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OMNI Book Forum on US Capitalism
OMNI FORUM February
NEWS RELEASE
February 8, 2010
Contact: Dick Bennett 442-4600

Sponsor: OMNI Center for Peace, Justice, and Ecology

FORUM ON CORPORATE POWER AND THE US CORPORATE STATE

**Monday, February 15 at 6:00 P.M.** at the OMNI Center for Peace, Justice, and Ecology.

At OMNI’s new location: 3274 Lee Avenue

With the recent Supreme Court decision removing the limits
of corporate sponsorship of political advertisement, our Nation plunged into a full-blown Corporate State in which our elected representatives are dominated by corporate money. The voice of the people is in danger of being drowned out by this flood of corporate money. Action is needed soon to reverse this damage...but what action? What can be done? We will be exploring our democratic possibilities during our discussion panel on February 15 at 6:00 P.M. at the OMNI Center for Peace, Justice, and Ecology. Coordinated by John Gray and Dick Bennett. We urge you to read or read about the book by Thom Hartmann, Unequal Protection: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights.

Moderator: Claire Detels
Panelists:
John Gray, Mayor of Greenland
Jacob Holloway, Graduate Student UA
Abel Tomlinson, Graduate Student UA
Cliff Hughes, Teacher

OMNI has a new location: 3274 Lee Avenue east of N. College north of Hobby Lobby, south of Fed Ex/Kinko’s and Liquor World.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS
“SUPREME COURT: U.S. Government For Sale”
January 22, 2010 by Faiz Shakir, Amanda Terkel, Matt Corley, Benjamin Armbruster, Zaid Jilani, Matt Duss, and Alex Seitz-Wald (forwarded b Sue S)
Yesterday, in the case of Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, the Supreme Court held that "the constitutional guarantee of free speech means that corporations can spend unlimited sums to help elect favored candidates or defeat those they oppose." The activist 5-4 decision struck down a 63-year-old ban that ensured corporations may not use their enormous profits to support or oppose candidates. The ruling "declared unconstitutional a large portion of the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform act passed in 2002." Ian Millhiser of the Center for American Progress Action Fund observed, "Today's decision does far more than simply provide Fortune 500 companies with a massive megaphone to blast their political views to the masses; it also empowers them to drown out any voices that disagree with them." Rep. Alan Grayson (D-FL), who is already pushing legislation to rectify the Court's decision, warned, "The law itself will be bought and sold. It would be political bribery on the largest scale imaginable." "The Supreme Court has thrust politics back to the robber-baron era of the 19th century," the New York Times writes today.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE CASE: The case grew from attempts by the conservative organization Citizens United to promote its anti-Hillary Clinton film, "Hillary: The Movie," in 2008, which "takes viewers on a savaging journey through Clinton's scandals." Because the
movie was partially financed with corporate funds, "it fell under restrictions in the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002," also known as The McCain-Feingold Act. The Federal Election Commission (FEC) therefore heavily restricted Citizens United's ability to advertise the film. A March 2009 ruling upheld the FEC's decision, writing that the film was "susceptible of no other interpretation than to inform the electorate that Senator Clinton is unfit for office, that the United States would be a dangerous place in a President Hillary Clinton world, and that viewers should vote against her." The film "was the brainchild of Citizens United President David N. Bossie, a former congressional aid" and longtime Clinton critic. According to Nick Nyhart, president of Public Campaign, "The movie was created with the idea of establishing a vehicle to chip away at the decision. ... It was part of a very clear strategy to undo McCain-Feingold."

A RIGHT-WING ACTIVIST COURT: The Washington Post writes that the Court's majority made "a mockery of some justices' pretensions to judicial restraint." Although Chief Justice John Roberts represented himself as an impartial "umpire" during his 2005 confirmation hearings -- acknowledging that "it is a jolt to the legal system when you overrule a precedent on the bench" -- Roberts "has shown himself more willing than his mentor and predecessor, William H. Rehnquist, to question the court's past decisions." During his short tenure thus far, Roberts' "record is not that of a humble moderate but, rather, that of a doctrinaire conservative." Likewise, Samuel Alito's replacement of Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has tipped the court's balance from supportive of congressional efforts to reduce the influence of special interests to suspicious of how the restrictions curtail free speech. Since Roberts and Alito joined its ranks, the Court ignored longstanding precedents protecting women against paycheck discrimination and older workers against age discrimination. The Court overruled a very recent precedent protecting women's reproductive freedom, and Roberts even had the audacity to claim that the Court's landmark Brown v. Board of Education decision forbids school boards from desegregating public schools. In his dissent, Justice John Paul Stevens wrote, "At bottom, the Court's opinion is thus a rejection of the common sense of the American people. ... While American democracy is imperfect, few outside the majority of this Court would have thought its flaws included a dearth of corporate money in politics."

