

Editorial

It is obvious that Israel's attack on Lebanon was pre-planned and constituted part of the US-NATO plan known as "The Democratization of the Middle East," a plan drawn up by the Pentagon, approved by NATO at the Summit meeting in Istanbul in June 2004 and also adopted by the EU. The objective of this plan is to reshape the region, so that the imperialist powers can control it politically, economically, and militarily. Any peoples and forces that put up a resistance and want their countries' independence are crushed.

The preparation for the implementation of the plan had already begun with the tolerance and justification of the attacks by Israel against the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and on the West Bank, with the refusal to recognize the new Palestinian Authority and with the arrest and imprisonment of its ministers and MPs.

When the Israeli attack on Lebanon was launched, provocative support for it was given by the USA and other imperialist forces. Despite the international outcry, the UN deliberately delayed taking measures, as it was waiting for Israel to achieve its objectives. But these plans were thwarted by the heroic resistance of the Lebanese people. The differences among the imperialist forces and their special interests — for example, those of France — along with the popular outcry, led to UN Security Council Resolution 1701/2006.

This resolution, however, cannot be considered as a safe basis for a just solution which would create the necessary conditions for the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Lebanon. It gives Israel the right to invoke its need for "self-defense," while at the same time continuing to intervene directly in domestic affairs of Lebanon. The deployment of a military force under a UN mandate likewise fails to offer a guarantee. Despite the assurances given that the "Peacekeeping Force" is there to prevent another war from breaking out, it seems that it is indirectly serving NATO's overall plan for the "Democratization of the Middle East," as have done similar missions in the past, such as those in the Balkans and Afghanistan. A typical example is that of Bosnia, where the UN "Peacekeeping Force" was replaced by NATO and then by the European Army, which ultimately constitutes an occupying army.

The developments in the region confirm this assessment. Israel is continuing to step up its attacks on the Palestinians, while at the same time a meeting has been held between NATO and Israel regarding the upgrading of the so-called Mediterranean cooperation. We therefore oppose the presence of this military force that will indirectly promote the more general plans of the USA and NATO, with the next step in the plan focused on Syria and Iran.

Various views have been expressed on this issue. The progressive forces in the Middle East either oppose or have serious reservations with regard to the foreign military forces. Certain organizations and movements in Europe have a positive opinion, specifying that the role of these forces must be strictly defined as one of averting a new war. The view that the major role is being undertaken by EU countries (France and Italy) and that this is a positive thing is

continued on page 2

End the Imperialist Aggression in the Middle East! End the Occupation of Iraq NOW!

On November 7, 2006, the people of United States expressed, through their votes, their strong sentiments for peace, and their clear opposition to the criminal imperialist war that is being waged by the Bush administration on the whole world, and particularly against the peoples of the Middle East. This setback for the right-wing of the US ruling class was, before anything else, a result of the tireless work of the peace movement throughout the world, and more directly, in the United States.

The struggle for peace was waged at the grassroots level, with many thousands of peace activists engaging the people in principled discussions, explaining the motives behind the pro-war policies of the US Government, and exposing the plunderous nature of the US imperialist wars in the Middle East. This is the struggle that needs to be celebrated and continued.

In the context of US politics, however, many may try to frame this as a "victory" of the Democratic Party against the right-wing Republicans. But this is far from the truth. The fact is that the Democratic Party's leadership as a whole did not play any significant role, neither in opposing the war policies of the Bush administration nor in representing the American people's pro-peace sentiments. It neither took a clear position against the war and occupation of Iraq, Lebanon and Afghanistan, nor is it now taking a clear position against the threats of invasion against Iran and Syria.

The issue here, therefore, is not about the "victory" of the Democratic Party over the Republican Party in the United States. It is, rather, about the fact that the US policy will not change as long as the transnational corporations are the ones who determine the content and direction of US foreign and domestic policy. And that is why the struggle for peace and justice must continue, regardless of which party is in charge in the United States.

The struggle for peace is, in essence, a long-term struggle against imperialism and its inherent drive for world domination. It involves not only the active participation of masses of people in electoral politics but, more importantly, a clear understanding of the nature of imperialism, the causes of war and peace, and the ability to organize a mass movement against the forces of war and imperialism. In this regard, one cannot agree more with the statement in the United States by the United for Peace and Justice coalition that the people's anti-war sentiment needs to be translated into political power in a way that turns the people into a force that is to be reckoned with.

One important step toward peace was taken by the people of the United States on November 7th, but the struggle certainly needs to continue, not just against this or that party, but against imperialism as a whole. ■

The Secretariat of the World Peace Council will hold its coming meeting in India from 15-16 December 2006, hosted by the All India Peace and Solidarity Organisation (AIPSO). The Meeting of Secretariat will be followed by an International Conference of Peace Movements on 16-17 of December.



People hold up their candles during a demonstration to call for weapon disarmament and world peace Saturday, Nov. 4, 2006, in Lisbon's downtown Rossio square, Portugal. The demonstrators gathered to mark the 60 year anniversary of the atomic bombing of the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki — AP PHOTO.

Statement of the World Peace Council On the Imprisonment of Omri Evron

The World Peace Council expresses condemnation of the Israeli military court's sentencing to prison of Omri Evron, who has refused to serve in the "Israeli Defense Forces" that are violating and occupying the Palestinian nation and its territories.

Omri Evron refuses to be used as instrument of the deprivation of the rights of the Palestinian People, of the policy of the apartheid wall, and of hatred.

The WPC expresses its solidarity to Omri Evron and all peace loving forces in Israel, including military officers who refuse to serve in the occupied territories, supporting clearly the peaceful coexistence of the two states — Israel and Palestine — based on the relevant UN resolutions and within the borders of 1967.

The WPC reaffirms its demand for the establishment of the independent State of Palestine, with East Jerusalem as its capital, alongside Israel.

The WPC calls upon Peace Movements and peace loving people in the world to condemn the policy of the Israeli regime and demand the release of Omri Evron.

*Athens, October 18, 2006
The Secretariat of WPC*

UN Resolution on "Prevention of Arms Race in Outer Space": US HYPOCRISY AND DECEPTION!

On October 25th, the First Committee of the UN General Assembly, which addresses disarmament issues, voted overwhelmingly for a Resolution to Prevent an Arms Race in Outer Space. There were 166 nations in favor of this sensible proposal with only one negative vote and two abstentions. The United States opposed the resolution, while Israel and Cote d'Ivoire abstained. A fallback resolution, to take "Transparency and Confidence Building Measures in Outer Space Activities," garnered a similar vote, with the United States opposing and Israel abstaining.

In a statement from the floor, the US delegation "explained" its vote by insisting that, "there is no arms race in space, and no prospect of an arms race in space. Thus there is no arms control problem for the international community to address." In light of the US abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and this month's new National Space Policy statement issued by the Bush administration stating that "Freedom of action in space is as important to the United States as air power and sea power," and that the United States will "develop and deploy space capabilities that sustain US advantage", coupled

with an \$11 billion dollar budget this year to develop space hardware, including laser attack weapons, it defies reason to think that the US is sincere in promoting the "peaceful" use of space.

The US claimed in its statement that the existing "multilateral outer space arms control regime already deals adequately with the non-weaponization of space." But existing agreements only ban weapons of mass destruction in space, not conventional weapons like laser beams designed to destroy space assets.

Sadly, the US statement was consistent with its flagrant assertion in its new space policy doctrine that it "will oppose the development of new legal regimes or other restrictions that seek to prohibit or limit US access to or use of space."

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

The full text of the US delegation's statement is reproduced below:

Thank you Madam Chair.

Our Delegation takes the floor to explain its votes on draft resolutions L.10,

continued on page 10

Editorial

(from p. 1)

likewise being put forward. But we must not forget that despite the differences expressed verbally by the EU, it has consistently followed the USA, participating in the imposition of economic sanctions on Palestine. Moreover, the EU Member States that have sent military forces are members of NATO and have endorsed the US plan for the "Democratization of the Middle East." Besides this, these countries have special interests in the region (France) and what is being negotiated through their military presence there is a bigger share of the booty.

Therefore, the issue of Lebanon cannot be dealt with as something unconnected to overall developments. For it is clear that there can be no peace to the benefit of the peoples without, first and foremost, the issue of Palestine being definitively resolved and Israel's aggressive policy being stopped. Unfortunately, there are no favorable developments in this direction — rather the contrary. The overall imperialist policy is aimed at pushing Palestine towards a civil war and invoking the need for combating terrorism. It is attempting to strike at anyone in the region who fights back, while trying to accustom public opinion to the idea of forthcoming interventions, with Syria and Iran as primary targets.

There cannot, and must not, be any illusions or complacency on our part. There is enough accumulated experience from the wars that have already been unleashed. Yugoslavia was torn apart and protectorate states were established. Afghanistan was democratized, but the war goes on and 90% of the world's opium supply is produced there. Plans are under way for the dissolution of Iraq, an event which would mean a more general exacerbation of the situation in the region.

In view of all this, the forces for peace must be mobilized, in cooperation with other movements, in order to express solidarity with the peoples and to thwart the imperialist plans, putting forth the following demands:

- Safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries.
- Withdrawal of all foreign troops from the region.
- Withdrawal of the Israeli army from all occupied territories, the dismantling of all settlements and the establishment of a Palestinian state adjacent to Israel, with East Jerusalem its capital.
- Release of all political prisoners by Israel.
- Resolving the refugee issue, based on UN General Assembly Resolution 194.

The WPC must organize mobilizations and take other initiatives in this direction, in cooperation with other international organizations. ■

Statement of the World Peace Council at the World Conference against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs

Hiroshima, 2nd August 2006

Delivered by Iraklis Tsavdaridis, Secretary of the World Peace Council

Dear friends and militants of peace,

I am conveying our warmest peace greetings to the organizing Committee of this important conference and to all Japanese and overseas delegates. The WPC feels much closeness to the peace sentiments of the Japanese peace loving people, especially with the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, who suffered 61 years ago the murderous and inhuman US bombing of these cities with uncountable consequences and sufferings till today.

We express our solidarity with the victims and the families of the ones who died. Reminded of and remembering those crimes committed by US imperialism, we are expressing our condemnation and anger as well for the indirect "occupation" of Japanese soil by the US, with the huge number of US

they just had started then.

It is the same concept the US administration applied by bombing Hiroshima and Nagasaki, namely the collective punishment of a people when the war was already over; or when they entered into a war in the 1950s on the Korean peninsula and maintain till today 40.000 troops in the South; or later in their dirty war in Vietnam, which ended with millions of dead and an ongoing suffering for generations from the toxic Agent Orange. It is the same concept that the US applied by backing the bloody dictatorships in Latin America, which caused the deaths of thousands of democratic and progressive men and women, or the dictatorships in Southern Europe (Spain, Portugal, Greece) till the 1970s.

The same philosophy stands behind the

including the fight against the liberation of the African countries by all means.

But dear friends, allow me to emphasize these days, without underestimating any of the previous or ongoing struggles for so many just causes, one particular region, the Middle East. There is has a case for which the United Nations have issued more resolutions (on Security Council or General Assembly level), than on the case of Palestine. Despite the clear provisions of all relevant resolutions for the establishment of an independent State of Palestine, alongside Israel, for almost 60 years we are witnessing the opposite. Occupation by the powerful and heavily armed Israel, with the full support of the USA, daily attacks and killings of Palestinians, displacement of families, settlements, checkpoints, and recently a wall in the West Bank and again bombing of the Gaza strip.

With the dramatic conditions the Palestinian people have been facing for decades, we forget sometimes that the Israeli state is not only the main aggressor in the region. It has been proved that Israel possesses nuclear weapons, with which it can threaten or attack any of its neighbors. The double standards of the US administration are visible in this case as well. The US has no problem if allies have nuclear weapons, they even supply them with those. In the case of Israel, there is no other country which receives more military aid (more than US \$5 billion yearly) from the US. But when countries or states which are not willing to cooperate with them want to develop such nuclear weapons, the US draws its axis of evil and includes those in it.

The barbaric war of Israel and the US policy in the Middle East are these days every day on the TV screens. The ongoing massacres of Lebanese children and other civilians, by the F 16s, the Apache Helicopters and bombs, prove the cruel and monstrous face of imperialism in the region, which is not hesitating even from bombing UN installations. By the way the statement of the Israeli government after the latest massacre of civilians in the Lebanese city of Qana, was that the victims have to be blamed, since they did not leave their city and their homes and thus became a "human shield" for the Hezbollah. How cynical and how brutal can this regime be?

We underline from our side as the WPC, that the governments and forces that do not denounce and condemn these crimes against humanity clearly make themselves likewise guilty.

Being here with you in Hiroshima, I think and believe that while commemorating the victims of this city and this people, we can not miss our duty to condemn all atrocities of US Imperialism in the world and especially the current ones in the Middle East, while expressing our solidarity with the peoples in the region which are in need of our help.

I think that this would be also in the spirit and the values of this conference, as it has been marked and outlined for so many years since 1945. ■



military bases all over this country, disturbing both the everyday life of the Japanese people and threatening peace and security in the whole region.

We declare our full support to the demands of the Japanese Peace Movement for the complete abolition of all nuclear weapons in the world and the dismantling of all foreign military bases around the globe.

It is today more than proved that US imperialism and its allies around the world are getting more and more aggressive. Its crimes did not stop in August 1945; maybe

aggression of the biggest war machinery ever, the US-led NATO, against Yugoslavia in 1999, then later the occupation of Afghanistan and the invasion and occupation of Iraq.

