Many of OMNI’s newsletters expose the US operating (invading, bombing, blockading) outside international moral standards and law. Especially see the US Imperialism newsletters. This newsletter pauses to focus not only on national leaders’ and individual soldiers’ crimes but on the large issues of war crimes and related illegal and immoral behavior.

An underlying theme of this newsletter and of all of the newsletters pertaining to war is the necessity of the US peace movement in all of its local organizations to be informed, to think, and to act globally. Often the argument is made that peacemaking must begin with individual search for inner equanimity, steadiness, and strength, and nobody can deny their importance, but our leaders’ reckless lawlessness, bombing and torturing, making the world more morally and socially violent and cruel, destabilizes each and every one of us locally and individually, and must be stopped. Our local leaders and citizens work hard to make our homes and towns beautiful, rational, peaceful. But simultaneously our national leaders operate from opposite values to demolish and disrupt in permanent war. Already the financial and moral costs of that chaos are affecting our local lives and hopes (we see and feel it only partly because the money is borrowed—called national debt). So we must be engaged in more than local beauty, order, and amity. In order to act globally, we are not compelled to wait until we have fully matured, and anyway a lifetime is seldom enough time to enable that ideal condition. —Dick

Oderint dum metuant –“Let them hate so long as they fear”—was a motto of the Roman Empire.” “…some nations are serial aggressors,’ observed The Black Commentator in the fourth year of the war in Iraq.” Blum, America’s Deadliest Export (2, 3).

"To initiate a war of aggression, therefore, is not only an international crime, it is the supreme international crime differing only from other war crimes in that it contains within itself the accumulated evil of the whole.”
- Robert H. Jackson, U.S. Prosecutor, Nuremberg Military Tribunal

“I wonder how the foreign policies of the United States would look if we wiped out the national boundaries of the world, at least in our minds, and thought of all children everywhere as our
own.” Howard Zinn  Let us be citizens of the world.

My blog:  War Department/Peace Department
http://jamesrichardbennett.blogspot.com/
My Newsletters:
http://www.omnicenter.org/newsletter-archive/
Index:
http://www.omnicenter.org/omni-newsletter-general-index/

#1 is at the end.
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Contact your Representatives
1. Book Talk: Author David Swanson's "Daybreak!" -
   YouTube w.youtube.com/watch?v=17A_fwn...
   Aug 31, 2009 - Uploaded by Bill Hughes

2. Reviewing David Swanson's 'Daybreak' - Rense.com
   rens.com/general87/midl.htm
   David Swanson is co-founder of AfterDowningStreet.org and Washington Director of Democrats.com. He's also a board member of Progressive Democrats of ...

3. Daybreak by David Swanson - CommonSense2.com
   We first encountered David Swanson, co-founder of AfterDowningStreet.org, when he broke the news of the 'Downing Street Memo', a document that many ...

---

War Crimes Times Statement of Purpose (revised 06/2011)

The War Crimes Times provides compelling, ongoing information on war and the war crimes that invariably accompany war, the many costs of war, the effects of our war culture on our national character and international reputation, and the need to hold accountable those who initiate and conduct illegal wars. Additionally and importantly, we also report on the efforts of the many people who sacrifice their time, money, and comfort to work for peace.

When national leaders initiate hostilities they create the conditions—the extreme use of force coupled with limited accountability—for the war crimes which invariably follow. War crimes are therefore an inherent part of war. The suffering caused and the enmity aroused by war crimes must be regarded as costs of war. Since these and other costs far exceed any benefits of war, we seek to end war as a tool of international policy.

Towards this goal, we believe that holding war criminals accountable will send a strong message to all current and future heads of state to very carefully weigh all the consequences of the decision to go to war. While we recognize that United States has long relied on unlawful military force to further its foreign policy goals, we are particularly concerned with the blatant and egregious violations of international law committed by the United States beginning with
the Administration of George W. Bush and now continued and expanded under President Obama.

We endorse any efforts, including impeachment, which would bring war criminals of any administration to justice. The War Crimes Times has resolved to see that Bush, Cheney, Obama, and other government officials and military officers who have committed war crimes are prosecuted—no matter how long it takes.

