

Father Paul Surlis Speaks

This interview took place on the radio program "Roots & Culture: Making the World Unsafe for Plutocracy, Roots Reggae Music & Politicization," WVAU, Washington, DC, 16 April 2003. Hosts: Jules Boykoff & Michael Schmidt

JB: We have Father Paul Surlis on the phone from Crofton, Maryland. He is a Catholic priest who taught at St. John's University in New York for twenty-five years and has been an activist for a long time, working hard for social justice. You are a real hero of ours here at "Roots & Culture," and it's a real pleasure to have you back on the show.



FPS: Thank you.

JB: We wanted to touch base with you about this so-called 'War on Terrorism' and more specifically what is happening with Iraq. Let's start off with a real broad question: What do you think about this war on Iraq?

FPS: Well, I think it was immoral, unjust, and illegal. And despite some good results that have come from it, like getting rid of an oppressive dictatorship and some of his regime, good results should not be achieved by evil means. And I'm convinced that the means are evil and dangerous. No weapons of mass destruction have been found, even though that was in the beginning given as the principal reason for going into Iraq, to disarm Saddam Hussein. And other reasons were advanced then as time went on: to bring democracy to the Middle East and to help solve the Palestinian crisis, although it's not at all clear how it will help there. In fact, Israel seems to be encouraging the United States right now to target Syria, and there is a real danger that the neoconservatives who helped to push this war and who provide ideological justification for it, want to target Syria, Iran, and possibly even Egypt, maybe even Saudi Arabia and Sudan. So I think it is dangerous.

JB: You mentioned the neoconservatives, or neocons. Let's name names, if you will. Could you just tell our listeners what we mean when we talk about neocons?

FPS: Well, William Kristol who publishes the *Weekly Standard* in Washington has been advocating this war for a while. Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Dick Cheney, William Bennett, Donald Rumsfeld. These people are associated with the Ford administration, Reagan, the first Bush administration, and they are hawks by any standard. They have been pushing for this war for several years, they have written position papers and the Heritage Foundation and the American Enterprise Institute have assisted them in doing that. These are think tanks that are set up to promulgate right-wing ideology and they are very successful because they write the op-ed pieces for the newspapers and they set the terms of debate, and they are now in power because several people whom I named are in the present Bush administration and they have access to power and to the Pentagon and they are overriding Colin Powell in the State Department who is somewhat moderate. He's not really moderate, just somewhat. And they are pushing for this war.

JB: It's interesting. You say Colin Powell is somewhat moderate, so you are kind of hedging, and I totally agree with you. After all this is the guy who in 1968 tried to cover up the My Lai Massacre, and he is also the guy who in 1992 said to the House Armed Services Committee: "I want to be the bully on the block." He said he wanted to lodge the idea in the mind of the enemy that "there is no future in trying to challenge the armed forces in the United States." So, thank you for naming all those neoconservatives because, as you say, they are very important in terms of understanding what is happening now, and as you also pointed out, they go back in time and in many cases are the same people who worked for Regan and for Bush I. You also mentioned the policy papers. The *Defense Planning Guidance* papers are what I imagine you are talking about. These are really, really important documents that were written in 1992, 1993, and then one came out under Rumsfeld's name in 2002. They are very explicit about this project. Now I just want to throw this quote out to you, Paul. This is from a 1992 Defense Planning Guidance document and all these people you mentioned, from Cheney to Rumsfeld to Wolfowitz to Perle are involved with this. Here is the quote: "While the US cannot become the world's policeman, we will retain the preeminent responsibility for addressing selectively those wrongs which threaten not only our interests, but those of our allies or friends." They get more specific than that, actually, and they say that among these interests are "access to vital raw materials, primarily Persian Gulf oil." We have heard a lot of talk in the news re-

cently—especially in mainstream sources—about how this is a war for freedom and democracy, and basically for freedom and democracy only. How does oil factor into all this, because clearly it seems to be on the minds and on the ends of the pens of these people who are in charge of this?

FPS: I think it is explicitly about oil. They do not say that, but it's the single deepest reason. There are some other reasons, but here I think a very important distinction is the one that has been made by Professor Michael Klare. He says we have to distinguish between oil as fuel and oil as power. And the United States in recent years has diversified the countries on which it depends for oil as fuel, In the Middle East Saudi Arabia is the premiere country with oil with Iraq probably coming up close because the exploration of the oil reserves in Iraq has not been done to any great extent yet, The oil in Iraq is easily accessed because its not as in Alaska under the tundra or as in other places under water. It can be easily accessed; it's cheap.