FURTHER EMPOWERING BIG BUSINESS: In 2008, "the Obama and McCain campaigns combined to spend just over $1.1 billion, an enormous, record-breaking sum at the time," but a small fraction of what corporations have available. "With hundreds of billions of dollars of corporate profits at stake every time Congress begins a session," wrote Millhiser, "wealthy corporations would be foolish not to spend tens of billions of dollars every election cycle to make sure that their interests are protected. No one, including the candidates themselves, have the ability to compete with such giant expenditures." David Kirkpatrick wrote in the New York Times that the Court "has handed a new weapon to lobbyists. If you vote wrong, a lobbyist can now tell any elected official that my company, labor union or interest group will spend unlimited sums explicitly advertising against your re-election." "The good news," wrote Millhiser, "is that lawmakers are already considering ways to mitigate the damage caused by Citizens United, and a number of options exist, such as requiring additional disclosures by corporations engaged in electioneering, empowering shareholders to demand that their investment not be spent to advance candidates they disapprove of, or possibly even requiring shareholders to approve a corporation's decision to influence an election before the company may do so." Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Rep. Chris Van Hollen (D-MD) have been "working for months to draft legislation in response to the anticipated decision." Potential fixes include banning political advertising by corporations that hire lobbyists, receive government
money, or collect most of their revenue abroad. "Another would be to tighten rules against coordination between campaigns and outside groups so that, for example, they could not hire the same advertising firms or consultants. A third would be to require shareholder approval of political expenditures, or even to force chief executives to appear as sponsors of commercials their companies pay for."

A SIMPLE SUMMARY
WHAT IS CORPORATE PERSONHOOD?
The claim that corporations are persons under the Fourteenth Amendment, are therefore equal to humans in possessing individual rights, and therefore enjoy all protections extended to individual humans in the Constitution.

WHEN DID IT HAPPEN?
The 1886 Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad case has been used to this day to justify equal protection under the Constitution for corporations. But Thom Hartmann’s book shows that the Supreme Court never ruled for personhood, the public never voted for it, and it was never enacted by law. This original ambiguity has now been removed by the recent Supreme Court ruling, removing what little restraint had been achieved by campaign regulation.

WHAT DID OUR FOUNDERS BELIEVE?
The Founders and early Presidents specifically warned that the safety of the new republic depended on keeping corporations on a tight leash.

THE HARMFUL CONSEQUENCES OF PERSONHOOD TO DEMOCRACY:
The enormous rise of the influence of corporate money over government, through lobbying, gifts, and other monetary influences, and through the media through First Amendment free speech protection.
The equally disastrous increase of corporate secrecy under Fourth Amendment right of privacy. And much more.

The history of and case against corporate personhood in one volume is *Unequal Protection: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights* by Thom Hartmann. Rodale, 2002. In its Nov. 10, 2008 Book Forum, OMNI discussed this book along with other
books that demonstrated the harms caused by corporate personhood. (Dick)

10 Ways to Stop Corporate Dominance of Politics by Fran Korten
It's not too late to limit or reverse the impact of the Supreme Court’s disastrous decision in Citizens United v. FEC.
http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/01/26-3
Also on alternet: http://www.alternet.org/story/145441/10 from Joanna

PETITIONS

[Here are 2 of maybe many petitions and a recommendation, part of the valuable process of finding the thesis and language for the final version.--D]
SIMPLE AMENDMENT NEEDED
So far all the constitutional amendments I've seen are either shooting at the wrong target (limiting corporate spending) or including things they shouldn't (federal and state governmental rights over local government). What we need is something as simple as the 19th or 26th amendments (women and 18-year old votes) - such as "a 'person' is constitutionally defined as a human being" (if necessary make it even more specific "a member of homeo sapiens sapiens" - as silly as "man, wise, wise" is for our species - but something that absolutely cannot be a creation of law). bf

FROM MOVE TO AMEND, PETITION AND OTHER ACTIONS
http://www.movetoamend.org/motion-amend