It is always the imperialist drive to dominate over peoples and regions, to impose their rule for the sake of the control of energy resources, markets, and spheres of influence. This has been witnessed as well on the African continent, where after the colonial rule was officially over, neo-colonial and imperialist rule took over supporting, among others, the most reactionary regimes like the Apartheid regime in South Africa,



World Peace Council

10 Othonos Str.

10557 Athens, Greece

info@wpc-in.org

www.wpc-in.org

Tel: +30-210-3316326

Fax: +30-210-3224302

President:

Orlando Fundora Lopez

Movimiento Cubano por la Paz y la Soberanía de los Pueblos (MOVPAZ)

General Secretary:

Thanasis Pafilis

Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE)
Member of European Parliament

Organizational Secretary:

Iraklis Tsavdaridis

Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE)

Organizational Members of the Secretariat:

- Congo Peace Committee
- Movimiento Cubano por la Paz y la Soberanía de los Pueblos (MOVPAZ)
- Egyptian Peace Committee
- French Movement for Peace
- Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE)
- Japan Peace Committee
- Mexican Movement for Peace and Development (MOMPADE)
- Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation (CPPC)
- Senegalese Movement for Peace
- US Peace Council (USPC)
- Vietnam Peace Committee (VPC)

Answers by Marie Nassif-Debs, Leader of the Peace Movement of Lebanon to Important Questions about Lebanon

Beirut, September 25, 2006

What is your opinion of the presence of UNIFIL 2 [the new UN contingent] in Lebanon?

UNIFIL 2 as it is currently made up is much different from what has been present at Lebanon for more than 30 years, following Resolution 425 of the Security Council of the UN. The differences between the two UNIFIL are notably:

— First of all, the reinforced presence of troops belonging to member states of NATO and, therefore, placed indirectly under U.S. command. And even if the States to which these troops belong are great powers, they nevertheless on several occasions have yielded to the U.S. administration regarding the manner of solving conflicts militarily, especially in the Middle East where the experience of Iraq is still an open wound.

— Then, certain leaders of these countries, Italy for example, signed military agreements with Israel; and that causes us to think that the representatives of these countries will in no way possess the impartiality necessary to carry out their mission properly.

— Moreover, the representatives of France helped, on several occasions these last years, the administration directed by George Bush, to satisfy the goals of Israel and certain Lebanese factions. This includes their [France's] participation in the development of Resolution 1559, which was and remains one of the points of contention among Lebanese concerning the weapons held by the Resistance, and by their support of Resolution 1701, which gave to Israel what it had lost during its aggression of July 12, 2006, against Lebanon, namely: the possibility of continuing its violations of the resolutions and of continuing to commit crimes against Lebanese civilians under the pretext of preventing Hezbollah from reinforcing its military arsenal.

What is your opinion of the behavior of the UNIFIL contingents? Is it correct to say that the European countries present in Lebanon want to recolonize the country to their profit?

During the latest Israeli aggression against Lebanon, certain troops of UNIFIL had refused to help Lebanese civilians; the inhabitants of Marwahine, the first village martyred, suffered from it and 28 died close to the UNIFIL base.

Currently also, we are disappointed, to say the least, by certain behaviors. Thus, at the Beirut airport the UNIFIL representatives got involved in dealing with the "Security of the territory;" in South Lebanon, the international troops are very discrete regarding Israeli violations of our territory: they "did not see" and they, therefore, did not say anything concerning the changes of the "blue line" in the villages of Kfarkela and Chebaa, and they also keep silent regarding the "passage" of the bombers in our sky and also on the decision of the government of Ehud Olmert to delay the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the places still occupied.

Can these behaviors be regarded as an attempt at "Re-"colonization on behalf of certain great powers? That is possible, especially since certain European statesmen think that in this way they could still have their (small) share of the pie in the region....

What is your opinion of the position of these European countries compared to that of infernal duo: Israel-USA?

I already drew attention to the subordinate position of these countries to the U.S. administration, because of their behavior during the Bush's war in Iraq, even if France and Germany had, at a given time, rejected the last war.

It should be said that some of these countries have, not only helped to the creation of the State of Israel (driving out the Palestinians of their country), but they made wars to help it; for example, the three-part aggression of 1956 and all the ambiguous resolutions which were voted "in favor" of Israel, including Resolution 242 written by the representative of the United Kingdom in the United Nations...

Thus, their partiality with respect to the Arabs and of Israel appears, even when Israel is declared responsible for massacres against the civilian populations, as in Lebanon and in Palestine where the names of Qana and Jenin went around the world.

In light, we can say that the new world order can be summarized as follows: a superpower that dominates all the others and pressures them to do what it wants, including participating in destructive wars (as in Bosnia) and the unconditional support with its policy of death (Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine), so that its oil companies and its arms dealers make larger profits and can continue to steal the wealth of the planet. These "others" are satisfied with the crumbs which the "sovereign of the new world" wants to leave them.

In this light, we can better understand the speed with which [German Chancellor] Angela Merkel delivered the three "nuclear" submarines to Israel, even before the blood of the 600 children of Lebanon crushed in the shelters and on the roads had dried, just as we understand her declarations concerning the German presence in Lebanon, whose "goal" is to protect Israel... We must say, finally, that the West thereby tries to resolve the crimes of the Second World War by new crimes. The Arab people never made pogroms or crimes against humanity with regard to the Jews.

Is it correct of saying that the countries of NATO want to use the United Nations like a Trojan horse to intervene in Lebanon?

The United States has already on several occasions during these last 10 years used the United Nations to facilitate their interventions and their aggressions against sovereign states on all the continents without any exception, from Somalia and to Lebanon, while passing by Bosnia, Afghanistan, Iraq...

We think that this international organization is getting increasingly weaker, especially since it is not even it [the UN] which makes the decisions, as all authority is transferred to its "Security Council." And sometimes when the Secretary-General of this organization tries to be objective, as happened in 1996, following the massacre of Qana (which had been done inside a position of UNIFIL), he is quickly dismissed. What the United States wants of this organization is docility - including today in Lebanon — or its dissolution pure and simple...

As for the other countries of NATO, they follow in the same direction as the U.S. administration, which they aid in its strategy aimed at weakening any possibility of international assistance to the oppressed people... If not, they should have refused to vote for the ambiguities of Resolution 1701 and refused to send troops on the unilateral basis which this resolution states; as they

should have refused the Israeli and American intervention in the domestic politics of Lebanon, as much through the diktats of the U.S. ambassador in Beirut as through Israeli aggression against this country. What the European governments "condemned" (this word is, moreover, very strong), is the "disproportionate" response of Israel, but not the military act in itself.

This policy is a double-edged sword, because its next victim will be Europe and its people, which has already suffered from U.S. economic pressures, and we think that, in the logic of the things, these pressures will not stop at the economic sector alone. The U.S. troops in Europe are capable of anything.

How the various sectors and classes of the Lebanese population consider UNIFIL?

The country is, in its majority, against the presence of the new "reinforced" UNIFIL, because this one comes "to protect" the attacker (Israel) against those which suffered from the aggression (the Lebanese). There are, of course, the Lebanese forces and the parties of Saad Hariri and Walid Jumblatt who want to eliminate the weapons of Hezbollah. But people, especially from the South, demand a balanced solution and reject the idea that Hezbollah should give up its weapons before Israel withdraws from the Chebaa farms and the Kfarchouba heights on the one hand, and releases the Lebanese prisoners on the other hand. Without forgetting, in the immediate future, new threats from Israel. They remember the bad experience of what happened to Iraq and, also, what happened to Lebanon during the last Israeli aggression.

What are the demands of the Lebanese CP and the national resistance?

The "National Resistance" and the Lebanese Communist Party also demand a more balanced policy on behalf of the United Nations. They invite the European people to require from their respective governments a greater transparency and, especially, clear prerogatives regarding the role of the forces which they send to the South of Lebanon.

The new UNIFIL, to be effective and work for peace, must be spread on the two sides of the "blue line"; it must also be very firm towards the Israeli infringements and aggressions against Lebanon, and not simply to count those, as it had done before while being satisfied to say that the "Israelis had committed 2,400 offenses in the year 2005 alone." It is necessary that the role of this new UNIFIL is more precise. This, in the area regarding the presence of international troops.

From another point of view, we think that a political help on behalf of the European Union is necessary regarding the United Nations, especially that the secretary-general of this organization is mandated to formulate a proposal concerning the "Lebanon-ness" of the Chebaa farms. A Lebanese request on this subject has been recorded for several years in the United Nations and documents exist on this problem, as well as with the French government, which ran a mandate in Lebanon until the year 1945, as well as in Lebanon.

What do you think of the immense gathering convened by Hezbollah this Friday, Sept. 22 in Beirut? In particular the significance of the speech of H. Nasrallah?

The gathering of Hezbollah, Friday September 22, aims at expressing - as well by the range of the political forces present, as by the mass movement it created - a certain new dynamic on the Lebanese political arena. We had already called with a more precise position on behalf of this party concerning the formation of an opposition having a program for change.

The speech of H. Nasrallah is, for us, a new language on behalf of a "religious-based" political party, since it stressed the need for leaving the political confessionalism which debilitates Lebanon and makes it weak before the foreign rulers. It is true that the Secretary-general of Hezbollah also spoke about "the deterrent force" of this party, but that was directed towards the United States and Israel.

We had called for changes to the organization of the government, which had only envenomed the situation, and we think that the position advanced there too by Hezbollah goes in the direction that we want and that also the majority of the Lebanese people wants.

Of course, this speech opened the way for certain pro-U.S. forces to hold similar gatherings. However, the religious-based speech (Maronite, even) of Samir Geagea and the absence of any balance in its position between Syria and Israel very clearly show what the LCP said concerning the American plan for the area: the partition into antagonistic "confessional" mini-States and all of them asking assistance from Israel in order to continue to survive, while U.S. transnational monopolies continue their seizure of the wealth contained in the Arab world.

Which are the immediate needs for the inhabitants of South Lebanon and other devastated areas?

All is necessary for the inhabitants of the South, but also of Békaa, which suffered from the war and the massacres as well as the South, because in this area Hezbollah and the Resistance in general (national and Islamic) are strong.

The damage is very great and the government has not done much up to now. There is, as everyone knows, more than 18,000 homes destroyed, not mentioning the schools, stores, bridges, roads, harvests and without forgetting the mini-bombs and the cluster bombs spread throughout the cities, the villages and the fields.

Help is greatly needed before winter at the level of prefabricated homes, warm clothes, blankets and assistance for the schools of the communities. In the same way, medical help is necessary: traveling private clinics, ambulances...

Who are the allies of the Lebanese people in the world? On whom can it count?

The Lebanese people must, initially, count on itself and its resistance and its national unity faced with the catastrophe and with what is still in preparation against it.

It counts, especially, on the Arab people, the movements against the wars and the aggressions in the world, but also on the people of the left from which it requires firmer positions, whether in the European Parliament or the national Parliaments in Europe, as well as from the governments of the anti-imperialist countries in the world: and, there, we can only salute the position of the Venezuelan president, Hugo Chavez, as well as those of many other governments in the world. ■

GLOBAL NET OF US MILITARY BASES GUARANTEE NEVER ENDING WAR

Hans-Peter Richter

In March 2007 the first world conference against foreign military bases will be held in Ecuador by the Global Network Against Foreign Military Bases, which was established in January 2004 in Mumbai. From the foreign military bases spreads war into all parts of the world. It would be an important step towards peace if the global peace movement can be active against them.

By its more than 1000 military bases the US wants to have "full spectrum dominance" as planned in the strategy paper "Vision 2020" of the Rumsfeld commission. From 1950 to 1990 the pretext for the military bases was to fight communism, now after the attack against the WTC in New York it is "the war against terror." There are those who claim that the US itself created this attack; anyway the US profits much by using this pretext to wage war against Afghanistan and Iraq and made agreements with many states for the establishment of new military bases, so the number of states with US military bases is now 93.

For military dominance the US has divided the world into nine commands. "There are nine unified combatant commands. Five have regional responsibilities, and four have functional responsibilities. EUCOM is considered a regional combatant command, with responsibility for all of Europe, most of Africa, and parts of the Middle East. European Command plans for regional contingencies, and when ordered, employs military forces within the region, either as a Standing Joint Force Headquarters, or through specialized Joint Task Forces. EUCOM is the only regional combatant command with a headquarters forward deployed outside the United States. Other Unified Combatant Commands include Pacific Command (PACOM), Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), Central Command (CENTCOM), Northern Command (NORTHCOM), Special Operations Command (SOCOM), Strategic Operations Command (STRATCOM), Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), Transportation Command, (TRANSCOM)."

EUCOM is responsible for over 90 countries and territories, from the North Cape of Norway, through the waters of the Baltic and Mediterranean seas, most of Europe, parts of the Middle East, to the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa.

SOUTHCOM encompasses 30 countries (19 in Central and South America and 12 in the Caribbean).

CENTCOM is responsible for a region consisting of 27 countries in Northeast Africa, Southwest and Central Asia, and the island nation of the Seychelles.

NORTHCOM includes air, land and sea approaches and encompasses the continental United States, Alaska, Canada, Mexico and the surrounding water out to approximately 500 nautical miles. It also includes the Gulf of Mexico and the Straits of Florida, Canada and Mexico.

PACOM is responsible for a region consisting of the Pacific Ocean, 43 countries, 20 territories and possessions, including China, Russia, India, Korea, Japan, Australia, Indonesia and 10 US territories, like Hawaii and Alaska.