But secondly, when the US controls this vast supply of oil that is in Iraq and has military there to guarantee access to this oil, then it can undermine OPEC and it can privatize the oil supplies that have been nationalized some years ago, and it can also provide leverage for the United States over against Japan, China, Germany, and countries that might be economic rivals in the global context and these countries depend largely on supplies of oil from the Persian Gulf.

So, I would say that that distinction between oil as fuel and oil as power is an extremely important one. And if you look at a map now of the region, the United States has military bases in all the major countries surrounding the Gulf except Iraq and Iran, and now they will very soon have them in Iraq. And they have extended their military into countries that formerly belonged to the Soviet Union, so there is a vast encirclement by the military to provide access to resources and easy availability of military troops if there is any threat, and ultimately, it's US hegemony that is being sought, and that is global hegemony, not just in one region as the material you quoted states directly.

MS: Please expand on what you mean by US hegemony because some listeners out there might not be familiar with that kind of theoretical perspective.

FPS: In a nutshell, hegemony refers to presenting the interests of a ruling class as if they were universal interests. Many people do not recognize that

the USA has a ruling class, but it does and it's the ruling class that is now pushing for global dominance. They already have monopoly control over economic and political issues in the US itself, and they wage relentless class warfare against workers and especially the working poor. They do not call it class warfare, but that is what it is when living wages are denied to so many people. Health care, good housing, good education, and the social requirements for a decent standard of living are all denied to so many people.

I think for quite a number of years now, the neoconservatives have been saying, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, that we are living in a unipolar world, although that is a contradiction in terms: you have to have two before you can talk about poles at all. But we are living in a world where there is one dominant power that is dominant in economic, nuclear and all other aspects of military might. President Bush has said, both at West Point and in his State of the Union and in other addresses that no other power will be allowed to threaten US superiority, and being the sole global power. They are not even going to allow another country to threaten exclusive preeminence. It seems to me that one country they have in mind is China. Because there has been a lot of emphasis in recent years on the need to be vigilant in East Asia, and East Asia includes China, Hong Kong, Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Mongolia, and places like that. But, the US intends to have access to resources, literally to the wealth of the world, to its oil and mineral resources, to maintain the standard of living in this country, but especially to maintain the profits for the oil companies, the corporations, and the people who benefit from all this. Not everybody benefits equally—the ruling class get the lion's share.

JB: You mentioned privatization, earlier, which is crucial in terms of oil in Iraq. Do you think that on balance this war is more about privatization than about democracy?

MS: Moreover, the U.S government has been very vocal about wanting the profits from the country's oil to go to the Iraqi people themselves. They claim to want the Iraqi people to be able to exploit their own natural resources so as to rebuild their infrastructure. Now, as the US occupies Iraq and begins to hand out contracts to private Western firms for reconstruction, do you see any contradiction—in a system built on contradictions—in the notion that the Iraqi people should be enjoying the spoils of their own natural resources on the one hand, yet at the same time US oil companies are the first ones invited to exploit the oil for private profit?

FPS: I think what they are giving you there is again ideology, and it's quite frankly lies. And they have told us a lot of lies about the buildup and the movement toward this invasion of Iraq. We got so many so many different rationales; we were told that Iraq was within six months of having nuclear weapons, that they had gone to Niger to get material for building a nuclear bomb. These assertions were quickly proven to be sheer, outright lies. Then the Blair administration used plagiarized material from a graduate student's essay on the danger presented by Iraq, and they presented that as part of the recent intelligence material that they had found. I think for the time being, they will make it appear that the oil resources are going to be used for the benefit of the Iraqi people, but there is no question about it that they are already talking about privatizing the oil and having the US corporations run them more efficiently.

It's interesting that before the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein had in fact used much of the oil wealth for the benefit of the Iraqi people. He had achieved a very high level of health care and a very high level of education in Iraq. And then after the first Gulf War, when the United States targeted the infrastructure, they destroyed water resources, they destroyed the means for purifying water, they destroyed the health care system, the educational system. The sanctions that were imposed for over eleven years reduced that country to poverty and to Third World status. There was an enormous outbreak of cholera, typhoid fever, and a whole range of diseases, so much so that you could say that the sanctions functioned as weapons of mass destruction.

