

“Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy”  
(Buy One, Get One Free)  
ARUNDHATI ROY

*This talk was first delivered May 13, 2003, at the Riverside Church, New York City, and broadcast live on Pacifica Radio. The lecture, sponsored by the Lannan Foundation and the Center for Economic and Social Rights, was delivered as an acceptance speech for the 2002 Lannan Prize for Cultural Freedom.*

In these times when we have to race to keep abreast of the speed at which our freedoms are being snatched from us, and when few can afford the luxury of retreating from the streets for a while in order to return with an exquisite, fully formed political thesis replete with footnotes and references, what profound gift can I offer you tonight?

As we lurch from crisis to crisis, beamed directly into our brains by satellite TV, we have to think on our feet. On the move. We enter histories through the rubble of war. Ruined cities, parched fields, shrinking forests and dying rivers are our archives. Craters left by daisy cutters, our libraries.

So what can I offer you tonight? Some uncomfortable thoughts about money, war, empire, racism, and democracy. Some worries that flit around my brain like a family of persistent moths that keep me awake at night.

Some of you will think it bad manners for a person like me, officially entered in the Big Book of Modern Nations as an “Indian citizen,” to come here and criticize the U.S. government. Speaking for myself I’m no flag-waver, no patriot, and am fully aware that venality, brutality, and hypocrisy are imprinted on the leaden soul of every state. But when a country ceases to be merely a country and becomes an empire, then the scale of operations changes dramatically. So may I clarify that tonight I speak as a subject of the American empire? I speak as a slave who presumes to criticize her king.

Since lectures must be called something, mine tonight is called Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy (Buy One, Get One Free).

Way back in 1988, on July 3, the U.S.S. *Vincennes*, a missile cruiser stationed in the Persian Gulf, accidentally shot down an Iranian airliner and killed two hundred and ninety civilian passengers.<sup>1</sup> George Bush the First, who was at the time on his presidential campaign, was asked to comment on the incident. He said quite subtly, “I will never apologize for the United States. I don’t care what the facts are.”<sup>2</sup>

I don’t care what the facts are. What a perfect maxim for the New American Empire. Perhaps a slight variation on the theme would be more apposite: The facts can be whatever we want them to be.

When the United States invaded Iraq, a *New York Times*/CBS News survey estimated that forty-two percent of the American public believed that Saddam Hussein was directly responsible for the September 11 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.<sup>3</sup> And an ABC News poll said that fifty-five percent of Americans believed that Saddam Hussein directly supported Al-Qaeda.<sup>4</sup> None of this opinion is based on evidence (because there isn’t any). All of it is based on insinuation, auto-suggestion, and outright lies circulated by the U.S. corporate media, otherwise known as the “Free Press,” that hollow pillar on which contemporary American democracy rests.

Public support in the United States for the war against Iraq was founded on a multi-tiered edifice of falsehood and deceit, coordinated by the U.S. government and faithfully amplified by the corporate media.

Apart from the invented links between Iraq and Al-Qaeda, we had the manufactured frenzy about Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction. George Bush the Lesser went to the extent of saying it would be "suicide" for the United States not to attack Iraq.<sup>5</sup> We once again witnessed the paranoia that a starved, bombed, besieged country was about to annihilate almighty America. (Iraq was only the latest in a succession of countries—earlier there was Cuba, Nicaragua, Libya, Grenada, Panama). But this time it wasn't just your ordinary brand of friendly neighborhood frenzy. It was frenzy with a purpose. It ushered in an old doctrine in a new bottle: the doctrine of pre-emptive strike, a.k.a. The United States Can Do Whatever The Hell It Wants, And That's Official.

The war against Iraq has been fought and won and no Weapons of Mass Destruction have been found. Not even a little one. Perhaps they'll have to be planted before they're discovered. And then the more troublesome amongst us will need an explanation for why Saddam Hussein didn't use them when his country was being invaded.

Of course, there'll be no answers. True believers will make do with those fuzzy TV reports about the discovery of a few barrels of banned chemicals in an old shed. There seems to be no consensus yet about whether they're really chemicals, whether they're actually banned, and whether the vessels they're contained in can technically be called barrels. (There were unconfirmed rumors that a teaspoonful of potassium permanganate and an old harmonica were found there, too.)

Meanwhile, in passing, an ancient civilization has been casually decimated by a very recent, casually brutal nation.

Then there are those who say, so what if Iraq had no chemical and nuclear weapons? So what if there is no Al-Qaeda connection? So what if Osama bin Laden hates Saddam Hussein as much as he hates the United States? Bush the Lesser has said Saddam Hussein was a "Homicidal Dictator."<sup>6</sup> And so, the reasoning goes, Iraq needed a "regime change."

Never mind that forty years ago, the CIA, under President John F. Kennedy, orchestrated a regime change in Baghdad. In 1963, after a successful coup, the Ba'ath party came to power in Iraq. Using lists provided by the CIA, the new Ba'ath regime systematically eliminated hundreds of doctors, teachers, lawyers, and political figures known to be leftists.<sup>7</sup> An entire intellectual community was slaughtered. (The same technique was used to massacre hundreds of thousands of people in Indonesia and East Timor.<sup>8</sup>) The young Saddam Hussein was said to have had a hand in supervising the bloodbath. In 1979, after factional infighting within the Ba'ath Party, Saddam Hussein became the president of Iraq. In April 1980, while Hussein was massacring Shias, U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski declared, "We see no fundamental incompatibility of interests between the United States and Iraq."<sup>9</sup> Washington and London overtly and covertly supported Saddam Hussein. They financed him, equipped him, armed him, and provided him with dual-use materials to manufacture weapons of mass destruction.<sup>10</sup> They supported his worst excesses financially, materially, and morally. They supported the eight-year war against Iran and the 1988 gassing of Kurdish people in Halabja, crimes which fourteen years later were reheated and served up as reasons to justify invading Iraq.<sup>11</sup> After the first Gulf War, the "Allies" fomented an uprising of Shias in Basra and then looked away while Saddam Hussein crushed the revolt and slaughtered thousands in an act of vengeful reprisal.<sup>12</sup>

The point is, if Saddam Hussein was evil enough to merit the most elaborate, openly declared assassination attempt in history (the opening move of Operation Shock and Awe), then surely those who supported him ought at least to be tried for

war crimes? Why aren't the faces of U.S. and U.K. government officials on the infamous pack of cards of wanted men and women?

