

# MEDIA EDUCATION FOUNDATION

60 Masonic St. Northampton, MA 01060 | TEL 800.897.0089 | info@mediaed.org | www.mediaed.org

## *Hijacking Catastrophe*

9/11, Fear & the Selling of American Empire

Transcript

## INTRODUCTION

**ARI FLEISHER:** They have weapons of mass destruction; that is what this war was about.

**ARI FLEISHER:** Saddam Hussein possesses biological and chemical weapons,

**ARI FLEISHER:** We know for a fact, there are weapons there.

**ARI FLEISHER:** You've heard the president say it repeatedly, that Saddam has chemical and biological weapons.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Saddam Hussein has chemical and biological weapons, and he is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles. High strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Thousands of tons of chemical agents, 500 tons of serin, mustard and VX nerve agent.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** He continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa.

**DICK CHENEY:** There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction.

**ARI FLEISHER:** They have weapons of mass destruction that is what this war was about.

**DICK CHENEY:** There is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies and us.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction.

**ARI FLEISHER:** They have weapons of mass destruction that is what this war was about.

**DAN RATHER:** Where are Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction? Former chief weapons inspector David Kay said last week quote “we were all wrong about Saddam’s weapons of mass destruction”. By now the world knows there was a massive intelligence failure on the war in Iraq. President Bush and other countries....

**JULIAN BOND (Narrator):** The failure to find Saddam Hussein's alleged weapons of mass destruction has raised serious questions about the legitimacy and legality of the ongoing war in Iraq. But as both American and Iraqi casualties escalate and as the conflict becomes more chaotic and deadly by the day, debate within the United States continues to focus narrowly on whether American intelligence agencies provided accurate enough information to justify going to war. In the process, a larger question has been all but ignored. If the war was not about weapons of mass destruction, what is it really about?

**SOLDIER:** I keep asking the question of why and how. Does this incident even have a purpose?

**JULIAN BOND:** Pursuing this question forces us to consider a different story. It is a story that begins as the Cold War ends. A story about a group of self identified radical conservatives at the right wing extreme of the Republican Party. A group of intellectuals and policy makers who saw the fall of the Soviet Union and communism not as a opportunity to scale back America’s Cold War military machine, but as an opportunity to build up its size and scale, to use military force more aggressively and unilaterally, to construct a new unchallenged American empire.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** It’s this kind of ideology that has grown up in the wake of the Cold War -- propounded quite openly by what we are calling neoconservatives in America -- that identifies the United States as a colossus athwart the world, a new Rome, beyond good and evil. We no longer need friends. We don’t need international law. Like the old Roman phrase, it doesn’t matter whether they love us or not, so long as they fear us.

## **CHAPTER 1: Blueprint for Empire**

**CHIEF JUSTICE REHNQUIST:** Repeat after me. I, George Walker Bush, do solemnly swear...

**JULIAN BOND:** When George W. Bush took office in 2000, he brought with him some of the most conservative foreign policy voices in the Republican Party. Chief among them were Vice President Dick Cheney, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and Deputy Secretary for Defense Paul Wolfowitz, all of whom had served together previously during the administrations of Ronald Reagan and George H.W Bush. Paul Wolfowitz, in particular, had long been

recognized as the intellectual force behind a radical neo conservative fringe of the Republican Party. For years, Wolfowitz had been advancing the idea that the United States should reconsider its commitments to international treaties, international law, and multilateral organizations such as the United Nations.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** You know, this is not just a Republican takeover, this is a very specific wing of the Republican Party. It's neoconservative. It's unilateralist. It doesn't believe in the rule of law. It doesn't believe that you have to tell the public the truth.

**NOAM CHOMSKY:** They happen to be an extremely arrogant, dangerous group of reactionary statist. They're not conservatives.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** They have a political agenda with regards to foreign policy that they had been working on for years and years and writing about this and saying this is the post-Cold War vision. This is our post-Cold War vision for American power.

**NORMAN MAILER:** Ever since the Cold War ended there were people who were fuming on the right thinking this is the golden opportunity now that Russia's out of the way for America to take over the world. We're not doing anything about it. Those damn liberals, those softheads, are keeping us from doing what is our godly mission.

**JULIAN BOND:** A radical plan for American military domination first surfaced during the administration of George H. W. Bush. In 1992, Paul Wolfowitz, working in the Department of Defense, was asked to write the first draft of a new national security strategy- a document entitled "The Defense Planning Guidance." The most controversial elements of what would later come to be known as the Wolfowitz Doctrine were that the United States should dramatically increase defense spending, that it should be willing to take pre-emptive military action, and that it should be willing to use military force unilaterally -- with or without allies. This new reliance on military force was necessary, according to Wolfowitz, to prevent the emergence of any future or potential rivals to American power, and to secure access to vital resources, especially Persian Gulf Oil.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** This caused uproar when it was leaked and the Europeans got upset and people like Colin Powell and George Herbert Walker Bush and even Cheney said 'this is kind of out there, guys. You've got to tone that down because the end of the Cold War isn't necessarily a green light for us to go ballistic in building up our military and pushing countries around using the sword rather than diplomacy.' But these guys never let go of that.

**JULIAN BOND:** Out of power during the Clinton presidency, Wolfowitz and his colleagues affiliated themselves with a number of influential conservative think tanks. In 2000, they would craft yet another proposed national security strategy. This one published by a right wing think tank calling itself the Project for the New American Century. At its core the document revived the Wolfowitz Doctrine. It called on the United States to increase the military budget by up to 100 billion dollars, to deny other nations the use of outer space, and to adopt a more aggressive

and unilateral foreign policy that would allow the United States to act offensively and preemptively in the world. The elimination of states like Iraq figured prominently in this grand vision.

**IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN:** They were coming out against the policy of every American president from Nixon to Clinton to even George Bush in his first year. They wanted to change that.

**JULIAN BOND:** But even these hard-line conservatives knew that the Wolfowitz Doctrine was likely too radical to win the support of the foreign policy establishment, their own Republican Party, and the American people. In their defining document, written in September of 2000, a full year before 9/11, they acknowledged that the process of transformation, even if it brings revolutionary change, is likely to be a long one -- absent, in their own chilling words some 'catastrophic and catalyzing event, like a new Pearl Harbor'. One year later, that event would arrive.

Audio/video montage:

The towers appear to crumble and start to fall. I didn't look anymore after that. I turned, and I started to run. Everyone ran. People just took off and ducked into doorways... I couldn't breathe at all; I find it really hard to talk. It's just a huge cloud of smoke. We have an airplane that crashed into the Pentagon...

