

CounterPunch

June 1-15, 2003

Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair

VOL. 10, NO. 11

Our Little Secrets

ANYBODY BUT BUSH? LOOK BEFORE YOU LEAP TO DEAN

BY ALEXANDER COCKBURN

Here we are, enjoying solstice sunrise at 5.48 am and sunset at 8.35 pm (probably classified info if you ask Tom Ridge). We're in the early summer of 2003 and already people are acting as though the first Democratic primary was only a month or two away. Do we care? Oh yes, we most definitely do. Already we're wading deeper into the issues that will pulse with increasing intensity across the next 17 months.

Is the task of booting George Bush out of the White House paramount? Out with the imperial Crusader, the death penalty loving, Bill of Rights trashing, drug-war advocating corporate serf! By all means. But whoa! Who's this we see, galloping out of the mists of rosy-fingered dawn, knight-errant sent by the gods to give the kiss of life to all our fainting hopes? It's... why it's... yes, it's *another* imperial Crusader, a death penalty loving, Bill of Rights trashing, drug-war advocating, corporate serf. Only he's a Democrat, not a Republican. That changes everything. Or does it?

Take Howard Dean, former governor of Vermont. Right now, he's enjoying a boomlet. Across this great land, ambitious Democrats are hopping from foot to foot in an agony of indecision. Kerry, Graham, Dean,

(OLS continued on page 2)

The Blitz and the Rosenbergs: How I Came to Oppose the Death Penalty

BY PETER LINEBAUGH

I had been living in London for five years after World War II. In 1953 our school was made to turn out in the streets for the Coronation. On the same day news arrived of Hillary, a New Zealander, and Tensing, a Nepalese, reaching the summit of Mt. Everest. There was no picture of Hillary at the top because he didn't trust Tensing with the camera.

At about this time our headmaster's brother came back from Kenya and told the school racist stories against the Mau Mau. I took the bus home from school everyday and walked by a crematorium. We lived in Golders Green, a Jewish suburb of London. I had seen pictures from Buchenwald and Auschwitz. I had begun to ponder these things, as an eleven-year old can.

When I got home Mrs. Church put the kettle on and we had a nice cup of hot tea, while waiting for Mr. Church to fetch her. Mrs. Church was our 'char,' as my mother said, a Cockney from the East End of London. She was even a pearly. She made her own clothes (decorating them with 'pearls') and wore stout leather shoes which Mr. Church kept polished. She was short and strong. Her hands were gnarled and gentle. Her hair was full, pure white, like a cumulus crown, and her eyes were as perfectly blue as the sky, and just as warm and just as clear.

Sometimes Mr. Church would stay for tea too. That's when I learned he had been an auxiliary in the London Fire Brigades, one of 23,000. When the high explosive bombs and the incendiaries began to fall on London in September

1940 for 57 consecutive nights it was the heroic mobilization of the Fire Brigades that kept the infernos of destruction from razing London to ashes, as happened later to Dresden or Hiroshima. They battled fire on the docks and they saved St. Paul's, and much else--democracy, for instance--from the advanced technology of the Nazis. The esprit of the brigades was "anarchic and tolerant."

Mr. Church survived and helped to initiate me into what another London fire fighter called the secret proletarian society of the wink. "If you could hear the bomb whistling, you knew it was not headed for you," he said passing on a secret of war. "It was the ones you couldn't hear that you had to watch out for."

On 19 June 1953 I came home as usual and sat down for tea. Mrs. Church turned on the wireless. We listened to the BBC as Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were electrocuted at Sing Sing prison in America. There was an incredible solemnity in the kitchen, and I was terrified.

When it was reported that Ethel was not killed by the first jolt of electricity, Mrs. Church's kindly demeanor began to change. As the subsequent jolts were administered she seemed to be remembering something, perhaps it was from one of the Discussion Groups that they used to have with the Fire Brigades. Then she came to a decision. She was no longer going to treat me as a child, soothing my fears with a "there, there." I was grown-up enough to learn, and it

(Rosenbergs continued on page 6)

OUR LITTLE SECRETS

Gephardt: which way to jump? Dean! Clinton without the satyriasis, Carter without the Baptist sanctimony; a simple country doctor (albeit with Dean and Witter armorial bearings) who ran Vermont through the Nineties and who, somewhere in the mid to late 90s, began to set his compass for the White House. Liberal, but not excessively so; against the war, but no peacenik.

