“America First” in Latin America

by Gary Prevost

Many of Latin America’s progressive governments are now in retreat. In this scenario, what do the Trump administration’s Latin American policies look like? They are a combination of his neo-isolationist “America First” approach to the wider world combined with a right-wing agenda on issues like immigration, as well as continuing bipartisan consensus on issues like regime change and fighting drug trafficking.

Trump’s policies on immigration to the U.S. from Mexico and Central America—policies fiercely opposed by civil society in both Mexico and the U.S.—fall within his “America First” agenda, as do his trade policies. With the support of the highest level of U.S. finance capital, his trade policies have included an insistence on renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) on the dubious grounds that it had unfairly benefited Mexico and Canada. In the hope of executing regime change, the Trump administration is making efforts to mobilize conservative Latin American governments like Brazil, Argentina, and Colombia to place pressure on the Venezuelan government. Also, Trump has initiated
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Art created on the border wall for Día de los Muertos in 2012, commemorating the deaths of immigrants attempting to cross from Mexico to the U.S. Photo: TV Azteca
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One important starting point for understanding certain aspects of Trump’s Latin American policies, especially on trade and immigration, is to unpack his neo-isolationist “America First” world outlook.1

Trump draws these ideas from Steven Bannon, an early Trump confidant who served as a formal adviser in the White House before resigning. The ideas can best be described as “economic nationalism” with strong overtones of racism and xenophobia. The outlook is one of anti-globalization with a fundamental distrust of multilateral, global institutions ranging from the UN to the World Bank to the World Trade Organization to multinational trade agreements. While the Trump administration may be unlikely to withdraw the U.S. from any of these institutions and agreements other than NAFTA, it prefers bilateral deals where the more powerful U.S. presumably has the upper hand to get the most concessions possible from a trade agreement with an individual country.

This perspective fits especially well with President Trump’s belief that his strongest asset is his deal making. Trump’s aversion to multilateral negotiating forums was demonstrated by his last-minute withdrawal from the Summit of the Americas meeting in Peru in April 2018 and the fact that one of his first acts as president in January 2017 was to declare that he was prepared to walk away from NAFTA unless there could be a significant renegotiation of terms more favorable to the U.S. His demands on NAFTA, which have resulted in long and arduous trilateral negotiations as of this writing, are being concluded as the U.S., Mexico and Canada Agreement (UMCA).2 [Update: It’s reported that leaders of all three countries are prepared to sign the agreement in November. Congress must then ratify it, but is not likely to consider it till 2019.]

Another part of Trump’s economic nationalism, the imposition of tariffs on a wide range of goods imported into the U.S., has emerged front and center in 2018. These tariff disputes have focused more on China and Europe, but within Latin America they have put the U.S. at odds with Brazil and succeeded in complicating already difficult trade negotiations with Mexico, in particular.

Mexico and Central America: Walling Out Our Humanity

Trump’s America First agenda has also been central to his policies regarding immigration to the U.S. from Mexico and Central America, particularly Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. During his campaign for the presidency, Trump made immigration from Mexico a major issue. He declared that Mexico was sending “bad people” to the U.S., primarily rapists and drug dealers, and that previous administrations, especially that of Barack Obama, had done nothing to “protect America.” As the centerpiece of his strategy to deal with the perceived problem, Trump proposed to build a permanent wall on the U.S.-Mexican border from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean.

Trump’s hard-line stance on immigration was not decisive in his election victory, but his arguments did gain some traction in white working-class communities where drug addiction, especially opioids, was a serious problem. Down to the present, neither the reality that the drug problems in the U.S. did not primarily emanate from Mexico nor that the building of the wall is largely impractical have stopped the Trump
administration and most officeholders and candidates on the right from embracing the xenophobic position on immigration.

The changing character of immigration across the U.S. southern border has kept the issue of immigration at the center of public attention for several years going back to the Obama administration.

The major economic downturn in the U.S. from 2007 onward dramatically slowed the migration of Mexicans to the U.S. as the job openings that had spurred the migration from the early 1990s disappeared. However, a new form of immigration to the border became prominent during the Obama years, driven primarily by gang-related violence that was ravaging El Salvador,
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We, the people of the U.S., are painfully aware of how our government has heartlessly separated children from their parents at the border. And we who are against military madness are also painfully aware of the “collateral damage” done with U.S. manufactured drones and bombs as they deprive children in other countries of life, itself.