**ROBERT JENSEN:** After 9/11 we have a very clear experience of what terrorism is and people should feel afraid. The question is what policies will make us more safe? So the fear is legitimate but it is manipulated and that's the core of the Bush policy, to manipulate that fear.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** There will be no going back to the era before September the 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 - to false comfort in a dangerous world.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** I've been a born New Yorker all my life. I've lived here all my life, so for me it was a powerful, personal event. What I remember, what I think it taught, of course my first reaction was fear, anger, rage, vengeance. I think all of us who are human have that reaction. The question for all of us is what we remember and what we do with the memories. What is the lesson, what does it tell, what does it teach? For the President, it teaches the lesson of the axis of evil.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** It teaches the lesson that America has enemies- secret, dangerous enemies that have to be taken out.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists and every government that supports them.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** It teaches the lesson that we can never be weak, that we have to flex our muscles at every turn.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** We will fight with the full force and might of the United States Military.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** That's one kind of lesson. It creates a politics of fear.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** We have every reason to assume the worst.

## **CHAPTER 2: Hijacking Fear**

**NORMON SOLOMON:** If you look at, say, FDR saying 'the only thing you have to fear is fear itself,' a kind of tacit counterpoint to that from the Bush administration after 9/11 was 'the only thing you have to fear is not enough fear'.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** We still have a dangerous world, and that's very important for, I think the people understand where I'm coming from, to know that this is a dangerous world.

**DONALD RUMSFELD:** We discuss the need to prepare for a full range of asymmetric threats including terrorism, cyber attacks, advanced conventional weapons, cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, and certainly weapons of mass destruction.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** This is a gang that needs people to be afraid. It's a gang that can't have any political success whatsoever in a state of tranquility and peace of mind.

**SHEPARD SMITH:** Tom Ridge convinced terrorists will try to hit America.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** The politics of fear that this administration has deployed in trying to respond to terrorism has itself in some ways been much more dangerous than terrorism itself and this administration has been, I think, responsible for inciting the very terror that it was the terrorist's purpose to incite in America.

**SHEPARD SMITH:** Code orange plus! The Fed's decision to raise the terror alert to high, America on high alert. From biggest cities to the smallest towns.

**SCOTT RITTER:** Red, yellow, orange, we're afraid, be afraid. What level of fear? The government can program that without any justification. You know, we have an intelligence report. The terrorists are about to attack. Who? We don't know. Where? We don't know. What? We don't know. But you tell us so now we're afraid.

**SHEPARD SMITH:** A Connecticut man wrapping his family's 19<sup>th</sup> century farmhouse in plastic, sealing it in duct tape.

**SCOTT RITTER:** Then, in the same breath, while the smoke is still rising out of the ruins of the World Trade Center and out of the Pentagon, we're told that this has gone beyond simply 19 men hijacking 4 airplanes. This has turned into a global conspiracy against the United States that must be confronted militarily.

**PAUL WOLFOWITZ:** One has to say it's not just simply a matter of capturing people and holding them accountable but removing the sanctuaries, removing the support systems, ending states who sponsor terrorism.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** We're too great a nation to allow the evil-doers to affect our soul.

**MARK DANNER:** The decision was made within the administration to take this event, to take the struggle against Al Qaeda and make it into a full-fledged struggle against good and evil.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Either you're with us, or you're with the terrorists.

**MARK DANNER:** The important thing to remember here is that one didn't have to put it in these terms. One didn't have to say 'if you're not for us, on our side, you're on the side of the terrorists.' That was not a necessary response. That was a chosen response.

**JULIAN BOND:** Within a year of 9/11, in a charged climate of fear, anxiety, and lingering outrage over the attacks on the World Trade Center, George W. Bush traveled to West Point to announce the basic elements of his own new national security strategy. Invoking the memory of the 9/11 terror attacks, he made the Wolfowitz Doctrine official US policy. In the process, setting the stage for a US invasion of Iraq.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** We must take the battle to the enemy, disrupt his plans, and confront the worst threats before they emerge.

**JULIAN BOND:** It was a brazen announcement that the United States now officially rejected article 51 of the UN charter, a cornerstone of international law enacted after WWII and used to convict Nazis of war crimes at the Nuremberg Trials, a law designed explicitly to prevent nations from using military force, to advance their own sense of national and moral superiority, and to prevent the kind of unprovoked so-called pre-emptive wars of aggression that ravaged the world over the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** And our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for pre-emptive action.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** It moves, for the first time in its history, it moves the United States outside of the compass of international law, away from article 51 of the United Nations Charter,

and says in effect that the United States will make war at a time and place of its choosing against enemies that it declares its enemies based on its own perception of what the threats are.

**JULIAN BOND:** It was hailed as a new strategy but it was based on old ideas. It marked the culmination of a relentless campaign by radical conservatives to change the very nature of American foreign policy, to use unrivaled American military power to shape the globe and the 21<sup>st</sup> century itself in the image of the United States -- to create, in their own words, 'a new American century'.

**ZIA MIAN:** And this is a strange notion actually that people think that the whole world, because we all live in the same time, it's 2003 for everybody, it will be 2004 for everybody, but that America has no territorial bounds, but that actually time belongs to America.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** They want the USA to outdo all previous empires, not in its longevity but in its permanence, which, for all their work in college, and all their wide reading, is an insane program. What does it have to do with the Constitution? What does it have to do with democracy? What does it have to do with the pursuit of happiness? Nothing. It's about power. It's about domination. It's about control of dwindling resources.

### **CHAPTER 3: Things Related and Not: From 9/11 to Baghdad**

**JODY WILLIAMS:** I understand that they want the American public to believe that the invasion of Iraq was the response to September 11<sup>th</sup>. I think it is a lie. I believe that it's a part of a neo-conservative agenda to assert that American hegemony is untouchable. And September 11<sup>th</sup> gave them the opportunity to put in play the plans that they had been considering since the first Bush administration.

**JULIAN BOND:** In all of its previous incarnations, and long before 9/11 and the current war on terror, the Wolfowitz Doctrine had identified regime change in Iraq as a crucial first step toward global domination by force. In a widely circulated letter to President Bill Clinton in 1998, the members of the Project for the New American Century challenged the President to act forcefully and militarily to remove Saddam Hussein from power. Two years later, George W. Bush would hand pick many of these same neo-conservatives for key foreign policy posts in the Pentagon and the state department. Once installed in government positions, as recent interviews with a number of former members of the Bush administration have revealed, the group maintained its long-standing focus on Iraq, a focus that intensified after the attacks of September 11<sup>th</sup>.

