As the U.S. hypocritically pressures other nations to sanction Iran for its development of nuclear power, one of the tightly guarded secrets of the major nations of the world is the number of nuclear warheads each possesses. Casual research reveals the following which is probably, at best, a very rough estimate. (Note: According to Jay Kvale, Twin Cities Peace Campaign and WAMM, who follows nuclear issues closely, numbers can be misleading because of the size and delivery mode of weapons. Although Russia has more warheads, the U.S. has a stronger arsenal because of advanced delivery systems in the form of its submarines, missiles, planes, etc.)

Russia: 11,000
United States: 8,500
France: 300
China: 240
United Kingdom: 225
Israel: 80
Pakistan: 90–110
India: 80–100
North Korea: 10

The new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, START, between the United States and Russia signed on July 6, 2009, will reduce the number of deployed warheads on each side to 1,500. To ascertain just where the other nuclear nations are in this effort would require much research. If there is such information, it is not easily available.

At the same time, in a November 11, 2011, Guardian Weekly article entitled, “Nuclear Powers Plan Arms Spending Spree,” Richard Norton-Taylor tells his readers that “the world’s nuclear powers plan to spend hundreds of billions of dollars modernizing and upgrading weapons warheads and delivery systems over the next decade.” The break-down follows: The U.S. will spend $700 billion and Russia $70 billion; China, India, Israel, France and Pakistan are expected to devote formidable sums to tactical and strategic missile systems.

The report is the first in a series of papers for the Trident Commission, an Independent cross-party initiative set up by BASIC, the British American Security Information Council. The report warns that Pakistan and India appear to be seeking smaller, lighter nuclear warheads so they have a greater range or can be deployed over shorter distances for tactical or “non-strategic” roles. In the case of Israel, the size of its nuclear-tipped, cruise missile-enabled submarine fleet is being increased and the country seems to be on course, on the back of its satellite-launch rocket program, for future development of an inter-continental ballistic missile.

A common justification for the new programs is perceived vulnerability in the face of nuclear and conventional force development elsewhere—for example, Russia has expressed concern over the U.S. missile defense and Conventional Prompt Global Strike programs. China has expressed similar concerns about the U.S., as well as India, while India’s programs are driven by fear of China and Pakistan. Pakistan justifies its nuclear arms plans by referring to India’s conventional force superiority.

In January, the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved the hands of its Doomsday Clock to five minutes to midnight, due to inadequate progress on nuclear weapons reduction and proliferation. Are we doomed, or can we turn back the hands of time?

Five Minutes to Midnight

by Polly Mann

continued on page 5
A Plea from Mothers for Peace in Iran

In a heart-wrenching letter to the Secretary-General and the Security Council of the United Nations dated November 3, 2011, Mothers for Peace in Iran beseech the international community to respect Iran and the lives of Iranians in the face of economic sanctions, from which they have since begun to seriously suffer. Military threats are increasing against Iran, as well. The full content of the letter can be seen in the blog section on the Fellowship of Reconciliation web site. http://forusa.org/blogs

—Editor’s Note

Economic sanctions and military threats toward Iran will have one result: institutions in power will increase their pressure on people inside of the country. The outcome of this pressure is the militarization of society by authorities. Hence, the only effect of this kind of isolation is the weakening of Iranian society and delaying our path toward democracy and the establishment of civil society. It is obvious that the only results of isolation and violence are, first, the destruction and waste of wealth and life of the Iranian nation, and, second, more instability in the region.

The only result of economic sanctions is that they deter Iranians from reaching democracy and preoccupy them with achieving basic daily needs.

A Wake Up All Call!

The more we can educate the better! We really need to reach outside our comfortable “choirs” of those who agree with us to the larger (ignorant, apathetic) public, either through demonstrations or through sharing news and photographs with those friends, relatives, and citizenry who are not paying attention to the issues of war and war crimes. The wars and war blowback are not over but worsen daily. As speakers said at the Washington D.C. event (See photo opposite page.), the situation under the Obama Administration is far worse than it was under Bush.

We are perched on the brink of watching a new war break out, this time on Iran. It will be a repeat of the destructive invasion of Iraq but many times worse not only in terms of the millions of people that will be killed in the Mid-east but also in terms of the blowback on the United States and Israel. And yet almost no one speaks out here in the U.S.! The mainstream media and, with very few exceptions, both political parties, have turned to war mongering. Not only do most of the congresspersons of both parties but Minnesota senators Klobuchar and Franken, both, accordingly give speeches in support of draconian sanctions (seen as war provocation), stopping diplomacy which will ultimately lead to war on Iran.

