



BLIND SPOT

<http://ontario.indymedia.org/blindspot> — a production of the Kitchener-Waterloo Independent Media Centre

Make love, not war

In honour of the victims, let's not kill any more innocent people

Horror has hit home in the United States. On September 11, Americans and people all over the world witnessed a numbing display of violence as first one hijacked plane, then another, slammed into the twin towers of the World Trade Center, triggering their collapse.

The Pentagon in Washington, D.C. was attacked in a similar manner and a fourth hijacked plane also went down in a crash.

Office workers, airline passengers and crew, and rescue workers were all innocent victims killed in this unthinkable act. New

Workers breathing in the asbestos and other chemicals released into the air by the levelled buildings are also victims, as are all others affected somehow by these attacks.

However, were you to ask any of those killed in the attacks or those who were first-hand witnesses to the complete scale of death and destruction, a common theme might emerge: that they wouldn't wish this type of evil on anyone, even their worst enemies.

Yet in the emotional aftermath of these attacks, we stand on the brink of bringing even more death and destruction onto more

innocent people.

U.S. President George Bush has declared war on terrorism. The U.S. Senate and Congress have offered unanimous backing and \$40 billion (US\$) to fight this "unconventional" war. NATO is also 100 percent onside.

Violence will not win the war against terrorism. Violence will only lead to more violence and will create more terrorists.

If you are opposed to more senseless violence, speak up. Protest for peace, phone your government representative, let the world know that we need to take a different tack.

Why did they do it?

The big question, besides who did it, is why did they do it?

There are many people around the world who hate the United States. As a result of employing their economic and military might to impose their will on situations across the world, the United States has made many enemies.

However, there was probably more behind this attack than plain revenge. A group that could

pull off such a well-coordinated undertaking could certainly foresee that the States would react strongly. Were these attacks launched to provoke some sort of response? What type?

It is important to understand what goals these attacks could further. If we can understand what those responsible were ultimately hoping to accomplish, we may be better able to make sure that doesn't happen.

Media propaganda machine firing on all cylinders

The government of a country needs the support of its people in order to wage a war of any sort. A main avenue for securing that support is through the media.

The vast majority of the news media in the western world are owned by a handful of corporations that serve the interests of those in power. They are very selective in the news and views they offer to the public for consumption, and can be very effective at shaping public opinion.

Past times of war have given us lessons to study in the types of propaganda that are used to shore up support for 'necessary action.'

Much of what has been offered since these attacks has been justification for war. Not much has questioned the need for military action.

However, there is a growing oppositional movement to the corporately-controlled media, as the web sites featured on the back of this page, and this paper itself, attest to.

Hatred, racist sentiment rise to surface after attacks

While many white people in America and Canada believe that racism is not a problem, those who are not white are much less likely to deny its existence.

Muslims and 'Muslim-like' peoples have reason to fear for their safety as people target them and their communities with threats and acts of violence.

Racism has always been a problem, and at times of extreme emotion things can get ugly. Es-

pecially when a media industry feeds off stereotypes and fuels hatred towards cultural groups.

Aside from a world war, this may be the most negative aftershock from the attacks. When people, who have done nothing wrong, must fear for their safety and are subject to indiscriminate hatred simply because of their culture, something is terribly wrong. Not that it was perfect before, but now it's a lot worse.

A double standard?

While there was almost universal declaration of grief for the innocent victims of the attacks and a united condemnation of the attacks and all terrorism, much has been left unsaid.

The United States has declared war on terrorism, but has not admitted any responsibility for its own conduct in that area.

If terrorism were to be defined as the direct and deliberate attacks on civilian targets for political purposes, then the U.S. can be seen as one of the most violent

terrorists of the world.

As they declare war on terrorism, it is up to the international community to try and come to a consensus on what terrorism is. This is the only way to ensure that a "war on terrorism" is not waged in a politically-motivated, selective manner.

As well, we must not condemn the murder of innocent Americans, then turn around and murder innocent civilians of other countries. American lives are not more valuable than other lives.

The war against the war, fought with words — excerpts:

From www.zmag.org

On the bombings

by Noam Chomsky

We have a choice. We can express justified horror; we can seek to understand what may have led to the crimes . . . we can do no better, I think, than to listen to the words of Robert Fisk . . . he writes that "this is not the war of democracy versus terror that the world will be asked to believe in the coming days. It is also about American missiles smashing into Palestinian homes and US helicopters firing missiles into a Lebanese ambulance in 1996 and American shells crashing into a village called Qana and about a Lebanese militia — paid and uniformed by America's Israeli ally — hacking and raping and murdering their way through refugee camps." And much more.