MOVE TO AMEND  (forwarded by Art Hobson)
Since Thursday, the internet, newspapers and people around kitchen tables across the country have been ablaze with outrage over the Supreme Court's action to open the floodgates to corporate money in our elections. Over 40,000 of you have joined with us in launching a long-term campaign to amend the Constitution, and others have begun to follow your lead.
We think you'll agree that it's time to raise a ruckus! Over the weekend we prepared some ideas for things you can do and materials to get you started. Please check out our new Take Action section right now at:
http://www.movetoamend.org/take-action
Here's some of what you'll find there:
1) **Spread the word!** Tell your friends about the Motion to Amend. Use our form to forward a message to your contacts. Join our new Facebook page to connect with others.
2) **Donate to the cause!** Move to Amend is the beginning of a multi-year movement to amend the Constitution. We're gearing up big and we need your financial support.
3) **Educate Others!** Write a letter to the editor to explain what Citizens United ruling does and let others know how they can take action. Make sure to mention the MovetoAmend.org website. Our website has useful tips and sample letters to help get you started.
In the words of Margaret Mead, "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has."
We agree, which is why we've also included ideas for group action like:
1) **Hold a Funeral for Democracy!** Organize a mock funeral outside your closest federal building, with mourners, music, speakers, and eulogies for democracy. Let everyone know that the U.S. judiciary has made democracy illegal by granting away our rights to corporations. Take video to post on
YouTube, invite the media, and make sure your political officials are invited to speak in memory of democracy.

2) **Organize a Study Group or Kitchen Table Discussion!** Most folks do not have a deep understanding of what corporate personhood means to democracy and elections. Bring your friends, family, co-workers, fellow students, or neighbors together for a discussion about why this happened, what it means and what needs to be done. We provide materials to help get you started and readings to discuss.

3) **Pass a Democracy Resolution!** We include a model resolution to start from. Your political party, rotary club, city, township or even state can pass this declaration calling for a Constitutional Amendment to Legalize Democracy and Abolish Corporate Personhood. We also provide some materials to get you started if you’d like to take action at the municipal level. From Art H

---

**FROM PUBLIC CITIZEN**

[publiccitizen@mail.democracyinaction.org](mailto:publiccitizen@mail.democracyinaction.org)

Dick, [sorry not all the links engaged]

…The Supreme Court ruled last month that corporations can spend unlimited amounts of money in our elections.

I'm asking you to do two things right now to join the fight to defend our democracy from a corporate takeover:

1. Sign our petition at [www.DontGetRolled.org](http://www.DontGetRolled.org) for a constitutional amendment to counteract this radical ruling.

2. Help grow the resistance by forwarding this email to 10 friends and family members and asking them to sign the petition, too.

We must preserve First Amendment rights for actual people and the press. The First Amendment was never intended to apply to artificial constructs like profit-hungry corporations.

Many members of Congress are introducing amendments and signaling their support, including Representatives Donna Edwards, John Conyers, Marcy Kaptur, Leonard Boswell and Dennis Kucinich, and Senators John Kerry, Arlen Specter and Chris Dodd.

A real movement is taking shape....

But constitutional amendments do not come easy. We need a groundswell of support from every corner of the nation. We need hundreds of thousands of people to drive the legislative push in Congress.

Thank you, [publiccitizen@mail.democracyinaction.org](mailto:publiccitizen@mail.democracyinaction.org)

Robert Weissman, President

---

**SENATOR LINCOLN** (202) 224-4843 Fax: (202) 228-1371.  
Fayetteville office: 251-1380

**Senator Mark Pryor** Phone: (202) 224-2353 Fax: (202) 228-0908

**CONGRESSMAN Boozman** Lowell office: 479-725-0400.

---

Media Commentary: “A sort of constitutional Frankenstein moment” From Sue Skidmore

The Court’s Blow to Democracy

With a single, disastrous 5-to-4 ruling, the Supreme Court has thrust politics back to the robber-baron era of the 19th century. Disingenuously waving the flag of the First Amendment, the court’s conservative majority has paved the way for corporations to use their vast treasuries to overwhelm elections and intimidate elected officials into doing their bidding.
Congress must act immediately to limit the damage of this radical decision, which strikes at the heart of democracy. Read more in the New York Times.

Watching as the Supreme Court turns a corporation into a real live boy.

But you can plainly see the weariness in Stevens eyes and hear it in his voice today as he is forced to contend with a legal fiction that has come to life today, a sort of constitutional Frankenstein moment when corporate speech becomes even more compelling than the "voices of the real people" who will be drowned out. Even former Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist once warned that treating corporate spending as the First Amendment equivalent of individual free speech is "to confuse metaphor with reality." Today that metaphor won a very real victory at the Supreme Court. And as a consequence some very real corporations are feeling very, very good. Read more in Slate.