Coleen Rowley Coleen Rowley is a former FBI Agent. She holds a law degree, and served in Minneapolis as “Chief Division Counsel,” a position which included oversight of Freedom of Information, as well as providing regular legal and ethics training to FBI Agents. Today, as a private citizen, she is active in civil liberties, and peace and justice issues.

Photo: Tom Bottolene

The need to arouse the broader public with an antwwar message is as urgent today as it was in 2003 when this photo was taken at the time the U.S. was about to launch war on Iraq.
Why were people in orange jumpsuits silently filing through the Minneapolis skyways? The answer may be ten years old, but those in the jumpsuits will tell you the problem is not in the past, but is a current one.

January 9, 2012 was the 10th anniversary of the memo that gave President George Bush the right to ignore the Geneva Conventions and authorize torture. Authors of the memo were Robert Delahunty, now a St. Thomas Law School professor and John Yoo, now a University of California at Berkeley law professor. Local peace activists have demonstrated against Professor Delahunty ever since he joined St. Thomas in 2004.

Many believe that the Delahunty-Yoo memo led directly to the torturing of prisoners at Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib prisons and many other human rights violations by American troops.

The “enhanced interrogation techniques” are reported to be continuing.

This year the demonstrators wore hooded orange jump suits, the attire of prisoners at Guantanamo, and marched silently through the Minneapolis Skyways from The Peoples Plaza to the second floor library at The University of St. Thomas Law School library asking to see the books authored by Delahunty. They were denied admission. The “prisoners” then joined a rally in front of the law school.

The objectives of this continued protest effort include closing Guantanamo, more public disclosure of the on-going Delahunty-Yoo writings and a forum at St. Thomas including Professor Delahunty and other lawyers with differing viewpoints. Protesters accuse Delahunty of war crimes. They have also been picketing St. Thomas Law School commencements arguing that the students are not getting a complete picture of the torture issue.

For more on the demonstration, see The Uptake at theuptake.org on January 12, 2012.

Roger Cuthbertson is a retired social studies teacher who protests against torture with Tackling Torture at the Top (T3). He is a dedicated activist, renown for employing original and creative tactics in the justice and peace movement, such as flying colorful kites with antiwar messages on them and performing in the musical duo, Chick Pea and String Bean, with his partner, Jo.

NDAA: Military Can Imprison Us, Too All Opposed: Occupy Power!

Our most precious safeguard, the Bill of Rights, has been effectively destroyed, and the Supreme Court has allowed the Constitution to be perverted. This cannot be allowed to stand unopposed. On March 30, 2012, people from across the country will gather for an American Spring in Washington, D.C. See: The National Occupation of Washington, D.C. at NOWDC.org.

None of Us Were Like This Before

by Joshua E.S. Phillips. Verso Books, dist by W.W. Norton; pub. date: June 10, 2010)

The experience of soldiers who detained and interrogated detainees reflects the huge dilemma and consequences of their actions. Senior leaders in the military and in the highest level of government failed to account for their actions, failed to protect soldiers who expected clear instructions, and failed the Nation in preventing torture and abuse of the enemy.

—Major General Antonio Taguba

Military Madness

When you ask young men to go kill people for a living, it takes a whole lot of effort to rein that in.


Poster: Occupy Cyberspace at http://occupycyberspace.wordpress.com

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT WILL AUTHORIZE THE U.S. GOVERNMENT TO USE THE U.S. MILITARY TO IMPRISON AMERICAN CITIZENS WHO QUESTION THE GOVERNMENT’S POLITICAL AGENDA, AND DETAIN THEM WITH NO CHARGES, OR TRIAL, INDEFINITELY.
But until the occupation of Wall Street, we had not yet been able to define ourselves as belonging to a collective group with shared interests; shared interests that cross religious, ethnic, and political lines. The proverbial cat was out of the bag, and the power elites watched on in disbelief and fear as the 99% began to come of age. The language of class struggle had returned and people of all backgrounds and perspectives began to see themselves as joined together in a struggle against the oppression, murder, and thievery that had been going on right under their noses.