There is no statute of limitations on war crimes.

The latest The War Crimes Times (Spring 2014)

In this issue p. 1: “By ‘absolving the people from meaningful involvement’ (Bacevich, p. 6) through elimination of the military draft, reliance on elite ‘special ops’ forces (Turse, p. 1), drones (pp. 1-11), and a subservient press, the military mentality has won the ideological battle (Hedges, p.1) But would it make a difference to the American people if they knew that since World War II, our military-minded foreign policy was responsible for the equivalent of three to five Holocausts (Lucas, p. 1) and other violations of international law (Rosal, p. 12;Ford, p. 18)? Would knowledge of blatant hypocrisy (Gamage, p. 16) or budget tradeoffs (Gagnon, p. 14) help restore sanity? We can only hope so and keep trying to inform the people of the truce costs of war and militarism.”

Guidelines for submissions to WCT

The ideal article for the quarterly print version of The War Crimes Times: 600 to 1200 crisply-written words on a topic relevant to our mission.

We also welcome high resolution photos, cartoons, poetry, and letters to the editor.

Third party material will be considered only with the express permission of the copyright holder.

The WCT editorial team will consider all submissions. If your submission is selected for publication, we will notify you. If your submission is rejected, please do not be discouraged. Many criteria — such as timeliness, style, freshness, relevance to the WCT mission or the particular issue's theme, and content of recent issues — are used to determine WCT content.

Submissions are due no later than the 1st of the month that the paper is printed: March, June, September, and December. EARLY SUBMISSIONS HAVE A BETTER CHANCE OF BEING CONSIDERED.

Send, in electronic format (preferred), to editor@WarCrimesTimes.org or to Editor, WCT/VFP, PO Box 10664, Greensboro, NC 27404. (Note: due to size constraints, all submissions may not be used in the print edition, but all will be considered for posting on this
Required Reading [on the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, AUMF]

By Charles Pierce, *Esquire* 19 January 14

If you read nothing else this weekend, read Gregory Johnsen's somewhat epic performance on Buzzfeed about the original Authorization for the Use of Military Force that came out of the attacks of September 11, 2001, and the permanent state of war that one 60-word sentence in that document created in the United States, a phenomenon that the Founders specifically and repeatedly warned against. (Johnsen is the recipient of first Michael Hastings Fellowship, named for the renowned journalist who died in an automobile accident last year.) If nothing else, the piece functions as a very loud warning siren against upending the rule of law and the separation of powers out of fear and panic. War, Mr. Madison cautioned, is "the true nurse of executive aggrandizement." We have traded his wisdom for the undying partisan hackery of apparatchiks like David Addington and John Yoo. It is not a good trade.

Unbound by time and unlimited by geography, the sentence has been stretched and expanded over the past decade, sprouting new meanings and interpretations as two successive administrations have each attempted to keep pace with an evolving threat while simultaneously maintaining the security of the homeland. In the process, what was initially thought to authorize force against al-Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan has now been used to justify operations in several countries across multiple continents and, at least theoretically, could allow the president - any president - to strike anywhere at anytime. What was written in a few days of fear has now come to govern years of action.

The piece goes on to illustrate with painful clarity a meek and timorous Congress, which had allowed so much of its constitutional war powers to leach into the executive over the previous five decades that most of its members had forgotten how to exercise them at all, let alone how to exercise them at a moment of national trauma. (One pissant aide to a forgettable schlub like Dennis Hastert gets to bulldoze past legitimate constitutional questions because we...must...do...something, and everybody acclaims him a hero.) Congress -- in the persons of Joe Biden and John Kerry, among others -- tries to cover its ass but ends up taking what everybody knows is a dive. And, after the dive, we see Yoo, who should have been kept away from the councils of government for the same reason we keep Charlie Manson out of the cutlery, immediately find a way to renege on a deal that had been cut with the Congress and expand the president's power beyond anything remotely conceived of in the Constitution.