“Last Rites for the USA” Cindy Sheehan
FRIDAY | January 29, 2010 | NO. 00 | BS. 0 | CARACAS
Correo del Orinoco - English Edition

A U.S. Supreme Court case decision from 1886, The County of Santa Clara v. the Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR), is the reason today that the U.S. is a corporate empire.

Many people mistakenly believe that corporations were given the same rights (not just privileges) as persons in this Supreme Court decision, but nothing could be farther from the truth - the reason my nation is such a dysfunctional system now is not because of a Supreme Court decision, nor a law passed by Congress, nor by a referendum of the people: it's because of a single statement, one sentence, spoken by a Supreme Court Chief Justice before the hearing even began.

The founders of the U.S. did not like corporations and for the first few decades of the existence of this nation, corporations were only given limited "privileges" and not "rights," but after the 14th Amendment to the Constitution was ratified in 1868 - which extended equal protection under the law to all male citizens of the U.S regardless of race - attorneys for the corporations recognized the opportunity that had been gifted to them and started to scheme for corporate personhood.

After many assaults against common law, finally a perfect test case came up before the Supreme Court, the previously referenced case. The case was brought before the Supremes because the SPRR (the Halliburton of the 19th Century) objected to the fact the state of California would not allow it to deduct mortgage costs on its vast holdings from its before tax income as could private citizens.

The Supreme Court did not even try that case to grant corporate personhood - the reason corporations now have 14th Amendment protections is because of a statement made by Chief Justice Waite: "The court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which forbids a State to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws, applies to these corporations. We are all of the opinion that it does."

This one sentence changed the frame of North American politics in a very corrupt way. 1886 is when the "noble experiment" of representative republicanism died. Despite some populist stabs at "anti-trust" laws and labor unionism, today we find that the U.S. system of government is "by and for" the corporations.

On Thursday, January 21, 2010 - a (little noticed) U.S. Supreme Court decision took our critically ill republic that has been on life support and effectively murdered it.

Our elections have been compromised and the presidential candidates have been chosen for
us by the tyranny of the oligarchy for many decades, and we the people of the U.S. are allowed to cast our votes to give us the appearance that we have a voice in our nation, but now with the decision in the recent United Citizens v. The Federal Elections Commission even any appearance of representation for the people has been overturned.

In this decision, the Supreme Court removed limits from corporate campaign expenditures stating that even limiting these contributions in the first place put restrictions on a corporations' 1st Amendment rights to free speech. Corporations have long held sway over our government and the soft fascism of corporate control has been running things behind the scenes.

However, the decision in United Citizens v. The Federal Elections Commission that expanded a mouth-less and mindless corporation's freedom of speech has effectively gagged 300 million more of us that don't have billions of dollars to buy the votes of our politicians who are just extensions of such crime cartels as Goldman Sachs, anyway.

I believe that United Citizens v. The FEC will go down in the history books as one of the most important, and most destructive Supreme Court decisions in U.S. history and we should just drop all pretense at democracy and call our leaders President Goldman and VP Sachs.

Cindy Sheehan - Cindy Sheehan is a US peace activist and founder of Peace of the Action, an anti-war organization that promotes profound structural change in the US.

http://centrodealerta.org/documentos_desclasificados/correo_del_orinoco_internat_2.pdf

DIONNE CALLS FOR REVOLT

Supreme Court ruling calls for a populist revolt
By E.J. Dionne Jr. Monday, January 25, 2010; A17

"Populism" is the most overused and misused word in the lexicon of commentary. But thanks to a reckless decision by Chief Justice John Roberts's Supreme Court and the greed of the nation's financial barons, we have reached a true populist moment in American politics.

The Supreme Court’s 5-to-4 decision last week giving American corporations the right to unlimited political spending was an astonishing display of judicial arrogance, overreach and unjustified activism.

Turning its back on a century of practice and decades of precedent, a narrow right-wing majority on the court decided to change the American political system by tilting it decisively in favor of corporate interests.


Think of this rather persuasive moment in a chat between a corporate lobbyist and a senator: "Are you going to block that taxpayer bailout we want? Well, I'm really sorry, but we're going to have to run $2 million worth of really vicious ads against you." The same exchange might take place on tax breaks, consumer protections, environmental rules and worker safeguards.