Secondly, at the United Nations, every time there was a proposal made to allow in dialysis machines, components for water purification systems, computers to help to run various systems that were needed for health care, for food, and for water, Britain and the United States blocked the resolutions supporting such imports, so much so that 500,000 children under the age of five have died since the end of the Gulf War under the impact of the sanctions. 250,000 children over the age of five, but still children, have died, and probably close to a million elderly women and men have died as a result of the sanctions.

As well, Britain and the United States unilaterally, proclaimed no-fly zones in the north and in the south of Iraq, and up to the year 2000 they had flown 280,000 sorties, bombing, and then they intensified the bombing after the year 2000. And in all that time, Iraq was never able to bring down

a single plane, British or American. And some people are saying: Why did they collapse so quickly when the war started? Well, it seems to me very obvious: because most of its military defense had been bombed into the earth during the eleven year period of the sanctions. This was followed by intense bombing in the first days of the present Gulf War.

MS: This addresses the issue of what went on between the first Gulf War and this current Gulf War. The sanctions were an important part of US involvement in Iraq. Also, there were regular bombings by the US and Britain over the supposed no-fly zones. Of course, those no-fly zones were never enforced by UN sanction; instead, they were enforced by the US and Britain. What were the effects of the sanctions and bombings?

FPS: Well, I think the effects of the sanctions reinforced by the bombings were terrible. As I said, they reduced the country to the status of a Third World country, and the educational benefits and health benefits, which they had enjoyed before the first Gulf War, were lost. Hussein is responsible for invading Kuwait. No one is excusing him. But the damage that was inflicted on the country afterwards was far out of proportion, considering that already they had killed thousands of Iraqis in the Kuwaiti invasion war, and by the way, they had buried thousands of Iraqi soldiers alive in the trenches towards the conclusion of their first Gulf War. The United States troops changed the blades on the tanks to make them function as ploughs and they rammed them down between the trenches and buried thousands of Iraqi troops alive in the sand. And I'm sure that if Saddam Hussein had done that to US troops it would have been considered a war crime, but through some technicality the United States was able to do it and get away with it, The US military have acknowledged this, it's not denied.

Plus they used depleted uranium in the Gulf War, and depleted uranium has a life of about four and a half billion years, and there has been a very high increase in cancer, leukemia, and health related effects for the Iraqi population since the first Gulf War. It's not only the Iraqi people who have suffered from the depleted uranium: 160,000 US veterans have been ill since the Gulf War took place. The Pentagon has never acknowledged what the possible nature of this illness is, or that it might be related to depleted uranium.

By the way, several thousand Gulf War veterans have committed suicide since the Gulf War, and these are relatively young soldiers. So wars like this are not without costs for the civilians and the soldiers on both sides.

JB: Right. And the ramifications—like suicide and the Gulf War Syndrome, which the US government is basically just saying is in these people's heads—keep going on and on and on even after they have supposedly run their course. Shifting gears slightly, back to global capitalism and how the US economy fits into that, Naomi Klein has recently argued that it's too simplistic to say that this war is about oil. She says, "Its about oil, water, roads, trains, phones, ports, and drugs, and if this process is not halted, 'Free Iraq' will be the most sold country on earth." I'm guessing you are somewhat sympathetic to that assertion, and if you are, where do you see this in the real world? Where do you see evidence of what she is talking about, that this war's about more than just oil?

FPS: The prevailing economic model, which the US—and the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, both under predominant US control—wishes to impose on Latin American, African, and other countries is neo-liberalism. This version of laissez faire capitalism wishes to put ownership of social assets and delivery of social services under private control, which means social wealth is privatized and services that should promote the common good are made into businesses run for profit.

I think that if you look at any good analysis of the global economy, you'll find evidence that for a number of years now that global capitalism has been in crisis. There was and still is a crisis in the Asian Tiger countries. The Japanese crisis is ongoing. France and Germany have very high rates of unemployment. There is also a crisis in US capitalism. There has been a falling rate of profit for the last number of years, and part of the reason for Bush pushing the war in the run-up to the mid-term elections was to draw attention away from the domestic situation in this country.

We are back once again at having over 30 million people who are poor by the government's own standards, and it's a very poor standard for estimating poverty. There would be far more if we had a more realistic estimate of what real poverty is. There are 41 million people who have no health insurance in the United States and up to 3 million people who are homeless. Every food kitchen in the country is filled to capacity every day in the week, and these are run by Jewish, by Islamic, by Christian organizations and many people get their one decent, daily meal in a food kitchen.