—Nation of Change www.nationofchange.org

When a WAMM friend said that providing for the Common Good was part of our Constitution, I blinked. “Surely not,” I demurred. We’d been discussing why on earth corporate-led capitalism, backed by military might, was the basis of U.S. domestic and foreign policy; maybe the Common Good should be a guide.

It seemed to me that in most religions and social theories, foundational principles call for taking care of one another—but was this principle part of the U.S. Constitution? The document that protects individuals and minorities from the oppression of the majority?

She started quoting, so I had to look it up.

“Common Good in the Constitution” led me to all sorts of references, including a number of right wing blogs that list common good among liberal buzzwords. Fascinating comments were attached, such as “When a politician says ‘for the common good’ I hide my billfold and keep my back against a wall,” and “Isn’t ‘the common good’ a communist slogan?” I hadn’t realized the phrase was so controversial.

In legal decisions about the Constitution, courts have relied on the Preamble for evidence about its intent, as the Founders understood it. Of course, such understandings need to be balanced with the changed circumstances of modern society, but the Preamble does form a guide to interpreting the principal document of our democracy:

We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Hmm. Providing for the Common Good didn’t seem to get in there; providing for the Common Defense did. The rest of the goals, however, do indicate an interest in taking care of one another, especially the objective “promote the general welfare.” Together with justice and peace (tranquility could be construed as domestic peace), and liberty’s blessings, the aims and duties of governance do seem to provide for a common good. Even the common defense is, arguably, a “good” in preventing attacks from other nations.

continued on page 5
The framers of the Constitution must have understood the common good as central to human polity; the phrase certainly was current in American revolutionary thought. In his inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson declared: “according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good.”

Another signer, James Madison, deplored the tendencies of political opponents to divide themselves into parties that “inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good” (Federalist Papers, 1787, Federalist No. 10). “To pour forth benefits for the common good is divine,” said Benjamin Franklin, less well known as the founder of U.S. library systems, who gave his first library that inscription.

The framers of the Constitution must have understood the common good as central to human polity; the phrase certainly was current in American revolutionary thought. In his inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson declared: “according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good.”

Another signer, James Madison, deplored the tendencies of political opponents to divide themselves into parties that “inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good” (Federalist Papers, 1787, Federalist No. 10). “To pour forth benefits for the common good is divine,” said Benjamin Franklin, less well known as the founder of U.S. library systems, who gave his first library that inscription.

The Common Good was not coined in the 18th century, although utilitarian principles associated with “the greatest good for the greatest number” may have reached an apogee with the philosophers Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. The notion originated, say ethicists at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, the Jesuits’ Santa Clara University in Southern California, “over two thousand years ago in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero.” Aspects of the idea were present in prophetic calls for justice and communal caring throughout Judeo/Christian scriptures and, I’d venture, in sacred writings of human societies much longer ago.

However, there are people and organizations doing more than hoping and praying. They are trying to beat the clock by working to eliminate nuclear weapons, through both grassroots and established institutions.

Polly Mann is a co-founder of Women Against Military Madness and a regular contributor and columnist for the WAMM newsletter. She is active in the organization and serves on the WAMM Newsletter Committee.

Cold War Aesthetics by
Chinese artist Wang Guangyi

Five Minutes, continued from page 1

North Korea unveiled a new Nusudan missile in 2010 with a range of up to 4,000 kilometers, capable of reaching targets in Japan but it is unclear whether the country can make warheads small enough to fit these missiles.

One thing is certain. We know that some people are very happy with this spending spree—the munitions makers and their stock holders—but one thing all of the people of the above nations have in common is that they are all paying for these weapons while they hope or pray that they will never be used. What a waste of resources and money!

A Common Thread, continued from page 4

The framers of the Constitution must have understood the common good as central to human polity; the phrase certainly was current in American revolutionary thought. In his inaugural address, Thomas Jefferson declared: “according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good.”

Another signer, James Madison, deplored the tendencies of political opponents to divide themselves into parties that “inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common good” (Federalist Papers, 1787, Federalist No. 10). “To pour forth benefits for the common good is divine,” said Benjamin Franklin, less well known as the founder of U.S. library systems, who gave his first library that inscription.

The Common Good was not coined in the 18th century, although utilitarian principles associated with “the greatest good for the greatest number” may have reached an apogee with the philosophers Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. The notion originated, say ethicists at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, the Jesuits’ Santa Clara University in Southern California, “over two thousand years ago in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero.”