**MARK DANNER:** In meetings of the inner sanctum of the Bush Administration the attack on Iraq was brought up from almost the first days, even though there was no evidence whatever that the Iraqis had been involved in this.



**RICHARD CLARKE** (60 Minutes clip): The president dragged me into a room with a couple of other people, shut the door, and said ‘I want you to find whether Iraq did this’. George W. Bush wanted me to come back with a report that said that Iraq did this.

**PAUL O’NEILL** (60 Minutes clip): In the very beginning, there was a conviction that Saddam Hussein was a bad person and that he needed to go.

**JULIAN BOND**: Just five hours after American Airlines flight 77 struck the Pentagon, and without any evidence linking Saddam Hussein to the attacks of 9/11, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was already ordering his aides to draw up plans for striking Iraq. The notes quote Rumsfeld as saying he wanted “best info fast.” “Judge whether good enough, hit S.H.” meaning Saddam Hussein. “Go massive,” Rumsfeld continued in the notes, “Sweep it all up, things related and not”.

**ROBERT JENSEN**: The problem for the Bush Administration was that plans which already existed for regime change in Iraq had to be justified. They couldn’t just go in without public support. The public support was created by connecting Saddam Hussein to those fears of terrorism, the fear generated by 9/11; the fear of terrorist networks has to be transferred to Iraq. That is the American people have to learn to be as afraid of Saddam Hussein as they are of Osama Bin Laden.

**JULIAN BOND**: Soon after September 11<sup>th</sup>, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld set up a small intelligence office in the Pentagon – the Office of Special Plans -- to create the rationales for the already planned attack on Iraq, to convince people that Saddam Hussein possessed Weapons of Mass Destruction, and that he was linked to Al Qaeda and 9/11.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI**: worked in the Pentagon’s Near East and South Asia office. She witnessed how the Office of Special Plans issued talking points about Iraq for senior government officials allegedly based on intelligence.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI**: The information there-drawn from fact. You could find bits and pieces of fact throughout. But framed, articulated, crafted to convince someone of what, well, of things that weren’t true, of things that weren’t true: 9/11, Al Qaeda related to Saddam Hussein possibly some involvement there.

**GEORGE W. BUSH**: The liberation of Iraq is a crucial advance in the campaign against terror. We’ve removed an ally of Al Qaeda.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI**: The very things that, a year later, President Bush himself denies, and feigns his surprise ‘I don’t know why everybody thinks that’.

**GEORGE W. BUSH**: We’ve had no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with September the 11<sup>th</sup>.



**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** Well, I worked in a place where they concentrated on preparing this story line and selling it to everyone that they could possibly sell it to.

**ROBERT JENSEN:** It wasn't a failure of intelligence. It was the manipulation of intelligence to achieve a political goal. They were disciplined. They stayed on message. They marshaled all of their forces in a relentless public relations campaign to convince the American people that there was a threat from Iraq.

**REPORTER:** It's day four of the Bush team's full-court press. Giving speech after speech after speech, and issuing reports.

**DONALD RUMSFELD:** The United States knows that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction. Any country on the face of the earth with an active intelligence program knows that Iraq has weapons of mass destruction.

**DICK CHENEY:** There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt that he is amassing them to use against our friends, against our allies, and against us.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** The choice is his. And if he does not disarm, the United States of America will lead a coalition and disarm him in the name of peace.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** Out of the President's mouth, the Vice President's mouth. The same things that were being given to us to put in our superiors, our senior civilian leadership's mouths. These things were not based on intelligence that we saw, that everyone saw. They were based on a very selective reading of the intelligence and then a creative packaging such that you could push through these two big points that the president and the vice president and the whole neo-conservative community used to justify this preemptive war on Iraq.

**COLIN POWELL:** Less than a teaspoon full of dry anthrax in an envelope shut down the United States senate in the fall of 2001.

**DANIEL ELLSBERG:** Their policy depends on deception and secrecy, like every imperial policy in history. Even dictatorships have taken great efforts always to disguise what they are doing and why they are doing it to their own people.

**SCOTT RITTER:** This was never about weapons. This was always about getting Saddam Hussein; and even in the most recent spin-up of this whole weapons issue, the Bush administration knew that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq; yet they continue to use the inspection process as a vehicle to achieve the ultimate goal and objective of regime change.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** These guys should be brought up on charges. There should be an investigation about whether these guys should be allowed to serve our country anymore. Because

to me it's criminal to say, we're going to send our troops to war based on falsified intelligence, based on puffed up and exaggerated details.

**JULIAN BOND:** So successful was the propaganda campaign, that by 2003 polls were showing that the vast majority of Americans believed the unfounded claims that Saddam Hussein was linked to 9/11; and that he possessed stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction. Beliefs that allowed the administration to frame an invasion of Iraq as a non-aggressive justified act of self-defense under international law. Rather than an offensive action designed to extend U.S. empire.

**DANIEL ELLSBERG:** In this case, I would say that we've been lied into this as blatantly as we were lied into Viet Nam. This was a purely aggressive, illegal crime against the peace. And they were trying to give it some color of legality, and that has now fallen to the ground.

**NORMON SOLOMON:** Robert Jackson, the justice from the U.S. Supreme Court, who went to Norenberg in 1945, made it very clear that the Nazi leaders were being put on trial not because they lost but because they launched an aggressive war, and he described it as a crime against humanity that had no possible justification.

**TARIQ ALI:** Contrary to the lies told to the American people Iraq had absolutely no connections to 9/11. Al Qaeda was despised by the regime in Iraq, which was a secular regime not interested in religion as such. But they still wanted to go for it. And so they delayed it. They went into Afghanistan first, and then they decided to go for Iraq. Now why did they decide to go for Iraq, that's the interesting question.

## CHAPTER 4: Empire

**DICK CHENEY** [Fox News Report]: America and our coalition took down the regime in a matter of weeks because of our superior technology, the unmatched skill of our armed forces. Above all, because we came as conquerors not as—because we came not as conquerors but as liberators.

**NORMON MAILER:** And I think the whole business with Iraq is a terribly sour comedy, abstracted down to its smallest motives. But what was there was the sense that Iraq had to be invaded because it was the first step in going toward American empire.