Even tonight there was a story on the national news about the crisis in New York City where thousands of jobs are being lost. Mayor Bloomberg

is being faced with cuts, he is closing fire stations. Just a few months ago, after 9/11, the firemen and the police were the great heroes and rightly so, they were courageous and heroically self-sacrificing in calamity. But somebody in the Congress said recently that firemen and policemen should work overtime without any extra pay. And Bloomberg has to go a stage further; he is closing fire stations, including one in Harlem where it is of great importance to the community, as well as a great safeguard. He is cutting jobs wholesale. The state government maintains it does not have the money to give him, and this is true in many other states throughout the country.

And what is being cut? Health care, daycare, school lunch programs for poor children, even breakfast programs for poor children. They are requiring children of the poor now to bring evidence that their parents are poor enough to qualify. Now, even middle class and rich families find it difficult to keep enough records for the IRS, but how can you imagine poor people, some of whom work two jobs just to make ends meet, also being able to provide documentary evidence that their children are poor enough to qualify for free breakfasts and lunches.

And also, I'm sure that you and others who have said they are against this war have been asked by people, Do you support the troops? I have been asked that, and I really don't know what it means, but I have a strong suspicion that it's a way of wrapping oneself in the flag and that its really a way of getting you to say you support the war. Now, I do not support the war and I never will. I do support the troops in the sense that I want them brought home safely, and I oppose having young men and women out there murdering on behalf of the corporations and the US administration at the present time.

But just look at the hypocrisy of so-called supporting the troops. The House of Representatives passed resolutions supporting the troops and within weeks they cut the benefits for veterans. President Bush, by the vast tax cut that he is giving to the wealthy top 1%, is making money unavailable, and once again, benefits for veterans are being cut. So when you hear people thanking the troops and saying how wonderful they are and then you hear about the appalling conditions under which veterans are treated in hospitals, and when you read that many military people, enlisted people, have to get food stamps to get by, especially when they have children—many military families are living just a little bit above the poverty line—if that, now what does this mean?

Well, for me, part of what it means is that the working class and the poor are being made to pay the bulk of the cost of this war because there will not be an increase in taxes. In fact, we are looking at another tax decrease of up to maybe \$500 billion, and at the same time all over the country nobody wants to raise taxes because this country is allergic to them, even though it's a moderately taxed country at least for the wealthy and the upper middle class. So what they're doing is raising fees—for drivers licenses, for the cost of tickets on the Metro and the subway and buses—so it's the working class people for whom 50 cents a day for a bus ticket makes a big difference to their income who are paying for the war and the tax cuts.

And then the unemployment rate has increased. Since Bush became president, more than 2 million jobs have been lost and more than ten million persons are now unemployed. So there is a crisis in US capitalism as well as in global capitalism, and to hedge off a worse crisis, having control of oil and access to resources in the interests of ever-increasing profits is part of what this war is about, I would say.

MS: As Jules told our listeners in the intro, you are a former professor of religion at St. Johns University. I'm sure that the issue of just war came up many times in your classes and discussions with fellow faculty, and I was just wondering how you deal with the issue of just war in general, and in the case of the current Gulf War in particular?

FPS: Just war teaching has evolved over the centuries. Originally it goes back to St. Augustine in the 5th century. At that time, the Roman empire was breaking down and people from the north of Europe were coming in and rampaging in the area of the Roman empire, stealing and killing and doing all sorts of things. For the first two hundred years of Christianity, Christians, following the example of Jesus, would not kill in self-defense, in war, and they would not take part in a judicial process where the execution of a criminal could be the outcome. But as time went on, and as the army became more middle class, and as Christianity spread, then greater tolerance for killing arose. But when killing and warfare intensified with the Barbarian Invasions into the Roman Empire, then Augustine and Ambrose went back to the pagan authors of antiquity—Greek and Roman—and they drew up regulations.

Really what they were doing was saying there is a presumption against violence, but if it must be used as a last resort, then certain rules must be

followed. The just authority must proclaim the war. Up until relatively recently, that has been the ruling power and in recent years, the nation-state, and then more recently the United Nations, since the UN Charter. Secondly, the intention must be a just intention; it must not be domination or power for its own sake. Thirdly, there must be proportionality between the damage that is foreseen and the good that is supposed to be achieved. And there are certain behaviors that are forbidden in a war. You cannot use nerve gas or bacteriological agents, although they were used in the First World War and at times the Second World War and they were used in the Iran/Iraq war by Iraq and probably also by Iran.