What the Bases Are For

Following Joseph Gerson the US bases have seven purposes:

To reinforce the status quo: for example the deterrent role of US bases in South Korea, and the intimidating role of many of the US bases in Middle East, which are designed to ensure continued US privileged access to, and control of, the region's oil

To encircle enemies: as was the case with the Soviet Union and China during Cold War

and China to this day. This is a role played by US bases in Korea, Japan, Philippines, Australia, Pakistan, Diego Garcia, and in many of the former Soviet Republics of Central Asia

To serve and reinforce the aircraft carriers, destroyers, nuclear armed submarines and other warships of the US Navy. This includes bases in Okinawa, Yokuska outside Tokyo, and "visiting forces" and "access" agreements in the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and many other countries.

To train US forces, as was long the case for bombardiers in Vieques, and for jungle war fighting and other training that continues in Okinawa.

To function as jumping off points for US foreign military interventions as the cases of Okinawa, the Philippines, now Korea with the changing missions of US forces here, Spain, Italy, Honduras, Germany and the new bases in Eastern Europe, Kuwait and likely in Iraq.

To facilitate C3I: Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence, including essential roles in nuclear war fighting, and the use of space for intelligence and warfare as we saw in Afghanistan and Iraq. US bases in Okinawa, Qatar, Australia and even China serve these functions.

To control the governments of host nations. Japan, Korea (where US military forces were deeply involved in military coups) Germany, Saudi Arabia, and today's Iraq begin the list.

Chalmers Johnson sees also an economical aspect. By its military power the US serves the US companies and the weapons industry. This concerns big parts of the US economy, like KBR (formerly Kellogg, Brown & Root Company), daughter of the Haliburton Corporation, which builds and maintains the wide spread outposts, including the comfortable housing of the uniformed personnel, who are well fed and enjoy the recreation centres, the 234 gulf ranges, and the ski resort in Garmisch.

In the last month another purpose of the US bases became public. Using the international network of US bases the CIA can kidnap any person in any country under the pretext of being a suspected terrorist and kill him or bring him to any other country for investigation and torture. The media in Germany reported about "black sites" in Poland and Romania. There are many cases of such CIA transports from Aviano in Italy and Ramstein and Frankfurt to Guantanamo and Afghanistan. In the years 2002, 2003 and 2004 there were more than 85 CIA flights from Frankfurt Rhein-Main Air Base. So, Germany is not only the military center in northern Europe but also very important for the CIA, which can act without any control. I assume that in all the countries with US military bases there exist also secret prisons, centers where human rights are broken blatantly.

Germany Plays a Key Role

If you compare the US military bases outside the US you will see that Germany today has more US bases and more US soldiers (68,000) than any other country except Iraq and Afghanistan. So you can say Germany is still a occupied country; the US troops and the British have never left Germany since 1945.

More than 60% of the US troops in Europe are stationed in Germany. In Germany Ramstein is the biggest US-airbase outside the US. Grafenwöhr is the biggest army training area outside the US. The current war against Iraq showed again the strategic importance of the German bases for the logistic, bringing the supplies to the

gulf from Ramstein and starting the fighter jets from Spangdahlen. Both the bases were enlarged.

Air Force Gen. Charles F. Wald, deputy of Gen. Jones (EUCOM), interviewed by the Air Force's internal information news service in August 2003, said, "Ramstein was critical to the success of the Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom missions. A lot of airlift aircraft landed at Ramstein" which "has significant infrastructure, and we have a great relationship with the Germans. It makes a lot of sense to keep places like Ramstein and Spangdahlem and Moron Air Base, Spain, open because they have large ramps that can handle large numbers of aircraft." "One of the things we like about Ramstein, for example, is the footprint of one strategic flight without refueling for an airlifter," Wald said. "You can take off from the States, no refueling, [and] land at Ramstein."

Of the 68,000 US soldiers stationed in Germany today, the US Army maintains nearly 59,000, along with a squadron of US Air Force and the European headquarters of the Marine Corps. A main contingent of the army is the V corps in Heidelberg (approx. 42,000 soldiers) under the command of Lt. Gen. Ricardo S. Sanchez.

In Stuttgart is the central command of the American forces in Europe (EUCOM). EUCOM gives orders to 112,000 soldiers on 499 military bases in Europe, Middle East and Africa, this concerns 68,000 in Germany, 12,000 in the UK, 2,000 in Portugal, Spain, 10,000 in Italy, 2,000 in Turkey, also soldiers in Greece, Norway, Belgium, Netherlands and Luxemburg and — very important — the Sixth Fleet, which is cruising in the Mediterranean Sea (home harbour Suda on the Greek island Crete) and consists of 14,000 sailors. Important air and sea bases are Lajes Field (Portugal), Incirlik (Turkey), Aviano, Sigonella, La Maddalena, Livorno and Vicenza (Italy), Able Sentry (Macedonia), Camp Bondsteel (Kosovo) or Comanche, Dohol and McGovern (all in Bosnia).

1,400 US soldiers are deployed in **Incirlik** (Turkey). From here the Iraq northern territories were observed and bombed until the war against Iraq began in 2003. In Incirlik are also US nuclear bombs.

In Poland a so-called "Joint Force Training Center" was established in Bydgoszcz. New bases will be built in Krsiny and Bidla Polaska. The CIA used the Polish airfield in Szymany.

Beginning in 2003 the US first used the harbour of Constanza and the air base Mihail Kogalniceanu in Romania. Also since 2003 Bulgaria allowed the use of the airbase Sarafowo. The Pentagon plans to deploy 15,000 soldiers in Romania and Bulgaria.

The Legal Status

The bases are de facto extrterritorial areas. The US-expert Chalmers Johnson wrote:

"America's 703 officially acknowledged foreign military enclaves (as of September 30, 2002), although structurally, legally, and conceptually different from colonies, are themselves something like microcolonies in that they are completely beyond the jurisdiction of the occupied nation¹. The United States virtually always negotiates a 'status of forces agreement' (SOFA) with the ostensibly independent 'host' nation, including countries whose legal systems are every bit (and perhaps more) sophisticated than our own. . . . Rachel Cornwell and Andrew Wells, two authorities on status of forces agreements, conclude, 'Most SOFAs are written so that national courts cannot exercise legal jurisdiction over US military

personnel who commit crimes against local people, except in special cases where the US military authorities agree to transfer jurisdiction.'"²

You can find the legal frame for Germany in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) from June 19, 1951. There are Additional Agreements to SOFA (ZA-NTS) between Germany, Canada, Great Britain, Netherlands, Belgium and France, which have been modified since 1993. There are special agreements for admission and coordination of manoeuvres from March 18, 1994.

Also for three US-German training shooting and bombing ranges there are administration agreements, which adapt regulations to the practice of the Bundeswehr. The same happened with three shared UK-German ranges, and one shared range with Belgium, France, and Netherlands.

The question is if the "allied forces" will obey this regulation, and if not what happens. I recall the incident in 1998 in Cavalese (Italy) where a US warplane killed 20 people of in alpine carriage lift while flying at a dangerously low (and not permitted) level. A US military tribunal found the pilots not guilty.

This reflects the experience elsewhere in the world with US bases — violators and criminals will not be punished. They act in this awareness and make the military bases an outlaw area. Even worse is that using the military bases means breaking international law.

In a verdict on June 21, 2005, (BVerwG 2 WD 12.04) the highest administration court in Germany stated that the war against Iraq violated international law. It was a violation of the ban against violence of the Charter of the United Nations. There was neither a UN mandate nor could the US use the excuse of self defence, which would only have been possible in the case of a direct attack against the US and only as long the UN took no measures. Neither was the case. The (alleged) enemy's possession of weapons of mass destruction is no reason for war anyway.

The verdict stated that Germany gave aid for the violation of international law and therefore violated international law also, for the following reasons:

- allowing the use of the US and UK military bases on German territory,
- allowing the US and UK to fly over German territory,
- guarding the US and UK military facilities in Germany,
- participation of German soldiers in AWACS planes for Turkish air space.

The court stated: "The act of a state allowing that its territory, given for use to another state, is used by this state for an act of aggression is in itself an act of aggression." Germany should have been neutral in the US war against Iraq. This means the following acts are forbidden:

- transport of soldiers
- use of communication
- use of cars, airplanes, and rockets.

Germany Was Obligated to Arrest US Soldiers

The court was even more strict: "Troops of conflicting parties, who pass a neutral territory, coming to the neutral territory after the start of the armed conflict are to be arrested. Only officers giving their word of honour not to leave the neutral Territory without permission, can be released. . . .The obligation for internment comes from the very meaning of the law of neutrality, because only in this way can it be hindered, that armed conflicts are supported from neutral territory thus

continued on page 11

Vancouver World Peace Forum — International Voice for Peace

Vancouver, Canada — June 23-28, 2006

Cathy Fischer, Regina Peace Council
Don Currie, Canadian Peace Congress

The World Peace Forum (WPF) held in Vancouver June 23-28, 2006 drew 5000 delegates from 93 countries all concerned with the problem of winning peace for the world. The WPF theme, Cities and Communities; Working Together to End War and Build a Peaceful, Just and Sustainable World; was led by a WPF Society and International Advisory Board which included World Peace Council (WPC) President Orlando Fundora Lopez and Al Marder, WPC Secretary and President of the US Peace Council.

The WPC was an international endorser-supporter of the WPF along with the over 70 other international peace groups. WPC affiliates represented at the WPF included the US Peace Council, Japan Peace Committee, Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE), Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation, the Cuban Movement for Peace and Sovereignty of the Peoples (Movpaz), and the Canadian Peace Congress. Also present at the WPF was Nguyen Van Huynh, General Secretary of the Vietnam Peace Committee and WPC coordinator for Asia and Pacific. General Secretary Niu Qiang, of the Chinese Association for Peace and Disarmament (CPAPD), which maintains friendly working relations with the WPC, also attended the WPF.

The WPF was rated a success by organizers and sponsors in spite of a media blackout and right-wing reactionary attempts to sidetrack the event. The minority Conservative Government of Prime Minister Stephen Harper was elected January 2006 and was cool to the event. The newly-elected Vancouver City Council dominated by right-wing members withdrew its political support and funding despite the fact that the Vancouver City Council Peace and Justice Committee had previously won Council approval based on the fact that Vancouver had the distinction of being designated as a UN Peace Messenger City in recognition of its long history of actions for peace.

Right-wing mayor Sam Sullivan encountered protests from labour and peace groups and individuals from across the country and was forced to retreat, restore some funding and appear at the WPF opening ceremonies which featured WPF Society Member Al Marder as featured speaker. In this connection, the steadfast support of such groups and individuals as progressive Vancouver City Council member David Cadman and former Council member Ellen Woodsworth; Mayor Derek Corrigan of the City of Burnaby and member of Mayor's for Peace; Bill Saunders, President of the Vancouver and District Labour Council, the B.C. Teacher's Federation, and the Stopwar Coalition, were among those who provided leadership and support to keep the event on track. The attempt of the right wing to scuttle the event galvanized WPF supporters. The WPF was noteworthy for its large number of volunteer workers. A key leadership role was played throughout by WPF executive secretary Jef Keighly.

More than 300 WPF workshops and activities, dealt with various aspects of the struggle for peace ranging from meditation to mass organized protest. A highlight of the WPF was a peace march through Vancouver streets under the slogan, "No War — No Where," that drew an estimated 10,000 participants. Canadian Peace Congress delegates carried the banner of the Canadian Peace Congress and the WPC. The march ended with a rally at Sunset Beach addressed by US peace activist Cindy Sheehan, the mother of an American soldier who was killed in Iraq. Sheehan took her protest to the doorstep of President Bush at his ranch in Texas and is one of the personalities in the current drive in the US to bring the troops

home. The Canadian Peace Congress and WPC literature table distributed Peace Messenger and three pamphlets prepared by the Regina Peace Council dealing with the militarization of the Canada, the use of "humanitarian intervention" as an excuse for military invasion, and the demand for nuclear disarmament.

The anti-imperialist struggle, international solidarity, nuclear disarmament, exposure of US-sponsored "reforms" of the UN, opposition to foreign military bases, support for the immediate withdrawal of the US-NATO forces from Iraq and Afghanistan, and denunciations of Israeli occupiers of Palestinian lands were topics at a number of workshops. Such events included presentations by Senator Doug Roche, a former Canadian Disarmament Ambassador to the UN and Conservative cabinet member in the federal government, and Steven Staples, a prominent Canadian peace activist and head of the Polaris Institute. Canadian endorsers included well known patriot and publisher Mel Hurtig, and the Council of Canadians, a large membership organization dedicated to Canadian Independence and active opposition to NAFTA. All major religious denominations were represented at the WPF.



A major highlight of WPF was the workshop sponsored by the Vancouver and District Labour Council, on the theme "The Economics of War versus the Economics of Peace." Ken Georgetti, president of the three million member Canadian Labour Congress, and Jim Sinclair of the BC Federation of Labour and leaders and members of other major affiliates participated. Also represented were labour leaders from the front lines of labour struggles in Columbia, Iraq and Palestine.

Al Marder, WPC secretary and president of Peace Messenger Cities opened the WPF ceremonies with an inspiring call to delegates to step up their efforts to prevent US imperialism from leading the world to a global catastrophe. Judith Leblanc of United For Peace and Justice (UFPJ) shared the platform at the closing ceremonies with former UN Weapons Inspector Hans Blix of Sweden, and David Corrigan, the Mayor of Burnaby. Le Blanc lauded the organizers of WPF and said the event was a significant contribution in the struggle for peace. Le Blanc stressed importance of the broad anti-Bush sentiment in the USA and the struggles waged by UFPJ to end the war in Iraq and defeat the Bush administration and its agenda of regime change and war. Hans Blix called for renewed efforts to ban nuclear and all weapons of mass destruction. He urged the peace movement not to give up on the UN. He said the UN inspection team was unable to prevent the war in Iraq because "the Bush administration had already made up its mind to go to war." Blix heads the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission which has just published its findings in a report entitled: Weapons of Terror; Free the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms.