Less evident and quite insidious are other ways of depriving children. They include depriving them of basic needs at birth. And it’s done again by our own U.S. government—under our name and with our tax dollars.

One particularly heinous way of harming children is to deprive them of their own mothers’ milk. Breastfeeding for six months to two years of a child’s life provides the strongest foundation of health. But, at the behest of the $70 billion U.S. infant formula manufacturing business, the U.S. government delegation to the World Health Assembly worked to discourage breast feeding around the world.

According to reports, countries were threatened with disadvantageous trade agreements and other forms of retaliation if they introduced an expected, standard resolution promoting breastfeeding. Our government made these threats at the World Health Assembly, the decision-making body of the World Health Organization (WHO), when it met in Geneva last summer. A resolution to protect children’s health was eventually introduced by Russia, a country powerful enough to stand up to the U.S., but all the same our government representatives to the assembly succeeded in having this language removed from the resolution: “protect, promote and support breastfeeding” and “restricting the promotion of food products that have a deleterious effect on young children.”

Along with processed foods, infant formula is being marketed in poorer nations as more U.S. mothers are able to breastfeed with workplaces accommodating them.

Mothers fortunate enough to find a woman friendly workplace aside, our nation now has characteristics of poorer nations, which result in the health of many children put at risk. That’s a reason why, this year, Rev. Barber and Rev. Liz Theoharis launched the nationwide Poor People’s Campaign. They decried:

The richest 1% in our country own more wealth than the entire bottom 90% combined, tightening their grip on political power to shape labor, tax, healthcare and campaign finance policies that benefit the few at the expense of the many. A full 60% more Americans now live below the official poverty line than in 1968, and 43% of all American children now live below the minimum income level considered necessary to meet basic family needs.

In response to this unacceptable situation, the two reverends call for a moral revival with their announcement of “the Moral Agenda to demand a massive overhaul of the nation’s voting right laws, new programs to lift up 140 million Americans living in poverty, immediate attention to ecological devastation and measures to curb militarism.”

As a woman against military madness, I’m especially glad to see the issue of curbing militarism addressed. In 2017, 53 cents of every federal discretionary dollar went to the military while only 15 cents was spent on anti-poverty programs. This situation is what is depriving children! Think of how children could benefit if the numbers were reversed—children in the U.S. could be provided for, Homeland Security could have its funds cut, ICE could be abolished, and many children in other countries where the U.S. wages war might still be alive!

Polly Mann is a founder of Women Against Military Madness, a regular columnist and contributor to this newsletter.
The Yemeni archipelago of Socotra in the Indian Ocean is located some 80 kilometers off the Horn of Africa and 380 kilometers South of the Yemeni coastline… Socotra is at the crossroads of the strategic naval waterways of the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. It is of crucial importance to the U.S. military.

Among Washington’s strategic objectives is the militarization of major sea ways. This strategic waterway links the Mediterranean to South Asia and the Far East, through the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden.

It is a major transit route for oil tankers. A large share of China’s industrial exports to Western Europe transits through this strategic waterway. Maritime trade from East and Southern Africa to Western Europe also transits within proximity of Socotra (Suqutra), through the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea. – Michel Chossudovsky, “Yemen and The Militarization of Strategic Waterways: Securing U.S. Control over Socotra Island and the Gulf of Aden,” Global Research, June 13, 2018; first published February 7, 2010

In addition to the Suez Canal, there are two significant choke points (narrow waterways, or straits) that oil tankers and trade ships can pass through connecting the Middle East with other parts of the world: Iran’s Strait of Hormuz and Yemen’s Strait of Bab Al-Mandeb. Iranian-American geopolitical analyst/peace proponent Soraya Sepahpour, who has long been noticing British and U.S. plans for alternatives to Iranian oil, observed that “control of Bab Al-Mandeb would diminish the strategic importance of the Strait of Hormuz in case of war.”* She states that geopolitical researcher Mahdi Darius Nazemroaya’s assessment was correct in his 2015 article, “The Geopolitics Behind the War in Yemen: The Start of a New Front Against Iran,” (Strategic Culture Foundation) in which he reiterates the significance of the area’s water routes and asserts that: “Bab Al-Mandeb is an important strategic chokepoint for international maritime trade and energy shipments…it is just as important as the Suez Canal…”