And then, in more recent years the tendency is to say there are only two basic reasons why a country can go to war. One is self-defense—if a nation is in imminent danger of being attacked. And secondly, for humanitarian purposes, such as the interventions in Kosovo, when large numbers of people were being massacred.

Now, the Vatican under Pope John Paul II is moving more and more to see that war is absolutely an issue of last resort. John Paul opposed this present war. He said it was unjust, and by that he meant that without a second resolution from the United Nations, for the United States and Britain to go to war together against Iraq would be an example of preventive war, which is unjust.

There is a distinction between preemptive war and preventive war. Preemptive war is when another country is poised to strike and action is taken against them. But it is imminent, immediate, and it is obvious they are a danger to a country's defense. That is preemptive war. Preventive war is when another group or power might become a danger to us, so let's strike them. They are a potential danger rather than an imminent danger. Eisenhower said preventive war was an invention of Hitler. And Pearl Harbor is regarded as an example of preventive war, and that has been universally condemned morally as an outrage since the time it took place.

Since 9/11, the Bush administration has been using the two terms interchangeably, as if there are no moral, legal or political differences between preemptive and preventive. The war they launched against Iraq is a preventive war. And that is a major reason why the Vatican has condemned it and why all the Christian leaders in this country condemned it and why Christian leaders and Orthodox leaders and some Jewish leaders and Islamic leaders throughout the world condemned this war as well. So that

distinction between preemptive and preventive is very important.

JB: Absolutely. And, I heard President Bush speaking today in St. Louis at a Boeing-sponsored event, and he said that this war was a case where the United States military was used as a last resort. At Boeing he received quite a warm reception for that thought. What do you think about President Bush's statement?

FPS: I think it is an outright lie. Hans Blix was making quite a bit of headway in exploring for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. By the way, none have been found to date. He needed more time, and also you could have had a more muscular approach to the search for weapons of mass destruction. If they put 500 armed UN troops, or police, in with Blix and the inspectors, and sent them around from place to place, and if the US had turned over the sites where they claimed they knew there were weapons of mass destruction, then this war could have been avoided. So, it was by no means a last resort. In fact, Bush kept giving us one rationale after another and when people came to see that they were not true or that evidence was being falsified, and then finally he pushed the war before the summer would come and before the fighting conditions would be more difficult. But he had intended to go to war. Some say the decision was made in December 2002, and Blix said recently the decision to go to war was made two years ago.

And I would also say that the decision to go to war in Afghanistan was made even prior to 9/11. In 1998, the Vice President of UNOCAL gave testimony in Congress—and this testimony has been published—and he said: “We need to get an oil pipeline from the Caspian region to the West. We cannot bring it through Iran. We cannot at the present time bring it through Afghanistan. To bring it through Afghanistan, we have to get rid of the Taliban.” So then when the 9/11 attacks took place it was a golden opportunity for them to say OK, now we have to remove the Taliban from Afghanistan, and then they proceeded at once to bring their pipeline through, and that is going ahead right now.

MS: I think it's important to make this distinction between preemptive and preventive war, especially in light of recent news about Syria. This should be of no surprise to anyone who has been really watching the rise of the neocons and read their policy reports. What do you think is going to happen with Syria?

FPS: There may be efforts to destabilize the ruling House of Saud. And it

is very ironic that the principal reason they went into Iraq was to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction. They did not find any. Now they are saying the reason they did not find them was that they had been sent on to Syria, and they also are arguing that Syria is producing weapons of mass destruction and also trying to produce nuclear weapons. So I am afraid that they have just decided to target Syria, and this could well be at the insistence of the Israeli government because [Prime Minister Ariel] Sharon is personally friendly with Perle and Wolfowitz, and convicted, pardoned felon Elliott Abrams now in charge of Middle Eastern Affairs and they have had long connections with Israel and with putting Israel's point of view to the administration.

Not that they need too much pressure to do that because Bush has been committed to Israel since he became president, and part of the reason for that is that the extreme Christian right-wing—30 or 40 million people in this country—want to see Israel in total control of the land, the West Bank included. And the reason for that is they have a theological belief that the second coming of Jesus will take place when Israel totally controls the country. When the second coming of Jesus takes place, however, its not going to be too good for the Jews because those of them who convert will get off to heaven with Jesus, but those who do not will go to hell. So, if I were a Jew and I was told that I was getting a lot of support from the Christian right-wing, the Evangelical Christians especially—not all of them but many of them—I would be very nervous because it is a two-edged sword. So the pressure for the war, in part, is coming from Israel.