A highlight of the WPF were hundreds of peace activists from Japan who engaged del-

egates in fervent appeals for solidarity and action to ban nuclear weapons and for the removal of US bases from Japanese territory. A Peace Boat carrying a thousand youth docked at the Port of Vancouver on the closing day. WPC Secretary Tadaaki Kawata member of the Standing Board of the Japan Peace Committee and Secretary of the WPC addressing the WPC workshop on June 28 reported on the broad mass movement in Japan for the removal of all US military bases and for the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons world wide and to prevent the Japanese Government from altering its constitution so as to permit Japan to engage in aggressive militarism. Kawata also called for urgent action to prevent the US from weakening the United Nations Charter. The WPC event on the theme, "The Aggressiveness of Imperialism World Wide and the People's Struggle" heard presentations and interventions by WPC secretaries from the USA, Cuba, Greece, Portugal, Japan, and Canada.

Noteworthy was the televised press conference with Shaw Cable, at which WPC President Orlando Fundora Lopez, Alfredo Leon Alvarez of Cuban Movement for Peace and Sovereignty of the Peoples (Movpaz), New Democratic Party Foreign Affairs

critic Alexa McDonough, and Jeff Keighly, Executive Director of the WPF, addressed the significance of the UN Convention Against Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment, which Canada signed in 1975. President Fundora, a victim of torture under the former Batista regime in Cuba, was also interviewed on the Canadian public radio network of CBC. The press conference denounced the violations of the Geneva Conventions by the US military at its torture chambers at Guantanamo Bay Cuba and Abu Ghraib in Iraq.

The delegation of Movpaz and the Canadian Committee for the Liberation of the Cuban Five (CCLCF) presented to the participants of the WPF and the media a great amount of information on the Five Cuban Heroes illegally jailed in the USA for over eight years. The CCLCF staged a demonstration in front of the US Consulate in Vancouver demanding the immediate release of the Cuban Heroes. The WPC also renewed its demand to the US Government on this urgent matter.

The WPC and Canadian Peace Congress delegates gave presentations and interventions at workshops on Foreign Military Bases, Latin America workshop, the Canadian Peace Alliance sponsored wind up session, and the WPC event on June 28th.

The No Military Bases Movement Plenary on June 27 was addressed by Iraklis Tsavdaridis, organizational secretary of the WPC and representing the Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE). Tsavdaridis pointed out that the USA maintains 800 larger installations/locations outside of US territory in 163 countries in four military commands. The European Command, responsible for Europe and Africa, the Central Command controlling Central Asia, the Arabian

Peninsula Iraq and the Horn of Africa, the Pacific Command, China and Japan, and the South Command Latin America.

The paper quoted extensively from the official US Overseas Basing Commission, detailing the costs of maintaining this enormous military presence around the world, which is borne by the people of the USA and countries where the bases are located. The paper exposed the long term goal of the USA to secure for itself the world's energy resources and to aggressively confront with military power so-called "great power competitors." The paper further points out that the US network of foreign military bases has the full support of NATO and the EU including support for US nuclear weapons in Europe.

Tsavdaridis concluded his statement with a WPC pledge to cooperate with the international peace movement to close all military bases. The WPC called for international support and participation at the World Conference Against Foreign Military Bases that will take place in Quito, Ecuador March 7 -10, 2007.

The Canadian Peace Congress was represented by Jeanette Morgan from Ontario, Blyth Nuttall from Alberta, Cathy Fischer and Peter Gehl from Saskatchewan, and Sylvia and Don Currie from British Columbia.

In an assessment of the event, requested by WPF executive Director Jeff Keighly, the WPC and Canadian Peace Congress said; "The WPC considers the work of the 5000 participants, from 93 countries representing diverse ideological, political, religious, class and social outlooks, as further evidence of the determination of the majority of humankind to unite in struggle to win a permanent and lasting world peace."

"The WPC considers the WPF a rebuff to the imperialist states that engage in wars of aggression, military occupation and intimidation for the sake of re-division of markets, the seizure of energy and water resources, to maintain privileges of wealth and power for a few while denying social and economic justice to the majority, the poor and oppressed people's of the world, and without regard for the environmental degradation of our planet. The WPF has given hope and encouragement to all who fight for peace and justice."

"The doctrine of "might is right", regime change, pre-emptive war, the "duty" to protect and so-called "humanitarian" intervention was roundly criticized and rejected. We also noted another complimentary trend that firmly upholds the sovereign right of people's to resist oppression, to choose their own form of government and to implement economic and social policies that do not conform to any imperialist model including those of the IMF, the WTO, the EU, NAFTA or the United States of America (USA)."

The following statement was adopted unanimously at the WPC event:

"Delegates and supporters of the World Peace Forum attending the World Peace Council event on June 28th 2006 in Vancouver BC declare that the offensive launched by imperialism against world peace, democratic rights and economic and social justice demands ever higher levels of people's unity and mass action to confront and eliminate aggression and war.

"We denounce and condemn the system of US and NATO military bases that violate sovereign territory, build up rapid deployment military forces, including nuclear weapons that are used to launch military attacks, seize oil and water resources, and suppress mass democratic and revolutionary movements of the people.

"We demand the closure of US and other military detention centers, concentra-

continued on page 10

Canadian Peace Movement Demands Withdrawal of Canadian Military Forces from the NATO War in Afghanistan

Cathy Fischer, Editor, *Saskatchewan Peace News*
Don Currie, Interim Executive, Canadian Peace Congress

Canadian peace activists united on October 28th in peace events, marches and demonstrations in all provinces and major cities of the country, to demand that the Conservative Government of Prime Minister Stephen Harper withdraw Canadian military forces from the US-NATO led war in Afghanistan. The actions were coordinated by the Canadian Peace Alliance (CPA), an umbrella group uniting all of the leading peace organizations in Canada. The October 28th events were co-sponsored by the CPA, the Canadian Labour Congress (CLC), a three million-member central labour organization and many of its leading affiliates. The Canadian Islamic Congress (CIC) and most other leading Muslim groups were cosponsors. All peace coalitions in all major cities back the event. The Council of Canadians, an influential nationwide group opposed to US-Canadian integration was a sponsor. The Canadian Peace Congress, the Canadian affiliate of the World Peace Council (WPC) was a sponsor. Political parties supporting the event included the Communist Party of Canada (CPC), the Green Party of Ontario, and the Canadian Action Party.

The New Democratic Party (NDP) a social democratic party with twenty nine members of Parliament in the 308-seat House of Commons passed a strongly worded resolution at its September 8-10, 2006 Quebec City National Convention calling for the withdrawal of all Canadian troops from Afghanistan. The 1800 delegates endorsed the resolution following a country-wide public outcry over escalating Canadian casualties among Canada's 2,500-member contingent in Afghanistan. Thirty-nine Canadian soldiers have died and more casualties occur each week.

Prior to their convention the NDP had forced a debate and vote in the House of Commons on the minority Conservative Government's plans to escalate Canadian military intervention from a low level occupation of Kabul into an aggressive search and destroy mission in Kandahar and to extend the mission from February 2007 to 2009. The Harper Government took the decision following high-level meetings at NATO headquarters in Brussels last February attended by Defense Minister Gordon O'Connor, a former brigadier general and well-known armament manufacturer lobbyist. A combined Liberal Conservative majority approved the extension and the combat role and rammed it through Parliament after a nine-hour debate. After the Parliamentary decision was taken the Government added several hundred more troops and 15 tanks to the Canadian forces. The next group of soldiers scheduled to be sent to Afghanistan will come from the French speaking Van Doos regiment from Quebec where opposition to the war is very intense.

Following the Quebec City NDP Convention, NDP Leader Jack Layton said, "Prime Minister Harper need only look at the experience in Iraq to conclude that ill-conceived and unbalanced missions do not create the conditions for a long-term peace. Why are we blindly following the defense policy prescriptions of the Bush administration? Canadians want a foreign policy rooted in fact, not fear. One that is uniquely independent, not ideologically imported. And one that leads the world into peace, not follows the U.S. into wars."

Ken Georgetti, President of the CLC in a strongly worded statement on September 9th condemned the Conservative Government's

decision to escalate and extend the Afghan mission. The labour leader said; "At the moment, Canada is sending its troops to support a parliament that is already half-dominated by drug-trafficking warlords, many of whom have committed atrocities against their own people during Afghanistan's civil war in the early 1990's. The US military strategy adopted by NATO hasn't brought peace, reduced poverty, stopped heroin production, or helped reconstruct Afghanistan." Georgetti added that it wasn't surprising that an Afghan resistance movement has emerged that brands Hamid Karzai "the mayor of Kabul" or "assistant to the American Ambassador." Addressing Prime Minister Harper directly, the CLC President said, "That's right Prime Minister. At the moment our military isn't fighting the forces of corruption, violence, and the heroin trade. We're supporting them, and this is never told to the thousands of Canadian soldiers sent to the battlegrounds of Kandahar."

In an effort to bolster its sagging support for the war, the Harper Government invited Hamid Karzai to speak to the House of Commons. The non-event has had little affect on public opinion polls which continue to run at 70 percent in opposition to the war.

The NDP and the CLC opposition to Canadian involvement in Afghanistan follow strong public opposition to the Conservative Party's pro-Bush stance on the war. US President George Bush is highly unpopular among Canadians. Prime Minister Harper is considered to be an uncritical supporter of the Bush Doctrine of pre-emptive war. The rising anti-war sentiment is also the result of public outrage at the scenes of massive destruction of southern Lebanon by the US-sponsored Israeli war. Prime Minister Harper was widely condemned for describing the Israeli land, sea, and air bombardment of southern Lebanon as a "measured response." There is a large Lebanese Canadian population in Canada and some were killed and wounded by Israeli bombing while visiting relatives in southern Lebanon.

The people of Quebec were particularly outraged by the massive Israeli destruction of southern Lebanon and Beirut and tens of thousands demonstrated in downtown Montreal led by prominent peace and labour activists and Bloc Quebecois Leader Gilles Duceppe. The Bloc has 50 seats in Parliament. Duceppe also demanded a Parliamentary debate on the Afghan mission in the House of Commons.

The Canadian Peace Congress issued a statement on the Israeli war on Lebanon on July 19th addressed to all opposition leaders in the House of Commons. The statement said:

"The bankrupt statements of Prime Minister Harper concerning the Israeli military assault on Palestinian lands and Lebanon, is further proof that the minority Conservative Government has abandoned all pretence of an independent Canadian foreign policy of peace and relies totally on the NATO-US-Israeli policy of all-out war as the preferred method of solving complex international disputes.

The practical results of placing the interests of the USA and Israel above those of the Canadian people is the abandonment of Canadian citizens in war zones, mounting civilian and military casualties, and relegating Canada

to an object of ridicule among the UN member states.

Stephen Harper mindlessly repeats word for word the policy directives emanating from NATO headquarters in Brussels, the Pentagon and the Israeli high command. The elected members of the Canadian Parliament are not consulted and relegated to the ignominious role of voiceless bystanders.

Outside Parliament growing numbers of Canadians are determined to bring real change in Canada's foreign policy, elect a House of Commons more in touch with the views of Canadians and end the danger created by the Harper Tories.

We call upon the leaders of the opposition parties to speak up and assert their legitimate role and immediately call for the re-convening of the Parliament of Canada to pass a motion of censure and lack of confidence in the Prime Minister and his Government. We call upon you to speak up for the majority of Canadians who reject the Bush doctrine of pre-emptive war and who support cessation of war, respect for the UN Charter and negotiations as the bedrock of an independent Canadian foreign policy of peace."

The Canadian Peace Congress has been active with other Vancouver World Peace Forum (WPF) delegates in speaking at September and October World Peace Forum report back meetings in Nelson, Castlegar and Grand Forks, towns in the interior of the Province of British Columbia. Peace Messengers were distributed and the statement of WPC President Orlando Fundora Lopez was read at the International Peace Day event in Castlegar on September 21st.

The Regina Peace Council, a Canadian Peace Congress affiliate co-sponsored with the Regina Peace Action Coalition and

Muslims for Peace a teach-in at the Regina City Hall, demanding a ceasefire in Lebanon. Speakers included Dr. Ray Cleveland. Dr. Shreesh Juyal and Dr. Jim Harding, all of the University of Regina, and Riaz Ahmed, president of the Saskatchewan Organization of Muslims for Peace and Justice, who called for a broad peace conference to deal with the root causes of the last 40 years of conflict in the Middle East, namely the illegal Israeli occupation of Arab lands in Palestine, Lebanon, and Syria. Dr. Harding warned of the dangers accompanying the attempted Western hegemony in a uni-polar world by one superpower with neo-liberal economics.

Regina Peace Council is sponsoring a workshop on October 28th, "Canada's Militarism and Its Role in Afghanistan," with prominent peace activist Richard Sanders from the Coalition to Oppose the Arms Trade as principal speaker. Peter Gehl, co-chair of the Canadian Peace Congress and vice-president of the Regina Peace Council is organizer of the event. There will be a march and rally in Regina, the Provincial capital, calling for Troops Out of Afghanistan on October 29th.