We're realists. We know that anyone hoping to win the Democratic nomination has to achieve acts of political prestidigitiation equivalent to, though harder than, guiding a herd of rampaging Gadarene swine through the eye of a needle. No matter that a candidate might have the idealism and social conscience of William Morris, the conscience of Philip Berrigan, the moral clarity of Robespierre or Ralph Nader, he'd still have to act as ruthless swineherd. We know that. But we'll confess it. The more we look at Dean the less we like him.

The death penalty? Yes, Dean evolved into a pro-death penalty position just when he was debating a White House run. For heinous crimes like killing kids or cops. Now, with his eye on the primary in South Carolina, he's added "terrorists" to those

into whose arms he would stick the needle. Isn't that the posture of Ashcroft or of W. Bush, who signed more death warrants than any other governor in US history? It is, but be reassured by the Dean campaign. In a Dean administration those consigned to Death Row will know, even as the needle starts pumping the poison into their veins, that President Dean went that last half mile to ensure fairness.

Medical marijuana? In our ledger that's a very, very big issue. Is the Democratic candidate wholly owned by the pharmaceutical companies, the bluenose lobby? Dean says "My opposition to medical marijuana is based on science, not based on ideology". Oh yeah? His opposition is based on straightforward, 200 percent proof political calculation. He looked in the crystal ball and he decided he didn't want to be pilloried by Tim Russert and the rest of the telepundits as a friend of the herb, so Gov. Dean headed off a really good medical marijuana law making its way through Vermont's assembly, same way he undercut a pioneering health initiative in Vermont. Recently he called Gephardt's health proposal "pie-in-the-sky radical revamping". He was gung-ho for welfare "reform", which he has called an "incredibly positive force". He's a "fiscal conservative", which is kiddy code for serf of capital.

But the editors of CounterPunch live west of the Rockies. Maybe there are things about the northeast, about Vermont, we don't know. We asked CounterPuncher Ron Jacobs, who lives in Vermont, and who's written a terrific book on the Weather Underground, for his take.

"I am not a fan of Dean's. His economic policies are essentially conservative (in the negative sense of that word) and his stances on social issues are, at best contradictory. He was never a trailblazer in Vermont while governor. Indeed, his support of what was probably the most controversial issue of his tenure in that position—the civil unions story—he only supported the bill after it was a done deal. Nonetheless, he did sign it and has become more supportive as time passes.

"The medical marijuana situation is not surprising, given Dean's record on controlled substances in general. Vermont only recently opened its first methadone

clinic (despite a growing number of heroin addicts) because Governor Dean fought tooth-and-nail against the clinic, claiming the treatment was ineffective. He has consistently opposed any attempts to liberalize the state's marijuana laws (medical or recreational), and has championed the ever-higher taxation of beer and wine.

"His personal history includes some drug and alcohol problems when he was younger and this seems to have colored his perception of all drugs and drug users. He even opposed a bill that would have re-introduced hemp growing in the state, making claims as ridiculous as the DEA's concerning industrial hemp being a gateway to the good stuff.

"In terms of his fiscal policies, he seems all too willing to compromise on the backs of the poor (working and otherwise). He did institute a very good program of medical insurance for uninsured children whose parents are low-middle income known as Dr. Dynosaur. However, as the state budget shrank, he began to raise the premiums working poor had to pay on the insurance and he also allowed the administration of said insurance to be privatized, which raised the cost again. On welfare reform, his approach seems to be working and is fairly humane and strives to be flexible within the ever-restrictive Federal guidelines. He tends to favor big business by providing tax break 'incentives' and less oversight on environmental laws. All this being said, his candidacy does intrigue me, if only because of his opposition to the Bush-Rumsfeld axis of war."

And just how deep is that opposition? Yes, he did denounce the attack on Iraq as unjustified, and he took some stick for that. Good for him, but as we reported here, in a recent issue of CounterPunch, Dean is a solid, mainstream imperial Democrat, with entirely predictable prostration to AIPAC and the Likudniks.

That's enough, for now. Just hold that check to the Dean campaign.