Maybe it shouldn't be so surprising that Congress didn't think about how the war would end when it passed the AUMF on Sept. 14, 2001, but after more than a dozen years, we are no closer to an answer. "This is a bizarro war," Jack Goldsmith told me recently. A tenured law professor at Harvard who worked in the Office of Legal Counsel under George W. Bush, Goldsmith has written
Read the whole thing and understand how we got to where we are today, when the president is going to deliver a speech about the NSA revelations, arguing for "reforms" in which there is no good reason to believe. Read the whole thing and see in it the seedbed for unlimited drone warfare and whatever comes after that, which undoubtedly will be worse. Read the whole thing and understand how Abu Ghraib happened and why Gitmo is still open. Read the whole thing and watch the relentless abandonment of self-government over the past 13 years. Read the whole thing and realize that we are no longer even the nation we pretend to be, Read the whole thing and realize how much the late Osama bin Laden actually won.

Authorization for the Use of Military Force and the permanent state of war

Gregory D. Johnsen wrote, "Maybe it shouldn't be so surprising that Congress didn't think about how the war would end when it passed the AUMF on Sept. 14, 2001, but after more than a dozen years, we are no closer to an answer."

(unknown)

See Elliott Adams, “Protecting the Wrong People at Drone Base.” Space Alert! (Dec. 2012), for a strong indictment of US war crimes, and the urgent responsibility of us all to resist now.

-Dick

Anti-drone protesters knocked off course by broad restraining order

Demonstrators who have gathered at New York air base for years say their constitutional right to protest has been compromised after colonel granted strict order of protection

Share 1003
Ever since the F16 fighters were replaced by Reaper drones at Hancock Air National Guard base in upstate New York three years ago, peace activists have engaged in regular anti-drone protests outside the facility. In that time they have learned what to expect: holding banners at a site across the road is tolerated; close proximity or blocking gates risks arrest for trespass or disorderly conduct, a fine, or at the most, a few uncomfortable nights in a cell.

But now, in what appears to be a significant escalation by base authorities, the activists have been subjected to what they describe as an "absurd" restraining order which they say breaches their constitutional right to protest.

The order was issued by a judge [PDF] following the arrest of 17 protesters accused of blocking all three base entrances to traffic last month. It bans them specifically from approaching the home, school or workplace of Colonel Earl A Evans, a commander at the base. Failure to comply is a felony, punishable by up to seven years in jail.

Some of the activists are due to have the charges against them, including disorderly conduct and harassment, heard in Dewitt criminal court on Wednesday.

The arrested protesters, three of whom spoke to the Guardian, said they had never heard of Evans, had never met him and did not know what he looked like. He is the mission support group commander of the 174th fighter wing group, according to court documents.

Neither his home or school address is known to the defendants or detailed in the order, which names his place of work as 6001 East Molloy Road in Dewitt, New York – the military base. They are also banned from all forms of communication with Evans, including by email.

In a deposition to the court dated 25 October, Evans called for an order of protection and prosecution of the arrested protesters to the "fullest extent". He said the blocking of all three gates by the protesters was the "third time that protesters had done an unannounced protest"
that resulted in a closure of the gate. Written by hand, in block capitals, Evans wrote: "As an authorised representative of Hancock Field, I request that the court issue an order of protection on each and every defendant arrested such that they are to stay away from Hancock Field and I request prosecution to the fullest extent of the law."

The order has created confusion among the activists involved, as they say they no longer know where they can legitimately protest against the unmanned drones, which are operated from the base.

One of the 17 arrested, Elliot Adams, said: "This is a new tactic to deny us our first amendment rights to freedom of speech and freedom of assembly and to petition our government."

Adams, a Vietnam veteran, past president of Veterans for Peace and former mayor of Sharon Springs, accused the military and local law enforcement of increasingly heavy-handed tactics against peaceful protests. In the last 18 months, more than 100 people have been arrested at the base, according to protesters, but in at least a third of the cases, the charges have been dropped. Last year, Adams was among 33 protesters arrested after marching in single file on the side of the road, in what he described as "frivolous charges" which were later dropped. But the latest order is the worst so far, he said.