The belly to do what needs to be done

by Tamin Ansary

We're flirting with a world war between Islam and the West. And guess what: that's Bin Laden's program. That's exactly what he wants. That's why he did this. Read his speeches and statements. It's all right there . . . he figures if he can polarize the world into Islam and the West, he's got a billion soldiers. If the west wreaks a holocaust in those lands, that's a billion people with nothing left to lose, that's even better from Bin Laden's point of view.

Bombs away!

The unseen war on America

by John McMurtry

— article ID# 1787 —

One would be naive to think the Bush Jr. faction and its oil, military-industrial and Wall Street backers who had stolen an election with its man rated in office by the majority of Americans as a "failure" on the economy (a Netscape poll taken off the screen when the planes hit the towers), and more deplored by the rest of the world as a deep danger to the global environment and the international rule of law, do not benefit astronomically from this mass-kill explosion. If there was a wish-list, it is all granted by this numbing turn of events. Americans are diverted from a free-falling economy to attack

America under attack

by Danny Schechter

The reporting focused first on the facts . . . And then the parade of "expert" interviews began, featuring virtually the same group of former government officials and terrorism specialists on each show . . .

I heard no one saying that violence breeds violence or that a massive retaliation may only invite more of the same. The only critical edge to the coverage involved raising the question about why so many official predictions about imminent terrorist threats went unresponded to for so long. These concerns were raised, but quickly sidelined . . . How the U.S. intelligence apparatus could have missed this was taken only as evidence that it needs more money, not a different policy . . .

Suddenly, we had moved from the stage of facts to the realm of opinion and endless speculation about what America would do and, then, what America MUST do . . .

There was virtually no international angle offered in most of the coverage except a few snatches of file footage of Osama Bin Laden fondling an AK47. Bin Laden looked like a cartoon figure, like Ali Baba in cartoons from my youth.

From
ontario.indymedia.org

another foreign Satan, while the Bush regime's popularity climbs. The military, the CIA and every satellite armed security apparatus have more money and power than ever, and become as dominant as they can over civilians in "the whole new era" now being declared by the White House. The anti-missile plan to rule the skies is now exonerated (if irrelevantly so), and Israel's apartheid civil war is vindicated at the same time. Even the surgingly popular "anti world-trade" movement is now associated with foreign terrorists blowing up the World Trade Centre.

The more you review the connections and the sweeping lapse of security across so many co-ordinates, the more the lines of force point backwards.

Why I will not rally around the president

by Paul Jensen

When we speak out against war in public, we will find support, but we also should expect hostility. We should expect the question posed by one of the people who wrote to condemn me: "Whose side are you on?"

The answers to that are simple:

I am on the side of the people — no matter where they live — who will suffer the violence, not the leaders — no matter where they live — who will plan it.

I am on the side of peace, not war.

I am on the side of justice, not vengeance.

And most important, I am on the side of hope, not despair.

We do not have the luxury of despair right now. There is too much at stake for too many people.

A unanimous triumph for masters of war

by Norman Solomon

On Sept. 14, the Senate voted 98-0 for a war resolution. It says: "The president is authorized to use all necessary and appropriate force against those nations, organizations, or persons he determines planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on Sept. 11, 2001, or harbored such organizations or persons, in order to prevent any future acts of international terrorism against the United States by such nations, organizations or persons."

This resolution, written as a blank check, is payable with vast quantities of human corpses.

Truth in Terror & in War

by Paul D. Boin

— article ID# 1793 —

In reacting to last weeks events Thomas Homer Dixon, Director of the University of Toronto's Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, stated "We have to step back and reflect on what's happening in the world that is leading to the kind of tensions that produce this kind of hatred against the west...There are disparities in this world, there are structural problems with the world economy that aren't being addressed. The envy, the frustration, and the anger that arises out of those problems will be directed against us." Homer Dixon goes on to say "We have to remember....this is a very small planet now...they can bring weapons everywhere. And other things like diseases, and pollution flow across boundaries. We have to recognize that the world has changed in a fundamental respect." {CBC Radio 2001}

"If they make us all panic then they can start martial law," from the song Propaganda, by Dead Prez