**ROBERT JENSEN:** There's no doubt that Saddam Hussein was a tyrant, a thug, a butcher. It's true. It was as true in 2003 as it was in 1983-84 when Donald Rumsfeld visited Iraq and met with Saddam Hussein and other top officials as an emissary of the Reagan administration to improve ties to Iraq. It was true in 1988 when Saddam gassed the Kurdish people in the north of Iraq with the implicit support of the United States. The United States was unconcerned with the fate of the Shiite in the South of Iraq in 1991 when after the Gulf War ended the U.S. allowed Saddam Hussein to very brutally put down the uprising that the United States had encouraged. In other words, the United States has consistently supported Saddam Hussein throughout the worst

of his crimes when his policy was consistent with U.S. interests in the area. The minute that those interests changed, then Saddam Hussein became the center of evil in the world.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Saddam Hussein's regime is a grave and gathering danger.

**ROBERT JENSEN:** This is the way propaganda is used. To motivate a public to support a war that is really not about liberating anyone, but about extending and deepening American control.

**JODY WILLIAMS:** We support democracy when it's convenient to the interests of the United States of America. And maybe I am an idealist when I believe that there should be some sort of standard for determining how we conduct our foreign policy, but I believe there should be a standard. We are seen in the world as hypocrites, we're seen as liars, we're seen as an imperialist power.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** What they're trying to do is have an Iraq that is a friend to us, not an Iraq that is liberated. That is totally bogus. We never intended to liberate Iraqi people. We intended to liberate Iraq from Saddam, and have a footprint, a military footprint there. We'd have done that now. We have Kuwait, we have fifth fleet in Bahrain, we have a nice base in Qatar, but it's a little too far south. And what do we have, we have four bases in Iraq, beautiful bases. We can hit Syria, we can hit Iran, we can keep tabs on Afghanistan. There's all kinds of things we can do from those bases.

**STAN GOFF:** The larger picture is being driven by the fact that we are about to hit peak oil worldwide. That there is this sort of emerging global competition between us and China. There's the ongoing economic rivalries between us and Europe, so southwest Asia becomes geopolitically a linchpin.

**MICHAEL KLARE:** I think they're much more interested in overall domination, in playing the world policeman, of using force when they see it necessary, and behind that I think there is a strategy of predation, that the world has to be made safe for the procurement of resources that are needed by the United States, especially oil, wherever they are.

**MAX WOLFF:** I mean, the idea is, if you want to have real leverage, or control in the future of global economy; if you can sit back and control the tap for natural gas mostly, and oil secondly, but very importantly, that will give you enormous strategic power in the world.

**MICHAEL KLARE:** One way you see this interconnection between anti-terrorism and oil is the increasing focus on the protection of pipelines. It may be not something that Americans think about so much, but more and more oil is coming from inaccessible places and they have to flow from pipelines. Pipelines are a natural target for saboteurs and terrorists, and so more and more American Military policy is going to be focused on the protection of these very vulnerable facilities.

**VANDANA SHIVA:** The war in Iraq was very, very clearly about oil as well as the invasion of Afghanistan also. The oil pipeline that was planned, the best security for that was an occupation of Afghanistan.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** If you map the pipeline, the proposed pipeline route across Afghanistan, and you look at our bases, it matches perfectly. Our bases are there to solve a problem that Taliban could not solve. Taliban couldn't provide security in that part of Afghanistan, well now that's where our bases are. So does that have anything to do with Osama Bin Laden? It has nothing to do with Osama Bin Laden. It has everything to do with a longer plan and in this case, a strategy, which I wouldn't necessarily call "neo-conservative." However, it fits perfectly in with the neo-conservative ideology, which says, if you have military force, and you need something from a weaker country, then you need to deploy that force and take what you need, because you country's needs are paramount. It's the whole idea of unilateralism, of about using force to achieve your aims.

**MICHAEL KLARE:** All of this on one hand describes as part of an anti-terrorist strategy, but underlying it is this blueprint, this Cheney blueprint for increasing the American's access to and control over the rest of the world's oil.

**ROBERT JENSEN:** The context is the desire of the United States to control these strategically crucial regions. The pre-text, that is the excuse for going in, in Afghanistan, was about terrorism and Osama Bin Laden. In Iraq, it's about weapons of mass destruction and Saddam Hussein. But in the end, neither one of those wars was really about those people or those regimes. It was about securing and solidifying American control over these incredibly important regions of the world.

**SOLDIER** [to a reporter]: We just pulled out here yesterday, just to come out and help protect the oil line. In a tank.

**IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN:** So yeah, they're interested in oil, but that's a middle-run interest. Their immediate goal is intimidation. So when people say, for example, which is very frequent, it's all about oil. Of course oil is important, and of course we want control of oil, but oil isn't enough to explain a war on Iraq.

**TARIQ ALI:** The major reason to take Iraq was a display of imperial power. It was to show both the Arab world, but not just them, but to show Europe and the far eastern block, China and the Koreans, who was master.

**COL. GERRY CROWDER** [news clip]: To make it so apparent, and so overwhelming at the very outset of potential military operations, that the adversary quickly realizes that there is no real alternative here other than to fight and die, or to give up.

**DONALD RUMSFELD** [news clip]: What will follow will not be a repeat of any other conflict, it will be of a force, and scope and scale that has been beyond what has been seen before.

Shock & Awe montage over news commentary:

**REPORTER:** It had been planned for months. And now, one day after that first air strike, the Pentagon's "Shock and Awe" campaign is under way. The idea, to blitz the capital with bombs, to stun the Iraqis into a quick surrender.

This is the beginning of the "Shock and Awe" campaign according to one official. This is going to be the entire nine yards.

It was a breathtaking display of firepower.

And the Pentagon says, "We 'ain't seen nothing yet."

**REPORTER:** We keep talking about this overwhelming force that we are prepared to use, I'm wondering are you concerned at all that we will be seen as a bully?

**JULIAN BOND:** While it may have appeared to American TV viewers that "Shock and Awe" was merely a catchy media label for the U.S. bombing campaign in Iraq, its actual origins, and a whole theory of warfare, are found in a 1996 advisory report published by the National Defense University. Authored by Harlan Ullman of the National War College, it argues that the aim of modern warfare is not merely to achieve military victory, but also, by means of sheer intimidation to inflict a deep psychological injury, to scare and terrorize potential rivals into submission. It is, in effect, the practical application of the Wolfowitz Doctrine of global domination through force. Describing shock and awe as "massively destructive strikes directly at the public will," Ullman writes, "intimidation and compliance are the outputs we seek to obtain. The intent here is to impose a regime of shock and awe through delivery of instant, nearly incomprehensible, levels of massive destruction directed at influencing society writ large." "Through very selective, utterly brutal and ruthless and rapid application of force to intimidate," Ullman continues, "The aim is to affect the will, perception, and understanding of the adversary. Without senses, the adversary becomes impotent and entirely vulnerable."