Aspects of the idea were present in prophetic calls for justice and communal caring throughout Judeo/Christian scriptures and, I’d venture, in sacred writings of human societies much longer ago.

Too many sites to explore can be brought up about the phrase common good in this googolific universe. But the commonality, in terms of political behavior, is that a society, through its systems and institutions, enables all its members to live fruitful, healthy, and beneficial lives. I won’t go into the negatives of this society that block such fulfillment; I’ll just say I’d rather put my hand in someone else’s hand than on my billfold, with my back against the wall.

* www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/decision/commongood.html

Carol Masters is a writer, editor and long-time peace activist. She serves on the WAMM Newsletter Committee and WAMM Board. Together with Mary Davids, she co-authored You Can’t Do That! Marv Davids, Nonviolent Revolutionary (Nodin Press, LLD, Minneapolis, 2009).

RESOURCES

Nukewatch: nukewatchinfo.org
Nuke Resistor: nukeresistor.org
Peace Action: peace-action.org
Global Network-Keep Space for Peace!: space4peace.org
Bulletin of Atomic Scientists: thebulletin.org
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation: wagingpeace.org
Global Zero: globalzero.org
International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons: ican.org
Ploughshares Fund: ploughshares.org

WORD UP!

2012: United Nations Year of the Cooperative

Cooperatives are a reminder to the international community that it is possible to pursue both economic viability and social responsibility.

— United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon

The International Year of Cooperatives raises public awareness of the invaluable contributions of cooperative enterprises to poverty reduction, employment generation and social integration. Highlights strengths of the cooperative business model as an alternative means of doing business and furthering socioeconomic development. social.un.org/coopsyear/index.html
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Please note that WAMM’s provision of information on other group’s events is not meant to convey or endorse any action contrary to public policy that would be inconsistent with exempt purposes under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) i.e., charitable purposes.

Ongoing WAMM Vigils for Peace

Vigil to End the War on Iraq: Every Wednesday, 4:30 to 5:30 p.m. on the Lake Street/Minneapolis Avenue Bridge spanning the Mississippi River between Minneapolis and St. Paul. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

Vigil to End the Occupation of Palestine: Every Friday, 4:15 to 5:30 p.m. at Summit and Snelling Avenues, St. Paul. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

For information on additional peace vigils in Minnesota and Wisconsin, call the WAMM office at 612-827-5364 or visit www.worldwidewamm.org.

Ongoing WAMM Committee Meetings

Board Meeting: Third Tuesday of each month, 6:00 p.m. at the Sabathani Community Center, 310 East 38th Street, Minneapolis. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

Book Club: Second Saturday of each month, 10:00 a.m. FFI and Location: Contact Suzy, 651-451-8627 or suzykoch@comcast.net.

Iraq Committee: First Monday of each month, 5:30 p.m. FFI: Call Marie, 612-522-1861.

Middle East Committee: Second Monday of each month, 9:30 a.m. at the Sabathani Community Center, 310 East 38th Street, Minneapolis. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

Media Committee: FFI: Email the committee, wammmmedia@gmail.com.

St. Joan of Arc/WAMM Peacekeepers: Fourth Tuesday of each month, 7:00 to 8:00 p.m. at St. Joan of Arc Church, Parish Center, 4537 Third Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Barbara, 612-722-4444

Tackling Torture at the Top (T3): Second Wednesday of each month, 10:00 a.m. at Afro Deli and Coffee, 1939 5th Street South (Riverside and 20th Avenue), Minneapolis.

WAMM Speak Out: First and Third Saturdays, 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Sabathani Community Center, 310 East 38th Street, Minneapolis. Join us to share what’s concerning you about the state of our country. For old and new WAMM members and other interested parties. Sponsored by: WAMM. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

People of Faith Peacemakers Breakfast: Second and fourth Wednesdays, 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. at the new location: African Development Center, Riverside and 20th Avenues. A resource and support group for those concerned about peace with justice from a faith perspective. FFI: www.justviewpoint.org or call 763-784-5177.

Grandmothers for Peace: First Wednesday 12:45 p.m. at Edina Public Library, 5280 Grandview Square, Edina. Program around justice issue that helps us to understand our role in changing unjust systems. FFI: 952-929-1566

Tea Time Conversational Salons: Most Tuesdays, 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. at Mad Hatter’s TeaHouse, 943 West Seventh St., St. Paul. Salons are open to all. Suggested donations $3-$5 include tea, treats. FFI: 651-227-2511 or 651-227-3228.