Congress executive member Don Currie has been invited to speak at several rallies and meetings in the Interior of British Columbia and is speaking at a march and rally in Nelson B.C. on October 28th. Congress executive member Darrell Rankin of Winnipeg organized a demonstration protesting the Israeli military attacks on Gaza and is active in CPA preparations for October 28th. The first issue of Peace Messenger has been sent to major cities across the country for distribution at the October 28th events.

World Peace Council affiliates are invited to visit the Canadian Peace Congress website: www.peacecongress.ca. Contact us by email at: congresspeace@peacecongress.ca. ■

More about the WPC

Executive Committee:

The Assembly of the WPC in its last meeting elected a 39-member Executive Committee composed of the respective member organizations from the following countries:

Asia and the Pacific: Australia; Bangladesh; India; Japan; DPR Korea; Mongolia; Nepal; Pakistan; Vietnam.

Africa: Angola; Congo Brazz.; Congo Dr.; Senegal; South Africa; Tanzania; Zimbabwe.

Middle East: Egypt; Iraq; Palestine; Syria; Yemen.

Americas: Argentina; Brazil; Canada; Costa Rica; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Mexico; Panama; USA; Venezuela.

Europe: Cyprus; Czech Republic; France; Germany; Greece; Portugal; Spain; Turkey.

Regional Coordinators:

Mexican Movement for Peace and development MOPPADE (Regional Coordinator for the Americas); Vietnam Peace Committee VPC (Regional Coordinator for Asia & the Pacific); Egyptian Peace Committee (Regional Coordinator for the Middle East); Portuguese Council for Peace and Cooperation (Regional Coordinator for Europe); Congo Peace Committee (Regional Coordinator for Africa).

Co-Presidents:

Argentina (MOPASSOL); India (AIPSO); Palestine (PCPJ).

Honorary President:

Romesh Chandra; Evangelos Mahairas.

Cuba Has the Right to Independence with Peace

Manuel E. Yepe*

The American “powers that be” have persistently longed for Cuba since the end of the 18th century, before the island’s first independence wars.

Two precepts have conditioned US foreign policies towards Cuba at the highest levels of government since then: the ‘manifest destiny doctrine’ and the ‘theory of the ripe fruit’.

On June 1783, the second US president, John Adams, expressed that the island of Cuba was a natural extension of the North American continent, and that its annexation was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the United States. He sustained that Cuban independence was never to be allowed and that the best way to achieve that purpose was to let Cuba remain under Spanish rule until the island could be absorbed by the US.

The “manifest destiny” was a conception developed in those days as a doctrine attributing to the US an alleged special mission: to carry its particular form of economic, social and political organization; first within North America and later throughout the Western Hemisphere. The westward expansion was completed by the end of the 19th century: the indigenous population was annihilated and the Mexican neighbors lost nearly half their territory (Texas, New Mexico and California).

In 1823, President James Monroe pronounced what became known as the Monroe doctrine, or the “America for the Americans” doctrine, stating that interference by any European power in the newly emerging Latin American republics would be considered an unfriendly act against the US itself and, therefore, the US had the right to “protect” the region. This apparent US defensive paternalism towards the rest of the hemisphere very soon became forceful expansionism.

Some years before, John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State in Monroe’s admin-

istration and his successor as president, had written: “... if an apple, severed by the tempest from its native tree, cannot but fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its unnatural connection with Spain and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only to the North American union, which by the same law of nature, cannot cast her off from its bosom.”

This principle was no obstacle, however, for the US trying to buy Cuba from Spain. An offer to purchase the island for \$100 million was refused by the Iberian crown.

By the 1880s, US capital was heavily involved in the Cuban economy, particularly in the sugar industry, as a result of its global interest in turning the Caribbean Islands into sugar-based economies.

The revolutionary origins of the US were still alive in American people’s memory and many ordinary US citizens were sympathetic to Cuba. This fact overlapped a tense build-up in the US for a direct military intervention in Cuba’s independence war against Spain. However, in 1895, shortly before being killed in combat, the Cuban revolutionary leader José Martí drew attention to the fact that, while fighting Spain, he also wanted “to prevent the United States, with the independence of Cuba, from extending itself through the West Indies and falling with added weight upon our lands of America. Everything that I have done is for that purpose,” he proclaimed.

On December 24th 1897, US Under-Secretary of War J.C. Breckenridge wrote in a memorandum: “This [the Cuban] population is made up of whites, blacks, Asians and people who are mixture of these races. The inhabitants are generally indolent and apathetic. Since they only possess a vague notion of what is right and wrong, the people tend to seek pleasure not through work, but through violence. It is obvious that the immediate annexation of these disturbing ele-

ments into our own federation in such large numbers would be madness, so before we do that we must clean up the country. We must destroy everything within our cannons’ range of fire. We must impose a harsh blockade so that hunger and its constant companion, disease, undermine the peaceful population and decimate the army. The allied army must be constantly engaged in reconnaissance and vanguard actions so that the Cuban army is irreparably caught between two fronts.”

The high US official went on to explain the plan for the military occupation of Cuba and the temporary maintenance by force of the new independent government of a minority of the autonomists and Spaniards who remained, until it was strong enough to maintain itself against the separatists.

“When this moment arrives, - he concluded- we must create conflicts for the independent government. That government will be faced with these difficulties. These difficulties must coincide with the unrest and violence among the aforementioned elements, to whom we must give our backing. To sum up, our policy must always be to support the weaker against the stronger, until we have obtained the extermination of them both, in order to annex the Pearl of the Antilles.”

Early in 1898, the battleship USS *Maine* arrived at Cuba on a “courtesy visit”. In the morning of February 15, the *Maine* exploded and 260 of the crewmembers were killed. US newspapers blamed Spain and coined the slogan “Remember the *Maine*, to hell with Spain”. One of the photographs published, allegedly showed the hole made in the hull by a Spanish torpedo.

Over 80 years after de *Maine* incident, US Admiral G.H. Rickover admitted that the Spanish had not blown up the *Maine*, and that actually US “specialists” had set the explosives on board. The majority of the 260 US crew killed were black, the white officers having been ashore at the time. Incidentally, it was known that the “hole in the hull” was actually an eclipse of the sun photographed much earlier.

On April 11, 1898, President McKinley requested authorization from the US Congress and Senate to intervene, and a few days later declared war on Spain.

The US had never recognized the Cuban people’s struggle for independence or their liberation army as a legitimate force. Just a few hours after declaring war on Spain, McKinley said he would not recognize the Republic of Cuba as declared by the revolutionary Government in Arms. He only wanted to drive Spain out and gain sole influence for the US.

In just eight months, Cuba saw US military intervention, the defeat of Spain, actions by the US forces against the Cuban independence army and the imposition of a transitional government — a US military governorship. More than thirty years of patriotic struggle for independence had served for nothing.

On December 10, the Treaty of Paris was signed. The US treated Cuba as a conquered country and got Spain to hand over the island to their military occupation. Cuban representatives were excluded from the proceedings.

The Cuban people angrily opposed annexation. General Máximo Gómez, one of the founders of Cuban independence, wrote in his campaign diary: “The Americans’ military occupation is too high a price to pay for their spontaneous intervention in the war we waged against Spain for freedom and independence. The American government’s

attitude toward the heroic Cuban people at this history making time is, in my opinion, one of big business. . . .Cuba cannot have true moral peace . . . under the transitional government. This transitional government was imposed by force by a foreign power and, therefore, is illegitimate and incompatible with the principles that the entire country has been upholding for so long and in the defense of which its sons have given their lives and all of its wealth has been consumed.”

On July 1900, the Constitutional Convention of Cuban representatives started its deliberations in order to implement the US Joint Resolution by drafting a new Constitution and stipulations concerning US-Cuban relations.

On March 1901, the US congress attached an amendment to the Cuban Constitutional project imposing, as conditions for the US to leave the government of the island in Cuban hands, those contained in what became known as the Platt Amendment, after Senator Orville Platt who presented it. Under this amendment, the US limited the country’s sovereignty and turned it into a neocolonial enclave. It legalized US military intervention. It assumed the right to seize part of Cuba’s territory by leaving ownership of the Isle of Pines (the second largest island in the Cuban archipelago) to be adjusted by future treaty. It limited Cuba’s rights to enter into treaties with other countries and it forced the country to sell or lease a part of its territory for the establishment of naval stations.

Coercion and fraud were used to establish US military bases in Cuba, factors that, under international law, make any agreement null and void. The Cuban Convention was warned not to modify the Amendment and told that the US troops would not leave Cuba until its terms had been adopted. So there could be no possible misunderstanding, Senator Platt finished his warning by saying that, if the Amendment were not accepted, there would be no Republic of Cuba.

In 1901, Theodore Roosevelt became US President. He had been Assistant Secretary for the Navy under President McKinley and one of the strongest advocates of military intervention in Cuba. The war had made his political career. He made an addition to the Monroe doctrine, known as the Roosevelt Corollary: “Chronic wrongdoing or an impotence which results in a general loosening of the ties of civilized society may, in America as elsewhere, ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation, and in the Western Hemisphere the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force it, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power.”

Invasions, threats and treaties made at gunpoint characterized Roosevelt’s term as president. On 24 March 1902, he met with Tomás Estrada Palma, US-appointed future President of Cuba. He told him which places had been chosen for the establishment of naval bases or coaling stations, as stipulated in the Platt Amendment.

In a memorable ceremony in which the Cuban flag was raised by respected General Maximo Gomez himself, the Republic of Cuba was officially established on May 20, 1902, but to pretend Cuba became independent that day is to disguise the historical truth and to twist the true role played by the United States in the outcome of Cuba’s war of independence against Spanish colonialism.

Almost seventy percent of the sugar industry — the most important and almost sole industry on the island — was in the hands of

continued on page 8

APPEAL OF THE WORLD PEACE COUNCIL

About the Illegal Imprisonment of the Five Cuban Political Prisoners in the USA

The World Peace Council is drawing the attention of the peace loving people of the world, about the internationally well-known legal and humanitarian scandal of the imprisonment of the five Cuban patriots in the USA, which have been sentenced heavily for espionage and conspiracy, while tried in Miami some eight years ago.

The WPC denounces this unlawful twist of the truth, although it was clear that the five Cuban patriots were collecting information against the Cuban-American mafia circles of Miami, who were preparing terror acts against Cuba.

Since then, many judicial and political efforts have been carried out, both inside the USA and allover the world. The mobilizations in support of the five Cuban citizens Antonio Guerrero, Fernando González, Gerardo Hernández, Ramón Labañino and René González, are growing in dozens of countries.

Millions and millions of people are getting to know every day the truth behind this criminal conspiracy of political revenge and silence. Even US courts are ruling that the decisions of the Miami court were null and void.

The case of the “five” has been used by the US administration in order to justify its war drive, its “war against terror”, and its imperialist policy against the peoples of the world and against Cuba in particular. It provokes feelings of anger and fury to us in the WPC, but also to any democratic and open minded person on earth, when the US administration is referring to “terrorism” while being the biggest terrorist on the planet.

The WPC considers the imprisonment of the five Cuban political prisoners, as a flagrant violation of Human Rights and of International law. We demand their immediate release from the US prisons.

We call upon all Peace Movements worldwide, to unite their voices with the Cuban Peace Movement in our common demand for justice, against the imperialist manipulation of truth.

US imperialism will not be able to carry on its cynical and arbitrary policy for ever.

The united power of the peoples can and will impose their rights and needs!
Hands off Cuba!

Athens October 6, 2006

On behalf of the Secretariat of WPC

Iraklis Tsavdaridis, Secretary

Statement on the North Korean Nuclear Test

By the South Korean Anti-War Group "All Together"

October 9, 2006

On October 9, North Korea (NK) announced that it had just conducted a nuclear test. The test came just six days after an official statement by the Foreign Ministry that NK would proceed with such a test. Experts had warned unequivocally that Pyongyang wasn't simply bluffing this time. But the Bush administration, by ignoring such warnings and responding with the usual blackmail, practically asked for this to happen.

Leon Sigal, the author of *Disarming Stranger*, recently noted that "the only way to stop NK's nuclear test would be for the US to negotiate seriously with NK, a prospect that seems remote at the moment."

The NK nuclear test, therefore, was a very predictable outcome. When the US continued to ignore NK by refusing dialogue and maintaining financial sanctions despite NK's proclamation of nuclear statehood and test-firing of missiles, Pyongyang turned to nuclear testing in a last-ditch attempt to be taken seriously.

NK's nuke test is the culmination of five years of the Bush administration's policy towards NK. Up until the year 2002, NK had been freezing its plutonium reactor and reprocessing facility, in compliance with the Agreed Framework. It was only after October 2002, when Bush's special envoy James Kelly went to Pyongyang to pick a fight, and only after November 2002, when the US stopped supplying NK with heavy oil (in violation of the Agreed Framework), that NK withdrew from the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and restarted operation of its nuclear reactor in Yongbyon.

Even as the invasion of Iraq reinforced the perception that countries actually need weapons of mass destruction to deter US aggression, people like Richard Pearle publicly bragged how "we've already smashed the Iraqi Republican Guard. We can do the same with NK's army."

Moreover, the US listed NK among its potential nuclear strike targets, in the Nuclear Posture Review submitted to the Congress in December 2001. A threat of this kind against a non-nuclear state clearly violates the Nonproliferation Treaty.

By leveling such naked threats for years and years against a NK that had acquired plutonium re-processing capability, Washington was in effect begging NK to develop nuclear weapons.

As a matter of fact, nuclear blackmail against NK has been ongoing for nearly half a century since 1957, when the US, in violation of the Armistice Agreement, brought nuclear bombs, missiles and mines into South Korea.