Because when it comes to Empire, facts don't matter.

Yes, but all that's in the past, we're told. Saddam Hussein is a monster who must be stopped now. And only the United States can stop him. It's an effective technique, this use of the urgent morality of the present to obscure the diabolical sins of the past and the malevolent plans for the future. Indonesia, Panama, Nicaragua, Iraq, Afghanistan—the list goes on and on. Right now there are brutal regimes being groomed for the future—Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Pakistan, the Central Asian republics.

U.S. Attorney General John Ashcroft recently declared that U.S. freedoms are “not the grant of any government or document, but... our endowment from God.”<sup>13</sup> (Why bother with the United Nations when God himself is on hand?)

So here we are, the people of the world, confronted with an Empire armed with a mandate from heaven (and, as added insurance, the most formidable arsenal of weapons of mass destruction in history). Here we are, confronted with an Empire that has conferred upon itself the right to go to war at will and the right to deliver people from corrupting ideologies, from religious fundamentalists, dictators, sexism, and poverty, by the age-old, tried-and-tested practice of extermination. Empire is on the move, and Democracy is its sly new war cry. Democracy, home-delivered to your doorstep by daisy-cutters. Death is a small price for people to pay for the privilege of sampling this new product: Instant-Mix Imperial Democracy (bring to a boil, add oil, then bomb).

But then perhaps chinks, negroes, dinks, gooks, and wogs don't really qualify as real people. Perhaps our deaths don't qualify as real deaths. Our histories don't qualify as history. They never have.

Speaking of history, in these past months, while the world watched, the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq was broadcast on live TV. Like Osama bin Laden and the Taliban in Afghanistan, the regime of Saddam Hussein simply disappeared. This was followed by what analysts called a “power vacuum.”<sup>14</sup> Cities that had been under siege, without food, water, and electricity for days, cities that had been bombed relentlessly, people who had been starved and systematically impoverished by the U.N. sanctions regime for more than a decade, were suddenly left with no semblance of urban administration. A seven-thousand-year-old civilization slid into anarchy. On live TV.

Vandals plundered shops, offices, hotels, and hospitals. American and British soldiers stood by and watched.<sup>15</sup> They said they had no orders to act. In effect, they had orders to kill people, but not to protect them. Their priorities were clear. The safety and security of Iraqi people was not their business. The security of whatever little remained of Iraq's infrastructure was not their business. But the security and safety of Iraq's oil fields were. Of course they were. The oil fields were “secured” almost before the invasion began.<sup>16</sup>

On CNN and the BBC the scenes of the rampage were played and replayed. TV commentators, army and government spokespersons portrayed it as a “liberated people” venting their rage at a despotic regime. U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld said: “[I]t's untidy . . . [F]reedom's untidy. And free people are free to make mistakes and commit crimes and do bad things.”<sup>17</sup> Did anybody know that Donald Rumsfeld was an anarchist? I wonder—did he hold the same view during the riots in Los Angeles following the beating of Rodney King? Would he care to share his thesis about the Untidiness of Freedom with the two million people being held in U.S. prisons right now?<sup>18</sup> (The world's “freest” country has one of the highest

numbers of prisoners per capita in the world.<sup>19</sup>) Would he discuss its merits with young African American men, twenty-eight percent of whom will spend some part of their adult lives in jail?<sup>20</sup> Could he explain why he serves under a president who oversaw one hundred and fifty-two executions when he was governor of Texas?<sup>21</sup>

Before the war on Iraq began, the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance (ORHA) sent the Pentagon a list of sixteen crucial sites to protect. The National Museum was second on that list.<sup>22</sup> Yet the museum was not just looted, it was desecrated. It was a repository of an ancient cultural heritage. Iraq as we know it today was part of the river valley of Mesopotamia. The civilization that grew along the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates produced the world's first writing, first calendar, first library, first city, and, yes, the world's first democracy. King Hammurabi of Babylon was the first to codify laws governing the social life of citizens.<sup>23</sup> It was a code in which abandoned women, prostitutes, slave, and even animals had rights. The Hammurabi code is acknowledged not just as the birth of legality, but the beginning of an understanding of the concept of social justice. The U.S. government could not have chosen a more inappropriate land in which to stage its illegal war and display its grotesque disregard for justice.

At a Pentagon briefing during the days of looting, Secretary Rumsfeld, Prince of Darkness, turned on his media cohorts who had served him so loyally through the war. "The images you are seeing on television, you are seeing over and over and over, and it's the same picture, of some person walking out of some building with a vase. And you see it twenty times. And you think, 'My goodness, were there that many vases? Is it possible that there were that many vases in the whole country?'"<sup>24</sup>

Laughter rippled through the press room. Would it be all right for the poor of Harlem to loot the Metropolitan Museum? Would it be greeted with similar mirth?

The last building on the ORHA list of sixteen sites to be protected was the Ministry of Oil.<sup>25</sup> It was the only one that was given adequate protection.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps the occupying army thought that in Muslim countries lists are read upside down?

Television tells us that Iraq has been "liberated" and that Afghanistan is well on its way to becoming a paradise for women—thanks to Bush and Blair, the twenty-first century's leading feminists. In reality, Iraq's infrastructure has been destroyed. Its people brought to the brink of starvation. Its food stocks depleted. And its cities devastated by a complete administrative breakdown. Iraq is being ushered in the direction of a civil war between Shias and Sunnis. Meanwhile, Afghanistan has lapsed back into the pre-Taliban era of anarchy, and its territory has been carved up into fiefdoms by hostile warlords.<sup>27</sup>

Undaunted by all this, on May 2, 2003, Bush the Lesser launched his 2004 campaign hoping to be finally elected U.S. president. In what probably constitutes the shortest flight in history, a military jet landed on an aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, which was so close to shore that, according to the Associated Press, administration officials "acknowledged positioning the massive ship to provide the best TV angle for Bush's speech, with the vast sea as his background instead of the very visible San Diego coastline."<sup>28</sup> President Bush, who never served his term in the military,<sup>29</sup> emerged from the cockpit in fancy dress—a U.S. military bomber jacket, combat boots, flying goggles, helmet. Waving to his cheering troops, he officially proclaimed victory over Iraq. He was careful to say that it was just "one victory in a war on terror... [which] still goes on."<sup>30</sup>

It was important to avoid making a straightforward victory announcement, because under the Geneva Convention a victorious army is bound by the legal obligations of an occupying force, a responsibility that the Bush administration does not want to burden itself with.<sup>31</sup> Also, closer to the 2004 elections, in order to woo

wavering voters, another victory in the 'War on Terror' might become necessary. Syria is being fattened for the kill.