APPOINTMENT NEAR O'HARE: CHICAGO MOOT SHOWS PEACE MOVEMENT FULL OF PEP AND FIZZ, (BUT DEMS BEWARE)

"When we look back in a year or two or five," the agitator (and friend of CounterPunch) Bill Dobbs recently wrote

Editors
ALEXANDER COCKBURN
JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

Business
BECKY GRANT

Design
DEBORAH THOMAS

Counselor
BEN SONNENBERG

Published twice monthly except
August, 22 issues a year:
\$40 individuals,
\$100 institutions/supporters
\$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.

All rights reserved.

CounterPunch

PO Box 228

Petrolia, CA 95558

1-800-840-3683 (phone)

counterpunch@counterpunch.org

www.counterpunch.org

us, "I think it will become clear the war on Iraq helped to propel the domestic peace and justice movement to a much higher level of organizing."

Okay, Bill, but people still wonder: Can the peace movement keep going; and if so, in what direction? Will it become a recruiting base for Democratic candidates for the nomination, or will it remain an independent force?

A foretaste, maybe even the taste, of what the answers might be came at the start of June in Chicago, at a conference organized by United For Peace and Justice. UFPJ. Wazzat? After organizing the two largest anti-war demos in this country (Feb 15, March 22) United for Peace and Justice (of which Dobbs is the press coordinator) is now the major national coalition with more than 650 member groups. UFPJ is the left of Win Without War (which finds the Democrats enchanting), and is the largest operation this side of ... the sectarians.

One of those at the conference was CounterPuncher Chris Ten Barge, who drove to Chicago from Salt Lake City, where she teaches at the University of Utah. Now laid up with a ruptured disc, Chris still managed to send us this report.

To keep the peace movement fired up, United for Peace & Justice (UFPJ), the broadest (and most ambitious) of the peace movement umbrella groups convened an intense, long weekend national meeting with 530 delegates from 38 states and 350 organizations, June 6-8 in a Holiday Inn near Chicago's O'Hare airport.

The conference was aflame with a cross section of America's radicals, everyone from the Socialist Alternative to Code Pink! to US Labor Against the War, to the Communist Party USA, along with local coalitions such as Wasatch Coalition for Peace & Justice (Salt Lake City), the Terre Haute (IN) Stop War on Iraq, and East End Women in Black, just to name a few.

UFPJ picked up the tab for room and board with cash mostly provided through the New York-based Funding Exchange. The gathering was overwhelming in its intensity and aspirations, joyous, highly energetic, loud and noisy.

The theme of UFPJ's relationship to the Democratic Party ran like a hot wire throughout the entire meeting. At no time did it seem likely that the majority of delegates were anything but independent of both parties. There were impassioned pleas

for UFPJ to endorse Dennis Kucinich (also, from a very few, Howard Dean) but such calls were easily overwhelmed by the majority of those present. UFPJ will not be endorsing or supporting any candidates, at any level. Demonstrations are scheduled for both the Republican and Democratic conventions next year.

The most heavily endorsed strategies included defense of immigrants and of the Bill of Rights and a campaign against the Patriot Act. There'll be protests against the WTO, and demonstrations scheduled for the meeting of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, November 17-21 in Miami, Florida, and the Fort Benning School of the Americas campaign November 22-23.

Almost as popular was a proposal for a Peoples Convention/World Says No to Bush campaign, including a Peoples Convention for the Spring of 2004 and the demonstrations noted above at the Democratic Convention in Boston, July 25-30, then in New York City and around the world during the Republican Convention in September.

There was significant support for campaigns to end the Israeli Occupation of Palestine. During the mini-plenary session 'Justice for Palestine Campaign', delegates pro-

And just how deep is that opposition? Yes, he did denounce the attack on Iraq as unjustified, and he took some stick for that. Good for him, but Dean is a solid, mainstream imperial Democrat, with entirely predictable prostration to AIPAC and the Likudniks.

posed UFPJ participate in another 'International Day of Action', building on the nationwide success of June 5 (36th anniversary of the Israeli Occupation), including coordinated local actions from around the world as well as in Israel and Palestine.