**NOAM CHOMSKY:** The reasons for the extreme hostility and fear that quickly rose all over the world were not just the invasion of Iraq, but the fact that the invasion was understood to be an action taken to demonstrate that this program for global domination by force, and crushing of any potential challenge, was meant extremely seriously.

## CHAPTER 5: Sorrows of Empire

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** Fear and terror are terrorism's means. Fear is terrorism's turf. America's turf is democracy, the open society, pluralism, an unwillingness to be scared into submission, scared out of its liberties, scared out of its multiculturalism.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Today, the Justice Department did issue a blanket alert. It was in recognition of a general threat we received. This is not the first time the Justice Department have acted like this. I hope it's the last. But given the attitude of the evildoers, it may not be.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** The danger since 9/11 has not been the damage of the 9/11 strikes themselves, but the damage we have done to ourselves on the way to try to "protect ourselves."

**SCOTT RITTER:** What did we see in the aftermath of September 11, 2001? Immediate action on all fronts. The patriot act was passed here in the United States without public debate, without any debate by Congress, just passed. It's a frontal assault on the Constitution.

**REPORTER:** Attorney General Ashcroft moved aggressively after the attacks, expanding the Executive branch's legal authority.

**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** Our assault on terror, or war on terror, allows us to justify and legitimate a whole bunch of things that I think are pretty scary and frightening.

**KEVIN DANAHER:** They can come into your home or my home, plant listening devices, take documents, photograph documents, tap the phone, and not tell you about it. And get away with it.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** Right now, as we talk, the Fourth and Sixth Amendments to the Constitution, to the Bill of Rights are dead letters.

**REPORTER:** Despite being a U.S. citizen, Jose Padilla has been held indefinitely in a naval brig in South Carolina. He's never been charged, and hasn't seen a lawyer.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** This administration has in effect repealed key sections of the Bill of Rights. It actually suspended Habeas Corpus in their Patriot Act. They have made indefinite detention possible.

**MEDEA BENJAMIN:** All of these things should be of the gravest concern to Americans. And yet, it's being done all under this guise of fear. We have to do this because the terrorists are lurking behind every door.

**SCOTT RITTER:** And the more we're afraid, the more you ask us to give. Patriot Act 2; enhancements to the Patriot Act. Now the budget's starting to be bankrupted, billions flowing out of this country into a war on terror. More defense expenditures.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** And therefore I've asked Congress for a one-year increase of more than \$48 billion for national defense. The largest increase in a generation.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** Perpetual war, the loss of civil liberties, the lack of trust in government because they don't tell the truth. These are outrageous and unpleasant political

developments, but they don't necessarily spell the end of the United States. Financial bankruptcy does.

**JULIAN BOND:** To maintain the Bush Administration's war doctrine, massive increases in military spending have been required. The United States now spends more than 400 billion dollars annually on the military. Seven times as much as the next biggest spender, and nearly equal to what the rest of the world spends combined. Such vast expenditures on military machinery and war, together with the largest tax cuts in history, have driven the Bush administrations record budget deficits. They have also been responsible for deepening the national debt, which by the end of 2004 figures to stand at over 7 trillion dollars. More than three times the size of the debt of the entire third world. Foreign countries hold the notes on about one-third of this unprecedented U.S. debt.

**MAX WOLFF:** That money must be paid back. And that means somewhere down the road, Americans will pay taxes and get nothing.

**KEVIN DANAHER:** Debt is reaching forward to future generations, taking their wealth, bringing it on to current account and spending it. It's like if I mortgaged my home and then using the money for crack or something. Eventually you are going to lose your home.

**MAX WOLFF:** The image and the rhetoric is tough America going it alone. The reality is in hoc, in debt America begging others for money. The cowboy stopping occasionally with the horse, getting off the saddle, going to the Western Union and wiring money to the rest of the world, is not in a lot of western films, because it doesn't seem super-cool. But that would be our cowboy. Our cowboys is going to have to hop off that horse, periodically -- by the way, the horse that he won't own -- and make payments to whomever does own the horse, and the saddle, and the gun, and the boots, and the hat.

**IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN:** The basis of US economic strength today is the fact that the dollar is the reserve currency all over the world and that's a political phenomenon. Now if tomorrow, and I think it will occur tomorrow or the next day, these countries decide that that makes no economic sense for them, it never made political sense, but it makes no economic sense for them, then the US goes down the drain. I mean it really goes down the drain in terms of a real reduction of standard of living and so forth.

**GREG SPEETER:** Over the next few years, if the neocons get their way, we're going to see increased money for the Pentagon, increased tax breaks for very wealthy people, and fewer dollars that are going to go to education, housing, health care, and other basic needs.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** Things that can't go on forever don't. What we're talking about right now is the rigged American economy can't go on forever -- and it's not rocket science to say so.



**KEVIN DANAHER:** In a lot of ways US power in the world is collapsing. What these neoconservatives are trying to do is to compensate with military might and muscle and force what they're losing in terms of economic control.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** I'm a war president. I make decisions here in the oval office in foreign policy matters with war on my mind.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** They are people who want war forever and this makes them much more like fascist movements than it does like conservative movements.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** One war after another, after another, we become a warfare state. That is, the system is set up to go to war. We're going to find wars. We already had two wars, two major wars, Iraq and Afghanistan.

**ROBERT JOHNSON:** One of the major characteristics of the process of militarizing an entire society is going to be the glorification of war and of weapons.

**DAN RATHER:** A Hollywood set designer was brought in to create a \$200,000 backdrop for official war briefings.

**NORMON SOLOMON:** In USA Today and in the major network coverage and so forth, you have this very elaborate computer generated graphic sort of coverage of the different US air force and army planes and gun ships and helicopters and very snazzy, weapons of all descriptions.

**SOLDIER** [news clip]: It's quite amazing. I've fallen almost in love with the F-18 Super Hornet because it's quite a versatile plane.

**NORMON SOLOMON:** There's really an idolatry there, a kind of gods of metal worship, that again is an extreme perversion, I think in human terms.

**AARON BROWN:** Seven months after the bombing campaign the patent office reports a flood of applications to use the phrase for products. There are filings to trademark golf clubs, action toys, coffee makers, even Shock and Awe condoms.

**NORMON SOLOMON:** It's not enough for us to be told to accept this war, we're really encouraged to gain some kind of vicarious pleasure from it.

**REPORTER** [news clip]: A full length DVD presented by Tom Brokaw- Operation Iraqi Freedom. Log on to ShopNBC.Com and get it today!

**ROBERT JENSEN:** One of the most important roles of the news media is to make sure the American public never sees the effects of the war. So we see the tanks from which the shells are

fired. We see the soldiers firing those shells. We don't see the people killed and maimed by those shells. The American public has received a very one-sided view of war.