It was Hermann Goering, that old Nazi, who said, "People can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders . . . All you have to do is tell them they're being attacked and denounce the pacifists for a lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country."<sup>32</sup>

He's right. It's dead easy. That's what the Bush regime banks on. The distinction between election campaigns and war, between democracy and oligarchy, seems to be dosing fast.

The only caveat in these campaign wars is that U.S. lives must not be lost. It shakes voter confidence. But the problem of U.S. soldiers being killed in combat has been licked. More or less.

At a media briefing before Operation Shock and Awe was unleashed, General Tommy Franks announced, "This campaign will be like no other in history."<sup>33</sup> Maybe he's right.

I'm no military historian, but when was the last time a war was fought like this?

As soon as the war began, the governments of France, Germany, and Russia, which refused to allow a final resolution legitimizing the war to be passed in the U.N. Security Council, fell over each other to say how much they wanted the United States to win. President Jacques Chirac offered French airspace to the Anglo-American air force.<sup>34</sup> U.S. military bases in Germany were open for business.<sup>35</sup> German foreign minister Joschka Fischer publicly hoped that Saddam Hussein's regime would "collapse as soon as possible."<sup>36</sup> Vladimir Putin publicly hoped for the same.<sup>37</sup> These are governments that colluded in the enforced disarming of Iraq before their dastardly rush to take the side of those who attacked it. Apart from hoping to share the spoils, they hoped Empire would honor their pre-war oil contracts with Iraq. Only the very naive could expect old Imperialists to behave otherwise.

Leaving aside the cheap thrills and the lofty moral speeches made in the U.N. during the run-up to the war, eventually, at the moment of crisis, the unity of Western governments—despite the opposition from the majority of their people—was overwhelming.

When the Turkish government temporarily bowed to the views of ninety percent of its population and turned down the U.S. government's offer of billions of dollars of blood money for the use of Turkish soil, it was accused of lacking "democratic credentials."<sup>38</sup> According to a Gallup International poll, in no European country was support for a war carried out "unilaterally by America and its allies" higher than eleven percent.<sup>39</sup> But the governments of England, Italy, Spain, Hungary, and other countries of Eastern Europe were praised for disregarding the views of the majority of their people and supporting the illegal invasion. That, presumably, was fully in keeping with democratic principles. What's it called? New Democracy? (Like Britain's New Labour?)

In stark contrast to the venality displayed by their governments, on February 15, 2003, weeks before the invasion, in the most spectacular display of public morality the world has ever seen, more than ten million people marched against the war on five continents.<sup>40</sup> Many of you, I'm sure, were among them. They-we-were disregarded with utter disdain. When asked to react to the anti-war demonstrations, President Bush said, "It's like deciding, well, I'm going to decide policy based upon a focus group. The role of a leader is to decide policy based upon the security, in this case, the security of the people."<sup>41</sup>

Democracy, the modern world's holy cow, is in crisis. And the crisis is a profound one. Every kind of outrage is being committed in the name of democracy. It has

become little more than a hollow word, a pretty shell, emptied of all content or meaning. It can be whatever you want it to be. Democracy is the Free World's whore, willing to dress up, dress down, willing to satisfy a whole range of tastes, available to be used and abused at will.

Until quite recently, right up to the 1980s, democracy did seem as though it might actually succeed in delivering a degree of real social justice.

But modern democracies have been around for long enough for neo-liberal capitalists to learn how to subvert them. They have mastered the technique of infiltrating the instruments of democracy—the “independent” judiciary, the “free” press, the parliament—and molding them to their purpose. The project of corporate globalization has cracked the code. Free elections, a free press, and an independent judiciary mean little when the free market has reduced them to commodities on sale to the highest bidder.

To fully comprehend the extent to which democracy is under siege, it might be an idea to look at what goes on in some of our contemporary democracies. The world's largest: India, (which I have written about at some length and, therefore, will not speak about tonight). The world's most interesting South Africa. The world's most powerful: the United States of America. And, most instructive of all, the plans that are being made to usher in the world's newest: Iraq.

In South Africa, after three hundred years of brutal domination of the black majority by a white minority through colonialism and apartheid, a nonracial, multi-party democracy came to power in 1994. It was a phenomenal achievement. Within two years of coming to power, the African National Congress had genuflected with no caveats to the Market God. Its massive program of structural adjustment, privatization, and liberalization has only increased the hideous disparities between the rich and the poor. Official unemployment among blacks has increased from forty percent to fifty percent since the end of apartheid.<sup>42</sup> The corporatization of basic services—electricity, water, and housing—has meant that ten million South Africans, almost a quarter of the population, have been disconnected from water and electricity.<sup>43</sup> Two million have been evicted from their homes.

Meanwhile, a small white minority that has been historically privileged by centuries of brutal exploitation is more secure than ever before. They continue to control the land, the farms, the factories, and the abundant natural resources of that country. For them, the transition from apartheid to neo-liberalism barely disturbed the grass. It's apartheid with a clean conscience. And it goes by the name of democracy.

Democracy has become Empire's euphemism for neo-liberal capitalism.

In countries of the first world, too, the machinery of democracy has been effectively subverted. Politicians, media barons, judges, powerful corporate lobbyists, and government officials are imbricated in an elaborate underhand configuration that completely undermines the lateral arrangement of checks and balances between the constitution, courts of law, parliament, the administration, and, perhaps most important of all, the independent media that form the structural basis of a parliamentary democracy. Increasingly, the imbrication is neither subtle nor elaborate.

Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, for instance, has a controlling interest in major Italian newspapers, magazines, television channels, and publishing houses. The Financial Times reported that he controls about ninety percent of Italy's TV viewership.<sup>44</sup> Recently, during a trial on bribery charges, while insisting he was the only person who could save Italy from the left, he said, “How much longer do I have

to keep living this life of sacrifices?"<sup>45</sup> That bodes ill for the remaining ten percent of Italy's TV viewership. What price free speech? Free speech for whom?