The U.S.-supported Saudi war on Yemen is causing widespread starvation and cholera for those able to survive massive amounts of death and infrastructure destruction. Source: UNICEF figures September 14, 2018. Image: Al Jazeera.
Solidarity Among People: A Response to Israel’s New Nation-State Law

Aida Touma-Sliman, a Palestinian member of the Israeli Knesset, spoke at the UN and on a tour of the U.S. sponsored by U.S. Peace Council. Born in Nazareth, to a Christian Palestinian family, she currently lives in the Mediterranean coastal city of Acre. She was the first female member of the High Follow-Up Committee for Arab Citizens of Israel and co-founded the International Women’s Commission for a Just Palestinian-Israeli Peace.

Synopsis of a talk sponsored by Women Against Military Madness in Minneapolis, August 26, 2018.

While Aida was speaking in the U.S., the Israeli ambassador to the UN claimed that she was giving Israel a bad name in the world. Aida’s response is that, as much as she can say, she could never compete with Israel’s right-wing government in giving Israel a bad name.

She went on to explain that just as Trump does not represent everyone in the U.S., Israel’s prime minister, Netanyahu, and the right-wing government do not represent all of Israel. The four Palestinian political parties: Communists, Islamists, liberals, and nationalists, in spite of their different ideological backgrounds, formed a block to gain representation in the Knesset (Israel’s parliament). Aida therefore represents 20% of the citizens of Israel – that is, she said, “Palestinians who stayed in their homeland, Palestinians who managed not to be deported, who managed not to be thrown out of their homeland, and managed to grow in numbers.” But she made clear that she represents Jewish citizens, as well. She continued, “I’m also representing the Jewish democracy forces who are interested to be partners in Israel for creating a different situation for the two people in that homeland.”

The new Jewish Nation State Law is “suppose to segregate Jews and Arabs.” But it has brought many together. When the new law was passed, Jewish citizens of Israel marched with Palestinians on the streets of Tel Aviv in protest because “they want to live in a normal state that is democratic, that is equal, and that is not practicing occupation anymore.” The protesters – 60,000 in number on August 11 – were evidence that “we [Palestinians] are not speaking about ourselves only. We are speaking in the name of those who refuse this new reality [the Jewish only state described in the new law.] This law is intolerable to many and exists “more for the fanatic right wing, racist government who is ruling this country and not for the two people who are living there and the citizens of the country.”

This new law wipes out democracy and equality and establishes that Israel belongs only to Jews!

Aida’s speech is peppered with dark humor and irony because the internationally illegal Jewish-only settlements on Palestinian land are declared legal, but only under Israeli law. Regarding Palestinians, she says: “This is not our homeland, this is not our place. We are by chance there, you know.”

This law was passed at the unusual hour of five o’clock on July 19, 2018, in the Knesset as one of Israel’s Basic Laws. In its seventy years of existence, Israel never established a constitution. Instead it is governed by a series of laws called Basic Law. These laws avoid defining the borders of Israel and therefore allow for the development of Jewish-only settlements on land that Arabs have been driven from. Discourse on borders confuse the land of Israel and the state of Israel. It erases the narrative of the indigenous Palestinian people who have existed in the land and claim it as their homeland.

With this new law, Netanyahu’s government ended the contradiction between Israel being both democratic and Jewish. Palestinian Knesset members combed through the text of the 2018 version of this law when it passed and found that Article 7 of the law “says very clearly that developing and building Jewish settlements is a national value.” The minute that the law established the Jewish-only settlements as a national value, then confiscation of land, moving people from their land, and demolishing their villages – things that were occurring regularly anyway – were encouraged under law and “the superiority of one group over the other is understood.” The new law stripped away any pretense of democracy and equality under the law. People can go to the Israeli Supreme Court and find discrimination upheld as law.