Now, on the question of weapons of mass destruction, it seems to me that Iraq did not use any weapons of mass destruction, and, you know, it's very unlikely that if they had them they would send them out of the country rather than use them, especially when they were being destroyed the way they were. But just look at what Britain and the United States have had in the way of weapons in this war. First you have the Massive Ordnance Air Blast, MOAB, and that bomb had 10,000 pounds of explosives, and when it explodes over an area, it destroys everything within a radius of a square mile. It destroys all persons, buildings, animals, and living things. Then you have missiles, which can be launched from a distance of 1000 miles. Many of these missiles cost a million dollars each, and they are called precision and high tech, but many of them have gone astray. And there have been enormous civilian casualties from these missiles. Then you have cluster bombs, which have been fairly widely used. The Red Cross in the week of April the 3rd reported that they saw one truckload of women and children with badly maimed bodies from the use of cluster bombs. These are

bombs that come out with little parachutes on them, and they divide up into other bombs and they fall down to the earth and some of them are colored yellow, the same color as the food packages that fell in Afghanistan. They are really a new form of landmines, and children have had their arms blown off, they have had their bodies mangled with these bombs, and many have been killed.

So if anybody has used weapons of mass destruction in Iraq in this recent war its the United States and Great Britain. But theirs are powerful and high tech, and you have soldiers in B-52s flying five miles above the earth and all they have to do is align a few sites and press buttons and they can drop thousands of pounds of explosives and destroy an area the size of two, three football fields. No warning. No sound. No noise. Just everything is vaporized. What are these, if not weapons of mass destruction? And then as I said earlier, when you have the sanctions and you destroy the water infrastructure and the means of purifying water, and you do not let them import means to do that, then there are outbreaks of diseases that kill women, children, men, and people. That's using biological agents to destroy people. There is state terrorism that has been employed at many different levels through the sanctions and through the conduct of the war in Iraq and you have had these weapons of mass destruction as well.

JB: That is an interesting point. You know these precision weapons that we have been hearing so much about, even the Defense Department says that one in ten misses its target, sometimes wildly, and that is the Defense Department, so we know that is a pretty conservative estimate.

MS: And the hypocrisy continues. If we remember back not so long ago, it was the US along with Iraq who refused to sign the UN treaty to ban the use and proliferation of chemical weapons. They refused to sign it, and their stated reason why was essentially because they wanted to protect corporate interests in developing chemical weapons and developing various chemical and biological products in general; they did not want inspectors to damage US sovereignty by being able to inspect corporate development of these weapons.

JB: Father Surlis, you always put forth such interesting, coherent analysis. Maybe we could close with a question, the answer to which might be of use to our listeners who might be wondering “My goodness, where is this guy finding all this incredibly compelling information. I have been watching my TV, I have been watching FOX News, and I do not see any of this stuff.” So maybe, Paul, if you could in closing point out a few places where

people can go in the future to learn about some of these cogent ideas and interpretations you have put forth.

FPS: Well, I have always in recent years been a believer that you have to go to alternative sources, that you will not get the truth from the mainline media. The *Washington Post* has been beating the drums of war almost incessantly for the last two years. They have from time to time allowed opposite voices to be present on the op-ed page, but the editorials have been consistently justifying this war. I think the Internet now is a great source of information. You get good information in *Z. Magazine*, in the *Nation*, you get a lot from Noam Chomsky, and there is a wonderful article in *Harper's Magazine* from not too long ago by a professor from Fairfield University. It is on the impact of the sanctions as weapons of mass destruction. Joy Gordon is the professor's name, and she is a professor of philosophy at Fairfield and she specializes in international relations. And then there was a most wonderful article by Simon Harak, which is still on the Internet. He is a Jesuit professor and it comes from the Blueprint for Social Justice, but its published on the Internet. You can get it by putting in his name in a search engine, and the title of the article is "Why Invade Iraq?"

He gives a lot of other sources. So by following the sources like the one in *Harpers Magazine*, the Simon Harak piece, the *Nation*, *Z. Magazine*, *In These Times*, and other sources, one leads to the other and you get a lot of information that seems to make a lot of sense. When you know some of the history of US interventions since the end of the Second World War, during the Cold War period, and you just keep at it; you just keep adding it up and reading between the lines. One learns to distrust the administration, which promulgates lies and repeats them so often that people think they must be true. Goebbels defined propoganda as make it simple and say it often, and Bush and his team have that down to a tee.