In the United States, the arrangement is more complex. Clear Channel Communications is the largest radio station owner in the country. It runs more than twelve hundred channels, which together account for nine percent of the market.<sup>46</sup> When hundreds of thousands of American citizens took to the streets to protest against the war on Iraq, Clear Channel organized pro-war patriotic "Rallies for America" across the country.<sup>47</sup> It used its radio stations to advertise the events and then sent correspondents to cover them as though they were breaking news. The era of manufacturing consent has given way to the era of manufacturing news. Soon media newsrooms will drop the pretense, and start hiring theater directors instead of journalists.

As America's show business gets more and more violent and warlike, and America's wars get more and more like show business, some interesting crossovers are taking place. The designer who built the \$250,000 set in Qatar from which General Tommy Franks stage-managed news coverage of Operation Shock and Awe also built sets for Disney, MGM, and *Good Morning America*.<sup>48</sup>

It is a cruel irony that the United States, which has the most ardent, vociferous defenders of the idea of free speech, and (until recently) the most elaborate legislation to protect it, has so circumscribed the space in which that freedom can be expressed. In a strange, convoluted way, the sound and fury that accompanies the legal and conceptual defense of free speech in America serve to mask the process of the rapid erosion of the possibilities of actually exercising that freedom.

The news and entertainment industry in the United States is for the most part controlled by a few major corporations—AOL-Time Warner, Disney, Viacom, News Corporation.<sup>49</sup> Each of these corporations owns and controls TV stations, film studios, record companies, and publishing ventures. Effectively, the exits are sealed. America's media empire is controlled by a tiny coterie of people. Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission Michael Powell, the son of Secretary of State Colin Powell, has proposed even further deregulation of the communications industry, which will lead to even greater consolidation.<sup>50</sup>

So here it is—the world's greatest democracy, led by a man who was not legally elected. America's Supreme Court gifted him his job. What price have American people paid for this spurious presidency?

In the three years of George Bush the Lesser's term, the American economy has lost more than two million jobs.<sup>51</sup> Outlandish military expenses, corporate welfare, and tax giveaways to the rich have created a financial crisis for the U.S. educational system. According to a survey by the National Conference of State Legislatures, U.S. states cut forty-nine billion dollars in public services, health, welfare benefits, and education in 2002. They plan to cut another \$25.7 billion this year.<sup>52</sup> That makes a total of seventy-five billion dollars. Bush's initial budget request to Congress to finance the war in Iraq was eighty billion dollars.<sup>53</sup>

So who's paying for the war? America's poor. Its students, its unemployed, its single mothers, its hospital and home-care patients, its teachers, and its health workers.

And who's actually fighting the war?

Once again, America's poor. The soldiers who are baking in Iraq's desert sun are not the children of the rich. Only one of all the representatives in Congress and the Senate has a child fighting in Iraq.<sup>54</sup> America's "volunteer" army in fact depends on a poverty draft of poor whites, Blacks, Latinos, and Asians looking for a way to earn a living and get an education. Federal statistics show that African Americans make up

twenty-one percent of the total armed forces and twenty-nine percent of the U.S. Army. They account for only twelve percent of the general population.<sup>55</sup> It's ironic, isn't it—the disproportionately high representation of African Americans in the army and prison? Perhaps we should take a positive view and look at this as affirmative action at its most effective. Nearly four million Americans (two percent of the population) have lost the right to vote because of felony convictions.<sup>56</sup> Of that number, 1.4 million are African Americans, which means that thirteen percent of all voting-age Black people have been disenfranchised.<sup>57</sup>

For African Americans there's also affirmative action in death. A study by the economist Amartya Sen shows that African Americans as a group have a lower life expectancy than people born in China, in the Indian State of Kerala (where I come from), Sri Lanka, or Costa Rica.<sup>58</sup> Bangladeshi men have a better chance of making it to the age of sixty-five than African American men from here in Harlem.<sup>59</sup>

This year, on what would have been Martin Luther King Jr.'s seventy-fourth birthday, President Bush denounced the University of Michigan's affirmative action program favoring Blacks and Latinos. He called it “divisive,” “unfair,” and unconstitutional.<sup>60</sup> The successful effort to keep Blacks off the voting rolls in the state of Florida in order that George Bush be elected was of course neither unfair nor unconstitutional. I don't suppose affirmative action for White Boys From Yale ever is.

So we know who's paying for the war. We know who's fighting it. But who will benefit from it? Who is homing in on the reconstruction contracts estimated to be worth up to one hundred billion dollars?<sup>61</sup> Could it be America's poor and unemployed and sick? Could it be America's single mothers? Or America's Black and Latino minorities?

Consider this: The Defense Policy Board advises the Pentagon on defense policy. Its members are appointed by the Under Secretary of Defense and approved by Donald Rumsfeld. Its meetings are classified. No information is available for public scrutiny.

The Washington-based Center for Public Integrity found that nine out of the thirty members of the Defense Policy Board are connected to companies that were awarded defense contracts worth seventy-six billion dollars between the years 2001 and 2002.<sup>62</sup> One of them, Jack Sheehan, a retired Marine Corps general, is a senior vice president at Bechtel, the giant international engineering outfit.<sup>63</sup> Riley Bechtel, the company chairman, is on the President's Export Council.<sup>64</sup> Former Secretary of State George Shultz, who is also on the board of directors of the Bechtel Group, is the chairman of the advisory board of the Committee for the liberation of Iraq.<sup>65</sup> When asked by the *New York Times* whether he was concerned about the appearance of a conflict of interest, he said, “I don't know that Bechtel would particularly benefit from it. But if there's work to be done, Bechtel is the type of company that could do it.”<sup>66</sup>

Bechtel has been awarded a \$680 million reconstruction contract in Iraq.<sup>67</sup> According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Bechtel contributed \$1.3 million toward the 1999-2000 Republican campaign.<sup>68</sup>

Arcing across this subterfuge, dwarfing it by the sheer magnitude of its malevolence, is America's anti-terrorism legislation. The U.S.A. Patriot Act, passed on October 12, 2001, has become the blueprint for similar anti-terrorism bills in countries across the world. It was passed in the U.S. House of Representatives by a majority vote of 337 to 79. According to the *New York Times*, “Many lawmakers said it had been impossible to truly debate, or even read, the legislation.”<sup>69</sup>

The Patriot Act ushers in an era of systemic automated surveillance. It gives the government the authority to monitor phones and computers and spy on people in



ways that would have seemed completely unacceptable a few years ago.<sup>70</sup> It gives the FBI the power to seize all of the circulation, purchasing, and other records of library users and bookstore customers on the suspicion that they are part of a terrorist network.<sup>71</sup> It blurs the boundaries between speech and criminal activity, creating the space to construe acts of civil disobedience as violating the law.