Aida addressed objections that some people have about interfering in the internal affairs of an independent sovereign state: As soon as you start to mix the external issue
of the Occupied Territories with the internal government of Israel, it is not an internal issue? The day before Aida spoke in Minneapolis, Israeli Minister of Education Naftali Bennett, a right-wing settlement promoter, had just celebrated at an illegal Jewish-only settlement on Palestinian-owned land. He gloated about the possibility of integrating the Palestinian territories, occupied since 1967 by the Israeli military, into the state of Israel: “We managed to change the discourse that is existing from a discourse of two states to a discourse of regaining our homeland, meaning the West Bank and Gaza.”

Another effect of the law, Aida said, is the “unification of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, including East Jerusalem, which is by international law an occupied territory, along with the West Bank and Gaza.” U.S. President Trump’s daughter Ivanka and her husband Jared Kushner, were main participants in the presentation ceremony, with Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu, when the U.S. declared that Jerusalem is the capital of Israel.

When the Israeli government speaks of “disengagement” of the Occupied Territories, it does not signal intent for Israel to withdraw its military forces – rather it signals intent to disengage Palestinian areas from one another and claim them for the official state of Israel. Israel is attempting to negotiate with Hamas in an effort to divide Gaza from other Palestinian areas.

But Palestinian cultural identity is strengthened in the struggle. In defiance of Hebrew being declared the official language of Israel, Arabs are declaring the year of Arabic language in schools. Arabic authorities will promote local bills and laws to display Arabic-only signs in towns and villages.

Aida asked for solidarity from the international community. “I’m not calling for troops to come to Israel. I’m like you – women against militarization. But for sure I am calling for a political position by the international community of what is happening and what is going to be established. In my opinion this law is not only a colonial law but it is officially a declaration of the establishment of an apartheid regime in Israel.”

“Our struggle is going to segregate the democratic forces of the Palestinians and the Jews from the fascist right-wing forces whoever they are. It’s not going to be only a struggle on a national basis – it’s going to be a struggle that unites all people against fascists.” Though she is returning home under threat of expulsion from the Knesset for speaking out at the UN and throughout the U.S., she said she is returning home energized by the support and solidarity she received, but cautioned that the news back home is of daily incidents of Arabs being threatened, attacked, and killed. And the settlement building continues. “We are in front of a long, terrible struggle…we still need you. It doesn’t end today.”

In conclusion, she said that Trump and his administration support Netanyahu unlimitedly and Netanyahu and his government support Trump so whenever the Palestinians struggle, it is your struggle and whenever you struggle, it is our struggle and we all help each other.

1. For news coverage in Israel, see “Tens of Thousands Gather in Tel Aviv for Nation-State Law Protest Led by Arab Israelis.” Haaretz. August 11, 2018. TinyURL.com/ydh7w6fh. Palestinians and Jews are the majority of the two peoples living in Israel but a vocal Druid minority is also affected by the new law.

A Warming Trend Goes Cold

The Trump administration entered office in January 2017 in the midst of what was a two-year opening toward Cuba negotiated by the Obama administration that had seen the upgrading of diplomatic relations, the signing of numerous bilateral agreements in areas ranging from the environment to law enforcement, and a relaxation of rules on U.S. citizen travel to the island that resulted in more than one million U.S. citizens, mostly non-Cuban-Americans, visiting in 2016.

Trump ordered a review of U.S. policy toward the island, and it was obvious to most Cuba observers that a policy change was in the offing. Candidate Trump had signaled such a change during the latter stages of his campaign in a visit to Miami, and right-wing think tanks in various reports in 2016 had been critical of the Obama initiative and called for its reversal. While the policy review revealed support within the U.S. government bureaucracy for opening relations with Cuba, Trump in a speech in Miami’s Little Havana in June 2017 declared that he was reversing the Obama-negotiated opening. Surrounded by long-standing lawmakers and community members who favored pre-Castro Cuba, Trump revived the harsh Cold War rhetoric of previous decades and made clear that his administration did not accept the implicit legitimization of the current Cuban government forwarded by Obama. In its place, he renewed the U.S. commitment to regime change.