Defenders of this vast expansion of corporate influence piously claim it's about "free speech." But since when is a corporation, a creation of laws passed by governments, entitled to the same rights as an individual citizen? This ruling will give large business entities far more power than any individual, unless you happen to be Michael Bloomberg or Bill Gates.

The only proper response to this distortion of our political system by ideologically driven justices is a popular revolt. It would be a revolt of a sort deeply rooted in the American political tradition. The most vibrant reform alliances in our history have involved coalitions between populists (who stand up for the interests and values of average citizens) and progressives (who fight against corruption in government and for institutional changes to improve the workings of our democracy). It's time for a new populist-progressive alliance.
This court ruling should also challenge the fake populism we have seen of late. It disguises a defense of the interests of the powerful behind crowd-pleasing rhetoric against "Washington," "taxes" and, yes, "Obama."

President Obama has helped feed this faux populist revolt by failing to understand until recently how deeply frustrated politically moderate, middle-class Americans are over policies that bailed out the banks while leaving behind millions of unemployed and millions more alarmed about their economic futures.

If average voters came to see government primarily as an instrument of the banks, why should they believe that the same government could help them on matters of health care and employment? This problem was aggravated by puffed-up, self-involved U.S. senators who conspired to make the legislative process look as ugly and chaotic as possible.

Obama began turning toward populism before the results of the Massachusetts Senate race rolled in. Republican Scott Brown's victory made the new turn imperative.

The president has now offered a modest tax on the big financial institutions to cover the costs of bailouts, and a tougher approach to banks that will limit their size and their capacity to make economy-wrecking financial bets. It's a decent start, and it's about time.

Next will come legislation to turn back the Supreme Court's effort to undermine American democracy. Sen. Charles E. Schumer and Rep. Chris Van Hollen are working with the White House on a measure to rein in the reach of the Supreme Court ruling.

Their bill is still being written, but the ideas they're considering include prohibiting political spending by corporations that receive government money, hire lobbyists or make most of their income abroad.

And shouldn't shareholders have the right to vote before a corporation spends money on politics? Do we want foreign-owned corporations, especially those owned by foreign governments, to exercise an undue influence in our politics? Imagine what an enterprise owned or influenced by the Chinese or Russian governments might try to do to a politician who campaigns too ardently for human rights?

My favorite idea: Requiring chief executives to appear in ads their corporations sponsor, exactly as politicians have to do. ("I'm Joe Smith, the chief executive of Acme Consolidated Megacorporation, and I approve this message.")

President Obama was right to invoke Teddy Roosevelt in his radio address on Saturday. American democracy and the square deal in government for which TR battled are in jeopardy.

Harry E. Jendro Jr., in a recent column.

I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. - Thomas Jefferson

CORPORATIONS AND CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE
If you are not alarmed by the recent SCOTUS decision to grant unlimited spending to corporations and special interest groups here is a little primer of how much they already spend

Click Here. [sorry the links do not work—D] You will note it is done via your local Chamber of Commerce which receives tax monies and then directs these monies into ultra conservative campaigns. A good effort to stop your city from giving people's tax monies to a local Chamber of Commerce would really be worthwhile. The fight against giving the Chamber of Commerce in Springdale what amounts to a blank check has begun. You can see some of their work here.

Most CoC's have no accountability for the tax monies they receive from a sponsoring city.
We do know that local CoC money is funneled into large national campaigns to defeat health care reform and anti-union activities. From Larry W
Published on Tuesday, January 26, 2010 by YES! Magazine

NEW BOOKS

NEW FILMS
Documentary based upon Naomi Klein’s *The Shock Doctrine*
Older film avail: *Bhopal: The Search for Justice*

CAPITALISM USA BOOK FORUM 2008
FORUM ON U. S. CAPITALISM
SPONSORED BY OMNI CENTER FOR PEACE, JUSTICE AND ECOLOGY
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2008, 6:30, NIGHTBIRD BOOKSTORE

A panel will discuss recent books that examine contemporary business in the U. S. and its impact on the citizens. The panel was arranged prior to the bailout of the banks, which made the subject even more urgent. $700 billion rescued banks without any guaranteed return to the public for its investment or any requirement that they use at least some of the money for the mortgage-burdened people. They were free to use the money to buy other banks, pay dividends to stockholders, or give executives a bonus. As of the end of October, almost four weeks after the bailout became law, officials were just beginning to talk about helping a few strapped homeowners to keep the foreclosure wolf from the door. How did this situation happen? How did US capitalism become so irresponsibly, powerfully rapacious, our recent Presidents so unconscionably cooperative, and our Congress so complicitly supine? These books give the historical
background.