One campaign proposal, submitted by Bay Area United Against War was to participate in the 'Global Day of Protest Against Occupation & Empire' initiated by the European peace movement (specifically from Campaign GENOA 2001-ESF, Stop the War Coalition, and Palestinian Workers Union in Greece) and endorsed by International A.N.S.W.E.R., on September 27, the first day of Rosh Hashanah, and the anniversary of the beginning of the second Intifada

This proposal provoked a long debate fueled by reps from the Tikkun Community, amid mostly silence from US Campaign to End the Israeli Occupation members. It was handled diplomatically by plenary facilitator (and CounterPuncher) Rahul Mahajan from Austin, Texas' NOWAR Collective. AN-SWER'S divisive date was defeated during the mini-plenary, not settled during the final session, but left instead for a working group which is tasked to find a date and craft a message that will "assure broad participation and sensitivity to both the Palestinian and Jewish communities".

Further down the list were proposals to set up a "Baghdad Occupation Watch", the development of "peace zones", support of the August 2-30 National Poor People's March for Economic Human Rights from Mississippi to Washington, D.C., a campaign to rid all countries of weapons of mass destruction, and educational awareness work around Iran and North Korea.

There were some swerves and jolts over the weekend, unsurprising with so large a crowd committed to democratic debate. The volatile and always contentious left wingers often shouted at each other over conference rumblings, holding up the triangle sign to

call attention and object to one point or another. The steering committee selected on Sunday morning consists of 35 people: 48.5 per cent are women, 51.5 per cent are people of color, 11.5 per cent are "youth", and 11.5 per cent are lgbt. These were all categories in which specific percentage targets were set in the Structure Proposal for UFPJ adopted late on the evening before.

The conference managed to finesse the ridiculous proposition that it adopt a model of (absolute) consensus for every decision. Eventually a modified consensus decision-making model was proposed, but not without long debate and some frustration. What's really important, though, is that the conference (OLS *continued on page 6*)

Onward and Downward

Book-Cooking at Boeing Reaches New Lows

BY JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

Early this summer, a top Wall Street stock picker issued a glowing report about Boeing: buy, buy, buy. The unusually rosy assessment for the troubled company had nothing to do with the need to replenish the Pentagon's arsenal of cruise missiles depleted by the Iraq war or the Bush administration's drive to implement Star War, both of which will net Boeing billions. No, this analysis, written by Heidi Wood, a vice-president at Morgan Stanley, pointed to "a no risk" risk deal with the federal government to lease 100 Boeing-767 tanker aircraft.

According to Wood's report, the deal will generate \$2.3 billion in profit for Boeing. To put this in perspective, that's about as much profit as Boeing reaps for the sale of 1,033 of its 737 commercial airliners. From Boeing's perspective, the great part of the tanker deal is that the company has few obligations, yet the government is locked into the leases, even if it proves that the Pentagon doesn't need the planes. Boeing is guaranteed a 15 percent profit on each plane it delivers. "There's substantially less risk than is common in the commercial aircraft market," Wood wrote.

Wood should know what she's talking about. The Wall Street Journal calls her the top stock analyst in the Aerospace/Defense sector and she also serves as a Bush appointee to the Commission on the Future of the US Aerospace Industry.

Under the deal approved by the Pentagon last month, Boeing will convert 100 B-767s into military refueling tankers. It's quite a coup, because many Air Force generals have said that the planes aren't needed, an assessment backed up by a Government Accounting Office investigation.

There are currently 545 KC-135 tankers in the Air Force fleet. More than 400 of them are new, fully upgraded "R" models. The other 134 tankers are older "E" models that some inside the Pentagon and the Congress are anxious to replace with the leased planes from Boeing.

On the surface, the Boeing proponents appear to have an argument: the E tankers

are aging. Most of the planes are 35 years old. However, the Air Force primarily assesses the life span of planes based not on age but on flight hours. The engines for the "E" model has a projected life of 36,000 flying hours. A 1995 GAO report revealed that the majority of the "E" tankers have accumulated about 13,000 hours. The report projected that not one of the tanker planes in the fleet would reach its limit until 2040. The new plan is to begin replacing the E tankers with the Boeing planes in 2006.