Interestingly, the formal policy changes that have been implemented since June 2017 have not fully matched the rhetoric of that speech. Full diplomatic relations have been retained and none of the agreements signed between 2014 and 2016 have been revoked, but there are significant changes under Trump: There are no ongoing negotiations for new agreements, and the U.S. government has dramatically decreased its staff in Havana over questionable accusations that Cuba targeted U.S. diplomats on the island with “sonic attacks.” As a result, no visa applications for Cubans to travel to or take up residency in the U.S. are being processed in Havana. The charges regarding sonic attacks also triggered U.S. State Department warnings about Cuba, thereby reducing U.S. travel to the island from mid-2017 onward. While the Trump administration may not have adopted all of the hopes of the right-wing Cuban community in the U.S., it has clearly stopped the momentum for achieving more normal relations.

Families in these countries, fearing that their children were being forced to enter the gangs as a means of survival, began to send their children northward to seek political asylum in the U.S. In Mexico there was a dramatic increase of children, some with parents and others without, coming to the U.S.-Mexico border.

Their arrival and presentation to border guards in a manner legal under both U.S. and international law overwhelmed the existing system of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Unable to detain children and their parents for the full time awaiting and during their asylum hearings, most children and their parents were released to relatives in the U.S. with the expectation that they would return to U.S. immigration courts for their hearings and, if denied asylum, be deported to their country of origin.

But because of the large backlog of cases, this meant that many would, at a minimum, be in the U.S. for a significant period and that some would not return for their hearings and would instead join the several million people in the U.S. without legal status residing in the U.S.

Almost immediately, conservative U.S. think tanks criticized the Obama administration’s approach, labeling it “catch and release.” Candidate Trump embraced their position and, once in office, crafted a new policy that was unveiled in 2018.

As a strategy of deterring the migration from Central America in particular, the Trump administration announced that children would be separated from their parents at the border. While the policy was supposed to apply only to those caught crossing the border illegally, in practice it was also applied to many presenting themselves at the border for asylum. By June 2018, the pushback against this policy became widespread among people in the U.S., including from within the ranks of conservatives, forcing a rare policy retreat from President Trump. However, in reversing the policy on family separation, the President reiterated that his overall stance on immigration remained in place, and he renewed his pressure on the U.S. Congress to fund his border wall proposal. [Update: In mid-October: the Trump admin. is reportedly developing a “family separation 2.0” policy.]
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in their tracks, reverting to the chilly relations of the second Bush administration.

Venezuela: U.S. Regime Change Heats Up Again

When the U.S. Department of National Intelligence was created after 9-11-2001, it formed a special task force on Cuba and Venezuela, the two countries in the region designated for regime change.

On some areas of policy in Latin America, the Trump administration, like Republican and Democratic administrations before it, is pursuing policies of continuity even if there may be nuanced differences. The best example of that is on the question of Venezuela. From the time of the late Hugo Chavez, Washington has treated the Venezuelan government with overt hostility. This was most clearly manifested in 2002 when the U.S. government under G.W. Bush backed a coup attempt — which failed — against the Venezuelan leader, who had proclaimed that he would pursue “21st century socialism” and was leading the Latin American opposition to the U.S.-backed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA).

It is worth noting that the Obama administration did not match its overt to Cuba with one aimed at Venezuela, and that throughout the Obama era diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Venezuela remained at a low level. The incoming Trump administration made no moves to change the long-standing hostility toward Venezuela, now headed by Nicolas Maduro. If anything, the Trump administration has stepped up its pressure for regime change. The administration has used the new conservative governments in Brazil and Argentina to break up previous Latin American unity that generally defended Venezuela from rhetorical attacks coming from Washington. In an even further indication of hostility, President Trump has threatened military action against Venezuela by having U.S. officials meet with dissident Venezuela military officers. U.S. officials have also explored the idea of boycotting Venezuelan oil coming into the U.S. market.10

Because the U.S. has been a major user of Venezuelan oil, that step has been avoided up until now. As of this writing it is not clear that the U.S. would institute a boycott or actually carry out military action against Venezuela, but it is clear that especially given Venezuela’s serious economic problems, Washington is not likely to let up the pressure anytime soon, leaving U.S.-Venezuelan policy in sync with its renewed hostility toward Cuba.