"We are committed to non-violence" said Adams. "It's absurd that this order is all about Evans' personal well being. He's the guy who has spent a lifetime training in delivering violence and killing people and I say that as a veteran myself. Those inside Hancock are the ones with the M16s and assault rifles, the MQ9 drones. We as individuals are obligated to stop our government committing war crimes – that's part of what came out of Nuremberg. This is a misuse of the law."

Adams said that he has repeatedly been arrested as he attempted to deliver a letter to the base commander, Colonel Greg Semmel, and others accusing the government of war crimes.

The order of protection, issued by Donald Benack, a judge in the Dewitt town court, Onondaga, New York, on 25 October, forbids the 17 activists from contacting Evans, and, specifically, forbids them from the following:

...assault, stalking, harassment, aggravated harassment, menacing, reckless endangerment, strangulation, criminal obstruction of breathing or circulation, disorderly conduct, criminal mischief, sexual abuse, sexual misconduct, forcible touching, intimidation, threats or any criminal offense or interference with the victim or victims of, or designated witnesses to the alleged offense and such members of the family or household of such victim(s) or witness(es) as shall be specifically named Earl A Evans.

The activists, Adams said, had asked if the order meant they had to stay away from the weekly permitted protest across the road from the base. The response from law enforcement officers: if Evans found it "irritating" then it did.

Adams now plans to consult an attorney over the best strategy to take over the order. His case comes up in court later this month.

Another protester, Mark Scibilia-Carver, said he considered it part of his duty as a Christian to
protest at the base, but that the order may deter him.

Scibilia-Carver, 60, an arborist from Trumensberg who has already spent five days in jail after being arrested at Hancock in the past, said: "The order of protection threatens a felony and that's seven years. It's very heavy-handed. I'm surprised the judge signed it. I will resist as far as I'm able but I have to think about the possibility of a longer sentence. I didn't do that well in jail the last time."

He has used court time in the past to argue the case against drones and has even offered, unsuccessfully in lieu of payment of a $250 fine, to submit a contribution to the Afghan Youth Peace Volunteers charity.

Scibilia-Carver, who began protesting at the base on Good Friday last year, said: "The US is the biggest imperial force in the world and it seems that poor people are expendable. Civilians get caught up in drone strikes. Even those who are targeted as terrorists are not being afforded the rule of law."

The letter of indictment, which protesters have attempted to deliver to Semmel and others, accuses the US government of war crimes, including the killing of innocent civilians, by remote means. It cites the United Nations special rapporteur on extrajudicial killings, who, in 2010, called the use of drones in targeted killings "a highly problematic blurring and expansion of the boundaries of the applicable legal frameworks" which has resulted in "the displacement of clear legal standards with a vaguely defined licence to kill, and the creation of a major accountability vacuum".

The letter adds: "There is no legal basis for defining the scope of area where drones can or cannot be used, no legal criteria for deciding which people can be targeted for killing, no procedural safety to ensure the legality of the decision to kill and the accuracy of the assassination."
Support Our Troops, Our War, and Our War Criminals
by Edward S. Herman / April 1st, 2013

The call to “support our troops,” or “our boys,” is really an appeal to support the war in which the troops are engaged. Critics of the war would say that if the war is unjustified, possibly even a criminal enterprise in violation of international law at several levels, as was so clearly true of the Iraq war, supporting the troops and war is to support international criminality. The proper support of our troops and boys therefore is to oppose the war and fight to get our boys (and girls) out before they can kill or be killed while participating in such a criminal enterprise.