**STAN GOFF:** I, for one, don't think we should censor photographs of people that are wounded or dead. I think we should see them in living color every single night. You know? Now they hide behind it, "Well, that it would be insensitive" and all that stuff.

**DAN RATHERS** [news clip]: Some of it, after careful thought, in trying to be responsible as well as sensitive, we have electronically blurred.

**STAN GOFF:** Of course it would be insensitive. People need to be sensitized to what's really going on.

**JULIAN BOND:** In addition to the thousands of Iraqi civilians who have been killed during the war and occupation, more than 600 American servicemen have fallen with thousands more wounded and permanently maimed. Each one of these casualties represents a family shattered by the war.

**MICHAEL FRANTI:** If you travel to where people are really living and where soldiers are really coming from, just the poor communities all around this country, people know what's up with war and people don't like and they don't support it.

**JULIAN BOND:** Jesus Suarez Del Solar was one of the first American victims of the war in Iraq. He left behind a wife, a young son, and a father, Fernando Suarez Del Solar, forced to come to terms with their loss.

**FERNANDO SUAREZ DEL SOLAR:** This war has destroyed a lot of families. This family is destroyed. And my grandson lost a father. He lost an opportunity to have good relations with a father and the mother. As he was leaving on February 5, he was telling me 'father, I'll come back. Don't worry about it. But, if something happens, take care of my son...my wife – my son, give the same education you gave to me. And I said, 'Don't worry about it. You'll come back.' And never come back.

**JULIAN BOND:** Stan Goff is a retired Army Special Forces Master Sergeant. His son is currently serving in Iraq. In November of 2003, Goff wrote an open letter to American troops in Iraq. He drew connections between his own combat experiences in the Vietnam War and what he now sees American troops experiencing in Iraq.

**STAN GOFF:** Two of the hardest things I had this year: one was when I said goodbye to my son. And one was the day after the truck bomb went off on the 11<sup>th</sup> of December in Ramadhi where he is because it took two days before we heard anything from him and we were on pins and needles. I have additional fears. I have the fear that he's going to come back as crazy as I was when I came back from Vietnam, and you know a lot of us went crazy in different ways, you know. I don't know how many helicopter pilots I talked to that came back from Vietnam and

said, “I just loved greasin’ them. It was the biggest thrill of their life. Just to find somebody, where there were no witnesses, and hose them down. Way more common than most people realize. People at My Lai got caught. That stuff was going on every single day somewhere.

**DANIEL ELLSBERG:** An atrocity situation, that’s what we have in Iraq right now. The attacks on our troops there are clearly inspiring a kind of trigger happiness and a readiness for revenge in our troops, and I think will result in the same kind of things we saw at My Lai.

**STAN GOFF:** I wrote the piece that said “hold on to your humanity” specifically to describe how that process happens to some people, why it happens, how at the very bottom of it is the ability to redefine people whose nation you occupy as somehow less than human.

**JULIAN BOND:** In November of 2003, a US delegation of military families and veterans visited Iraq. Medea Benjamin, of Global Exchange, helped organize the trip and accompany the group.

**MEDEA BENJAMIN:** The son of one of the members of our delegation said to him, his father, “Dad, they hate us here. They saw us first as liberators, and now they see us as occupiers, and they hate us. They want us to go home. We want to go home.” One woman who saw her daughter for the first time in three years, because her daughter had been stationed in Germany, and this mother broke down and cried seeing her daughter, and she said, “If I had the money to put my daughter in college, she would be holding a book instead of a gun. She shouldn’t be holding a gun, none of these kids should be holding guns.”

## CHAPTER 6: “Bring It On”

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** Foreign policy was hijacked by some people that -- I think it’s cruel but proper -- General Zinni of the Marine Corps called them Chicken Hawks, war lovers who have no experience of either barracks life or war, who are abstract enthusiasts for empire.

**JACKSON KATZ:** How many of these men who are the “neocon intellectuals” avoided military service when they had the chance or when they were of draft age? They avoided it, but of course they are willing to send blue collar, and working class, and men of color from the poor and working classes off to kill and die for their imperial ambitions, but they’re sitting in their “tony” offices in Washington and New York.

**SCOTT RITTER:** I’m an American first and foremost. I love my country more than anything, I’m willing to die for my country, unlike George W. Bush, our President, Mr. Chicken Hawk, a guy who couldn’t even have the courage to see through his tour of duty in the Air National Guard. Maybe flying F102 ‘s over Texas was too dangerous so he ran off to Alabama, while millions of Americans were going to Vietnam, and he has an administration chock full of these so called heroes. People who didn’t have the courage to defend their country in a time of

unpopular war and yet today they've got us engaged in another unpopular war and their asking other people to go out there and do things.

**LT. COL. KAREN KWIATKOWSKI:** We call them Chicken Hawks because none of them served in the military. They didn't wear a uniform they all had other things to do. None of their children serve in the military. So this is a double Chicken Hawk whammy here, because you know, George Bush's daughters don't wear a uniform. It's funny they compare, he says my daughter's the same age as Jessica Lynch, yeah but there's a big difference. Jessica Lynch wore a uniform and did what you guys told them to do.

**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** You say you're the leader of the free world because you have military experience and we find out you've been AWOL. You didn't really show up. There are holes even in the stories you put forth in the media now, that suggest, "I was there, look, I have memories of it. I remember that I was there."

**JOURNALISTS:** There isn't anyone who can stand up and say, I served with George W. Bush. These records ought to have been noted by his commanding officers. Some of his officers don't remember seeing him. It's a simple question how about a simple answer.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** Bush was a draft dodger. Not only that he was AWOL, in fact he was a deserter, because if it's longer than thirty days, you're a deserter. The guy was actually a deserter in wartime. If it had been Clinton, they would have just crucified him on the White House lawn.

**MEDEA BENJAMIN:** I was in Iraq when George Bush made the comment, when he was talking about Iraqi attacks on US soldiers, and he said "Bring 'em on."

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** There are some who feel like the conditions are such that they can attack us there. My answer is bring 'em on.

**MEDEA BENJAMIN:** And you should have seen the reaction among the troops when they heard that. They started saying bring on the attacks? We're the ones who are out here on the streets doing patrol that are the targets, how could he be saying that? This could only be coming from people who never fought. He can dress himself up all he wants in this military gear and show up on aircrafts and present himself with a turkey in front of the troops. This guy never fought a war.