The arrival of the Trump administration to office represents continuity of foreign policy toward Latin America but with at least some rhetorical differences marking a transition from the previous administrations. The Middle East, North Korea, and the rise of China gained the greater foreign policy attention of the White House since 9-11-2001, and Latin America did not receive the priority it had in the decades of the 1980s and 1990s. The focus on Mexico has been mainly for U.S. domestic political differences. But for economic and strategic reasons, Latin America remains a region of significance to Washington.

In the U.S.: Viva la Resistance!

Grassroots resistance within the U.S. to Trump’s Latin America policies continues to be strong, both locally and nationally. On the national level the most significant organizing has centered around opposition to the administration’s xenophobic stance toward immigrants from Mexico and Central America. Immigrant rights groups, including in Minnesota, mobilized against the separation of children from their families at the border; a minor victory was won when the administration backed down from the most draconian aspects of the policy. The Alliance for Global Justice has mobilized efforts to push back against interventionist plans aimed at the governments of Venezuela and Nicaragua. In Minneapolis/St. Paul, the Minnesota Peace Action Coalition [Women Against Military Madness is a member.] and the Antiwar Committee have backed those efforts, while the Minnesota Cuba Committee continues its work against the blockade of Cuba.


Endnotes

America First in Latin America
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3. For details on Trump’s attacks on Mexico and Mexicans in the U.S., see Katie Reilly, “Here Are All the Times Donald Trump Insulted Mexico,” Time, August 31, 2016.


7. See Dara Lind, “Catch and Release” Explained: The Heart of Trump’s New Border Agenda, April 9, 2018, dara@vox.com
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Minnesota Immigrant Rights Action Committee (MIRAC)
Stands in solidarity with people of all races and nationalities. Supports end to bans, deportations, incarceration. Education, action. FFI: Facebook

The Interfaith Coalition on Immigration (ICOM)
Multi-cultural action in solidarity with immigrants and refugees to achieve justice and stand up to systems of oppression. Education, action.

Minnesota Cuba Committee:
Events, actions in the face of historic and ongoing U.S. intervention. Supports normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations and an immediate end to the U.S. embargo and travel ban. Member National Network on Cuba. Minnesotacubacommittee.org
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**Wamm Calendar**

Please note that Wamm’s provision of information on other groups’ 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 Events**

**Peace Vigils**

**Vigil to End War**  
Every Wednesday, from 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. Lake Street/ Marshall Avenue Bridge. Signs available on St. Paul side. Brief circle up for announcements after the vigil on St. Paul side. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Vigil to End the Occupation of Palestine**  
Every Friday, 4:30 to 5:30 p.m. corner of Summit Avenue and Snelling Avenue, St. Paul. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Peace Vigil**  
Every Tuesday, 5:00 to 6:00 p.m. on the east side of the Franklin Avenue Bridge, Minneapolis. Sponsored by: Prospect Hill Neighbors for Peace. FFI: Call 612-379-7398.

**Grandmothers for Peace Vigil**  
Every Wednesday, 4:45 to 5:45 p.m. 50th Street and Halifax (1 block west of France), Edina. FFI: Call Marian Wright 612-927-7607.

**Immigrant Solidarity Vigils**  
**Every Tuesday, 7:30 a.m.**  
Stand up for justice, say NO to family separation, deportation. Gather weekly with signs (bring your own or use one provided) at ICE entrance closest to Fort Snelling light rail station. Vigil on Minnehaha Ave., Minneapolis by the sign at the driveway entrance to ICE. Rain or shine. (If using GPS – 6000 Minnehaha Ave, Minneapolis). Info: Pepper 612-701-6963 or Mary Lou 612-280-0354.

**Second Tuesday of every month**  
Interfaith Coalition on Immigration (ICOM) gathers in solidarity with immigrants and refugees to achieve justice and stand up to systems of oppression. Vigil outside the Bishop Whipple Building, 1 Federal Drive, Fort Snelling. St. Paul. FFI: Facebook: Interfaith Coalition on Immigration (ICOM).