Naturally, this critical view of supporting our troops gets little play in the propaganda system, and the propaganda design of the formula “support our troops” is probably effective in the environment of patriotic fervor that wars engender. But the hypocrisy here runs deep. Many of the threads of hypocrisy woven into this propaganda fabric stem from the fact that the political and military establishments care very little about the welfare of our boys. The really bad thing about their deaths, injuries and suffering is the resultant negative publicity and possible increased financial costs of greater attention to their needs that might limit military budget size and flexibility. There has been a notorious struggle over the damage our boys have suffered in Iraq and Afghanistan from economies in the protective equipment provided to them; from the damaging psychological effects of multiple tours of duty; from the reluctance to recognize the symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and the seriousness of traumatic brain injury (TBI); and the scandals reflecting lagged and poor care of personnel back home and in need of medical care.
In earlier years, also, it was a long struggle to get recognition of the damage suffered by U.S. troops in Vietnam from the massive chemical warfare used there, where, of course, the damage to U.S. personnel was only a small fraction of that suffered by the Vietnamese people, still unacknowledged and unrectified by the responsible criminal state. The ironical usage of “MIA” to mean “missing in America,” referring to war veterans in a sad state of indigence and homelessness at home, also goes back at least to the Vietnam and post-Vietnam war days. There are many MIAs in the United States today, and a dramatic figure that did get some publicity was that more military personnel committed suicide than were killed in combat in Afghanistan in 2012 (349 versus 295).

It is enlightening also that there is an inverse correlation between aggressively supporting U.S. wars and supporting our troops with generous funding of their medical care and post-service education and general welfare. This is plausible. The bulk of service personnel are drawn from that 47 percent of the population that Mitt Romney derided as government-dependent and not “job creators.” (The heads of Lockheed Martin, General Dynamics. Ratheon and Textron are job creators.) Romney, Paul Ryan, George Bush, John Boehner (etc.) and their monied base are fighting a major battle to diminish or terminate the welfare state, and many Democrats as well as Republicans are with them, so that containing what amounts to welfare state benefits to our boys with PTSD and otherwise in distress is entirely logical.

Of course, along with “support our troops” there is an implicit “support our torturers and higher level war criminals.” This flows from the overwhelming and increasingly centralized power in the hands of the dominant elite, including the military-industrial complex (MIC) and leading politicians, and an associated remarkable level of self-righteousness. Anything we do is tolerable because we are not only strong and the global policeman, but also good and always well-intentioned, and are therefore not to be questioned when we do abroad precisely what we condemn in target states. We can support Saddam Hussein and even provide him with “weapons of mass destruction”, when he is doing us a service in attacking Iran, even when he is using chemical weapons there; and with no seeming sense of shame or guilt we can quickly turn him into “another Hitler” when he disobeys orders. We can help the Shah of Iran build a nuclear capability, but threaten war when his successor regime tries to do what was encouraged with the Shah; and again, with utter self-righteousness. It testifies to the greatness of the Western propaganda system that these shifts and mind-boggling double standards can occur without the slightest pause or recognition or any need for explanation or apology.

The really high level war criminals like Bush, Blair, and Obama can get away with anything, not only because they are at the pinnacle of power and can set their own rules, but also because they dominate the external institutions that supposedly make the rule of law international, but fail to do so. One of the prettiest cases is, of course, the invasion of Iraq in March 2003, an act matching Hitler’s 1939 invasion of Poland, and resulting in a million or more Iraqi deaths. Although this was a blatant violation of the most fundamental principle of the UN Charter, while UN Secretary-
General Kofi Annan did point out that the invasion was “illegal” he didn’t express great anger or suggest that the invaders be expelled or even reprimanded. He got on board the aggression ship, as did the Western great powers (with the Russians and Chinese essentially just sitting there watching).

But the sick comedy of “international law” rode on, with the UN, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and International Criminal Court (ICC) playing their assigned role by applying it whenever the Big Aggressor or one of his leading allies felt the application of legal principles to be useful. The Big A and his Little Aggressor client Israel wanted a legal input for Darfur, but not for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, invaded by Rwanda and Uganda, whose leaders were Big Aggressor clients, and so it was—Sudan’s al-Bashir was indicted by the ICC, Rwandan and Ugandan leaders were exempt. Big A and allies wanted legal authority for attacking Libya, but not Bahrain, so the ICC and United Nations Security Council (UNSC) obliged with indictments for Gaddafi and sons, silence on Bahrain. The Big Aggressor wants international law applied to Syria, so Navi Pillay, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, who along with her predecessor Louise Arbour didn’t lift a finger in the case of the Iraq invasion-occupation, which produced a million dead and 4 million refugees, now repeatedly urges the UNSC to call on the ICC to investigate Bashir al-Assad’s war crimes in Syria. Pillay played the same role in the case of Libya, in collaboration with the ICC, greasing the skids for a NATO military attack on Libya and the ouster and murder of Gaddafi.