Although the Bush Administration, along with the South Korean, Japanese, and the Chinese authorities, is currently condemning NK's nuclear test, the International Court of Justice said in a 1996 ruling that it could not "determine categorically whether the use of nuclear weapons by a state would be unlawful even under extreme circumstances in which the very survival of the state is at stake." In a way, Bush's NK policy served merely to strengthen NK's missile and nuclear capabilities without being able to replace the regime.

UN Sanctions are not the Solution

The aftermath of NK's test has become the subject of utmost interest. Pyongyang apparently wishes to gain de facto recognition as a nuclear power, or to gain a more potent leverage for negotiation. This is one possible outcome, but the immediate effect would be a tightening of sanctions through the UN.

The Bush Administration is obliged, by its own fierce rhetoric of the past, to show a tough response to NK's test. And yet "there's really nothing much the US can do in the event of a nuclear test by NK other than to issue condemnations through a new UN resolution," as Professor Don Oberdorfer of Johns Hopkins pointed out.

Washington can't take the military option for three reasons. First, the administration's hands are tied to Iraq; it has its eyes on Iran on top of it. As strong as the US military is, it can't afford to pick another fight in another front. This must have been part of



Pyongyang's calculation. Even a limited, pin-point strike on NK nuclear facilities could easily escalate into a far wider conflict. General Gary Luck (ret.), who commanded US forces in Korea in 1994, estimated that if the US strikes NK nuclear facilities, a full-scale war would erupt in which "one million lives would be lost, including those of 80 to 100 thousand Americans; material costs would exceed \$100 billion." Second, the US must take into account how China and South Korea would react. The two might agree on UN sanctions (albeit not on their intensity), but they are not likely to support military action. For China, the prospect of having US forces right across the Chinese border is un-

acceptable; for South Korea, the scale of the destruction that would result from war with NK could be crippling beyond recovery.

According to a study released in 2005, a surgical strike on NK's nuclear facility, at worst, can turn the entire Korean Peninsula into a radioactive desert for 10 years. At best, 80% of living organisms within a 10-15 kilometer radius of the strike will die in a couple of months, and the radioactive fallout will travel up to 1400km — enough to cover Seoul.

If Washington presses NK too hard, South Korea could move closer to China, which in turn would hurt US hegemony in Northeast

Asia. Preserving US hegemony in the region has been the pre-occupation of US strategists like Brezinsky ever since the end of the Cold War. The US is in the difficult position of having to play NK's threat as a means of bolstering the US-Korea alliance, and at the same time avoid escalating the tension too much.

Third, US public opinion against war (which has now moved to the mainstream) is making it even more difficult for the administration to resort to military action.

In the given circumstances, the Bush administration is likely to apply pressure on NK through UN sanctions first, and then wait and see how things develop, trying to figure out how to respond. An administration that has been

incapable of devising a unified policy on NK for the last five years is unlikely to have suddenly found one in the course of a few days.

The progressive forces in South Korea must oppose UN sanctions as well as military action by the US, for the sanctions themselves could further destabilize the situation. We shouldn't lend our support to the South Korean government's plan to support UN sanctions. Sanctions will only make ordinary North Koreans suffer. The only way to stop nuclear proliferation is to force the US to quit threatening NK.

A Dangerous Game

NK claims its nuclear test would "serve to defend peace and stability in the Korean Peninsula and the region surrounding it." That is just false. Even if there's no immediate military action from the US, NK's test will serve to intensify tension in Northeast Asia.

NK's test will encourage Japan to go nuclear, which will then encourage South Korea and Taiwan to follow suit. The result will be a Northeast Asian region living in constant fear of thermonuclear war.

From the point of view of NK state officials, nuclear arms may seem the only possible deterrent against Washington's aggression. But from the perspective of the ordinary people of Northeast Asia, NK's nuclear test is a dangerous gamble with their lives which has nothing to do with socialism. It could also have a negative impact on people's movements in South Korea, Japan, etc.

The logic of mutually assured destruction can ensure neither peace nor the survival of the regime. Humanity went near the brink of thermonuclear war during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Only four years ago, India and Pakistan came close to waging nuclear warfare over Kashmir. Threatening the workers and the people of other countries with nuclear weapons will only serve to whip up fear and thus damage their real potential to defeat imperialism. ■

CUBA HAS THE RIGHT TO INDEPENDENCE (from p. 7)

US capitalists, who also owned Cuba's best arable lands.

The Cuban Revolutionary Party -founded by Jose Marti in 1892 as the single political organization intended to unite all the Cubans to struggle for independence against Spain and prevent the US from absorbing Cuba-had been dissolved; the Cuban Liberation Army had been discharged and the Platt Amendment was securely attached to the Cuban Constitution.

So vile was the American interference in Cuba's internal affairs that Leonard Wood, Cuba's military governor after the Spanish-American War, wrote in a letter to Theodore Roosevelt, "There is, of course, little or no independence left for Cuba under the Platt Amendment."

By 1902, time had come for the first elections to be called. The elected president was a Cuban who had become a naturalized American citizen after living in the United States for 25 years and who favored the annexation of Cuba to the US.

In July 1903, a so-called Permanent Treaty was signed, which involved, among other "generous" Cuban concessions to the US, the unlimited lease a territory in the bay of Guantanamo. The neocolonial Cuban government requested that the inauguration be discreet because the Cuban people were protesting against the lease, and it sent only one representative. At noon the day of the event, the Cuban flag was lowered, and the

US flag rose to sound of a 21-gun salute. Then 600 US Marines landed.

One hundred years later a terror prison camp for the abuse and torture of detainees under US custody was established there in defiance of international humanitarian law and is still existent despite almost unanimous universal reproach. The US naval base at Guantánamo has also been the place from where the US has launched many invasions on other countries in the region, most recently Haiti, Dominican Republic, Panama and Grenada.

Opening the 20th Century, Cuba emerged as the model for US imperialism. American economic and political domination had been secured without the seizure of a colony. The US could continue to boast its anti-colonial tradition and beliefs despite having made Cuba a dependency. It was at this time that the term "sphere of influence" became an international euphemism for neo-colonialism.

However, the US militarily intervened in Cuba in 1906, 1909 and 1912. During this last intervention, the US took the opportunity to impose an extension of its territory at Guantanamo in exchange for giving up another base in Bahia Honda, West of Havana. That same year, US President William Howard Taft said: "The day is not far distant when three Stars and Stripes at three equidistant points will mark our territory; one at the North Pole, another at the Panama Canal, and the third at the South Pole. The whole hemisphere will be ours in fact as, by virtue of our superiority of race, it already is ours morally."

After six decades of submission to US hegemony, first as an occupied country and then as a semi-colony under US control and supervision, the Cuban people defeated the furious Batista's dictatorship, notorious for its corruption and repression, which had full support of the US with military advisors in every arm and branch.

After the triumph of the Revolution in January first 1959, ten US Administrations have used every means at their disposal, short of all-out war, to strangle the Revolution.

The economic blockade, euphemistically called embargo in the US, which has been exercised against Cuba for 48 consecutive years has had an estimated cost of 125 billion US dollars.

As those who manipulate and control the media in a global scale happen to be the same interests served by the policy-makers and strategists that generate these deceptive US actions, world public opinion must remain aware of such ripe fruit appetites.

Cubans have a right to independence ... and Peace!

**Manuel E. Yepe is Secretary of the Cuban Peace Movement, an NGO existing since 1949 with consultative status before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization. Ex-Ambassador, lawyer, economist and social scientist, he is also Adjunct Associate Professor at the Raul Roa Higher Institute of International Relations in Havana. He served as Director General of Prensa Latina Latin-American News Agency and Vice President of the Cuban Institute of Radio and Television, as well as founder National Director of the UNDP's Technological Information Pilot System in Cuba..*

Resolution of the International Solidarity Meeting with the Peoples of the Middle East: No to War and Imperialism

Larnaca (Cyprus) — October 21, 2006

The representatives of the international and national peace movements and organisations listed below, who have participated in the International Solidarity Meeting with the Peoples of Middle East, organized by the Cyprus Peace Council in cooperation with the World Peace Council (WPC) on October 21st 2006 in Larnaca (Cyprus), have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

The participants,

- Denounce the criminal and inhuman policy and military operations of Israel both in Lebanon and Palestine which causes the deaths of thousands of people, the destruction of social and civil infrastructure, as well as thousands of houses and apartments;
- Denounce the imperialist policies of the USA and their closest allies in their support of the Israeli aggressors under the pretext of “fight against terrorism;”
- Categorically reject the hypocritical equal distance approach held by the EU that evens up the aggressor with the victims and attempts to criminalize the legitimate right of the peoples of the region to struggle for the defence, liberation, and self-determination of their countries;
- Denounce the continuation of occupation of Iraq by the USA and its allies, as well as the formulation of threats and execution of pressure towards Syria and Iran, as part of the imperialist plans for the formation of the so called “New Middle East;”
- Oppose categorically the collaboration of NATO war-machinery in the region with the cynical task of peace-keeping and the military collaboration of EU countries with Israel, bilaterally or through NATO that makes them direct accomplices of the Israeli war policy;

- Denounce the increasing attempts to link Islam with terrorism, as part of the doctrine of Imperialism about the “clash of civilizations;”
- Express their solidarity and unconditional support to the peoples of Lebanon and Palestine who are victims of the criminal military actions of Israel in the recent aggression. They express their solidarity with all patriotic-progressive forces and movements of the Middle East who are resisting and struggling for the defence, liberation, sovereignty and independence of their countries;

policy and aggression. International community must take initiatives on the basis of the principles of the International Law towards permanent, just and viable solution in the region;

- Consider that the cease-fire and deployment of multinational troops cannot compensate the final and lasting resolution of the Middle East problem. Underline that there cannot be peace without justice in the region and without the solution of the key issue, the self-determination of Palestinian people;
- For the final and sustainable solution

the right of the return of the refugees and the immediate release of all political prisoners from Israeli jails, including the Palestinian MPs and Ministers;

o Financial compensation of all victims and their families as well as for the destruction of properties and infrastructure caused by Israel in Lebanon and Palestine;

• Ask furthermore the UN to establish urgently a comprehensive independent and impartial inquiry about the violations of international humanitarian law in Lebanon and Palestine;

• Propose to the WPC to take the initiative to organize in the near future a fact finding mission to Lebanon and report to the peace loving people of the world about the cruelties and consequences of the brutal aggression against the Lebanese people and to organise a solidarity mission to the occupied territories of Palestine;

• Express their support to the initiative of the Lebanese Peace Movement and other political and social structures to organize an international conference on 16-19 November in Beirut;

• Declare their firm solidarity with the people of Cyprus (Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots), who are suffering for 32 years under occupation of 37% of the Cyprus Republic and express their support for a just and viable solution within a bi-zonal, bi-communal, federal structure, which will guarantee the respect of human rights and civil liberties of all Cypriots and the creation of a peaceful and prosperous island, which will operate as a bridge of peace and security in the region.

The participants of the meeting commit themselves to work closely with the WPC for a broad campaign against the imperialist interventions in the Middle East.



• Salute the massive protest demonstrations held in dozens of countries in support of the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon and express their solidarity with the peace-loving forces inside Israel, who bravely resist against the Israeli regime and the war;

• Condemn the continuation of Israeli military operations in Lebanon and in Palestine that are being observed despite Security Resolution 1701 for cessation of hostilities. Condemn the “equidistance” approaches, which allow Israel to continue its criminal

of the Middle East conflict the participants of the meeting demand:

- o Withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied (including Golan Heights and Sheba farms);
- o Unconditional, complete and immediate withdrawal of all occupation forces from Iraq;
- o Resumption of comprehensive peace negotiations for the completion of the establishment of the independent Palestinian state in the borders of 1967 and with East Jerusalem as its capital, the guarantee for

TURKEY: For Peace, Struggle against Imperialism

For many years imperialism’s main aim has been intervention in and redesign of our region. The aim is very apparent; what it brought is war, invasions and massacres. There is nothing but blood every day in the Middle East. Imperialism is devastating in Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine. Under these conditions the struggle for peace is very urgent and timely for patriots. 1st of September International Day of Peace is very important for us as it is a day when we have to raise our struggle against imperialism and for peace, and to curse imperialism and its wars together with other peace lovers all over the world. Peace Association of Turkey tried this year too, to do its best.

We faced the September 1st in an atmosphere of rising imperialist expectations from our country, and national political ruling circles ready to collaborate. Turkey searches how to go beyond supplying only logistical support to US and EU imperialists and Israel. Ruling classes did not discuss much whether or not to send troops to Lebanon but only their number and qualifications. However one should add that rulers hesitate at a point; this is the reaction and protest of the people, of the patriotic forces and peace lovers. They are scared of the possible popular anger that would inevitably arise if sons of their country die in Lebanon.

Patriotic March Arrived Dolmabahçe on September 1st

Patriotic Front organized a march from Incirlik

base in Adana to Istanbul. The event also supported by the Peace Association was called “US Go Away! This Country is Ours!”. Dolmabahçe, the finishing place is in fact a symbol of the anti-imperialist struggle in Turkey, where patriotic and revolutionary students fought against US marines, and threw them to the sea.



On September 1st, Patriotic Front organized a mass rally in Dolmabahçe.

Marchers walked 1,134 kilometers in forty-nine days, taking breaks to visit towns, villages and cities, where several meetings and rallies were held. Imperialist plans and the role of the collaborating ruling forces were discussed through Anatolia. A retired army officer, Murat Pabuç marched during the whole event, while others participants changed from one city to other. Pabuç is also a member of

the administrative council of the Peace Association.