The Panelists are Claire Detels, UA Prof. Emer.; Max Greenwood, retired engineer; John Rule, retired teacher, farmer; and Larry Woodall, retired businessman.

The books to be discussed are: Confessions of an Economic Hitman by John Perkins; Unequal Protection: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights by Thom Hartmann; Free Lunch: How the Wealthiest Americans Enrich Themselves at Government Expense (And Stick You with the Bill) by Robert Johnston; Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism by Naomi Klein.

Max Greenwood, Thom Hartmann, UNEQUAL PROTECTION: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights.
Larry Woodall: John Perkins, CONFESSIONS of an Economic Hitman.

Another book well worth reading: THE WAR AT HOME: THE CORPORATE OFFENSIVE FROM RONALD REAGAN TO GEORGE W. BUSH, ECONOMIC CLASS WAR IN AMERICA by Jack Rasmus. US corporations and the right wing have launched four offensives against the working people of our nation to prevent and roll back regulation of corporations and union power/workers’ rights. The Third Corporate Restructuring occurred from the end of WWII, from the anti-Labor Taft-Harley Act of 1947 to the Landrum-Griffin Act of 1959. The 4th from 1978 and inauguration of Reagan to present destroyed intra-industry wide bargaining, broke back of manufacturing, construction, and transport unions, transformed bargaining into concessions, extended pro-corporate taxing, inaugurated Free Trade policies, crippled Democratic Party as voice of labor, and of course much more. The book’s importance is greatly heightened by Pres.-Elect Obama’s virtual silence on restoring working people’s organizing power and regulation of business that benefits the people. (Dick)

RELATED RECOMMENDED BOOKS ON US CAPITALISM (Dick)
--Batra ?. The Myth of Free Trade and Greenspan’s Fraud. See John Gray’s praise for both books in TMN (8-25-08).
--Alternative Radio: Noam Chomsky : Rollback: The Return of ...
Rollback: The Return of Predatory Capitalism (2 Tape Set) Noam Chomsky.
--The Globalization of Poverty and the New World Order by Michel Chossudovsky. 2008. In this new and expanded edition of Chossudovsky international best-seller, the author outlines the contours of a New World Order which feeds on human poverty and the destruction of the
environment, generates social apartheid, encourages racism and ethnic strife and undermines the rights of women.


-- Fraser, Steve. Wall Street. Also interv. by Moyers. Includes loss of democratic populism by Democratic Party. Cp. Twain’s Golden Age about late 19th c. rapacity and inequality. Also “Inequality and the American Dream” in The Economist.


-- Thom Hartmann, UNEQUAL PROTECTION: The Rise of Corporate Dominance and the Theft of Human Rights. (John Gray)

-- Hartmann, Thom. Screwed: The Undeclared War Against the Middle Class. Berret-Koehler, 2006;

-- Robert Johnston, Free Lunch: How The Wealethiest Americans Enrich Themselves At Government Expense (and Stick you With the Bill). (John Rule)

-- Naomi Klein, TheSHOCK DOCTRINE : The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. (Claire Detels)

-- Perkins, John. Confessions of an Economic Hitman. (Larry Woodall)


-- Jack Rasmus, The War at Home: The Corporate Offensive from Ronald Reagan to George W., Bush, Economic Class War in America

-- Reich, Charles. Opposing the System.

-- Robert Reich, Supercapitalism

-- Dean Ritz, ed. Defying Corporations, Defining Democracy, for POCLAD, Apex P, 2001 (Program on Corporations, Law, and Democracy);

-- Sklar, Holly. Raise the Floor. Interviewed by Bill Moyers on Moyers’ Journal 6-13-08.

-- Speth, James Gustave. The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability. Yale UP, 2008. Blind faith in economic growth is ruining the planet. Rev. The Interdependent (Spring 2008) (UNA-USA magazine); “…my conclusion…is that most environmental deterioration is a result of systemic failures of the capitalism that we have today and that long-term solutions must seek transformative change in the key features of this contemporary capitalism.”

---- Big Think presents a short video of Columbia University economist Joseph Stiglitz explaining how foreign governments are buying America. See (with Linda Bilmes) his The Three Trillion Dollar War. http://www.boingboing.net/2008/09/16/joseph-stiglitz-how.html


Additional books:


-- Brown and Jacobs. The Private Abuse of the Public Interest: Market Myths and Policy

END OF OMNI CORPORATIONS/US CAPITALISM WATCH NEWSLETTER #2, February 11, 2010