Third Thursday Global Issues Forum: 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. at Hennepin Ave. United Methodist Church, Groveland at Lyndale Ave., Minneapolis. FFI: globalsolutionsmn.org

Middle East Peace Now: Usually 2nd or 3rd Saturdays, 9:30 a.m. Refreshments, 10:00 a.m. Program. Location may vary. FFI: Call 651-696-1642 or see www.mepn.org


Active Nonviolence Training: Interactive session (non-lecture and non-reading) in social change analysis, community-building and project planning to strengthen our group for action. FFI and to register, visit www.creatingacultureofpeace.org

Special Events

Grand Jury Indictment Emergency Action: If the federal Grand Jury indicts Sarah Martin, Ahn Pham or Tracy Molm, or if other activists are re-subpoenaed, there will be an emergency action held at 4:30 p.m. at the U.S. Federal Building, 4th St & 4th Ave., Downtown Minneapolis. Watch for action alerts. FFI: See stopfbi.net and mnStopFBI.wordpress.com, or call (612) 379-3585.

Not About Bombs—Iraqi Female Artists Exhibit: Through Saturday, March 3, Intermedia Arts, 2822 Lyndale Ave. S., Minneapolis. Contemporary, photo-based works by eminent female Iraqi artists exploring an identity in flux. Addresses how a female perspective can fit into the modern context of turmoil and conflict through art and avoid falling into the typical ways that women are represented and misrepresented. Presented by Intermedia Arts and the Iraq American Reconciliation Program. WAMM is a co-sponsor FFI: 612-871-4444 or 612-827-5364

WAMM's Sixth Annual Valentine's Party “Love, not War!” Saturday, February 11, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m. See ad on page 10 for details. or call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

World in Arms Art Exhibit: March 9 through May 4, The Anderson Center at Tower View, 163 Tower View Drive, Red Wing. Sculptor Gita Ghei's exhibit showcases drawings, photography, large installation pieces about war. Talks by three Iraqi war veterans, and

Dr. Corine Wegener, curator, Minneapolis Institute of Arts, who will discuss art conservation during the recent Iraq war. FFI: Visit www.andersoncenter.org.

Citizens for Global Solutions 2012 Annual Conference: March 15 through 17, Washington, D.C. Three exciting days reflecting on inspiring social, political changes of past year. Learn to use your political voice at lobby, messaging trainings, be inspired by international individuals changing their countries, spend a day inside the most powerful house in America: the White House! Sponsored by: the Citizens for Global Solutions FFI and to Register: Visit https://org2.democracyinaction.org/go/5550/p/salsa/event/common/public?event_KEY=45255.

WAMM 2012 Annual Meeting: Date: TBD, 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. Location: TBD Good Music! Good Program! Good Brunch! WAMM Action! Meet old friends. Make new friends. Win raffle prizes. Support WAMM. FFI: Call WAMM, 612-827-5364.

United National Antiwar Coalition Conference: Say No! To the NATO / G8 Wars & Poverty Agenda: March 23-25, Stamford Hilton Hotel, CT (just one Metro North train stop from NYC) Plan peaceful, legal actions to protest NATO/G8 Summit in May and further actions against the program of endless war of the global elite. Activists from the occupy movements, and the antiwar, social justice and environmental movements. Workshops. Registration: www.unacpeace.org.


Additional upcoming events are listed at www.worldwidewamm.org, or you may call the WAMM office for more information: 612-827-5364. Other peace and justice events can be found on Minnesota Alliance for Peacemakers at www.mapm.org.
The U.S. Challenges China: Three Responses

by Polly Mann

President Obama has announced that United States foreign policy focus will shift to the Asia-Pacific region, as troops begin to leave Iraq and Afghanistan. He promised to expand U.S. influence and “project power and deter threats to peace” in that part of the world. The following are a synopsis, excerpt, and translated reprint of three articles sent from Minnesota-born French journalist Diana Johnstone. It is interesting to see what Chinese analysts say, and observe that the most pessimistic view of future China/U.S. relations is that of the American correspondent, Stephen Glass. (Note: all articles in the WAMM newsletter are generally original but occasionally it is believed that it is important to include material that may not have been accessed by our readers.)—Polly Mann