**NORMON MAILER:** He's not qualified to speak of himself as macho, but he's shrewd enough to know that those working males out there are very angry, and that if he presents himself as macho -- as he did of course with that ridiculous flight, in the back seat of that fast plane to land on the carrier, in full combat gear -- if he presents himself that way, they'll buy it. They'll buy it because they need it.

**REPORTER** [news clip]: A recent AP poll shows Mr. Bush leading his democratic opponent, John Kerry by almost 20 percent when it comes to white men.

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** On his visit to ground zero a few days after the catastrophe, he took the bull horn and stood along side some of the rescue workers, and basically did the one thing he has always been undeniably good at which is cheerleading. He was a cheerleader at Phillips Andover actually and very good at it. This is a culture of TV, where the press really only cares about, and only responds to, televisual performance. And at a moment where everybody wanted a big daddy, Bush did well enough to allow the press to marvel at his aplomb, at his stature, and it became a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** If I had a little window into the average American household, you know like five minutes on their TV screen at night to tell them how to decode the kind of propaganda they're going to see from President Bush about security, I think I would say, you know, first of all, don't just look at the images, don't just look at Bush landing on the aircraft carrier, Bush surrounding himself with our troops.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** Hoo-aa! Semper Fi!

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** They want him to look tough, they want him to look strong, in fact even on Earth Day, you know, the image they chose was him with an ax in his hand, clearing trails in the Adirondacks. So his administration is so dripping with testosterone, that even to celebrate Earth Day the guy's got to have a weapon in his hand.

**JACKSON KATZ:** They lose no opportunity to take pictures of Bush on the ranch, outdoors, not sitting at a desk, you know, wearing reading glasses and having intellectual conversations, but out walking, clearing brush, sitting in the back of a pickup truck. Those images are plentiful, and that's not an accident. That's how they've understood Bush's popularity. He is the rugged individualist. He is the cowboy.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** "Whoo!"

**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** The Republicans have ingeniously created this sense that this is about real men.

**GOV. ARNOLD SCHWARZNEGGER:** If they don't have the guts I call them "girlie men."

**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** It's time for real men to step to the plate. Now enough of this mamby pamby, because George W. represents the reborn American male.

**JACKSON KATZ:** In 1992, James Carvel hung up a sign in the Clinton campaign headquarters that said, "It's the Economy, Stupid," which became a famous slogan of the 1992 campaign. Well, in 2004, the Democrats need to hang up a sign that says, "It's the masculinity, stupid."

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** Bush's propagandists have been masterful at crafting a certain image for him, an image actually based to some extent on his weaknesses. He's not a guy who was born in Connecticut, and was a legacy admission to Phillips Andover and Yale. He's not a guy who has the Queen of England as a cousin. He's not a guy from a fabulously wealthy family. None of that is the case. He's just Will Rogers. He's just a regular guy, and when he messes up the language it proves he's just like you and me.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:**

"I understand the emotionality of the death penalty."

"The US daily story about the subliminal messages. "

"To reduce power, power plant emissions."

"First time we may be completely certain he has a nuclear weapons."

"Some accuse us both of not being able to speak the language."

**MARK CRISPIN MILLER:** That's quite brilliant. To make Bush out to be a kind of Jacksonian figure, a kind of natural leader from the wilds.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** President Bush and his colleagues talk about a certain America to defend their policies. They think America is still back in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and where the tough guys can take out one another in an open combat, man against man, High Noon, on Main Street with Gary Cooper, being played by President Bush.

**GEORGE W. BUSH:** I want him, I want justice and uhh, there's an old poster out West, as I recall, that said, "Wanted: Dead or Alive."

**SCOTT RITTER:** He's not Gary Cooper, he's a coward who Bushwhacked the American people by exploiting the fear and ignorance engendered in the post-911 environment, to portray Iraq as a threat to our national security. Weapons of mass destruction that would destroy the very society that we live in. The need therefore for frontier justice to prevent mushroom clouds from popping up all over American cities. He lied to us. He Bushwhacked us.

**NORMON SOLOMON:** You know, it's fascinating to talk about the persona and the individual of George W. Bush, and yet at the end of the very dire day that we find ourselves in the midst of, it's really about an entire system that's cranked up for war and profiteering, and I think that's our challenge—to, in a sense, go beyond the personalities.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** You know, you think of past elections, Michael Dukakis, you think of him riding around in a tank looking like Snoopy, you know. You think of the Willie Horton ad against him. You know you don't really think of substantive things, because our elections rarely turn any more on substantive issues. But this is one that really needs to be decided on the

substance, because our country faces real threats. But these guys are not going after the right threats. They're pursuing a pre-existing agenda under the guise of fighting terrorism that is going to bankrupt our country, that is going to put our troops at risk and that is going to make the terrorist threat to us grow over time instead of diminish.

**JACKSON KATZ:** I would reject categorically the idea that to oppose the Bush agenda or the right-wing, or the neocon, militarism, that somehow opposing that means you're just laying down and saying, "Come get us, we're just going to be defenseless." That's ludicrous. No one would make that argument.

**DICK CHENEY:** If he were in charge, he would fight a more sensitive war on terror. America has been in too many wars for any of our wishes, but not one of them was won by being sensitive.

**JODY WILLIAMS:** I am not a pacifist. I think sometimes you need to have police and military action. Of course, you do. You know, if someone is breaking into your house, you should call the police, and they come and take the criminal away. They go to jail. When the terrorists attacked the United States, I fully supported working with the international community to share intelligence and capture them and to bring them to trial and put them in jail for life. But you don't invade another country just because you don't like the guy. That is breaking international law. And the Bush administration may scoff at international law, but if you act with impunity at that level, that filters down through all levels of society. If people believe that those in power can do whatever they want and not have to pay for it, it affects all of the fabric of society.

## CHAPTER 7: The Politics of Citizenship

**JULIAN BOND:** In the immediate aftermath of September 11, the people of the United States came together in an unprecedented display of national unity and the world rallied to their cause. Across the globe people came together in a spontaneous and stunning display of unified support for the people of the United States. Yet just two years later, in those same places and on those same streets, tens of millions of people would come together again, this time to march in outrage over the Bush administration's decision to invade Iraq. How the American people interpret the meaning and importance of this dramatic and sudden shift is a question that has yet to be answered.

**ZIA MIAN:** One of the things that the exercise of power does is that it cuts both ways. So the US exercises power in the world to create stability, people on the receiving end of that power see themselves being oppressed, and so they resist. And as a consequence, this process of trying to pacify the world and get it to go along with what the United States wants, actually creates the resistance that the US is trying to quell. And so this is not the way that will actually get us forward out of the situation that we find ourselves in. It only makes things worse.