The role of the “international community” (in the sense of the leadership of the Western great powers and their clients, not the underlying populations) was dramatically exhibited in giving the newly elected U.S. President Barack Obama the Nobel Peace prize in 2009. He hadn’t done anything whatsoever for peace at that time, but gave the appearance of a leader more moderate than Bush and Cheney. A silly award, but once again a giveaway on the supportive-groveling qualities of Western political/cultural institutions. (Can you imagine the Nobel Committee giving the award to Amira Hass, Malalai Joya, Kathy Kelly, or Richard Falk, people actually making genuine personal sacrifices in the interest of peace?) Honest analysis and morality would have recognized that Obama was going to be a major war criminal by structural necessity, embedded as he was in a permanent war political economy where political survival, let alone success, required the commission of war crimes. Obama soon found that political success demanded killing foreigners; that budget enlargement for killing was easy, but spending for progressive civilian needs was difficult and would anger powerful people. He quickly adapted to being a warrior president, his seemingly most proud accomplishment being the killing of bin-Laden.

Obama has played all the war cards. He has lauded the Vietnam War as a noble enterprise and is pleased to participate in and laud a memorial that celebrates it. Like Bush he loves to speak to military cadres where he can draw resounding applause with patriotic and war rhetoric, although increasing numbers of liberal Democrats have gotten on board his war-oriented ship of state and also find his warrior image and actions agreeable. He has gone somewhat beyond Bush in
institutionalizing government rights to invade privacy, closing down information access, and criminalizing whistle-blowing. His drone war policy and claimed right to assassinate even U.S. citizens based on executive decision alone breaks new ground in criminality and in enlarging the scope of acceptable war crimes. He has also refused to prosecute U.S. torturers and high level war criminals, violating earlier promises but, more importantly, violating international law and effectively ending the rule of law. We need change we can believe in, but Obama is giving us compromise and literal regression that we must vigorously oppose.

• Article first appeared in Z Magazine April 2013

Edward S. Herman is an economist and media analyst with a specialty in corporate and regulatory issues as well as political economy and the media. Read other articles by Edward.

This article was posted on Monday, April 1st, 2013 at 8:01am and is filed under Crimes against Humanity, Drones, GWB, Iraq, Libya, Military/Militarism, Obama, Sudan, United Nations, Vietnam, War Crimes.

The Lawyer and the Kill-List Memo
Lizza writes: "David J. Barron, a lawyer at the Department of Justice, sent Eric Holder, the Attorney General, a lengthy memorandum. Barron, who had celebrated his forty-third birthday earlier that month, was a professor at Harvard Law School, on leave for a couple years to work for President Barack Obama. Barron, like many young lawyers who arrived in Washington with the new Administration in 2009, had impeccable liberal credentials."

READ MORE

American Unlimited Imperialism: Now Ukraine
Historically, this latest eruption of American militarism at the start of the 21st Century is akin to that of America opening the 20th Century by means of the U.S.-instigated Spanish-American War in 1898. Then the Republican administration of President William McKinley stole their colonial empire from Spain in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines; inflicted a near genocidal war against the Filipino people; while at the same time illegally annexing the Kingdom of Hawaii and subjecting the native Hawaiian people (who call themselves the Kanaka Maoli) to near genocidal conditions. Additionally, McKinley's military and colonial expansion into the Pacific was also designed to secure America's economic exploitation of China pursuant to the euphemistic rubric of the “open door” policy.

But over the next four decades America's aggressive presence, policies, and practices in the “Pacific” would ineluctably pave the way for Japan's attack at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 1941, and thus America's precipitation into the ongoing Second World War. Today, a century later, the serial imperial aggressions launched and menaced by the Republican Bush Jr. administration and now the Democratic Obama administration are threatening to set off World War III.

