioned.

EB

Staten Island, New York, USA

28 June 2007

On "The New York Times has to correct itself again, this time on Iran"

In the same edition of the *Times*, there was an editorial scathing in its criticism of the secrecy/criminality of the Bush administration—Vice President Cheney especially. The only thing missing from the piece, in fact, was a demand for impeachment, and that, of course, is because the *Times* does not want them impeached, despite the editorial nicely stating the case for it. The *Times* was doing what it always does: feigning indignation while giving the usual pass.

CJM

27 June 2007

On February 25, 2007 the *New York Times* tried to say ("Approaching Iran Intelligence with Intelligent Skepticism") that the public can now trust its reporting on Iran. The so-called "public editor" Byron Calame asserted that the writers and editors have now learned to be skeptical, that the biased or "sloppy" reporting, like the "weapons of mass destruction" frenzy, will not be repeated.

In my opinion, the thinking public should learn that skepticism with respect to the major bourgeois news sources is not enough. Capitalist mass media are heaping lie upon lie in a desperate drive to another war. This frenzy of lies is an indication of the crisis of the whole system.

FK

Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA

26 June 2007

On "Blair leaves office and becomes Bush's 'peace envoy': Sycophancy in parliament and an insult to world opinion"

What more can be said about this appalling spectacle? As usual, the WSWS has hit the nail on the head with its

objective analysis of what actually is involved, both in terms of global capitalism and the continuing oligarchic war crimes perpetuated by the Western powers. I could only watch a few minutes of that final speech leading to an unheard of standing ovation in the House of Commons, which echoed the usual US Congress behavior during each State of the Union speech no matter which president is in office. Britain's political system has lost its identity. Another alternative is desperately needed.

TW

29 June 2007

On "CIA documents point to massive and ongoing government criminality"

I wanted to make sure you had seen this statement by the Frank Olson family, some five years old. It has every relevance to your article here.

Info from this site helped me so see how 'old issues' can still relate to current events. That site as well as some of Fletcher Prouty's writings regarding the Pentagon Papers (among others), helped me to see how 'government information releases' can be damage control and subtle (or not so subtle, in this case) deceit disguised as 'coming clean.'

Your article painfully illustrates this: "The [National Security Archive] posted both [a] 1977 version [of a document concerning the CIA's role in ... spying on protesters coming to the 1972 Democratic and Republican national conventions in Miami] and the newly released one side by side, showing that more than half of the information released 30 years ago had been excised."

PL

29 June 2007



To contact the WSWS and the Socialist Equality Party visit:

wsws.org/contact