Already hundreds of people are being held indefinitely as "unlawful combatants."<sup>72</sup> (In India, the number is also in the hundreds.<sup>73</sup> In Israel, five thousand Palestinians are now being detained.<sup>74</sup>) Noncitizens, of course, have no rights at all. They can simply be "disappeared" like the people of Chile under Washington's old ally, General Pinochet. More than one thousand people, many of them Muslim or of Middle Eastern origin, have been detained, some without access to legal representatives.<sup>75</sup>

Apart from paying the actual economic costs of war, American people are paying for these wars of "liberation" with their own freedoms. For the ordinary American, the price of New Democracy in other countries is the death of real democracy at home.

Meanwhile, Iraq is being groomed for "liberation." (Or did they mean "liberalization" all along?) The *Wall Street Journal* reports that "the Bush administration has drafted sweeping plans to remake Iraq's economy in the U.S. image."<sup>76</sup>

Iraq's constitution is being redrafted. Its trade laws, tax laws, and intellectual property laws rewritten in order to turn it into an American-style capitalist economy.<sup>77</sup>

The United States Agency for International Development has invited U.S. companies to bid for contracts that range from road building and water systems to textbook distribution and cell-phone networks.<sup>78</sup>

Soon after Bush the Second announced that he wanted American farmers to feed the world, Dan Amstutz, a former senior executive of Cargill, the biggest grain exporter in the world, was put in charge of agricultural reconstruction in Iraq. Kevin Watkin, Oxfam's policy director, said, "Putting Dan Amstutz in charge of agricultural reconstruction in Iraq is like putting Saddam Hussein in the chair of a human rights commission."<sup>79</sup>

The two men who have been shortlisted to run operations for managing Iraqi oil have worked with Shell, BP, and Fluor. Fluor is embroiled in a lawsuit by black South African workers who have accused the company of exploiting and brutalizing them during the apartheid era.<sup>80</sup> Shell, of course, is well known for its devastation of the Ogoni tribal lands in Nigeria.<sup>81</sup>

Tom Brokaw (one of America's best-known TV anchors) was inadvertently succinct about the process. "One of the things we don't want to do," he said, "is to destroy the infrastructure of Iraq because in a few days we were going to own that country."<sup>82</sup>

Now that the ownership deeds are being settled, Iraq is ready for New Democracy.

So, as Lenin used to ask: What Is To Be Done?

Well...

We might as well accept the fact that there is no conventional military force that can successfully challenge the American war machine. Terrorist strikes only give the U.S. government an opportunity that it is eagerly awaiting to further tighten its stranglehold. Within days of an attack you can bet that Patriot II would be passed. To argue against U.S. military aggression by saying that it will increase the possibilities of terrorist strikes is futile. It's like threatening Brer Rabbit that you'll throw him into

the bramble bush. Anybody who has read the document called "The Project for the New American Century" can attest to that. The government's suppression of the congressional joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities before and after the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, which found that there was intelligence warning of the strikes that was ignored,<sup>83</sup> also attests to the fact that, for all their posturing, the terrorists and the Bush regime might as well be working as a team. They both hold people responsible for the actions of their governments. They both believe in the doctrine of collective guilt and collective punishment. Their actions benefit each other greatly.

The U.S. government has already displayed in no uncertain terms the range and extent of its capability for paranoid aggression. In human psychology, paranoid aggression is usually an indicator of nervous insecurity. It could be argued that it's no different in the case of the psychology of nations. Empire is paranoid because it has a soft underbelly.

Its homeland may be defended by border patrols and nuclear weapons, but its economy is strung out across the globe. Its economic outposts are exposed and vulnerable.

Yet it would be naive to imagine that we can directly confront Empire. Our strategy must be to isolate Empire's working parts and disable them one by one. No target is too small. No victory too insignificant. We could reverse the idea of the economic sanctions imposed on poor countries by Empire and its Allies. We could impose a regime of Peoples' Sanctions on every corporate house that has been awarded a contract in post-war Iraq, just as activists in this country and around the world targeted institutions of apartheid. Each one of them should be named, exposed, and boycotted. Forced out of business. That could be our response to the Shock and Awe campaign. It would be a great beginning.

Another urgent challenge is to expose the corporate media for the boardroom bulletin that it really is. We need to create a universe of alternative information. We need to support independent media like *Democracy Now*, Alternative Radio, South End Press.

The battle to reclaim democracy is going to be a difficult one. Our freedoms were not granted to us by any governments. They were wrested from them by us. And once we surrender them, the battle to retrieve them is called a revolution. It is a battle that must range across continents and countries. It must not acknowledge national boundaries, but if it is to succeed, it has to begin here. In America. The only institution more powerful than the U.S. government is American civil society. The rest of us are subjects of slave nations. We are by no means powerless, but you have the power of proximity. You have access to the Imperial Palace and the Emperor's chambers. Empire's conquests are being carried out in your name, and you have the right to refuse. You could refuse to fight. Refuse to move those missiles from the warehouse to the dock. Refuse to wave that flag. Refuse the victory parade.

You have a rich tradition of resistance. You need only read Howard Zinn's *A People's History of the United States* to remind yourself of this.<sup>84</sup>

Hundreds of thousands of you have survived the relentless propaganda you have been subjected to, and are actively fighting your own government. In the ultra-patriotic climate that prevails in the United States, that's as brave as any Iraqi or Afghan or Palestinian fighting for his or her homeland.

If you join the battle, not in your hundreds of thousands, but in your millions, you will be greeted joyously by the rest of the world. And you will see how beautiful it is to be gentle instead of brutal, safe instead of scared. Befriended instead of isolated. Loved instead of hated.