Even if the Air Force decided it needed to upgrade the engines on the E planes sooner, because of added usage and stress from the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, it would be much cheaper to simply upgrade the engines instead of entering into a lease arrangement with Boeing. The GAO estimates that the entire fleet of "E" tankers

Bulls for Boeing: Billions in profits and no risk involved.

could be upgraded with "R" engines for about \$3.6 billion. This is more than seven times cheaper than the \$26 billion the Air Force will have to fork out for the Boeing commercial tankers.

Even though Boeing famously fled Seattle to set up its new headquarters in Chicago, the tanker lease deal was engineered through the tireless work of the Washington State congressional delegation, led by Sen. Patty Murray and Congressman Norm Dicks. Wood, who demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of the political economics of the Beltway, cautions investors that Boeing may need to demonstrate its gratitude to the Washington delegation by agreeing to locate some of its manufacturing plant for the new 7E7 commercial jet in Seattle rather than in a more corporate friendly environs.

"A subtle negative may be the payback required considering political capital BA [Boeing] has expended to land the tanker deal," Wood warned. "Now the company

is somewhat beholden to its hard-working Washington constituency. This may limit some of the latitude the company would probably like to have in deciding where to build the 7E7, adding pressure to keep some of the 7E7 work in expensive, union-dominated Seattle."

Of course, the congressional delegation couldn't have prevailed on its own. Boeing got some vital help greasing this deal from the inside as well in the form of Darleen Druyun, a top Air Force official who called herself the Godmother of the C-17—the troubled air transport plane made by Boeing. According to Pentagon sources, she helped craft the tanker deal, fought off skeptical Pentagon accountants and auditors, worked the appropriations committees and, finally, when it all seemed nicely tied up, retired from the Pentagon and joined Boeing as an executive vice-president, where she now supervises the company's interests before congress and the Pentagon.

Druyun is not the only Pentagon powerbroker to be recruited into Boeing's corporate hangar. Recently, Boeing's board has boasted both former Defense Secretary William Perry and John M. Shalikashvili, at one time the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In 2001, Boeing also hired Rudy de Leon, Clinton's Deputy Secretary of Defense, to run its Washington office. Although De Leon is known as a hawk and a masterful dealmaker, his hiring may have been a rare misstep for Boeing, since congressional Republicans howled that the company should have picked one of their own from the Pentagon's rolls.

It's just this kind of zealous devotion to political payback and behind-the-scenes influence peddling that has landed Boeing in a rare spot of trouble. According to a one paragraph item in Reuters from early June, the Inspector General of the Air Force has opened an investigation into Boeing whether or not Boeing should be debarred from bidding on contracts with the federal government. The probe stems from allegations that Boeing executives received proprietary information from Lockheed concerning bids on Pentagon

In the past decade, the Pentagon has suspended the contract privileges of only one major company... for five days

contracts.

The Lockheed affair is not Boeing's only transgression. The Project on Government Oversight, a DC-based Pentagon watchdog group, reported last year that since 1990 Boeing has committed more than 36 violations and has been forced to pay more than \$350 million in fines, penalties, restitution and settlement. Among the more recent allegations:

- Boeing placed defective gears in Chinook helicopters;
- Company officials offered bribes to members of the Bahamas government as a means of securing a contract;
- Produced a defective safety system for the Apache helicopter;
- Misrepresented the progress of cleanup at Rocky Flats nuclear weapons site;
- the State Department charges that Boeing violated the Arms Export Control Act and International Traffic in Arms Regulations—more than 100 instances are cited;
- Accused of civil rights violations in hiring and salary practices toward blacks and women;
- Routinely mistated labor costs and exaggerated overhead costs.

These are serious charges of criminal and civil malfeasance, some of which Boeing didn't even dispute. Yet, despite the rap sheet, Boeing has never been suspended or debarred from bidding on contracts since 1990. Federal contract guidelines require that contractors to the government sanction violators and only award contracts to "responsible" contractors with a record of "integrity and business ethics".

Of course, Boeing is hardly alone in getting a pass from these high-minded rules. In the past decade, out of the top 50 defense contractors the Pentagon has only suspended the contract privileges of only one major company, General Electric Avionics Division, and that lasted for only five days.

Even so, some in Congress, aghast at the mere possibility of a crackdown on cheating contractors, are make haste to loosen the rules even further. At the behest of Boeing and other big contractors, Rep, Tom Davis, the Virginia Republican who chairs the House Government Reform Committee, has just introduced legislation

that will unravel many of the key provisions governing the regulation of Pentagon contracts.