The primary agenda of the September 1st meeting was a call to protest in Ankara against the National Assembly that would vote on September 5th for sending troops to Lebanon. The meeting was supported by many mass organizations.

Peace Week

Peace Association also took part together with the Nazım Hikmet Cultural Center in the “peace week” activities. Concerts, exhibitions, theatre performances and panels were organized with the contribution of hundreds of artists sharing the protest against sending troops to Lebanon.

Peace Days and Children was one of the events supported by the Peace Association in which children performed dramas, played music and participated to painting workshops.

A discussion panel was held on September 3rd. Contributors were two well-known Turkish journalists, the secretary general of the CP of Turkey, a Greek member of parliament from KKE, and Vera Nikolaidu, the vice-president of Greek Peace Committee.

Peace Exhibition: From Tradition to Future

Peace Association first organized this exhibition on September 1st, 2003. This year was the third experience with 175 painters contributing to the event with 193 pieces of art. The exhibition was repeated in Ankara.

Peace NEWS

KSCM Launches Campaign against US Anti-Missile Base in the Czech Republic

Prague — August 04, 2006. The Communists (KSCM) have launched a campaign against the possible stationing of an US anti-missile base on Czech territory, KSCM spokeswoman Monika Horeni told reporters.

The petition against the US military base has been so far signed by some 5,000 people. KSCM representatives will deliver the first petition sheets with signatures to the Chamber of Deputies on Friday.

The Communists want to use traditional summer nationwide events where people will have the chance to sign the petition and discuss the issue with KSCM politicians. Within the campaign, the KSCM has also issued leaflets and postcards addressed to constitutional officials.

“The KSCM will support all events against military bases no matter who organises them,” Horeni said.

In their petition, the Communists also demand that information on the current course of negotiations with the US on stationing of its anti-missile base in the Czech Republic be released in public.

The KSCM also wants the Chamber of Deputies to reject similar projects.

The KSCM is now considering staging a protest meeting in the military training grounds Libava, North Moravia, Brdy, Central Bohemia, and Boletice, South Bohemia, which have been taken into consideration as suitable localities for the base. US military experts visited the areas in July.

Prima TV reported that the US experts found Libava the most suitable locality. The team of US experts has also searched localities in Poland, while Hungary is allegedly definitely out of the question.

Washington has addressed the Czech Republic and other Central European countries over “the anti-missile umbrella” as the US equipment in North America is not sufficient. The base in Central Europe should therefore play a strategically important role.

Unlike the old Soviet bases in the then-Czechoslovakia, the US anti-missile site would be invisible as its silo with probably only one missile would be hidden dozens of meters under ground, experts say. However, apart from economic and strategic benefits, the anti-missile site could draw terrorists’ attention to the Czech Republic.

A recent poll has also shown that most Czechs are against stationing of a US anti-missile base on the Czech territory. Of the parties in parliament, only the right-wing Civic Democrats (ODS) clearly support the idea.

Statement of the WPC

The World Peace Council expresses its firm condemnation of the recent decision of the Czech government to ban and dissolve the Communist Youth Union (KSM), an Organisation which stands in the forefront for the struggle for Peace and against the establishment of new Military Bases in the Czech Republic. The WPC expresses its solidarity to the KSM while condemning the reactionary prohibitions.

Speech Presented to the International Solidarity Meeting with the Peoples of the Middle East — Larnaca (Cyprus), October 21, 2006

By Emily Naffa, Jordanian Peace Committee

Dear friends and Comrades

It gives me a great pleasure to convey to you the greetings of the Jordanian Peace Committee members, and express our appreciation for organizing this meeting to discuss the latest developments after the Israeli aggression against the Lebanese and Palestinian people.

The current situation in the Middle East is worsening and not improving as far as peace, demilitarization and development are concerned.

The facts on the ground indicate that the US and NATO countries are behind the new war crimes and pertaining conflicts. Their ultimate goal, other than complete domination is to sell weapons and increase military spending in the region.

The London based International Institute for Strategic Studies affirmed the Middle East is the largest arms market with expenditures topping 60 billion US dollars.

The policy of Bush Administration on the world stage is militarist and interventionist. There is literally no region of the world free from the particularly aggressive hand of the Bush Administration. It launched war on Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq and backed the right wing government in Israel to launch new war against Lebanon, and has intensified the violent suppression of the Palestinian and is threatening Syria and Iran, and is insisting on continuing its sanctions on Cuba against the will of 182 countries that voted against the sanctions.

The Bush Administration declared that it will redraw the geopolitical map of the region under different projects, the “Greater Middle East” the “New Middle East” in order to have an upper hand on the oil, to strengthen its hegemony as global cop, and continue to impose its “new global order” by militarizing globalization.

The goal of the US Administration is to establish total economic and political structure in the Middle East and Africa. The interests of imperialism in this region as well as its strategic position between the three continents of Asia, Europe and Africa are directly related to its need for energy resources.

The Israeli aggression on Lebanon that broke out on (12 July- 14 August) has shocked peace loving and progressive forces when the cable news had shown the USnds of innocent families forced to leave their homes and seek refuge in schools, churches, mosques and parks.

Ceasefire was delayed in the UN Security Council for several weeks while heavy bombardment from air and sea was leaving multitude of villagers trapped without food or running water.

The Israeli aggression against Lebanon went far beyond a reaction to military operation targeting its soldiers. Israeli army targeted Lebanese civilians and civil infrastructure. The aggression on Lebanon comes on the heels of Israel’s invasion and reoccupation of large parts of Gaza Strip, resulting in the death of many Palestinians.

The estimate number of dead people was 1071 and the injured were 3628 (these numbers could be much higher as some people were still uncounted).

The total of 971,361 persons was displaced. Israel even targeted the ambulances and trucks of aid products. Thirty the USnds private houses, apartments hospitals, clinics were destroyed.

During the Israeli aggression several massacres were perpetrated in Marwaheen, Aytoun, Qana, Baalbeck and Al Qa’a. In these massacres 134 civilians were killed among them 56 children.

The Lebanese economy was badly affected. The direct damage to the infrastructure is estimated at \$3.6 billion. The reconstruction cost is likely to exceed \$5 billion, while Lebanon is saddled with about \$40 billion public debt.

The Israeli war caused great damage to the Lebanese environment. Countless reports confirmed that Israel used new weapons prohibited internationally.

CONCLUSION:

- The root causes for the Israeli- Arab conflict whether with the Palestinians, Lebanon, Syria, Egypt or Jordan lie in the Israeli occupation of Arab territories. Unless Israel withdraws from the Arab territories occupied in 1967 and stops the atrocities against the Palestinians people there will be continuous conflict.

- A comprehensive peace process should be resumed to find solutions based on UN resolutions and international legitimacy.

- Lebanon has been pushed back 20 to 30 years, due to the demolishing of the infrastructure of Lebanon, and destruction of hundreds of villages.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

We call on all humanitarian agencies, human rights organizations, peace loving people and international organizations to voice their condemnation of the Israeli aggression on Lebanon and Palestine backed politically and financially by Bush Administration and demand the following:

1. Ask UN General Secretary to establish urgently a comprehensive independent and impartial inquiry into violations of international humanitarian law. It should examine

US HYPOCRISY AND DECEPTION

(from p. 1)

Rev 1, “Prevention of an arms race in outer space,” and L.36, “Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities.”

Madam Chair, there is no arms race in space, and no prospect of an arms race in space. Thus there is no arms control problem for the international community to address. There already exists an extensive and comprehensive system for limiting certain uses of outer space. The existing multilateral outer space arms control regime already deals adequately with the non-weaponization of space.

As stated in our National Space Policy, the United States is committed to the peaceful exploration and use of space by all nations for peaceful purposes. Peaceful purposes can include appropriate defense activities in pursuit of national security and other goals. We take seriously our commit-

VANCOUVER WORLD PEACE FORUM

(from p. 5)

tion camps, and torture chambers. We support the United Nations demands that the US Government close its interrogation and torture center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, release the detainees and vacate this occupied Cuban territory and return it to the people of Cuba.

“We express our solidarity and support for the International Conference Against Foreign Military Bases to be held in Quito Ecuador, March 7-10, 2007.

“We call upon all governments to live up to their United Nations and International treaty obligations to eliminate nuclear arsenals and end all further nuclear weapons development.

“The participants declare their support

in particular the impact of the aggression on civilians with a view to holding individuals responsible for crimes under international law and ensuring that full reparation is provided to the victims.

2. The problem of prisoners and detainees at both sides should be negotiated through UN mediators in a comprehensive way since Israel is capturing and holding Lebanese detainees in its prisons.

3. Provide Lebanon immediately with humanitarian assistance and immediate reconstruction of the war-torn country.

4. The UN international community is asked to exert pressure on the Israeli government to secure financial compensation for the damage and losses caused by the military operations.

5. The withdraw of Israeli troops from all Palestinian and Syrian occupied territories, the complete withdrawal from Lebanese territories including Sheba farms.

6. The complete dismantling of settlements, the demolishing of the apartheid wall, as well as the establishment of independent sovereign Palestinian state with East Jerusalem as its capital. The solution of the issue of the refugees and ensure their return based on UN resolution No. 194

7. The immediate release of all Palestinians and Arab prisoners in Israeli jails.

8. The immediate withdraw of the American army and its allies from/Iraq and recognize the right of all peoples of Lebanon, Palestine, Iraq, Syria, Jordan and other countries who are struggling against the unjust and aggressive military operations of Israel and America and the attempts to implement the US-NATO plan for the “Greater Middle East.” ■

ment to carry on all US activities in the exploration and use of outer space in accordance with international law, including the Outer Space Treaty and the Charter of the United Nations, in the interest of maintaining international peace and security and promoting international cooperation and understanding.

The United States already has a number of efforts under way to help safeguard and improve peaceful uses of outer space for all, including providing information on objects in space through a public domain website. We have led the way in negotiating guidelines for mitigating the dangers to space operations presented by orbital debris. We also have extended assistance to other spacefaring nations by offering help in collision-avoidance.

In short, Madam Chair, we see no reason for international institutions to address a non-existent arms race in outer space.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

for the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter and condemn the attempts of the United States under the guise of “reform” to eliminate the role of the General Assembly and to convert the Security Council into a club of rich imperialist states.

“We demand the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all occupation forces from Iraq, Afghanistan, and Palestine and denounce all military aggression carried out in the name of “humanitarian intervention.”

“We express our solidarity with the 4,500 Canadian and international peace activists from 90 countries attending the World Peace Forum and pledge to unite and intensify our efforts in the fight for peace, and to end imperialist aggression and war.” ■

Notes from Around the WORLD

Greece: Demonstrations in Solidarity with the Peoples of Palestine and Lebanon

At the initiative of the Greek Committee for International Détente and Peace (EEDYE), the All-Workers' Militant Front (PAME), the Federation of Greek Women (OGE) and the Greek Committee for International Democratic Solidarity (EEDDA), dozens of anti-war demonstrations condemning the Israeli barbarity in Palestine and Lebanon were held nationwide, especially in the larger towns and cities. Once or twice a week during the summer, during the Israeli attack on Lebanon, dynamic demonstrations were held, primarily in Athens and Thessalonica, expressing support for and solidarity with the heroic peoples of Lebanon and Palestine. In Athens the protest marches set out from the downtown area and ended at the Israeli Embassy after passing in front of the US Embassy (US support for Israel's murderous attacks on Lebanon and Palestine being well-known).

From the very first moment the Greek peace movement stood in solidarity with the Palestinian and Lebanese peoples and condemned the barbarous acts committed by the Israeli occupation forces on Palestinian territory and in Lebanon, with the unceasing slaughter of civilians, women and children.

The terrorism used by the Israeli government and the imperialists is aimed at striking every type of resistance and at subjugating the peoples of that region. The Israeli army has acted with complete impunity and with the full support of the USA and the EU, which wish to impose their own "solutions" on the Middle East.

The crimes committed by the Israeli Air Force and the use of prohibited types of bombs causing hundreds of casualties amongst the civilian population of Lebanon have angered Greek public opinion. The Greek government has also provoked the indignation of the Greek people, as for the entire duration of the war it kept the same stance vis a vis the perpetrator and the victims, accepting its own share in the guilt and its total subjugation to the commands of the USA and the EU.

The support and solidarity of the Greek anti-imperialist peace movement towards the peoples of Palestine and Lebanon were also expressed through financial aid. Delegations



from EEDYE handed over funds collected for this purpose by peace fighters all over Greece to representatives of the peace movements of Palestine and Lebanon.

The war is over, but on the pretext of offering humanitarian aid and following the relevant UN resolution the forces of imperialism and the EU have set foot in Lebanon. This development is part of the plan of the USA and its allies to dominate the Middle

East under the false title: "Democratization of the Middle East". This plan, which is already being implemented in Iraq, has been set out in a NATO-EU document.

The Greek anti-imperialist peace movement demands that the foreign troops leave Lebanon and that the murderous Israeli attacks on the Palestinians be stopped. It demands that the Palestinian and Lebanese prisoners be released from Israeli prisons

and that the Palestinians acquire their own state with East Jerusalem its capital.

The PLO Condemns the Bloody Attacks against Gaza

The Israeli military forces, for the fifth day, are escalating its vicious attacks on the

town of Beit Hanon and the surroundings. Forty Palestinians from both sexes and all ages are reported dead while more than 200 have been injured. Witnesses add that massive destructions for the infrastructure, houses and mosques in the neighborhoods are still ongoing.