**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** But even, those who want to cut Bush some slack and suggest that he and his administration are doing basically what is good for America don't realize there is tremendous ideological blowback.

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** The central defect of preventive war as an instrument against terrorism is not that it's illegal, although that's pretty awful, but that it doesn't work, it hasn't worked, and it cannot work.

**DANIEL ELLSBERG:** I would say that the war against Iraq not only is not part of the war against terror, meaning against Al Qaeda or against terrorist networks, but it virtually gives up the war on terror. It substitutes for it and suppresses it, in the sense that I think it's impossible to think of reducing the threat from Osama Bin Laden and from Al Qaeda so long as we are occupying Iraq and killing Muslims in Iraq.

**CHALMERS JOHNSON:** An Iraqi freedom fighter, an Iraqi nationalist, a man just like a Vietnamese, identifying foreign invaders in his country who are dominating his life, who are humiliating him in front of his family, who are barging into his house, brandishing weapons before his children, that's blowback. And that man 'til the end of time wants to kill Americans, and they're going to keep trying to do it.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** These guys who claim to be protecting our security basically are not taking the advice of the professionals—the professional intelligence community, the professional foreign service, the professional military—all are being shoved aside by the neoconservatives, most of whom are Chicken Hawks, who when they had the chance to serve their country, they ducked it. They got student deferments; they got their father to pull strings. Now they're sending other people's kids over there to Iraq, and basically, it's open season on U.S. troops over there. And every nutcase in the world who's got a beef with the United States knows where to go.

**MEDEA BENJAMIN:** Well I look at this from the point of view of a mother. I have two children, I want my children to live in a safe world. I don't want anymore September 11<sup>th</sup>s to happen. And I look at what this government has done post September 11, and I think, not much more you could have done to make us less safe.

**JODY WILLIAMS:** Why do people in the US think that if we have bigger weapons, and more weapons, it's going to make us safe from terrorists. We have the most advanced military in the world. We have the most sophisticated weapons in the world. We have more nuclear weapons than anybody in the world. Did that stop September 11? It didn't stop it.

**GREG SPEETER:** I think it's really important that we begin to redefine national security. If people don't have jobs, if people can't provide education for their children, if people are going hungry, if people don't have health insurance, they're insecure. We need to be able to address that level of insecurity in this country and the federal government is not addressing those needs because we're pouring all of this money into a unilateral war and providing tax breaks for very wealthy people.

**NORMAN MAILER:** You have a set of religious beliefs here that to the extent that we must support the wealthy, the rich, that the rich are in terrible trouble, that if we don't take care of the rich everything terrible will happen. Well, my theory is the rich can always take care of themselves. That's why they're rich. They have a wonderful skill for making money. They don't need our government help. They need to be impeded by the government. It'll bring out the best in them. At the same time it would level the playing field a little bit.

**WILLIAM HARTUNG:** So, I think what it really comes down to is: are the American voters going to sit still for this? Are we going to treat our democracy like some sort of spectator sport, like watching the Super bowl, or are we going to ask a little more of ourselves this time. Are we going to explore these claims? Are we going to look at the details of what this administration has actually done?

**MICHAEL ERIC DYSON:** Politics is about the arguments over the distribution of resources. That's what politics, at one level, is about. You got an argument, you got a dog in that fight—don't think that is doesn't concern you. It concerns you if you're concerned about what kind of water you drink, what kind of air you breathe, what kind of terrorists will be around you. . .

**VANDANA SHIVA:** Good societies have cultivated fearlessness and hope among their citizens. Good politics has always been about real courage, real fearlessness. Take Gandhi, whose ultimate weapon was fearlessness, against one of the worst empires of our times. And the very notion of not cooperating with that empire was based on fearlessness. Martin Luther King walked in the Gandhian tradition he walked in fearlessness. Every leader worth their names promotes fearlessness.

**SCOTT RITTER:** I think we have to understand that the definition of patriotism cannot be hijacked by people with a specific ideological agenda. A patriot is somebody who loves their country, and how they express that love can be either by waving a flag and blindly supporting the president—I would say that they are limited patriots because they truly don't understand the concept of representative democracy. And then there are those who have considered the whole range of issues, have compared and contrasted the positions taken by the government with the Constitution of the United States and the values we espouse as people, and find the government's policies wanting, and then have the courage to speak out against those policies, so that there is informed consent when we send those other patriots—young men and women who honor us by wearing a uniform. When we send them abroad to fight and die for a cause, it's patriotic to make sure that the cause we are asking them to sacrifice for is worth it.

**MICHAEL FRANTI:** And patriotism is when you say we have love for our nation and love for our communities and sometimes our nation does things that are positive and sometimes our nation does things that are negative and it's my responsibility out of my love for this nation to speak out loudly in support of the things that it does well and speak out loudly against those things that it's doing that is hurtful.

**ZIA MIAN:** The Project for the New American Century involves not just re-making the World but re-making America. Over all the advances that have been made in the last thirty, forty years—fundamental notions of civil rights and democracy and identity. Are we willing to let those old men take them away because it somehow doesn't fit their notion that you're supposed to be deferential to those that know better, to those who are in charge?

**BENJAMIN BARBER:** I think the people most without fear on September 12<sup>th</sup> in America were those working at ground zero. They were in the greatest danger, actually, but because they were active, they were engaged, the firemen and the medical officials and the cops who were working there first to find victims, then to find remains and clear the site, they had a civic task. They were engaged and they weren't afraid of anything. American citizens after 9/11 asked the president, "What can we do? What can we do to become engaged and take some responsibility?" President Bush, unfortunately, said, "Go shopping, go back to the mall, go back to your normal life. We'll take care of it." Spectatorship is an invitation to fear. Citizenship is how we fight the politics of fear. The politics of citizenship, the politics of engagement, taking responsibility is a much better way to deal with terrorism than hunkering down, being spectators, and allowing the government to rob us of our liberties, to rob us of our multiculturalism, in the name of protecting us.

**KEVIN DANAHER:** And that's their project - to make us scared and stupid. And see, my problem is that I've been to Washington DC and stood in the middle of the night out in the Jefferson Memorial and read the inscriptions. Jefferson's quotes are hammered into the marble and when you look up inside the rotunda, the favored quote at the highest point of the building, you have to turn around backwards to read it, he says, "On the altar of god, I pledge undying hostility to any government restriction on the free minds of the people." We were the first nation state to establish the principle that sovereignty, ultimate political power, resides in the people. That's a fundamentally radical concept and these guys don't like the implications of it for their maintenance of minority wealth and power and they're out to destroy that. But they will fail. I guarantee you they will fail.

[END]