One of the changes proposed by Davis is for the Pentagon to shift to so-called Time and Material and Labor Hour contracts, where the weapons firms would get paid for how much time they spent working on a project rather than by such standards as to whether they completed it on time or according to code. This amounts to a blank check without any incentive ever finish the job. Davis even includes a provision that would prohibit government auditors from examining the contractor's billing records.

The congressman, who once won a Harvard rock trivia contest by correctly identifying the Blues Magoos as the group that performed the 1966 hit "(We Ain't Got) Nothin' Yet", also wants to expand the use of Share-in-Savings Contracts, a kind of Enron-style financial speculation that allows contractors to be lavishly reimbursed for investments in infrastructure upgrades, such as computer systems. The companies are allowed to charge the government for "efficiency savings" over the lifetime of the contract. But even the Bush administration is skeptical of such claims. In hearings before Congressman Davis's committee last year, Angela Styles, the chief procurement analyst for the White House, testified that her office had examined dozens of the contracts and had "seen no real savings."

The program is so ripe for fraud that one expert in defense contracts compared it to the savings-and-loan scandal. "Share-in-Savings contracts could propagate problems similar to those that accompanied deregulation of the government-insured savings-and-loans institutions or procurement of defense spare parts in the 1980s by sole-source contracts," says Charles Tiefer, a professor at the University of Baltimore School of Law.

The biggest prize for the defense contractors is Davis's plan to scrap key provisions in two hated laws: the Truth in Negotiations Act and the Cost Accounting Standards Act. Back in the late 1960s, Senator William Proxmire teamed with Admiral Hyman Rickover to standardize accounting procedures for defense con-

tractors during the spending frenzy of the Vietnam War. They also set up a board to oversee the enforcement of the standards and deflate the complex accounting tricks of the defense contractors which were costing the government more than \$6 billion a year.

The Truth in Negotiations Act forced weapons manufacturers to come clean with the true basis of their pricing and cost data. Under current guidelines, defense contractors must comply with TINA for any contract over \$550,000. Davis's measure would effectively gut the bill by making the reporting requirements apply only to contracts involving more than \$200 million.

After the defense industry consolidation frenzy of the 1990s, many Pentagon contract offerings now receive only one bid. To allow the defense companies to set their own accounting and pricing rules in this sole-source environment is to invite the kind of runaway fraud last seen in the procurement scandals of the 1970s and 1980s. It's one way to jumpstart the economy. No wonder Wall Street's bullish on Boeing. CP

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year \$40 Two yrs \$70
 (\$35 email only / \$45 email/print)
 One year institution/supporters \$100
 One year student/low income, \$30
 T-shirts, \$17
 Please send back issue(s)
 _____ (\$5/issue)

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

Payment must accompany order, or dial 1-800-840-3683 and renew by credit card. Add \$12.50 for Canadian and \$17.50 for foreign subscriptions. If you want Counter-Punch emailed to you please supply your email address. Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch Business Office**
 PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

(**Rosenbergs** continued from page 1)

was time I came of age.

I shall never forget her words. "That's what Mr. Church fought against during the Blitz." Her words were like those that might accompany a burnt offering or a sacrificial holocaust and I hold them accordingly.

It was not long before we sailed to New York on the S.S. United States, then the fastest ocean-going liner in the world. We were supposed to be impressed that the only thing on it that could burn was the wooden butcher's block. Behind glass on the foyer outside the First Class Lounge was a facsimile of the Declaration of Independence which my mother helped me to read aloud. Opposite it was a Navajo sand painting.

America, as I was beginning to know, had some history of freedom and lots of technology, but it was also a land, like that of the National Socialists, where they burnt people.

Later in college I lived across the hall from Mike Meeropol, the eldest son of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. He threw his head back, strummed the twelve-string guitar, and sang blues and protest songs of the whole world as if his life depended on it.

That helped me, as well, to see how anti-fascism, anti-racism, anti-imperialism, and anti-capitalism have to begin with opposition to the death penalty. CP

Peter Linebaugh is the author of The London Hanged and, with Marcus Rediker, of the excellent Many-Headed Hydra.