As U.S. troops leave Iraq and Afghanistan, the Pentagon has been planning to contest its largest creditor, China. The Pentagon is seeking to adapt a concept known as AirSeaBattle, a vehicle for conforming U.S. military power to address threats in the Western Pacific and the Persian Gulf—code word for challenging China and Iran. Another important concept (This one waiting in the wings for twenty years.) is found in the 1992 Defense Planning Guidance that precluded the rise of any “peer competitor” that might challenge U.S. dominance worldwide and “that is exactly what China appears to be doing in the South China Sea.” Marine Corps Commandant Gen Jim Amos last May remarked that the wars in the Persian Gulf were denying Washington the resources needed to cope with an increasingly assertive China.

A U.S. mobilization in Asia is now well underway. A spring 2001 Pentagon study, “Asia 2025,” identified China as a “persistent competitor of the U.S. bent on foreign military adventurism.” Similarly, the 2008 nuclear energy cooperation deal signed by the U.S. and India was an obvious containment maneuver aimed at Beijing. In March of 2011, the press reported a major buildup of U.S. forces in Asia as the Pentagon transforms Guam into its primary hub in the Pacific.

Meanwhile Beijing identifies the U.S. as an outright threat. The 2007 destruction of a U.S. weather satellite with a ballistic missile was a warning to Washington along with the ramming six years earlier of a U.S. spy plane by a Chinese fighter jet off the coast of Hainan Island. Vietnam, Brunei, Taiwan, Malaysia and the Philippines, in addition to China, have claims on several clusters of South China Sea islands. Rather than intervening with diplomacy, the U.S. has sided against Beijing. In late July, three U.S. Navy ships called on Vietnam and held a week-long joint exercise, prompting a formal protest from the Chinese. This was followed by a statement of Secretary of State Hillary Clinton (then in Manila) assuring her hosts that the U.S. would honor its mutual defense pact with the Philippines and sell it new weaponry on discounted terms.

Inside the Pentagon Andrew Krepinevich, head of Washington’s Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments said that China is jostling for control off the Western Pacific, and “We have to decide whether we’re going to compete or not. If we’re not, then we have to be willing to accept the shift in the military balance. Otherwise, the question is how to compete effectively.”


“As China’s economy grows ever stronger, market competition with the United States does likewise. I am a political realist and a student of Chinese history and believe that China’s rise does challenge the United States. Both governments must

continued on page 8
Trading Places
China’s trade with India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan and Vietnam is increasing at a far faster rate than that of the U.S. . . . Even Australia, the anchor and linchpin of the U.S. military thrust in Asia, is heavily dependent on mineral exports to China . . . The US economy is in no condition to replace China as a market for Asian or Australian commodity and manufacturing exports. The Asian countries must be acutely aware that there is no future advantage in tying themselves to a declining, highly militarized, empire.


Too Big to Fail?
The People’s Republic of China gained admission to United Nations in 1971 and became a permanent member of the UN Security Council. China is also a member of numerous formal and informal multilateral organizations, including the World Trade Organization (WTO), Asian-Pacific Economic Cooperation forum (APEC), an international organisation of leading emerging economies; Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS), the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation and the G-20.

How Many?
The People’s Republic of China and the U.S. are very close in size, each containing approximately 3.7 million square miles of land mass, but China has the largest population in the world with more 1.3 billion citizens, whereas the U.S. has 312 million people.

understand that political leadership, rather than throwing money at problems, will determine who wins the race for global supremacy.

“Most people wrongly believe that China can improve its foreign relations only by significantly increasing economic aid. . . . it’s hard to buy affection; such ‘friendship’ does not stand the test of difficult times. How then can China win people’s hearts across the world? China must shift its priorities from economic development to establishing a harmonious society free of huge gaps between rich and poor. It must display humane authority to compete with the U.S., the world’s pre-eminent hegemonic power, where military strength underpins hegemony. President Obama has made strategic mistakes in Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya but, nevertheless, has been successful in leading three foreign wars simultaneously, whereas China has had no war since 1984 with Vietnam and very few of its high-ranking officers or soldiers have any battlefield experience. The U.S. has better relations with the rest of the world than China; the U.S. has more than 50 formal military allies while China has none. North Korea and Pakistan are only quasi-allies.