By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of 11 September 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth their empire from the Muslim states and peoples living in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf and Africa under the guise of fighting a war against international terrorism; and/or (2) eliminating weapons of mass destruction; and/or (3) promoting democracy; and/or (4) self-styled “humanitarian intervention”/responsibility to protect.

Only this time the geopolitical stakes are infinitely greater than they were a century ago: control and domination of the world’s hydrocarbon resources and thus the very fundament and energizer of the global economic system. The Bush Jr./Obama administrations have already targeted the remaining hydrocarbon reserves of Africa, Latin America, and...
Southeast Asia for further conquest or domination, together with the strategic choke-points at sea and on land required for their administration announced the establishment of the U.S. Pentagon's Africa Command (AFRICOM) in order to better control, dominate, and exploit both the natural resources and the variegated peoples of the continent of Africa, the very cradle of our human species. Libya and the Libyans became the first victims to succumb to AFRICOM under the Obama administration. They will not be the last.

This current bout of U.S. imperialism is what my teacher, mentor, and friend Hans Morgenthau denominated "unlimited imperialism" in his seminal work *Politics Among Nations* (4th ed. 1968, at 52-53):

"The outstanding historic examples of unlimited imperialism are the expansionist policies of Alexander the Great, the Arabs in the seventh and eighth centuries, Napoleon I, and Hitler. They all have in common an urge toward expansion which knows no rational limits, feeds on its own successes and, if not stopped by a superior force, will go on to the political world. This urge will not be satisfied so long as there remains anywhere a possible object of domination—a politically organized group of men which by its very independence challenges the conqueror's lust for power. It is, again, the lack of moderation, the aspiration to conquer all that lends itself to conquest, characteristic of unlimited imperialism, the past has been the undoing of the imperialistic policies of this kind..."

It is the Unlimited Imperialists along the lines of Alexander, Rome, Napoleon, and Hitler who are now in charge of American foreign policy. The factual circumstances surrounding the outbreaks of both the First World War and the Second World War currently hover like twin Swords of Damocles over the heads of all humanity.

Francis Anthony Boyle is a professor of international law at the University of Illinois College of Law.
murder prisoners—most of them poor people of color who have been locked up for more than a decade. The United States believes in regeneration through violence.

http://www.nationofchange.org/murder-our-national-sport-
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The American public probably is not aware
Editor’s note: An edited version of this article appears in the Spring 2014 WCT print edition. The link below is to the original unedited version with source notes. The numbers in this article were compiled in 2007. Since then, the U.S. has added to its total through attacks in other nations including Libya, Yemen, and Somalia; with its drone program; with the residual political instability from past actions in Afghanistan; and likely from secret special operations.

"After the catastrophic attacks of September 11, 2001, monumental sorrow and a feeling of desperate and understandable anger began to permeate the American psyche. A few people at that time attempted to promote a balanced perspective by pointing out that the United States had also been responsible for causing those same feelings in people in other nations...

"The overall conclusion is that the United States most likely has been responsible, since WWII, for the deaths of between 20 and 30 million people in wars and conflicts scattered over the world."

Read the details about the 37 victim nations in the full article here.

Posted by Kim Carlyle 0 comments

Friday, March 21, 2014

The forgotten coup - and how the godfather rules from Canberra to Kiev

"Washington's role in the fascist putsch against an elected government may surprise only those who watch the news and ignore the historical record. Dozens of governments, many of them democracies, have met a similar
Gough Whitlow, elected Australian Prime Minister, ousted in a CIA coup.

Edward Gough Whitlam, Prime Minister of Australia from 1972 to 1975, was a “maverick social democrat of principle, pride, propriety and extraordinary political imagination. He believed that a foreign power should not control his country’s resources and dictate its economic and foreign policies.” His attitudes and policies ran counter to America’s interests. In fact, one of his actions caused “apoplexy in the White House.”

He was sacked by Governor-General Sir John Kerr (who the CIA referred to as “our man Kerr”).