I hate to disagree with your president. Yours is by no means a great nation. But you could be a great people.  
History is giving you the chance.  
Seize the time.

This lecture was taken from the book *An Ordinary Person's Guide to Empire*, South End Press, 2004.

#### NOTES: INSTANT-MIX IMPERIAL DEMOCRACY

1. Molly Moore, "The USS Vincennes and a Deadly Mistake: Highly Sophisticated Combat Ship at Center of Defense Department Investigation," *Washington Post*, July 4, 1988, p. A23.
2. RW. Apple, jr., "Bush Appears in Trouble Despite Two Big Advantages," *New York Times*, August 4, 1988, p. A1. See Lewis Lapham, *Theater of War* (New York: New Press, 2002), p.126.
3. Patrick E. Tyler and Janet Elder, "Threats and Responses: The Poll: Poll Finds Most In U.S. Support Delaying a War," *New York Times*, February 14, 2003, p. A1.
4. Maureen Dowd, "The Xanax Cowboy," *New York Times*, March 9, 2003, p. 4: 13.
5. President George W. Bush, address to the nation, State Floor Cross Hallway, the White House, Federal News Service, March 17, 2003, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html>.
6. President George W. Bush, speech at the Cincinnati Museum Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, Federal News Service, October 7, 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021007-8.html>.
7. See Said K. Aburish, *Saddam Hussein: The Politics of Revenge* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001). See also the PBS *Frontline* interview with Aburish, "Secrets of His life and Leadership," from *The Survival of Saddam*, <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saddam/interviews/aburish.html>.
8. See Anthony Arno, "Indonesia: Crisis and Revolt," *International Socialist Review* 5 (Fall 1998).
9. Originally stated in a May 1980 interview on the *MacNeil/Lehrer Report* on PBS. Quoted in Philip Geyelin, "Forget Gunboat Diplomacy," *Washington Post*, September 29, 1980, p. A13.
10. See Anthony Arno, ed., *Iraq Under Siege: The Deadly Impact of Sanctions and War*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2002), especially the chapter by Noam Chomsky, "US Iraq Policy: Consequences and Motives," pp. 65-74, and Arno's Introduction, pp. 11-31.
11. See, among many other of Bush's speeches, his address to the Wings over the Rockies Air and Space Museum, Denver, Colorado, Federal News Service, October 28, 2002, in which he reminded his audience that Hussein "is a person who has gassed his own people .... [H]e's anxious to have, once again to develop a nuclear weapon. He's got connections with al Qaeda." Bush also commented: 'We love life, everybody matters as far as were concerned, everybody is precious. They have no regard for innocent life whatsoever. (Applause.) They hate the fact that we love freedom. We love our freedom of religion, we love our freedom of speech, we love every aspect of freedom. (Applause.) And we're not changing. (Applause.) We're not intimidated. As a matter of fact, the more they hate our

freedoms, the more we love our freedoms. (Applause.)”

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/20021028-5.html>

12. See Arno, *Iraq Under Siege*, pp. 68-69.
13. “We are a nation called to defend freedom—a freedom that is not the grant of any government or document, but is our endowment from God.” See Dan Eggen, “Ashcroft Invokes Religion in U.S. War on Terrorism,” *Washington Post*, February 20, 2002, p. A2.
14. Michael R. Gordon, “Baghdad’s Power Vacuum Is Drawing Only Dissent,” *New York Times*, April 21, 2003, p. A10.
15. Peter Beaumont, “Anger Rises as US Fails to Control Anarchy,” *The Observer* (London), April 13, 2003, p. 3.
16. Jim Dwyer, “Troops Endure Blowing Sands and Mud Rain,” *New York Times*, March 26, 2003, p. A1; Neela Banerjee, “Army Depots in Iraqi Desert Have Names of Oil Giants,” *New York Times*, March 27, 2003, p. C14.
17. Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, Defense Department operational update briefing, Pentagon Briefing Room, Arlington, Virginia, Federal News Service, April 11, 2003.
18. Reuters, “Number Imprisoned Exceeds 2 Million, Justice Dept. Says,” *Washington Post*, April 7, 2003, p. A4; The Sentencing Project, “U.S. Prison Populations: Trends and Implications,” May 2003, p. 1, <http://www.sentencingproject.org/pdfs/1044.pdf>.
19. The Sentencing Project, “U.S. Prison Populations,” p. 1.
20. Fox Butterfield, “Prison Rates among Blacks Reach a Peak, Report Finds,” *New York Times*, April 7, 2003, p. A12.
21. Richard Willing, “More Seeking President’s Pardon,” *USA Today*, December 24, 2002, p. 3A.
22. Paul Martin, Ed Vuffiamy, and Gaby Hinsliff, “US Army Was Told to Protect Looted Museum,” *The Observer* (London), April 20, 2003, p. 4; Frank Rich, “And Now. ‘Operation Iraqi Looting,’” *New York Times*, April 27, 2003, p. 2: 1.
23. See Scott Peterson, “Iraq: Saladin to Saddam,” *Christian Science Monitor*, March 4, 2003, p. 1.
24. Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, Defense Department operational update briefing, Pentagon Briefing Room, Arlington, Virginia, Federal News Service, April 11, 2003.
25. Martin, Vuffiamy, and Hinsliff, “US Army Was Told to Protect Looted Museum,” p. 4.
26. See Robert Fisk, “Americans Defend Two Untouchable Ministries from the Hordes of Looters,” *The Independent* (London), April 14, 2003, p. 7:

“Iraq’s scavengers have thieved and destroyed what they have been allowed to loot and burn by the Americans—and a two-hour drive around Baghdad shows clearly what the US intends to protect. After days of arson and pillage, here’s a short but revealing scorecard. US troops have sat back and allowed mobs to wreck and then burn the Ministry of Planning, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Irrigation, the Ministry of Trade, the Ministry of Industry, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Information. They did nothing to prevent looters from destroying priceless treasures of Iraq’s history in the Baghdad Archaeological Museum and in the museum in the northern city of Mosul, or from looting three hospitals. The Americans have, though, put hundreds of troops inside two Iraqi ministries that remain untouched—and untouchable—because tanks and armoured personnel

carriers and Huruvees have been placed inside and outside both institutions. And which ministries proved to be so important for the Americans? Why, the Ministry of Interior, of course—with its vast wealth of intelligence information on Iraq—and the Ministry of Oil.”