(**OLS** continued from page 3)

ence achieved its goals: to keep the spirit and drive, the incredible energy of so many devoted peace activists, alive and kicking. It was a great start and promises much. Let's hope it doesn't get bogged down with trivial in-fighting about just who's in charge of peace.

FOWL SLURS REBUTTED EGG ON 60 MINUTES' FACE?

Here at CounterPunch we're keen admirers of John Sugg, senior editor at the Atlanta-based paper Creative Loafing. When it comes to reporting John's no loafer. Sugg recently described in hilarious detail how 60 Minutes has apparently made a fool of itself trumpeting news that Gainesville, Georgia, had hosted terrorist chickens, alleged feathered friends of Osama bin Laden operating out of training camps (OK, deep fryers) near the shores of Lake Lanier.

60 Minutes alleged that millions of chickens had disappeared from a poultry farm's ledger books, with the proceeds funneled to terrorist groups based in Virginia. Lawsuits just filed in Atlanta and Washington claim that the network didn't check facts before it claimed several Muslim groups based in Herndon, Virginia, had terrorist ties. For a start, the litigation contends, correspondent Bob Simon never bothered to ask Mar-Jac Poultry of Gainesville—whose investors include some individuals connected to the Virginia groups—about its squadrons of alleged terrorist-tinged fowls.

Instead, Simon relied on a woman called

"Anonymous" who, in her lurid book dubbed Terrorist Hunter, boasts: "Mata Hari had nothing on me." Who she? In the "60 Minutes" report, Anonymous—later identified as a self-appointed spy named Rita Katz—points to a chart that purportedly shows the flow of dollars from the Virginia outfits to Osama bin Laden. Mar-Jac Poultry, a pillar of Gainesville business since 1948, is named on the chart. "Chicken is one of the things that no one can really track down," Katz said to CBS' Simon. "If you say in one year that you lost 10 million chickens, no one can prove it. They just died. You can't trace money with chickens."

Sugg reports that no charges have been filed, and Mar-Jac's lawyers say they've been told their client isn't a target of prosecutors. "CBS News aided and abetted a disguised and anonymous character assassin's hit-and-run tactics," says Nancy Luque, a Washington lawyer for the Muslim groups. Luque is demanding \$80 million for her clients in Washington.

It turns out Katz was the "research director" for self-styled terrorism expert Steven Emerson until sometime last year when the two split. Sugg has pointed out for years that Emerson is a fraud. Emerson sued him and but collapsed last month, and withdrew his suit.

As Sugg writes, Emerson has made "so many many gaffes—most memorable, his 1995 attempt on CBS to link the Oklahoma City bombing to Muslims—he's been run out of many respectable newsrooms." These days he has a perch at MSNBC, an outfit whose relationship to truth is remote at all times. CP

CounterPunch

PO Box 228

Petrolia, CA 95558

BBQ Weather, Wear a CP Shirt!

To Order Call: 1-800-840-3683

GALLOWAY IRAQ PAPERS WERE FAKES

Faked documents pop up in many chapters of the Iraq saga, most notoriously with the forgeries, seemingly done by a department of Britain's MI6, designed to show that Saddam's regime was getting nuclear material from Niger.

Among the documents headlined around the world after the US/UK invasion were ones supposedly showing that George Galloway, a Scottish member of parliament and vociferous opponent of the invasion, had been on Saddam's payroll.

We now learn, courtesy of a story in the London Evening Standard that the Christian Science Monitor has conceded that the documents claiming he had accepted millions from Saddam Hussein were forgeries. As the Standard said,

"The admission by the Christian Science Monitor was a huge boost for the Glasgow Kelvin MP in his fight to retain his place in the Labour party... The Monitor conceded that its claims against the MP were based on forged material. It had claimed he took 6million (pounds sterling) from Baghdad over several years. It admitted that papers obtained by its journalist Philip Smucker from Iraqi general Salah Abdel Rasool were fakes."

Thus far, the British Telegraph, owned by fanatic Sharon-backer Canadian tycoon Conrad Black, (who also owns the Jerusalem Telegraph) has refused to back down from its claim that documents found in Baghdad show Galloway got vast sums from Saddam Hussein. Galloway has threatened a libel suit, but according to the Standard, not yet served a writ.