See John Pilger’s surprising account of the CIA’s role in overthrowing a democratically elected leader in Australia!
Laos, 1983. An intensive bombing campaign, coupled with artillery battles on land, has left the landscape filled with craters. Photo: Titus Peachey

From 1964 to 1973, the U.S. dropped more than two million tons of ordnance on Laos during 580,000 bombing missions—equal to a planeload of bombs every 8 minutes, 24-hours a day, for 9 years – making Laos the most heavily bombed country per capita in history. The bombings were part of the U.S. Secret War in Laos to support the Royal Lao Government, Pathet Lao and to interdict traffic along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The bombings destroyed many villages and displaced hundreds of thousands of Lao civilians during the nine-year period.

Up to a third of the bombs dropped did not explode, leaving Laos contaminated with vast quantities of unexploded ordnance (UXO). Over 20,000 people have been killed or injured by UXO in Laos since the bombing ceased. The wounds of war are not only felt in Laos. When the Americans withdrew from Laos in 1973, hundreds of thousands of refugees fled the country, and many of them ultimately resettled in the United States.

Regions in Laos that were bombed are highlighted in red and yellow.

Here are some other startling facts about the U.S. bombing of Laos and its tragic aftermath:

- Over 270 million cluster bombs were dropped on Laos during the Vietnam War (210 million more bombs than were dropped on Iraq in 1991, 1998 and 2006 combined); up to 80 million did not detonate.

- Nearly 40 years on, less than 1% of these munitions have been destroyed. More than half of all confirmed cluster munitions casualties in the world have occurred in Laos.

- Each year there continue to be over 100 new casualties in Laos. Close to 60% of these accidents result in death, and 40% of the victims are children.
Between 1996 and 2012, the U.S. contributed on average $2.6M per year for UXO clearance in Laos; the U.S. spent $17M per day (in 2010 dollars) for nine years bombing Laos.

The U.S. spent as much in three days bombing Laos ($51M, in 2010 dollars) than it spent for clean up over 16 years ($51M).

Legacies of War travels across the USA!
Legacies of War is very excited to announce “Voices from Laos: Clearing Bombs, Protecting Lives,” a groundbreaking, national speakers tour across the United States.

This legacy must end,
so others can begin.
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Contact Arkansas Congressional Delegation

Arkansas is represented in Congress by two senators and four representatives. Here is how to reach them. None of the senators or representatives publishes his e-mail address, but each can be contacted by filling in forms offered through his website.

SENATORS
Sen. John Boozman  
Republican, first term  
320 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510  
Phone: (202) 224-4843  
Fax: (202) 228-1371  
Arkansas offices:
FORT SMITH: (479) 573-0189  
JONESBORO: (870) 268-6925  
LITTLE ROCK: (501) 372-7153  
LOWELL: (479) 725-0400  
MOUNTAIN HOME: (870) 424-0129  
STUTTGART: (870) 672-6941  
EL DORADO: (870) 863-4641  
Website: [www.boozman.senate.gov](http://www.boozman.senate.gov)

Sen. Mark Pryor  
Democrat, second term  
255 Dirksen Office Building  
Constitution Avenue and  
First Street NE  
Washington, D.C. 20510  
Phone: (202) 224-2353  
Fax: (202) 228-0908  
Little Rock office: (501) 324-6336  
Website: [www.pryor.senate.gov](http://www.pryor.senate.gov)

REPRESENTATIVES
Rep. Rick Crawford  
1ST DISTRICT  
1771 Longworth Office Building  
New Jersey and  
Independence Avenues SE  
Website: [www.crawford.house.gov](http://www.crawford.house.gov)

Rep. Tim Griffin  
2ND DISTRICT  
1232 Longworth Office Building  
New Jersey and  
Independence Avenues SE  
Website: [www.griffin.house.gov](http://www.griffin.house.gov)

Rep. Steve Womack  
3RD DISTRICT  
1119 Longworth Office Building  
New Jersey and  
Independence Avenues SE  
Website: [www.womack.house.gov](http://www.womack.house.gov)

Rep. Tom Cotton  
4TH DISTRICT  
415 Cannon House Office Building  
Washington 20515  
Phone: (202) 225-43772  
Arkansas offices:
CLARKSVILLE: (479) 754-2120  
Website: [www.cotton.house.gov](http://www.cotton.house.gov)
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