27. Carlotta Gall, “In Afghanistan, Violence Stalls Renewal Effort,” *New York Times*, April 26, 2003, p. A1. See also David Rohde, “U.S. Rebuked on Afghans in Detention,” *New York Times*, March 8, 2004, p. A6.
28. Scott Lindlaw, “Accommodating TV-Friendly Presidential Visit Caused a Few Changes in Navy Carrier's Routine,” Associated Press, May 2, 2003.
29. Walter V. Robinson, “1 -Year Gap in Bush's Guard Duty: No Record of Airman at Drills in 1972-73,” *Boston Globe*, May 23, 2000, p. A1.
30. David E. Sanger, “Bush Declares 'One Victory in a War on Terror,'” *New York Times*, May 2, 2003, p. A1.
31. James Harding, “Bush to Hail Triumph but Not Declare a US Victory,” *Financial Times* (London), May 1, 2003, p. 8.
32. Quoted in John R. MacArthur, “In the Psychological Struggle, Nations Wield Their Weapons of Mass Persuasion,” *Boston Globe*, March 9, 2003, p. D12.
33. General Tommy Franks, *Sunday Morning CBS*, March 23, 2003.
34. “'Non' Campaigner Chirac Ready to Address French,” *Daily Mail* (London), March 20, 2003, p. 13.
35. Robert J. McCartney, “Germany Stops Short of Saying 'I Told You So': Opposition to War Vindicated, Officials Say,” *Washington Post*, April 3, 2003, p. A33: “Although Germany formally opposes the war, it is supporting the U.S. effort through such steps as overflight rights and special security at U.S. bases in Germany. Officials say Germany is doing more for the war than any country except Britain.” See also Giles Tremlett and John Hooper, “War in the Gulf: Clampdown on Coverage of Returning Coffins,” *The Guardian* (London), March 27, 2003, p. 3.
36. Judy Dempsey and Robert Graham, “Paris Gives First Signs of Support to Coalition,” *Financial Times* (London), April 4, 2003, p. 4.
37. Interfax, “Putin Wants US Victory,” *Hobart Mercury* (Australia), April 4, 2003.
38. Morton Abramowitz, “Turkey and Iraq, Act II,” *Wall Street Journal* January 16, 2003, p. A12.
39. Noam Chomsky, *Hegemony or Survival: Americas Quest for Global Dominance* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), p. 131.
40. Angelique Chrisafis et al., “Millions Worldwide Rally for Peace,” *The Guardian* (London), February 17, 2003, p. 6, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/antiwar/story/0,12809,897098,00.html>.
41. Richard W. Stevenson, “Antiwar Protests Fail to Sway Bush on Plans for Iraq,” *New York Times*, February 19, 2003, p. A1.
42. David McDonald and John Pape, “South Africa: Cost Recovery Is Not Sustainable,” *Africa News*, August 30, 2002; David McDonald and John Pape, eds., *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa* (London: Zed Press, 2002). See also Ashwin Desai, *We Are the Poors: Community Struggles in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (New York Monthly Review Press, 2002).
43. “Africa's Engine,” *The Economist*, January 17, 2004.
44. Paul Betts, “Ciampi Calls for Review of Media Laws,” *Financial Times* (London), July 24, 2002, p. 8. For an overview of Berlusconi's holdings, see Ketupa.net Media Profiles: <http://www.ketupa.net/berlusconil.htm>.

45. Frank Bruni, "Berlusconi, in a Rough Week, Says Only He Can Save Italy," *New York Times*, May 10, 2003, p. A1. 134
46. Tim Burt, "Mays on a Charm Offensive: The Clear Channel Chief Is Seeking to Answer His Group's Critics," *Financial Times* (London), October 27, 2003, p. 27. See also John Dunbar and Aron Pilhofer, "Big Radio Rules in Small Markets," The Center for Public Integrity, October 1, 2003, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/telecom/report.aspx?aid=63&sid200>.
47. Douglas Jehi, "Across Country, Thousands Gather to Back U.S. Troops and Policy," *New York Times*, March 24, 2003, p. B15.
48. Frank Rich, "Iraq Around The Clock," *New York Times*, March 30, 2003, p. 2: 1.
49. Bagdikian, *The New Media Monopoly*.
50. Tom Shales, "Michael Powell and the FCC: Giving Away the Marketplace of Ideas," *Washington Post*, June 2, 2003, p. C1; Paul Davidson and David Lieberman, "FCC Eases Rules for Media Mergers," *USA Today*, June 3, 2003, p. 1A.
51. David Leonhardt, "Bush's Record on jobs: Risking Comparison to a Republican Ghost," *New York Times*, July 3, 2003, p. C1.
52. Robert Tanner, "Report Says State Budget Gaps jumped by Nearly 50 Percent, with Next Year Looking Worse," Associated Press, February 5, 2003.
53. Dana Milbank and Mike Allen, "Bush to Ask Congress for \$80 Bil. ... Estimate of War's Cost Comes as Thousands March in Protest," *Washington Post*, March 23, 2003, p. A1.
54. Sheryl Gay Stolberg, "Senators' Sons in War: An Army of One," *New York Times*, March 22, 2003, p. B10. See also David M. Halbfinger and Steven A. Holmes, "Military Mirrors a Working-Class America," *New York Times*, March 30, 2003, p. 1A.
55. Darryl Fears, "Draft Bill Stirs Debate Over The Military, Race and Equity," *Washington Post*, February 4, 2003, p. A3.
56. David Cole, "Denying Felons Vote Hurts Them, Society," *USA Today*, February 3, 2000, p. 17A; "From Prison to the Polls," editorial, *Christian Science Monitor*, May 24, 2001, p. 10.
57. See Cole, "Denying Felons" and sidebar: "Not at the Ballot Box."
58. Kenneth J. Cooper, "In India's Kerala, Quality of Life Is High but Opportunity Is Limited," *Washington Post*, January 3, 1997, p. A35; Amartya Sen, *Development As Freedom* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999). See also Fareed Zakaria, "Beyond Money," *New York Times Book Review*, November 28, 1999, p. 14.
59. Linda Villarosa, "As Black Men Move Into Middle Age, Dangers Rise," *New York Times*, September 23, 2002, p. F1.
60. Amy Goldstein and Dana Milbank, "Bush joins Admissions Case Fight: U-Mich. Use of Race Is Called 'Divisive,'" *Washington Post*, January 16, 2003, p. A1; James Harding, "Bush Scrambles to Bolster Civil Rights Credibility," *Financial Times* (London), January 21, 2003, p. 10.
61. Elizabeth Becker and Richard A. O'Connell, Jr., "Bechtel Top Contender In Bidding Over Iraq," *New York Times*, March 29, 2003, p. 136.
62. André Verloy and Daniel Politi, with Aron Pilhofer, "Advisors of Influence: Nine Members of the Defense Policy Board Have Ties to Defense Contractors," Center for Public Integrity, March 28, 2003, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/report.aspx?aid91&sidz200>.
63. Laura Peterson, "Bechtel Group Inc.," Center for Public Integrity, <http://www.publicintegrity.org/wow/bio.aspx?act=pro&ddlC=6>.
64. Peterson, "Bechtel Group Inc."
65. Bob Herbert, "Spoils of War," *New York Times*, April 10, 2003, p. A27.