**Wamm Committee Meetings**

**Board Meeting**  
Third Tuesday of every month, 6:00 p.m. 4200 Cedar Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Book Club**  
Episcopal Senior Living Complex, Welcome Center, 1860 University Avenue West, St. Paul. Call Wamm for meeting time and date. FFI: Call 612-827-5364.

**End War**  
First Monday of every month, 6:00 p.m. 4200 Cedar Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Ground All Drones**  
Times/dates pending, 4200 Cedar Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Middle East**  
Second Monday of every month, 10:00 a.m. at Wamm, 4200 Cedar Avenue South, Suite 3, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**St. Joan of Arc/Wamm Peacemakers**  
Fourth Tuesday of every month, 7:00 to 8:00 p.m. St. Joan of Arc Church, Parish Center, 4537 Third Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Barbara 612-722-4444.

**Tackling Torture at the Top (T3)**  
Second Wednesday of every month, 10:00 a.m. 4200 Cedar Avenue South, Minneapolis. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364.

**Ongoing Events**

**People of Faith Peacemakers Breakfast**  
Second and fourth Wednesdays of every month, 8:00 to 9:30 a.m. African Development Center, Riverside and 20th Avenues South, Minneapolis. Peace with justice resource, support group. FFI: Visit justviewpoint.org or call 612-333-4772.

**Grandmothers for Peace**  
First Wednesday of every month, 12:45 p.m. Edina Public Library, 5280 Grandview Square, Edina. Justice issue programs for understanding our role in changing systems. FFI: Call 952-929-1566.

**Pax Salons**  
Every Tuesday, call for details and location. Small donations accepted. FFI: Call 651-227-3228.

**Middle East Peace Now**  
Usually second or third Saturday. Refreshments 9:30 a.m. Program 10:00 a.m. Location varies. FFI: Visit mepn.org.

**Wamm Second Monday Movies**  
Second Monday of every month, 7:00 p.m. 4200 Cedar Avenue South (enter on 42nd St.), Minneapolis. Projected on big screen. Free admission, popcorn. All welcome. Discussion follows film. FFI: Call Wamm 612-827-5364, or email wamm@mtn.org.

**Rikers: An American Jail**  
Monday, November 12, a riveting new award-winning documentary from Bill Moyers, brings you face to face with men and women who have endured incarceration at Rikers Island.

**Celebrate Polly Mann’s 99th Birthday!**  
November 17. See back of this newsletter.

**Special Events**

**Palestinians: Past, Present and Future**  
Saturday, November 3, 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at St. John’s Lutheran Church, 500 3rd St. West, Northfield, MN. Registration: $40; students: $10. Scholarships available. Tickets: tinyurl.com/y9w9z5q FFI: njpmn.org or email: info@njpmn. Sponsored by Northfielders for Justice in Palestine/Israel.

**The Day After**  
November 7. See back of this newsletter.

**Say No to U.S. Intervention in Venezuela: A Talk by Steve Ellner**  
Saturday, November 10, 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. at 4200 Cedar Ave W., Minneapolis. National speaking tour of Steve Ellner, professor, Universidad de Oriente, Venezuela. Co-sponsored by Anti-War Committee, MN Peace Action Coalition and Wamm. FFI: 612-827-5364.

**Reclaim Armistice Day: Day of Peace at Landmark Center**  
Sunday, November 11, 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., Landmark Center, 75 West Fifth St., St. Paul. Special program, speakers, storytelling. Sponsored by Veterans for Peace. Free. FFI: 612-827-5364.
Women Against Military Madness invites you to:

**The Day After**
Join us for an open discussion about **the election results**. What they mean? How do you feel about them? Are you happy? Mad? Mystified? All or none of the above. And, what’s next?

**Wednesday**
**November 7, 2018**
**6:00 p.m.**
Gather for complimentary pizza, wine, beer, and nonalcoholic beverages (donations appreciated but not mandatory).
**6:30 p.m.**
Open discussion

---

**WAMM FUN RAISER**
Join us in celebration of the 99th Birthday of WAMM co-founder Polly Mann

2:00-4:00 pm
Saturday, November 17, 2018
1425 West 28th Street Party Room

Bring your favorite stories about Polly to share!