Sadly, the war is launched and -as it has always been the case when it comes to Palestine- the international community is silent at the best. This same community is besieging the Palestinians economically and pressuring them to abandon "violence" and to abide by the world's order and law.

We at the Department of Arab and International Relations do rally behind the appeal by President Mahmoud Abbas to the UN Security Council to interfere and put a halt to the atrocities committed in Gaza Strip. The Israeli troop's immoral crimes would only help to drag the region towards more violence and instability.

We appeal to the Arab and Islamic nations to take the lead and to rise up to their responsibilities in order to stop the Israeli attacks.

We also call the free voices, peace lovers and the humanitarian bodies along the world to take serious and influential stands to help lifting the accumulated pressure and unjust that is practiced on the Palestinians.

*Palestine Liberation Organization
Ramallah — Palestine
November 2006*

GLOBAL NET OF US MILITARY BASES... (from p. 4)

leading to an escalation of armed conflicts and including the neutral state. The Federal Republic of Germany was not released from this obligation of international law, in the case of the war, which began on March 20th, 2003, and in which we see severe violations of international law, by being a member of NATO, which includes also the US and the UK (and other members of the war coalition)."

"Neither the NATO treaty nor the NATO Status of Forces Agreement nor the additional agreements to SOFA oblige the Federal Republic of Germany to support acts of NATO partners that violate international law or the UN Charter."

"A NATO state that prepares and makes war against international law, violates not only the UN Charter but also article I of the NATO treaty. Therein all NATO states are obliged 'in accordance with the statutes of the United Nations to solve every international conflict, in which they take part, with peaceful means, so that the international peace and the security and justice are not endangered and to abstain from every threat or use of violence, which is not in the framework of the goals of the United Nations.' This means also that a war, which is not justified by article 51 of the UN Charter, also cannot represent or justify a 'NATO case of alliance' according to Art. 5 of the NATO treaty."

"A war of aggression by a NATO state, prohibited by the UN Charter, cannot become a war of defence by declaring the 'NATO case of alliance.'"

According to the additional agreements to SOFA, the US and UK have to ask the German government for allowance "if their military planes — outside the framework of NATO — use the German air space or airfields given for their disposal for transport of troops, deployed in the US or UK, for stopover, refuelling or taking material or weapons on board on their way without NATO mandate to the war theatre outside the NATO area." Therefore the concerned German authorities, especially the German government, have the legal right in a case of conflict to control, if the deployed military forces use the yielded facilities (and the air space above) in every case only for "duties of defence" according to the additional

agreements to SOFA and the NATO treaty, or use or prepare them for other activities." The German government has to start and take "all necessary measures to hinder that actions and support for war in violation of international law are initiated from the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany. One more reason for this is Article 2 of the treaty, concerning the final regulations about Germany (so called Two-Plus-Four Treaty), which was adopted as part of the framework for German reunification. This was the essential basis for establishment of the German union of states. By this treaty Germany is obliged by international law to take care "that only peace comes from German territory."

Secret Agreements are Invalid

"This is also valid for the case of secret agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the US and the UK, which are not registered and published by the Secretary of the United Nations in spite of Art. 102 of the UN Charter and which might foresee different arrangements in the case of a military conflict. Independent from the validity of such secret agreements, Article 103 of the UN Charter, has to be fulfilled strictly. It says: 'In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.'"

Indeed there seems to be such a secret agreement between the German government and the US. This was mentioned in a radio broadcast with author Albrecht Müller, who worked in former German governments. He said that at the time of German reunification the US government was very anxious to give up their military bases in Germany, but that Chancellor Kohl made a secret agreement with the US that they could use their bases for any reasons they wanted at any time. I heard the same from the former member of the German government Oskar Lafontaine at a conference in January 2006 in Berlin. He said that Germany in this sense is not a sovereign country like France.

This explains why the US was allowed use of its German bases for the illegal war against Iraq.

Another violation of international law is

the deployment of nuclear weapons in Germany. This is forbidden by the NPT and the advisory opinion of the International Court from July 8th, 1996.

Generally international law and the constitution are broken by the SOFA and additional agreements.

Nuclear Sharing within NATO

In Europe the US have deployed 480 nuclear bombs in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Italy and Turkey. The NATO still follows the "doctrine of first use." In the strategy concept of NATO nuclear weapons still have an important role. But the deployment of US nuclear bombs in countries that don't have own nuclear bombs, is a violation of international law (NPT treaty) and also prohibited by the advisory opinion of the International Court from July, 8th, 1996.

Abandonment of Sovereignty and Justice

In every SOFA the uncontrolled entering of US soldiers into the host nations is guaranteed. So the military bases are de facto extraterritorial areas. So the 93 states which have agreed on SOFAs have abandoned a part of their sovereignty and given a carte blanche to the US. The US can commit all types of crimes, violations of international law, and the Geneva conventions. In every SOFA there is a paragraph that no US soldier may be sent to the new International Criminal Court. So we see an erosion of the Charter of the United Nations and other international law. Every year there are new wars and new pretexts are invented.

How to Get Rid of the Military Bases

Only very seldom does the US give up military bases. This happened of course after wars in North Korea and Vietnam. But there are also other examples. In 1991, after much protest, the US had to leave the military bases in the Philippines. In 2002 the US had to give up their shooting and bombing range in Vieques in Puerto Rico after many people had occupied the territory for several months.

In 2004 in Henoko (Okinawa) people occupied the construction ground for a "heliport" for 500 days and forced the government of the US and Japan to new negotiations.

Unfortunately both governments agreed in May 2006 to intensified military cooperation and also for a "heliport". So this struggle goes on.

On November 21, 2005 the last US soldier left the airbase of Karshi-Khanabad (Uzbekistan). The US had used this airbase after September 11, 2001. But then the "Shanghai Cooperation Organisation" (SCO) was established by China, Russia, Kasachstan, Kirgisias, Tadschikistan, and Uzbekistan. The SCO forced the US to leave Uzbekistan.

A strong and enduring resistance of the people or a union of states is needed to get rid of military bases.

After several wars there have been official and unofficial tribunals about war crimes. It is far better to hinder the training for wars of aggression. That means we have to close all foreign military bases in our countries and we must hinder our own military forces from training with weapons of aggression.

And all politicians who violated the charter of the United Nations and other international law and the constitutions of their own countries must be punished by national and international courts.

The world conference in Ecuador in 2007 is of utmost importance to foster these goals. As before in Cuba in November 2005, the World Peace Council encourages all members to join the conference and to become active against foreign military bases.

1. The number of 703 U.S. military bases located in other people's countries is from the Office of the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense (Installations and Environment), Base Structure Report (A Summary of DoD's Real Property Inventory) (Washington, DC: Department of Defense, 2003), www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2003/basestructure2003.pdf. The figure for 2001 was 725. For details and analysis of these reports, see Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), pp. 151-60. The figure 703 seriously underestimates the actual number since it omits secret intelligence bases, those disguised by national identities (e.g., Royal Air Force bases in Britain), those omitted in order to avoid embarrassment to foreign governments, and most of the bases in the Balkans, Persian Gulf, and Central Asia acquired in recent American wars.

2. Rachel Cornwell and Andrew Wells, "Deploying Insecurity," *Peace Review* 11:3 (1999), p. 410.

US Government Seeks Confrontation — The World Wants Peace Canadian Peace Congress Press Release, October 13, 2006

Don Currie, Canadian Peace Congress

The Canadian Peace Congress calls upon Prime Minister Harper to oppose all proposals for a military attack on Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and to work in the UN for a policy of de-escalation of tensions and a diplomatic solution. The way out of the crisis is the resumption of direct talks between the US and North Korea.

Support for President Bush's Korean policy is the road to war. The Bush administration faced with possible defeat in the November Congressional elections, and seeking a pretext to divert world attention from the US debacle in Iraq has seized on a nuclear weapon test by the DPRK and raised it to the level of an international crisis. The US did not threaten war against Pakistan, India and Israel when these states acquired nuclear weapons.

The Bush Administration's policy towards the DPRK is regime change. Branding North Korea as part of an "axis of evil," the Bush Administration demands a free hand to punish a member state of the United Nations by economic blockade and war. At the same time, the US administration declares the DPRK has no right to self-defense. Given such options, it is not surprising that the DPRK has resorted to nuclear weapons tests.

The world needs peace, not another war. The US policy of regime change has resulted in the deaths of 655,000 Iraqis. A nuclear war on the Korean Peninsula would bring untold suffering to the people of both North and South Korea. Nuclear disarmament is the best guarantee of security and the most firm basis for an enduring peace.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) are important international agreements to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. To prevent the use of nuclear weapons existing nuclear weapons stockpiles must be reduced and eliminated. A powerful and united worldwide peace movement is needed to make that happen.

The policy of all US administrations has been to maintain nuclear weapons supremacy. The policy was established in August 1945 when President Harry Truman ordered atomic bombs to be dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Bush Administration continues that policy.

The Bush Administration withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM) to be free of constraints in its Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) program. The ABM treaty is now defunct.

The NPT dating from 1968 and signed by 189 states was intended to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons to countries not possessing them and was extended indefinitely in 2003 with a solemn agreement among the major nuclear powers to accelerate efforts to reduce the numbers of nuclear weapons. The US Bush administration backed

out of the acceleration commitment.

The Clinton administration signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) but the US Republican dominated Senate refused to ratify it because the US was heavily engaged in the production and testing of tactical nuclear weapons of the bunker busting type which it has plans for using against Iran. The US has to this day not ratified CTBT.

The current frenzy of condemnation of the DPRK by the major nuclear lacks credibility. The US, Russia, France, Great Britain, China, India and Pakistan and Israel to 1990 conducted 530 nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere or under water and 1,522 tests underground. The US alone to 1992 conducted 1,032 tests. The 1998 tests by India and Pakistan took place in defiance of the NPT. Israel has conducted secret tests and is reported to have a nuclear stockpile greater than Britain, including the long-range missile system to deliver them throughout the Middle East. Nuclear weapons development, testing and deployment by the US and Israel have proceeded without any IAEA oversight. The use by NATO of depleted uranium in shells and bombs has wreaked havoc on the lives and territory of the former Yugoslavia, and now Iraq and Afghanistan.

Twelve thousand nuclear warheads are deployed (in active service) with 90% of these weapons in the hands of the US and Russia. The total of both deployed and non-deployed nuclear weapons number 27,000. Thousands of nuclear weapons are on hair trigger alert defined as readiness to fire as early warning systems activate launch-on-warning. Hair trigger alert is fraught with dangers of false warnings.

It is clear to all, except for an ideologically blinded minority, that the DPRK is not decisive in eliminating the nuclear threat from the world. The major nuclear powers are. In the first place, it is the US and NATO that is driving the current renewal of the nuclear arms race by the development and deployment of BMD and tactical nuclear weapons. The US maintains a first strike nuclear policy and includes in its military doctrine the use of nuclear weapons against states that do not possess them. The US deploys nuclear weapons offensively outside its own territory from foreign military bases aimed at states it deems to be adversaries such as the DPRK and Iran.

The hue and cry about an alleged threat to the US by the DPRK drips with hypocrisy. The U.S. has 30,000 troops in South Korea and has recently conducted military maneuvers aimed at the DPRK involving 120,000 US and South Korean forces, armed with nuclear weapons. The people of Korea remember that US General Douglas Macarthur, called for the use of atomic weapons against the DPRK and China, during the Korean war of 1950, a scant

five years after President Truman ordered atomic bombs to be dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Adhering to the terms of the defeat of Japanese forces in Korea at the end of the war in the Pacific, the USSR withdrew all of its forces from the Korean Peninsula in 1947. The US is still there, claiming it has "strategic interests" in the area.

The US seeks to prolong its military presence in South Korea to maintain a powerful nuclear equipped military force in proximity to China. The US has nuclear weapons in South Korea, on the US Pacific Fleet and at huge air bases near Tokyo and on the island of Okinawa. The presence of US bases has resulted in large peace movements in both Japan and South Korea demanding the removal of all US military forces from the region.

The US is opposed to détente between North and South Korea. The process of North South détente began in 1985 when the DPRK acceded to the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and signed a Joint Declaration with South Korea on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. That process was halted when the US accused the DPRK of engaging in the production of weapons grade plutonium and imposed economic sanctions.

Pressure from the Korean people restarted negotiations between DPRK and the US in 1994 and the DPRK agreed once again to freeze its nuclear program, accede to IAEA inspections, rejoin the NPT and agree to a treaty on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including the dismantling of its nuclear plants. The DPRK demanded formal assurances from the US that it would not use nuclear threats against the DPRK and the US would help finance light- water reactors to supply two 1000 MW plants and supply heavy oil to ease the energy needs of the DPRK domestic economy. The agreement would include easing trade restrictions and lead to formal diplomatic relations.

The election of the Bush Administration, and its infamous declaration that North Korea was part of an "Axis of Evil" that included Iran and Syria, effectively destroyed the diplomatic process. The US reneged on its agreements, and the DPRK reverted to a military defensive posture and declared on February 2005 that it possessed nuclear weapons.

The Bush policy of regime change, confrontation, nuclear supremacy leads to war. Another policy is needed to achieve peace. The Canadian Peace Congress joins in solidarity with all peace forces who assert that isolation of the DPRK, sanctions, military threats will lead to a deeper crisis and possible nuclear war. The process of negotiations based on respect for the sovereignty and rights and security of the DPRK, can lead to a reduction of tensions and avoidance of conflict. That is what we expect our Government to work for. ■



World Peace Council

10 Othonos Str.
10557 Athens, Greece