“To shape a friendly international environment, Beijing must develop more high-quality, diplomatic and military relationships than Washington. In order to achieve that goal, China has to provide higher-quality moral leadership than the U.S. China must also recognize that it is a rising power and assume concomitant responsibilities as the U.S. has in Europe and the Persian Gulf. China needs to create regional security arrangements with surrounding countries and draw on its tradition of meritocracy. Top government officials should be chosen for their virtue and wisdom—not simply technical and administrative ability.

“Over the next decade China’s new leaders will come from a generation that experienced the hardships of the Cultural Revolution: resolute and more likely to value political principles than material benefits. They must play a larger role on the world stage and offer more security and economic support to less powerful countries. This will mean competing with the U.S. politically, economically and technologically. This may cause diplomatic tensions, but there is little danger of military clashes such as that between the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Neither China nor the U.S. needs proxy wars to protect its strategic interests or to gain access to natural resources and technology.

“China’s quest to enhance its world leadership status and the United States’ effort to maintain its present position is a zero-sum game. The battle for people’s hearts and minds will determine who eventually prevails.”


The U.S. has proclaimed its return to the Asia-Pacific region by expanding its strategic deployment with an apparent aim to suppress China. In doing so they make three critical mistakes, which follow:

1. China is not America’s enemy. When George W. Bush became president in 2001, he regarded China as a major adversary. After September 11, 2011, the U.S. realized that Al-Qaeda terrorists, rather than China, were the most dangerous enemy of the U.S. The emergence of China as a major power may offend the hegemonic consciousness of some Americans but it will not threaten their lives.

continued on page 9

Map: CIA
Heavily traveled and with vast oil and natural gas reserves within it, the South China Sea is bordered by China, Vietnam, the Philippines and Indonesia.
2. The Asia-Pacific region should not be a central part of U.S. security strategy. The core interests of the U.S. lie in its national security. It can and should see the region as a hub for economic cooperation and development. It was quick to deploy forces to Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya. However it left more problems than it solved. It is unlikely to be able to withdraw very soon. Compared with terrorists, the Asia-Pacific region poses a much smaller threat. U.S. interests concern mainly the safety of sea lanes and U.S. allies—neither more important than its own national security. Taking this into consideration the U.S. should rethink the main objectives of its security strategy.

3. Containment policies won’t defeat China. The U.S. “return to Asia” strategy could potentially ignite conflict at the wrong time, with the wrong enemy for the wrong reasons. In the post-Cold War era, mutually beneficial cooperation has prevailed over containment and suppression. However, the U.S. is still urging Cold War techniques to fight an imaginary enemy. The U.S. has [in the past] adopted containment policies against China since 1949 when it was established, excluding it from membership of the United Nations and then the World Trade Organization. The U.S. still has an arms and high-tech embargo on China. Nevertheless, China has grown to be the world’s second largest economy and a superpower. The U.S., as well as the other Asian countries, should give up containment and begin to cooperate with China.

U.S. risks repeat of the 9/11 tragedy. When U.S. withdrew from Vietnam after the war there, it gave up control over the Asia-Pacific region. The present economic crisis with its permanently high unemployment and the threat of terrorism at home and abroad means the U.S. should shift its attention from the South China Sea and the Asia-Pacific region and deal with threatening terrorism at home. Since China doesn’t harm U.S. interests, the U.S. has no reason to suppress it. In shifting its attention to the Asia-Pacific it risks its own national security. In short, it is not America’s enemies but rather America’s decision that will lead to its decline.
END WAR!
SAVE MILLIONS OF LIVES
AND BILLIONS OF DOLLARS!

WAMM’s Sixth Annual Valentine’s Party:

Love, not War

Saturday, February 11 • 7– 9 p.m.
Polly Mann’s Party Room,
1425 West 28th St., Minneapolis

This Valentine’s Party is for every kind
of love and passion for anything or being.
- Lots of fun, all are welcome!
- Wine, coffee, hors d’oeuvres
- Peace-loving (but lively) company
- Suggested Donation: $10-$25

Can’t make the party? Send a valentine to
WAMM and help us create love, not war,
in the world! Cut along the dotted line and
mail to: WAMM, 310 E. 38th Street,
Suite 222, Minneapolis, MN 55409.
FFI: Call WAMM 612-827-5364.

Are you one who goes
the distance,
at making love and war resistance?
Then come party with us,
at WAMM’s insistence!

With love from:
Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________