66. Quoted in Herbert, "Spoils of War."
67. Karen DeYoung and Jackie Spinner, "Contract for Rebuilding of Iraq Awarded to Bechtel: U.S. Firm 1 of 6 Invited to Bid for \$680 Million Project," *Washington Post*, April 18, 2003, p. A23. In December 2003, the contract was raised by \$350 million, to \$1.03 billion. In January 2004, Bechtel won a contract worth another \$1.8 billion. See Elizabeth Douglass and John Hendren, "Bechtel Wins Another Iraq Deal," *Los Angeles Times*, January 7, 2004, p. C2.
68. Stephen J. Glain, "Bechtel Wins Pact to Help Rebuild Iraq: Closed-Bid Deal Could Total \$680M," *Boston Globe*, April 18, 2003, p. A1.
69. Robin Toner and Neil A. Lewis, "House Passes Terrorism Bill Much Like Senate's, but with 5-Year Limit," *New York Times*, October 13, 2001, p. 136.
70. See Cole, *Enemy Aliens*, pp. 57-69.
71. Evelyn Nieves, "Local Officials Rise Up to Defy the Patriot Act," *Washington Post*, April 21, 2003, p. A1.
72. See Cole, *Enemy Aliens*.
73. Amnesty International, "India: Abuse of the Law in Gujarat: Muslims Detained Illegally in Ahmedabad," November 6, 2003, AI index no. ASA 20/029/2003, <http://web.amnesty.org/library/Index/ENGASA200292003?open&of=ENG-IND>. See also "People's Tribunal Highlights Misuse of POTA," *The Hindu*, March 18, 2004; and Sanghamitra Chakraborty et al., "Slaves in Draconia: Ordinary Folks-Minors, Farmers, Minorities-Fall Prey to POTA for No Fault of Theirs," *Outlook India*, March 22, 2004.
74. Greg Myre, "Shootout in West Bank Kills an Israeli Soldier and a Palestinian," *New York Times*, March 13, 2003, p. A5.
75. Wayne Washington, "More Opposition to Detentions in Terror Probe," *Boston Globe*, May 13, 2002, p. A1; Tamar Lewin, "As Authorities Keep Up Immigration Arrests, Detainees Ask Why They Are Targets," *New York Times*, February 3, 2002, p. 1: 14.
76. Neil King, jr., "Bush Officials Draft Broad Plan For Free-Market Economy in Iraq," *Wail Sheet Journal*, May 1, 2003, p. A1.
77. Naomi Klein, "Iraq Is Not America's to Sell," *The Guardian* (London), November 7, 2003, p. 27. See also Jeff Madrick, "The Economic Plan for Iraq Seems Long on Ideology, Short on Common Sense," *New York Times*, October 2, 2003, p. C2.
78. David Usborne, "US Firm Is Hired to Purge Schools of Saddam's Doctrine," *The Independent* (London), April 22, 2003, p. 10; Steve Johnson, "Scramble to Win the Spoils of War," *Financial Times* (London) April 23, 2003, p. 27; Paul Richter and Edmund Sanders, "Contracts Go to Allies of Iraq's Chalabi," *Los Angeles Times*, November 7, 2003, p. A1.
79. Heather Stewart, "Iraq: After the War: Fury at Agriculture Post for US Grain Dealer," *The Guardian* (London), April 28, 2003, p. 11.
80. Alan Cowell, "British Ask What a War Would Mean for Business," *New York Times*, March 18, 2003, p. W1; "Spoils of War," editorial, *San Francisco Chronicle*, March 29, 2003, p. A14; Jan Hennop, "S. African Apartheid Victims File Lawsuit in US Court, Name Companies," *Agence France-Presse*, November 12, 2002; Nicol Degli Innocenti, "African Workers Launch \$100bn Lawsuit," *Financial Times* (London), October 13, 2003, p. 9.
81. John Vidal, "Shell Fights Fires as Strife Flares in Delta," *The Guardian* (London), September 15, 1999, p. 15; Vidal, "Oil Wealth Buys Health in Country Within a Country," *The Guardian* (London), September 16, 1999, p. 19. See also Ike Okonta and Oronto Douglas, *Where Vultures Feast: Shell, Human Rights, and Oil* (New

- York: Verso, 2003) and Al Gedicks, *Resource Rebels: Native Challenges to Mining and Oil Corporations* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2001).
82. Tom Brokaw, speaking to Vice Admiral Dennis McGinn, *NBC News Special Report: Target Iraq*, NBC, March 19, 2003.
  83. Bryan Bender, "Roadblocks Seen in Sept. 11 Inquiry," *Boston Globe*, July 9, 2003, p. A2. See also Josh Meyer, "Terror Not a Bush Priority Before 9/11, Witness Says," *Los Angeles Times*, March 25, 2004, p. A1, and Edward Alden, "Tale of Intelligence Failure Above and Below," *Financial Times* (London), March 26, 2004, p. 2.
  84. Howard Zinn, *A People's History of the United States*, 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 2000). See also Anthony Arnove and Howard Zinn, *Voices of a People's History of the United States* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2004).